

EX LIBRIS
LEO

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024 with funding from
No Sponsor

https://archive.org/details/catholicencyclop09char

The Catholic Encyclopedia

VOLUME NINE

Laprade–Mass

LEO

THE CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA

AN INTERNATIONAL WORK OF REFERENCE ON THE CONSTITUTION, DOCTRINE, DISCIPLINE, AND HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

EDITED BY
CHARLES G. HERBERMANN, PH.D., LL.D.
EDWARD A. PACE, PH.D., D.D. CONDÉ B. PALLEN, PH.D., LL.D.
THOMAS J. SHAHAN, D.D. JOHN J. WYNNE, S.J.
ASSISTED BY NUMEROUS COLLABORATORS

IN FIFTEEN VOLUMES
VOLUME IX

New York
ROBERT APPLETON COMPANY

Nihil Obstat, October 1, 1910

REMY LAFORT

CENSOR

FEB 15 1952

Imprimatur

✠ JOHN M. FARLEY

ARCHBISHOP OF NEW YORK

Copyright, 1910

By ROBERT APPLETON COMPANY

The articles in this work have been written specially for The Catholic Encyclopedia and are protected by copyright. All rights, including the right of translation and reproduction, are reserved.

Contributors to the Ninth Volume

AHERN, MICHAEL JOSEPH, S.J., Innsbruck, Austria: Lueger, Karl.

AHERNE, CORNELIUS, Rector, Professor of New Testament Exegesis, St. Joseph's College, Mill Hill, London: Luke, Gospel of Saint.

AIKEN, CHARLES F., S.T.D., Professor of Apologetics, Catholic University of America, Washington: Manu, The Laws of.

ALBERS, P., S.J., Maastricht, Holland: Lidwina, Saint.

ALBERT, F. X. E., Ph.D., Professor of Sacred Scripture, St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie, New York: Le Camus, Emile-Paul-Constant-Ange; Loaves of Proposition; Lot.

ÁLDÁSY, ANTAL, Ph.D., Archivist of the Library of the National Museum, Budapest: Margaret of Hungary, Blessed.

ALSTON, G. CYPRIAN, O.S.B., Downside Abbey, Bath, England: Llanthony Priory; Low Sunday.

AMADO, RAMÓN RUIZ, S.J., LL.D., Ph.L., Madrid: Leon, Diocese and Civil Province of.

ARENDZEN, J. P., Ph.D., S.T.D., M.A. (Cantab.), Professor of Sacred Scripture, St. Edmund's College, Ware, England: Manichæism; Marcellus of Ancyra; Marcionites; Marcosians; Marcus.

AUCLAIR, ELIE J., B.A., S.T.D., J.C.D., Professor at the University of Laval, Montreal, Canada: Mance, Jeanne.

AVELING, FRANCIS, S.T.D., London: Man.

AZEVEDO E CASTRO, JOÃO PAULINO D', Bishop of Macao, China: Macao, Diocese of.

BACCHUS, FRANCIS JOSEPH, B.A., The Oratory, Birmingham, England: Macarius, Saint; Macarius of Antioch.

BARNES, Mgr. ARTHUR STAPYLTON, M.A. (Oxon. and Cantab.), Cambridge, England: Lateran, Saint John.

BAUMGARTEN, PAUL MARIA, J.U.D., S.T.D., Domestic Prelate, Rome: Maestro di Camera del Papa; Majordomo; Marini, Luigi Gaetano.

BECHTEL, FLORENTINE, S.J., Professor of Hebrew and Sacred Scripture, St. Louis University, St. Louis, Missouri: Machabees, The; Machabees, The Books of; Manna.

BEECHER, PATRICK A., M.A., S.T.D., Professor of Pastoral Theology and Sacred Eloquence, Maynooth College, Dublin: MacCarthy, Nicholas Tuite.

BEMELMANS, JOHN, C.M., Ozone Park, New York: Mary, Missionaries of the Company of.

BENIGNI, UMBERTO, Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Pont. Collegio Urbano di Propaganda, Rome: Larino, Diocese of; Lecce, Diocese of; Leghorn, Diocese of; Leo XIII, Pope; Lippomano, Luigi; Litta, Alfonso and Lorenzo; Lodi, Diocese of; Lucca, Archdiocese of; Lucera, Diocese of; Luni-Sarzana-Brugnato, Diocese of; Macerata and Tolentino, United Sees of; Machiavelli, Nicolò; Maffei, Raffaelo; Magistris, Simone de; Manfredonia, Archdiocese of; Mantua, Diocese of; Margotti, Giacomo; Marsi, Diocese of; Marsico Nuovo and Potenza, Diocese of.

BERTRIN, GEORGES, Litt.D., Fellow of the University, Professor of French Literature, Institut Catholique, Paris: Le Sage, Alain-René; Lourdes, Notre Dame de; Maistre, Joseph-Marie, Comte de; Maistre, Xavier de.

BESSE, J. M., O.S.B., Director, "Revue Mabillon", Chevetogne, Belgium: Lérins, Abbey of.

BIHL, MICHAEL, O.F.M., Lector of Ecclesiastical History, Collegio San Bonaventura, Quaracchi, Florence: Leonard of Port Maurice, Saint; Macedo, Francisco; Magnus, Valerianus; Maillard, Olivier.

BONNEY, EDWIN, Professor and Librarian, St. Cuthbert's College, Ushaw, England: Lingard, John.

BOUDINHON, AUGUSTE-MARIE, S.T.D., D.C.L., Director, "Canoniste Contemporain", Professor of Canon Law, Institut Catholique, Paris: Law, Canon; Lay Confession; Majority; Mansi, Gian Domenico; Margaritæ.

BOYLAN, PATRICK, M.A., Professor of Sacred Scripture and Oriental Languages, Maynooth College, Dublin: Lefèvre de la Boderie, Guy.

BRANN, HENRY A., S.T.D., New York: McCloskey, William George.

BRANTS, VICTOR, J.C.D., Member of the Royal Academy of Belgium, Louvain: Louvain, University of.

BRASSINNE, JOSEPH, PH.D., LITT.D., FIRST ASSISTANT LIBRARIAN, UNIVERSITY OF LIÈGE, BELGIUM: Liège, Diocese of.

BRAUN, JOSEPH, S.J., BELLEVUE, LUXEMBURG: Mace; Maniple; Mantelletta; Manuterge.

BRÉHIER, LOUIS-RENÉ, PROFESSOR OF ANCIENT AND MEDIEVAL HISTORY, UNIVERSITY OF CLERMONT-FERRAND, PUY-DE-DÔME, FRANCE: La Valette, Jean Parisot de; Manuscripts; Manuscripts, Illuminated.

BRIDGE, JAMES, S.J., M.A. (OXON.), PROFESSOR OF PHILOSOPHY, STONYHURST COLLEGE, BLACKBURN, ENGLAND: Libellatici, Libelli; Lucy, Saint; Malebranche, Nicolas; Martyrs, Acts of the.

BROCK, HENRY M., S.J., ORE PLACE, HASTINGS, ENGLAND: Mann, Theodore Augustine.

BRUCKER, JOSEPH, S.J., EDITOR, "ETUDES" PARIS: Malabar Rites.

BURKE, EDMUND, B.A., INSTRUCTOR IN LATIN, COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK: Manutius, Aldus.

BURTON, EDWIN, S.T.D., F.R. HIST. SOC., VICE-PRESIDENT, ST. EDMUND'S COLLEGE, WARE, ENGLAND: Lawrence, Saint; Lichfield, Ancient Diocese of; Lincoln, Ancient Diocese of; Llandaff, Ancient Diocese of; London; Lucas, Frederick; Malmesbury, The Monk of; Marian Priests; Marshall, Thomas William.

BUTLER, RICHARD URBAN, O.S.B., DOWNSIDE ABBEY, BATH, ENGLAND: Laura; Lehnin, Abbey of; Luxeuil, Abbey of.

CABROL, FERNAND, O.S.B., ABBOT OF ST. MICHAEL'S, FARNBOROUGH, ENGLAND: Lauds.

CAMBOUÉ, PAUL, S.J., TANANARIVO, MADAGASCAR: Madagascar.

CANDIDE, FATHER, O.M.CAP., VICAR AND PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY, COLLEGE OF THE CAPUCHIN FATHERS, OTTAWA, CANADA: Lorenzo da Brindisi, Saint.

CAPES, FLORENCE MARY, LONDON: Mary Magdalen de' Pazzi, Saint.

CATHREIN, VICTOR, S.J., PROFESSOR OF MORAL PHILOSOPHY, ST. IGNATIUS COLLEGE, VALKENBURG, HOLLAND: Law.

CERRETTI, BONAVENTURE, S.T.D., J.U.D., LL.D., CENSOR OF THE THEOLOGICAL ACADEMY IN ROME, PRIVATE CHAMBERLAIN TO HIS HOLINESS, AUDITOR OF THE APOSTOLIC DELEGATION AT WASHINGTON, U. S. A.: Legate.

CHAMPON, LOUIS MARIE ABEL, S.J., LITT.L., ST. HÉLIER, JERSEY: La Rue, Charles de, S.J.

CHAPMAN, JOHN, O.S.B., B.A. (OXON.), PRIOR OF ST. THOMAS'S ABBEY, ERDINGTON, BIRMINGHAM, ENGLAND: Liberius, Pope.

CLEARY, GREGORY, O.F.M., S.T.L., J.U.L., PROFESSOR OF MORAL THEOLOGY AND CANON LAW, ST. ISIDORE'S COLLEGE, ROME: MacCaghwell, Hugh; Marchant, Peter.

CLEARY, HENRY W., S.T.D., BISHOP OF AUCKLAND, NEW ZEALAND: Lismore, Diocese of.

CLUGNET, JOSEPH-LÉON-TIBURCE, LITT.L., PARIS: La Sallette; Lazarus of Bethany, Saint; Leontius, Saint; Margaret of Lorraine, Blessed; Margaret of Savoy, Blessed; Margaret of the Blessed Sacrament; Marie Christine of Savoy, Blessed; Maris, Martha, Audifax, and Abachum, Saints; Mark and Marcellian, Saints; Martial, Saint; Martina, Saint; Martin of Leon, Saint; Martin of Tours, Saint.

CORDIER, HENRI, PROFESSOR AT THE SCHOOL FOR ORIENTAL LIVING LANGUAGES, PARIS: Manchuria; Martyrs in China.

CUTHBERT, FATHER, O.S.F.C., CRAWLEY, SUSSEX, ENGLAND: Margaret of Cortona, Saint.

D'ALTON, E. A., LL.D., M.R.I.A., ATHENRY, IRELAND: Limerick, Diocese of; Lombard, Peter, Archbishop of Armagh; Lynch, John; McCabe, Edward; MacGeoghegan, James; Magrath, John Macrory.

DEGERT, ANTOINE, LITT.D., EDITOR OF "LA REVUE DE LA GASCOIGNE", PROFESSOR OF LATIN LITERATURE, INSTITUT CATHOLIQUE, TOULOUSE: Latin, Ecclesiastical; León, Luis de; Marca, Pierre de.

DE JONGH, HENRI, S.T.L., PROFESSOR OF MORAL THEOLOGY, UNIVERSITY OF LOUVAIN: Lindanus, William Damasus.

DELAMARRE, LOUIS N., PH.D., INSTRUCTOR IN FRENCH, COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK: Littré, Paul-Maximilien-Emile.

DELANY, JOSEPH, S.T.D., NEW YORK: Lust.

DELEHAYE, HIPPOLYTE, S.J., BRUSSELS: Martyrology.

DELPLACE, LOUIS, S.J., PROFESSOR OF RELIGION, CHRISTIAN BROTHERS' NORMAL SCHOOL, LOUVAIN: Martyrs, Japanese.

DOLAN, JOHN GILBERT, O.S.B., THE PRIORY, LITTLE MALVERN, ENGLAND: Malmesbury; Malvern; Martinsberg.

DOLL, SISTER MARY BERNARD, OF THE VIS. H. M., MONASTERY OF THE VISITATION, WILMINGTON, DELAWARE: Margaret Mary Alacoque, Blessed.

DONOVAN, JUSTIN FOLEY, M.D., M.CH., PORT HEALTH OFFICE, PORT ROYAL, JAMAICA: Leprosy in the Middle Ages.

DONOVAN, STEPHEN M., O.F.M., FRANCISCAN MONASTERY, WASHINGTON: Louis of Casoria, Venerable; Margaret Colonna, Blessed; Marianus of Florence; Mark of Lisbon.

DRISCOLL, JAMES F., S.T.D., New York: Levites.

DRUM, WALTER, S.J., Professor of Hebrew and Sacred Scripture, Woodstock College, Maryland: Lazarus; Magi; Manahem; Manahen, Saint; Manasses; Manuscripts of the Bible; Martin, Paulin.

DRURY, EDWIN, Nerinx, Kentucky: Loretto, Sisters of, at the Foot of the Cross.

DUBRAY, C. A., S.M., S.T.B., Ph.D., Professor of Philosophy, Marist College, Washington: Le Fèvre, Jacques.

DUGGAN, THOMAS, Editor, "The Catholic Transcript", Hartford, Connecticut: MacFarland, Francis Patrick.

DUNN, JOSEPH, Ph.D., Professor of Celtic Languages and Literature, Catholic University of America, Washington: Mabinogion.

DWYER, PATRICK VINCENT, S.T.D., Bishop of Maitland, Australia: Maitland, Diocese of.

EDMONDS, COLUMBA, O.S.B., Fort Augustus, Scotland: Lindisfarne, Ancient Diocese and Monastery of.

ENGELHARDT, ZEPHYRIN, O.F.M., Watsonville, California: Magin Catalá; Margil, Antonio; Martin of Valencia.

FANNING, WILLIAM H. W., S.J., Professor of Church History and Canon Law, St. Louis University, St. Louis, Missouri: Legitimation; Manifestation of Conscience; Marriage, Mixed.

FARLEY, JOHN M., S.T.D., Archbishop of New York: McCloskey, John.

FENLON, JOHN F., S.S., S.T.D., President, St. Austin's College, Washington; Professor of Sacred Scripture, St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore: Legrand, Louis; Le Hir, Arthur-Marie; Le Long, Jacques.

FINEGAN, PHILIP M., S.J., College of the Ateneo, Manila, Philippine Islands: Manila, Archdiocese of; Manila Observatory.

FINN, WILLIAM JOSEPH, C.S.P., Chicago, Illinois: Marcello, Benedetto; Marenzio, Luca.

FISHER, J. H., S.J., Woodstock College, Maryland: Liberatore, Matteo; Lohner, Tobias; Lugo, Francisco de; Mary Anne de Paredes, Blessed.

FORD, JEREMIAH D. M., M.A., Ph.D., Professor of French and Spanish, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Lope de Vega Carpio, Felix; March, Auzias; Marenco, Carlo and Leopold.

FORTESCUE, ADRIAN, Ph.D., S.T.D., Letchworth, Hertfordshire, England: Latin Church; Lavabo; Lector; Leo Diaconus; Leontius Byzantinus; Lessons in the Liturgy; Libera Me; Libera Nos; Liberatus of Carthage; Liturgical Books; Liturgy; Lumen Christi; Marcellinus Comes; Marcian; Marcus Diadochus; Marcus Eremita; Mass, Chapter and Conventual; Mass, Liturgy of the.

FORTIER, ALCÉE, LL.D., Chevalier of the Legion of Honour; Officer of Public Instruction; President, Louisiana Historical Society, Professor of Romance Languages, Tulane University, New Orleans: Louisiana, Colonial.

FOURNET, PIERRE AUGUSTE, S.S., M.A., Professor of History, Collège de Montréal: Marie de l'Incarnation, Blessed; Marie de l'Incarnation, Venerable.

FOX, JAMES J., S.T.D., Professor of Philosophy, St. Thomas's College, Washington: Law, Natural.

FOX, WILLIAM, B.S., M.E., Associate Professor of Physics, College of the City of New York: Maignan, Emmanuel; Mariotte, Edme; Marsigli, Luigi Ferdinando.

GANČEVIĆ, ANTHONY LAWRENCE, Ph.D., S.T.D., Zaostrog, Dalmatia: Lesina; Lucić (Lucius), John.

GANSS, HENRY G., Mus.D., Lancaster, Pennsylvania: Liszt, Franz; Luther, Martin.

GARDNER, EDMUND GARRETT, M.A. (Cambridge), Barlow Lecturer on Dante, University College, London: Latini, Brunetto; Malatesta, House of; Manzoni, Alessandro.

GEUDENS, FRANCIS MARTIN, O.Præm., Abbot Titular of Barlings, Corpus Christi Priory, Manchester, England: Lohel, Johann.

GHELLINCK, JOSEPH DE, Professor of Patrology and Theological Literature of the Middle Ages, University of Louvain: Lessius, Leonard; Lugo, John de.

GIBBONS, JAMES CARDINAL, Archbishop of Baltimore: Magnien, Alphonse.

GIETMANN, GERARD, S.J., Teacher of Classical Languages and Æsthetics, St. Ignatius College, Valkenburg, Holland: Lemercier, Jacques; Lescot, Pierre; Levau, Louis; Liesborn, Master of; Lochner, Stephan; Maderna, Carlo; Mansard, François and Jules.

GILDAS, M., O.C.R., La Trappe, Quebec: Lestrange, Louis-Henri de.

GILLET, LOUIS, Paris: Limbourg, Pol de; Lippi, Filippino; Lippi, Filippo; Lorenzetti, Pietro and Ambrogio; Masolino da Panicale.

GIROUX, C. H. A., O.M.I., Providence, Canada: Mackenzie, Vicariate Apostolic of.

GLASS, JOSEPH S., C.M., S.T.D., President, St. Vincent's College, Los Angeles, California: Le Gras, Louise de Marillac, Venerable.

GOYAU, GEORGES, Associate Editor, "Revue des Deux Mondes", Paris: La Rochefoucauld-Liancourt, François-Aléxandre-Frédéric, Duc de; La Rochelle, Diocese of; Laurentie, Pierre-Sébastien; Laval, Diocese of; League, The; Leclerc du Tremblay, François; Le Mans, Diocese of; Le Puy, Diocese of; Le Tellier, Michel; L'Hospital, Michel de; Lille; Limoges, Diocese of; Louis IX, Saint; Louis XI; Louis XIV; Luçon, Diocese of; Lyons, Archdiocese of; Lyons, Councils of; MacMahon, Marie-Edme-Patrice-Maurice de; Mâcon, Ancient Diocese of; Maintenon, Françoise, Marquise de; Mame, Alfred-Henri-Amand; Marie Antoinette; Marseilles, Diocese of; Martinique, Diocese of.

GRATTAN-FLOOD, W. H., M.R.I.A., Mus.D., Rosemount, Enniscorthy, Ireland: Lawrence O'Toole, Saint; Locke, Matthew; Loman, Saint; Lotti, Antonio; Lully, Jean-Baptiste; Machutus, Saint; Malachy, Saint.

GREY, J. C., New York: León, Diocese of; Lérida, Diocese of; Lima, Archdiocese of; Linares, Archdiocese of; Lisbon, Patriarchate of; Madrid-Alcalá, Diocese of; Marquesas Islands, Vicariate Apostolic of.

GRUBER, HERMANN, S.J., Stella Matutina College, Feldkirch, Austria: Liberalism; Masonry.

GUINET, JOHN PETER, M.S., Superior, Missionaries of La Salette, Hartford, Connecticut: La Salette, Missionaries of.

GÜNTHER, HEINRICH, Ph.D., Tübingen, Germany: Legends of the Saints.

HAGEN, JOHN G., S.J., Vatican Observatory, Rome: Lilius, Aloisius.

HANDLEY, MARIE LOUISE, New York: Maderna, Stefano; Majano, Benedetto da; Marchesi, Pompeo.

HARTIG, OTTO, Assistant Librarian of the Royal Library, Munich: Lorraine; Magellan, Ferdinand; Magnus, Olaus; Mailla, Joseph-Anna-Marie de Moyria de; Mandeville, Jean de; Martyr d'Anghiera, Peter.

HARTIGAN, JEREMIAH AUGUSTUS, S.J., D.Litt. (Orientalium), Stonyhurst College, Blackburn, England: Mageddo; Maspha.

HASSETT, Mgr. MAURICE M., S.T.D., Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Lateran, Christian Museum of; Lucina, Crypt of; Mamertine Prison; Martyr.

HEALY, JOHN, S.T.D., LL.D., M.R.I.A., Archbishop of Tuam, Senator of the National University of Ireland: Lismore, School of.

HEALY, PATRICK J., S.T.D., Assistant Professor of Church History, Catholic University of America, Washington: Lucian of Antioch.

HECKMAN, FERDINAND, O.F.M., Teacher of Latin and Greek, Franciscan Monastery, Washington: Mary Frances of the Five Wounds of Jesus.

HENRY, H. T., Litt.D., Rector of Roman Catholic High School for Boys, Professor of English Literature and of Gregorian Chant, St. Charles Seminary, Overbrook, Pennsylvania: Lauda Sion; Magnificat.

HERWEGEN, ILDEFONSUS, O.S.B., Maria-Laach Abbey, Niedermendig, Germany: Maria-Laach.

HOEBER, KARL, Ph.D., Editor, "Volkszeitung" and "Akademische Monatsblätter", Cologne: Lasaulx, Ernst von; Leipzig, University of; Marius Maximus.

HOLMAN, FREDERICK VAN VOORHIES, Portland, Oregon: McLoughlin, John.

HUDLESTON, GILBERT ROGER, O.S.B., Downside Abbey, Bath, England: Liessies; Ligugé; Lilienfeld; Llancarvan; Lobbes, Benedictine Abbey of; Loccum; Margaret of Scotland, Saint.

HUGHES, JAMES, Liverpool, England: Liverpool, Diocese of.

HULL, ERNEST R., S.J., Editor, "The Examiner", Bombay, India: Madras, Archdiocese of; Madura Mission; Malabar; Malacca, Diocese of; Mangalore, Diocese of.

HUNT, LEIGH, Professor of Art, College of the City of New York: Lorrain, Claude de.

HUNTER-BLAIR, D. O., Bart., O.S.B., M.A., Fort Augustus Abbey, Scotland: Leslie, John; Lindores, Benedictine Abbey of; Lochleven.

HUONDER, ANTHONY, S.J., Editor, "Katholische Missionen", Bellevue, Luxemburg: Le Gobien, Charles; Maroni, Paul; Martini, Martino.

JONES, ARTHUR EDWARD, S.J., Corresponding Member of the Minnesota, Ontario, and Chicago Historical Societies; Hon. Member of the Missouri Historical Society; Member of the International Congress of Americanists; Archivist of St. Mary's College, Montreal: La Richardie, Armand de; Lauzon, Pierre de; Le Mercier, François; Levadoux, Michael; Marchand, Jean Baptiste; Martin, Felix.

JOUVE, ODORIC-M., O.F.M., Candiac, Canada: La Roche Daillon, Joseph de; Le Caron, Joseph; Leclercq, Chrestien.

JOYCE, GEORGE HAYWARD, S.J., M.A. (Oxon.), St. Beuno's College, St. Asaph, Wales: Lister (alias Butler), Thomas.

KEEGAN, PETER CHARLES, Van Buren, Maine: Maine.

KEILEY, JARVIS, M.A., Grantwood, New Jersey: La Salle, René-Robert-Cavalier, Sieur de; Malory, Sir Thomas.

KELLY, BLANCHE M., New York: Macarius Magnes; Majorca and Iviza, Diocese of; Malaga, Diocese of; Malherbe, François; Mangan, James Clarence; Mantegna, Andrea; Margaret Pole, Blessed.

KELLY, JOSEPH I., PH.D., LL.D., FORMERLY LECTURER ON ROMAN LAW IN NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY AND DEAN OF THE FACULTY OF LAW IN LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY, CHICAGO: Law, Roman.

KELLY, LEO A., PH.B., ROCHESTER, NEW YORK: Lourdes, Brothers of Our Lady of.

KELLY, MARY TERESA, DUBLIN: MacHale, John.

KENDAL, JAMES, S.J., BULAWAYO, RHODESIA, SOUTH AFRICA: Malta.

KENNEDY, THOMAS, B.A. (R.U.I.), LONDON: Lebwin, Saint; Letourneux, Nicolas; Lockhart, William; MacCarthy, Denis Florence; Majunke, Paul; Mariana Islands, Prefecture Apostolic of.

KENT, W. H., O.S.C., BAYSWATER, LONDON: Manning, Henry Edward.

KETTENBURG, PHILIPP, BARON VON, CHAPLAIN OF ST. ANSGAR'S CHURCH, COPENHAGEN, DENMARK: Lund.

KIRSCH, JOHANN PETER, S.T.D., DOMESTIC PRELATE, PROFESSOR OF PATROLOGY AND CHRISTIAN ARCHÆOLOGY, UNIVERSITY OF FRIBOURG: Lapsi; Lawrence, Saint; Lawrence Justinian, Saint; Lay Abbot; Leo I (the Great), Saint, Pope; Leocadia, Saint; Leonidas, Saint; Liber Diurnus Romanorum Pontificum; Liber Pontificalis; Linus, Saint, Pope; Liutprand of Cremona; Lucius I, Saint, Pope; Luna, Pedro de; Macrina, Saints; Mamertus, Saint; Marcellina, Saint; Marcellinus, Saint, Pope; Marcellinus, Flavius; Marcellus I, Saint, Pope; Mark, Saint, Pope; Martin of Troppau; Martinuzzi, George.

KNOTT, A. LEO, BALTIMORE, MARYLAND: Maryland.

KRAFT, JOSEF, PH.D., INNSBRUCK, AUSTRIA: League, German (Catholic).

LABOURT, JÉRÔME, S.T.D., LITT.D., MEMBER OF THE ASIATIC SOCIETY OF PARIS, PARIS: Maphrian; Maronites.

LAUCHERT, FRIEDRICH, PH.D., AACHEN: Liebermann, Bruno Franz Leopold; Manharter.

LEBRETON, J., S.J., LITT.D. (SORBONNE), PROFESSOR, HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN ORIGINS, INSTITUT CATHOLIQUE, PARIS: Logos, The.

LECLERCQ, HENRI, O.S.B., LONDON: Lateran Councils; Lay Communion; Lucifer of Cagliari.

LEHMKUHL, AUGUSTINUS, S.J., ST. IGNATIUS COLLEGE, VALKENBURG, HOLLAND: Mariana, Juan; Marriage, Sacrament of.

LEJAY, PAUL, FELLOW OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FRANCE, PROFESSOR, CATHOLIC INSTITUTE, PARIS: Lascaris, Constantine; Lascaris, Janus; Latin Literature, Christian, Early Centuries; Latin Literature in the Church, Classical; Lipsius, Justus; Mai, Angelo; Manuel Chrysoloras; Martianus Capella.

LENNOX, PATRICK JOSEPH, B.A., PROFESSOR OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE, CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA, WASHINGTON: Marryat, Florence.

LINDSAY, LIONEL ST. GEORGE, B.SC., PH.D., EDITOR-IN-CHIEF, "LA NOUVELLE FRANCE", QUEBEC: Lauzon, Jean de; Laval, François de Montmorency; Laverdière, Charles-Honoré; Le Moyne Family; Le Moyne, Simon; Lescarbot, Marc; Lusignan, Jean-Baptiste-Alphonse; Maillard, Antoine-Simon.

LINS, JOSEPH, FREIBURG-IM-BREISGAU, GERMANY: Lavant; Leipzig; Leitmeritz, Diocese of; Limburg, Diocese of; Linz, Diocese of; Lithuania; Lübeck; Lublin, Diocese of; Lucerne; Mainz.

LÖFFLER, KLEMENS, PH.D., LIBRARIAN, UNIVERSITY OF BRESLAU: Leo X, Pope; Leubus; Liesborn; Lindemann, Wilhelm; Luscinius, Ottmar; Magdeburg; Magliabechi, Antonio; Mallinckrodt, Hermann von; Maria Theresa; Marienberg.

LUCEY, MGR. JOHN M., VICAR-GENERAL, DIOCESE OF LITTLE ROCK, ARKANSAS: Little Rock, Diocese of.

MAAS, A. J., S.J., RECTOR, WOODSTOCK COLLEGE, MARYLAND: Lentulus, Publius; Logia Jesu; Lucifer.

MACAULEY, PATRICK J., BELFAST, IRELAND: Legists; Loango, Vicariate Apostolic of.

MACDONALD, ANNA SPRAGUE, B.A., BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS: MacDonald, John.

MACDONALD, DONALD R., B.A., GLEN NEVIS, ONTARIO, CANADA: Macdonell, Alexander.

MACERLEAN, ANDREW A., NEW YORK: Leodegar (Leger), Saint; Loja, Diocese of; Lugo, Diocese of; Magnesia; Maine de Biran, François-Pierre-Gonthier; Mariana, Archdiocese of; Marshall Islands, Vicariate Apostolic of.

MCGAHAN, FLORENCE RUDGE, M.A., YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO: Magdalens; Marcoux, Joseph.

MCHUGH, JOHN AMBROSE, O.P., S.T.L., LECTOR OF PHILOSOPHY, DOMINICAN HOUSE OF STUDIES, WASHINGTON: Lutheranism.

MCKENNA, CHARLES F., PH.D. (COLUMBIA), SECRETARY, CATHOLIC HOME BUREAU, VICE-PRESIDENT NEW YORK STATE PROBATION COMMISSION, NEW YORK: Lavoisier, Antoine-Laurent.

MCLOUGHLIN, JAMES J., LL.B., NEW ORLEANS: Louisiana, The State of.

MCNEAL, J. PRESTON, B.A., LL.B., BALTIMORE: McSherry, James (2); McSherry, Richard; Maréchal, Ambrose.

MACPHERSON, EWAN, NEW YORK: Maffei, Francesco; Malvenda, Thomas; Map, Walter; Martini, Antonio; Mason, Richard Angelus.

MacRORY, JOSEPH, S.T.D., Professor of Sacred Scripture, Maynooth College, Dublin: Margaret, Saint, Virgin and Martyr; Mark, Saint and Evangelist; Mark, Gospel of Saint; Mary of Egypt, Saint.

MAERE, R., S.T.D., Professor of Christian Archæology, University of Louvain: Le Blant, Edmond-Frédéric; Mamachi, Thomas Maria; Marchi, Giuseppe; Martigny, Joseph-Alexandre.

MAHER, MICHAEL, S.J., Litt.D., M.A. (London), Director of Studies and Professor of Pedagogics, Stonyhurst College, Blackburn, England: Life.

MANN, HORACE K., Headmaster, St. Cuthbert's Grammar School, Newcastle-on-Tyne, England: Leo II, Saint, Pope; Leo III, Saint, Pope; Leo IV, Saint, Pope; Leo V, Pope; Leo VI, Pope; Leo VII, Pope; Leo VIII, Pope; Leo IX, Saint, Pope; Marinus I, Pope; Marinus II, Pope.

MARIQUE, PIERRE JOSEPH, Instructor in French, College of the City of New York: Laprade, Victor de; La Rochejacquelein, Henri-Auguste-Georges du Vergier, Comte de; Lecoy de La Marche, Richard-Albert; Marie de France.

MATHIEU, Rt. Rev. Mgr., O. E., S.T.D., Seminary of Quebec, Canada: Laval, University of, Quebec.

MAYENCE, FERNAND, Ex-Member of the École Française at Athens, Professor of Archæology, University of Louvain: Lenormant, Charles; Lenormant, François.

MAYER, JOHANN GEORG CANON, D.C.L., Regent and Professor of the Seminary of Chur, Switzerland: Lussy, Melchior.

MEEHAN, THOMAS F., New York: Lead, Diocese of; League of the Cross, The; L'Enfant, Pierre-Charles; Liberia; Lincoln, Diocese of; London, Diocese of; Longstreet, James; McGee, Thomas D'Arcy; McMahon, Martin Thomas; McMaster, James Alphonsus; McQuaid, Bernard John; Mallory, Stephen Russell; Marquette League.

MERK, AUGUST, S.J., Professor of Apologetics, St. Ignatius College, Valkenburg, Holland: Lebanon; Machpelah; Magdala.

MERSHMAN, FRANCIS, O.S.B., S.T.D., Professor of Moral Theology, Canon Law, and Liturgy, St. John's University, Collegeville, Minnesota: Larue, Charles de; Lectern; Lennig, Adam Franz; Le Nourry, Denis-Nicolas; Litany; Litany of the Holy Name; Litany of the Saints; Ludger, Saint; Lumper, Gottfried; Maffei, Bernardino; Martin I, Saint, Pope; Martin, Abbot of Schottenkloster; Martyrs, The Ten Thousand; Maruthas, Saint.

MEYER, GEORGE, Provincial, Society of Mary, of Paris, Dayton, Ohio: Mary, Society of, of Paris.

MOELLER, CH., Professor of General History, University of Louvain: Lazarus, Saint, Order of, of Jerusalem.

MOLLOY, JOSEPH VINCENT, O.P., S.T.L., Somerset, Ohio: Malchus.

MOONEY, JAMES, United States Ethnologist, Bureau of American Ethnology, Washington: Lesueur, François Eustace; Lillooet Indians; Lorette; Lulé Indians; Lummi Indians; Maina Indians; Maipure Indians; Maliseet Indians; Mameluco Indians; Mandan Indians; Mascoutens Indians.

MORICE, A. G., O.M.I., Editor of "Le Patriote de l'Ouest", Duck Lake, Saskatchewan, Canada: Lavérendrye, Pierre-Gaultier de Varennes, Sieur de; Laverlochère, Jean-Nicolas; Loucheux; Manitoba.

MOUGEL, AMBROSE, O.Cart., St. Hugh's Charterhouse, Parkminster, England: Ludolph of Saxony.

MÜLLER, ULRICH F., C.PP.S., Professor of Philosophy, St. Charles Borromeo Seminary, Carthagena, Ohio: Le Verrier, Urbain-Jean-Joseph.

MURPHY, JOHN, C.S.Sp., Provincial of the Fathers of the Holy Ghost, Cornwells, Pennsylvania: Libermann, Francis Mary Paul, Venerable.

OBRECHT, EDMOND M., O.C.R., Abbot of Gethsemani Abbey, Kentucky: La Trappe; Mariannhill, Congregation of the Missionaries of.

O'CONNOR, JOHN B., O.P., St. Dominic's Priory, San Francisco, California: Louis Bertrand, Saint; Louis of Granada.

O'LEARY, THOMAS M., Chancellor, Diocese of Manchester, New Hampshire: Manchester, Diocese of.

OLIGER, LIVARIUS, O.F.M., Lector of Church History, Collegio S. Antonio, Rome: Latera, Flaminius Annibali de; Louis of Toulouse, Saint; Marcellinus of Civezza.

O'NEILL, ARTHUR BARRY, C.S.C., M.A., Associate-Editor "Ave Maria", Notre Dame, Indiana: Lefebvre, Camille; Le Loutre, Louis-Joseph.

OTT, MICHAEL, O.S.B., Ph.D., Professor of the History of Philosophy, St. John's University, Collegeville, Minnesota: Laski (a Lasco), John; Laymann, Paul; Ledochowski, Miecislas Halka; Lemcke, Henry; Leo XI, Pope; Lucius II, Pope; Lucius III, Pope; Ludmilla, Saint; Magnus, Saint; Malagrida, Gabriel; Mallinckrodt, Pauline; Maran, Prudentius; Marbodius, Bishop of Rennes; Marcellus II, Pope; Marius Mercator; Martin IV, Pope; Martin V, Pope; Martin of Braga, Saint; Mary de Cervellione.

OTTEN, JOSEPH, Pittsburg, Pennsylvania: Lassus, Orlandus de.

PÉREZ GOYENA, ANTONIO, S.J., EDITOR, "RAZÓN Y FE", MADRID: Maldonado, Juan; Martín y García, Luis.

PÉTRIDÈS, SOPHRONE, A.A., PROFESSOR, GREEK CATHOLIC SEMINARY, KADI-KEUI, CONSTANTINOPLE: Laranda; Lebedus; Lete; Leuce; Limyra, Linoe; Loryma; Lyrbe; Lysias; Macri; Mactaris, Madaurus; Magydus; Mallus; Marciane.

PHILBIN, EUGENE A., REGENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK, NEW YORK: Libel.

POLLEN, JOHN HUNGERFORD, S.J., LONDON: Martinov, John; Mary Queen of Scots (Mary Stuart).

PONCELET, ALBERT, S.J., BRUSSELS: Leonard of Limousin, Saint.

POPE, HUGH, O.P., S.T.L., DOCTOR OF SACRED SCRIPTURE, PROFESSOR OF NEW-TESTAMENT EXEGESIS, COLLEGIO ANGELICO, ROME: Maledictio (in Scripture); Mammon; Martha, Saint; Martianay; Mary, the name of several personages in the N. T.; Mary, The Name of, in Scripture and in Catholic use; Mary Magdalen, Saint.

POULAIN, AUGUSTIN, S.J., PARIS: Louis-Marie Grignion de Montfort, Blessed; Marriage, Mystical.

POWER, ALICE, R.S.H., CONVENT OF THE SACRED HEART, KENWOOD, ALBANY, NEW YORK: Lataste, Marie.

PRESTAGE, EDGAR, B.A. (OXON.); COMMENDADOR, PORTUGUESE ORDER OF S. THIAGO; CORRESPONDING MEMBER OF THE LISBON ROYAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES AND LISBON GEOGRAPHICAL SOCIETY, MANCHESTER, ENGLAND: Macedo, José Agostinho de.

QUINN, STANLEY J., NEW YORK: Line, Mrs. Anne.

RANDOLPH, REGINA, BALTIMORE, MARYLAND: Margaret Haughery.

REILLY, THOMAS À KEMPIS, O.P., DOMINICAN HOUSE OF STUDIES, WASHINGTON: Mariales, Xantes.

REINHOLD, GREGOR, FREIBURG-IM-BREISGAU, GERMANY: Lausanne and Geneva, Diocese of; Lieber, Moriz.

REMY, ARTHUR F. J., M.A., PH.D., ADJUNCT-PROFESSOR OF GERMANIC PHILOLOGY, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, NEW YORK: Lassberg, Baron Joseph Maria Christoph von; Legends, Literary and Profane; Maelrant, Jacob van.

REZEK, ANTOINE IVAN, HOUGHTON, MICHIGAN: Marquette, Diocese of.

ROBINSON, PASCHAL, O.F.M., FRANCISCAN MONASTERY, WASHINGTON: Leo, Brother.

ROCK, P. M. J., LOUISVILLE, KENTUCKY: Louisville, Diocese of.

ROMPEL, JOSEPH HEINRICH, S.J., PH.D., STELLA MATUTINA COLLEGE, FELDKIRCH, AUSTRIA: Latreille, Pierre-André; Lossen, Karl August; Mallard, Ernest-François.

ROTH, LEANDER M., MANDEVILLE, LOUISIANA: Lorsch Abbey.

RYAN, JOHN A., S.T.D., PROFESSOR OF MORAL THEOLOGY, ST. PAUL SEMINARY, ST. PAUL, MINNESOTA: Marriage, History of.

SACHER, HERMANN, PH.D., EDITOR OF THE "KONVERSATIONSLEXIKON"; ASSISTANT EDITOR OF THE "STAATSLEXIKON OF THE GÖRRESGESELLSCHAFT", FREIBURG-IM-BREISGAU, GERMANY: Lippe.

SÄGMÜLLER, JOHANNES BAPTIST, PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY, UNIVERSITY OF TÜBINGEN: Lay Tithes; Letters, Ecclesiastical; Ligamen.

SALEMBIER, LOUIS, S.T.D., PROFESSOR OF CHURCH HISTORY, UNIVERSITY OF LILLE: Marsilius of Padua.

SANTI, ANGELO DE, S.J., ROME: Litany of Loreto; Liturgical Chant.

SCANNELL, THOMAS B., CANON, S.T.D., WEYBRIDGE, ENGLAND: Latria.

SCHAEFER, FRANCIS J., S.T.D., PH.D., PROFESSOR OF CHURCH HISTORY, ST. PAUL SEMINARY, ST. PAUL, MINNESOTA: Law, Civil, Influence of the Church on; Madruzzi, Christopher.

SCHEID, NICHOLAS, S.J., STELLA MATUTINA COLLEGE, FELDKIRCH, AUSTRIA: Latin Literature, II, Sixth to Twentieth Century.

SCHLAGER, HEINRICH PATRICIUS, O.F.M., ST. LUDWIG'S COLLEGE, DALHEIM, GERMANY: Lupus (Wolf), Christian; Lütolf, Aloys; Maassen, Friedrich Bernard Christian; Marius Aventicus; Martène, Edmond; Martin, Konrad.

SCHROEDER, JOSEPH, O.P., DOMINICAN HOUSE OF STUDIES, WASHINGTON: Lemos, Thomas de; Loaisa, García; Marini (de Marinis).

SELINGER, JOSEPH, S.T.D., JEFFERSON CITY, MISSOURI: Marriage, Moral and Canonical Aspect of.

SHIPMAN, ANDREW J., M.A., LL.M., NEW YORK: Lutzk, Zhitomir, and Kamenetz, Diocese of.

SHORTER, JOSEPH A., LEAVENWORTH, KANSAS: Leavenworth, Diocese of.

SILVA, PAOLO, S.J., S.T.D., ROME: Lombardy.

SLATER, T., S.J., ST. BEUNO'S COLLEGE, ST. ASAPH, WALES: Law, Divine, Moral Aspect of; Lottery; Lying; Malone, William.

SMITH, IGNATIUS, O.P., DOMINICAN HOUSE OF STUDIES, WASHINGTON: Leonard of Chios.

SMITH, SYDNEY F., S.J., LONDON: Low Church.

SMITH, WALTER GEORGE, M.A., LL.B. (UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA), PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA: Law, International; Marriage, Civil.

SOLLIER, JOSEPH FRANCIS, S.M., S.T.D., San Francisco, California: Lavigerie, Charles-Martial-Allemand; Le Camus, Étienne; Le Coz, Claude; Le Tellier, Charles-Maurice; Loménie de Brienne, Étienne-Charles de; Love, Theological Virtue of; Mary, Society of.

SORTAIS, GASTON, S.J., Assistant Editor, "Études", Paris: Magaud, Antoine-Dominique; Masaccio.

SOUVAY, CHARLES L., C.M., S.T.D., Ph.D., Professor, Sacred Scripture, Hebrew and Liturgy, Kenrick Seminary, St. Louis, Missouri: Leprosy.

SPAHN, MARTIN, Ph.D., Professor of Modern History, University of Strasburg: Lieber, Ernst Maria.

SPALDING, HENRY S., S.J., St. Ignatius College, Chicago, Illinois: Marquette, Jacques.

SUAU, PIERRE, S.J., Toulouse, France: Leander of Seville, Saint.

SWIFT, HENRY JARVIS, S.J., Editorial Staff, "America", New York: Lapuente, Louis de, Venerable.

TAAFFE, JAMES A., S.J., Professor of Rhetoric, College of St. Francis Xavier, New York: Maltret, Claude.

THURSTON, HERBERT, S.J., London: Lectionary; Lent; Libraries; Lights; Lord's Prayer; Louis Allemand, Blessed; Luminare; Lunette; Lyndwood, William; Marriage, Ritual of; Mary Tudor.

TOKE, LESLIE ALEXANDER ST. LAWRENCE, B.A., Stratton-on-the-Fosse, Bath, England: Lay Brothers; Leo XII, Pope; Little Office of Our Lady; Mabillon, Jean; Maedoc, Saint; Maelruan, Saint; Maelrubha, Saint.

TONER, PATRICK J., S.T.D., Professor of Dogmatic Theology, Maynooth College, Dublin: Limbo.

TRISTRAM, HENRY, B.A. (Oxford and London), The Oratory, Birmingham, England: Lejeune, Jean.

TURNER, WILLIAM, B.A., S.T.D., Professor of Logic and the History of Philosophy, Catholic University of America, Washington: Leibniz, System of; Logic; Maimonides, Moses, Teaching of; Marianus Scotus.

URQUHART, FRANCIS FORTESCUE, Fellow and Lecturer in Modern History, Balliol College, Oxford: Lollards; Magna Carta; Mannyng, Robert; Marisco, Adam de.

VAILHÉ, SIMEON, A.A., Member of the Russian Archæological Institute of Constantinople, Professor of Sacred Scripture and History, Greek Catholic Seminary of Kadi-Keui, Constantinople: Lares; Larissa; Legio; Lemberg; Leontopolis; Lepanto; Leptis Magna; Le Quien, Michel; Leros; Lesbi; Livias; Lorea; Lugos, Diocese of; Lycopolis; Lydda; Lystra; Marash; Marcianopolis; Marcopolis; Mardin; Maronia; Martyropolis.

VAN HOONACKER, A., Professor of Critical History of the Old Testament and Oriental Languages, University of Louvain: Malachias.

VAN HOVE, A., D.C.L., Professor of Church History and Canon Law, University of Louvain: Legacies; Lex (Law); Liber Septimus; Liber Sextus Decretalium; Luca, Giovanni Battista de.

VINCENT, HUGUES, O.P., S.T.D., Associate Editor, "Revue Biblique" and "Études Bibliques", St. Stephen's Biblical School, Jerusalem: Madianites.

WAINEWRIGHT, JOHN BANNERMAN, B.A. (Oxon.), London: Leigh, Richard, Venerable; Lloyd, John, Venerable; Lockwood, John, Venerable; Mahony, Charles, Venerable.

WALSH, JAMES J., M.D., Ph.D., LL.D., Dean of the Medical School, Fordham University, New York: Larrey, Dominique-Jean; Linacre, Thomas; MacNeven, William James; Malpighi, Marcello.

WARD, Rt. Rev. Mgr. BERNARD, President, St. Edmund's College, Ware, England: Martiall, John; Martin, Gregory.

WARREN, KATE MARY, Lecturer in English Literature under University of London at Westfield College, Hampstead, London: Lydgate, John.

WATRIGANT, HENRI, S.J., Enghien, Belgium: Mary de Sales Chappuis, Venerable.

WAUGH, NORMAN, Carlton, Yorkshire, England: Leeds, Diocese of.

WEBER, N. A., S.M., S.T.D., Professor of Fundamental Theology and Church History, Marist College, Washington: Lefèvre d'Etaples, Jacques; Lorenzana, Francisco Antonio de; Lupus, Abbot of Ferières; Maimbourg, Louis.

WILHELM, J., S.T.D., Ph.D., Battle, England: Loci Theologici.

WILLIAMSON, GEORGE CHARLES, Litt.D., London: Lebrun, Charles; Lefèvre, Family of; Lopez-Caro, Francisco; Lotto, Lorenzo; Luini, Bernardino; Maratta, Carlo; Martini, Simone.

WILLIS, JOHN WILLEY, M.A., St. Paul, Minnesota: Law, Common.

WITTMANN, PIUS, Ph.D., Reichsarchivrat, Büdingen, Germany: Linde, Justin Timotheus Balthasar, Freiherr von; Luxemburg.

ZEPHIRINY, BROTHER, Iberville, Canada: Mary, Little Brothers of.

ZIMMERMAN, BENEDICT, O.D.C., St. Luke's Priory, Wincanton, Somersetshire: Legipont, Oliver; Lezana, Juan; Lobera, Ann; Ludovicus a S. Carolo.

Tables of Abbreviations

The following tables and notes are intended to guide readers of THE CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA in interpreting those abbreviations, signs, or technical phrases which, for economy of space, will be most frequently used in the work. For more general information see the article ABBREVIATIONS, ECCLESIASTICAL.

I.—GENERAL ABBREVIATIONS.

a. . . . article.
ad an. . . . at the year (Lat. *ad annum*).
an., ann. . . . the year, the years (Lat. *annus, anni*).
ap. . . . in (Lat. *apud*).
art. . . . article.
Assyr. . . . Assyrian.
A. S. . . . Anglo-Saxon.
A. V. . . . Authorized Version (i.e. tr. of the Bible authorized for use in the Anglican Church—the so-called "King James", *or* "Protestant Bible").
b. . . . born.
Bk. . . . Book.
Bl. . . . Blessed.
C., c. . . . about (Lat. *circa*); canon; chapter; *compagnie*.
can. . . . canon.
cap. . . . chapter (Lat. *caput*—used only in Latin context).
cf. . . . compare (Lat. *confer*).
cod. . . . codex.
col. . . . column.
concl. . . . conclusion.
const., constit. . . . Lat. *constitutio*.
curâ. . . . by the industry of.
d. . . . died.
dict. . . . dictionary (Fr. *dictionnaire*).
disp. . . . Lat. *disputatio*.
diss. . . . Lat. *dissertatio*.
dist. . . . Lat. *distinctio*.
D. V. . . . Douay Version.
ed., edit. . . . edited, edition, editor.
Ep., Epp. . . . letter, letters (Lat. *epistola*).
Fr. . . . French.
gen. . . . genus.
Gr. . . . Greek.
H. E., Hist. Eccl. . Ecclesiastical History.
Heb., Hebr. . . . Hebrew.
ib., ibid. . . . in the same place (Lat. *ibidem*).
Id. . . . the same person, *or* author (Lat. *idem*).
inf. . . . below (Lat. *infra*).
It. . . . Italian.
l. c., loc. cit. . . . at the place quoted (Lat. *loco citato*).
Lat. . . . Latin.
lat. . . . latitude.
lib. . . . book (Lat. *liber*).
long. . . . longitude.
Mon. . . . Lat. *Monumenta*.
MS., MSS. . . . manuscript, manuscripts.
n., no. . . . number.
N. T. . . . New Testament.
Nat. . . . National.
Old Fr., O. Fr. . . . Old French.
op. cit. . . . in the work quoted (Lat. *opere citato*).
Ord. . . . Order.
O. T. . . . Old Testament.
p., pp. . . . page, pages, *or* (in Latin references) *pars* (part).
par. . . . paragraph.
passim. . . . in various places.
pt. . . . part.
Q. . . . Quarterly (a periodical), e.g. "Church Quarterly".
Q., QQ., quæst. . . . question, questions (Lat. *quæstio*).
q. v. . . . which [title] see (Lat. *quod vide*).
Rev. . . . Review (a periodical).
R. S. . . . Rolls Series
R. V. . . . Revised Version
S., SS. . . . Lat. *Sanctus, Sancti*, "Saint", "Saints"—used in this Encyclopedia only in Latin context.
Sept. . . . Septuagint.
Sess. . . . Session.
Skt. . . . Sanskrit.
Sp. . . . Spanish.
sq., sqq. . . . following page, *or* pages (Lat. *sequens*).
St., Sts. . . . Saint, Saints.
sup. . . . Above (Lat. *supra*).
s. v. . . . Under the corresponding title (Lat. *sub voce*).
tom. . . . volume (Lat. *tomus*).

tr.....translation *or* translated. By itself it means "English translation", *or* "translated into English by". Where a translation is into any other language, the language is stated.
tr., tract.....tractate.
v.....see (Lat. *vide*).
Ven.....Venerable.
Vol.....Volume.

II.—Abbreviations of Titles.

Acta SS.....*Acta Sanctorum* (Bollandists).
Ann. pont. cath.....Battandier, *Annuaire pontifical catholique.*
Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.Gillow, Bibliographical Dictionary of the English Catholics.
Dict. Christ. Antiq...Smith and Cheetham (ed.), Dictionary of Christian Antiquities.
Dict. Christ. Biog. ..Smith and Wace (ed.), Dictionary of Christian Biography.
Dict. d'arch. chrét...Cabrol (ed.), *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie.*
Dict. de théol. cath. .Vacant and Mangenot (ed.), *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique.*
Dict. Nat. Biog. .....Stephen and Lee (ed.), Dictionary of National Biography.
Hast., Dict. of the Bible .....Hastings (ed.), A Dictionary of the Bible.
Kirchenlex.....Wetzer and Welte, *Kirchenlexicon.*
P. G.....Migne (ed.), *Patres Græci.*
P. L.....Migne (ed.), *Patres Latini.*
Vig., Dict. de la Bible.Vigouroux (ed.), *Dictionnaire de la Bible.*

Note I.—Large Roman numerals standing alone indicate volumes. Small Roman numerals standing alone indicate chapters. Arabic numerals standing alone indicate pages. In other cases the divisions are explicitly stated. Thus "Rashdall, Universities of Europe, I, ix" refers the reader to the ninth chapter of the first volume of that work; "I, p. ix" would indicate the ninth page of the preface of the same volume.

Note II.—Where St. Thomas (Aquinas) is cited without the name of any particular work the reference is always to "Summa Theologica" (not to "Summa Philosophiæ"). The divisions of the "Summa Theol." are indicated by a system which may best be understood by the following example: "I-II, Q. vi, a. 7, ad 2 um" refers the reader to the *seventh* article of the *sixth* question in the *first* part of the *second* part, in the response to the *second* objection.

Note III.—The abbreviations employed for the various books of the Bible are obvious. Ecclesiasticus is indicated by *Ecclus.*, to distinguish it from Ecclesiastes (*Eccles.*). It should also be noted that I and II Kings in D. V. correspond to I and II Samuel in A. V.; and I and II Par. to I and II Chronicles. Where, in the spelling of a proper name, there is a marked difference between the D. V. and the A. V., the form found in the latter is added, in parentheses.

Full Page Illustrations in Volume IX

	PAGE
Apse, St. John Lateran, Rome	14
Convent of Mar Saba, from Brook of Cedron	38
St. Lawrence being ordained Deacon by Sixtus II	90
St. Peter giving the Pallium to Leo III	158
Leo XIII—Chartran	170
León	176
Lichfield Cathedral	232
Lincoln Cathedral	266
Madonna with the Violet—Lochner	320
Shrine of Edward the Confessor, London	352
St. Peter Martyr—Lorenzo Lotto	366
St. Louis relieving the Needy, etc.	368
Louisville	386
The Dormition of the Virgin—Luini	418
Lund	434
Isabella the Catholic	518
Signing of the Magna Carta—Ernest Normand	532
Chapel of St. Peter in Carcere, Mamertine Prison	578
Henry Edward Cardinal Manning—Edwin Long	606
The Holy Women at the Sepulchre—Mantegna	610
Cardinal Giulio Rospigliosi—Carlo Maratta	636
Christ and Mary Magdalen—Correggio	760
Mary Queen of Scots	764
Mary Tudor, Queen of England—Antonio Moro	768

Coloured Plates

Leo X—Raphael	164
Lindisfarne Gospels	270
St. Luke painting the Virgin and Child—Van der Weyden	426
The Adoration of the Shepherds—Ghirlandajo	528
Codex Argenteus	616
Illumination in the Grimani Breviary	626
The Virgin of the Rocks—Leonardo da Vinci	752
Mary Stuart, Queen of Scotland—Clouet	766

THE CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA

L

Laprade, VICTOR DE, French poet and critic, b. at Montbrison in 1812; d. at Lyons in 1883. He first studied medicine, then law, and was admitted to the bar, but soon left it to become professor of French literature at the "Faculté des lettres" of Lyons. He lost this position in 1863 for having published "Les Muses d'État", a satire aimed at the men of the Second Empire, and from that time on he devoted all his time to poetry. In 1858 he had taken the seat of Musset in the French Academy. Laprade is probably the most idealistic French poet of the nineteenth century. His talent somewhat resembles that of Lamartine, whom he gladly acknowledged as his master. His inspiration is always lofty, his verses are harmonious and at times graceful. God, nature, the fatherland, mankind, friendship, the family are his favourite topics. To form a correct opinion of his work, one should discriminate between the two phases of his literary career. During the first, which extends down to his admission into the French Academy, he takes pains to connect the ancient with the modern world, mythology with Christianity. This is what might be termed the impersonal phase of his thought. "Psyché" (1842), "Les Odes et Poèmes" (1844), "Les Poèmes évangéliques" (1852). "Les Symphonies" (1855), belong to this first period. Another collection of poems "Les Idylles héroïques" (1858), marks the transition from the first to the second phase. Laprade's poetical pantheism has now given place to a more Christian and more humane inspiration. The "poet of the summits", as he was sometimes called, had become a man of his times; filial and parental love, the country life of his dear native province (Forez), are now his topics. To this period belong "Pernette" (1878), "Harmodius" (1870), "Les Poèmes civiques" (1873). It was then that, in some measure, he became popular. He was also a remarkable educational and æsthetical writer, as is shown by the following works: "Questions d'art et de morale" (1867), "Le Sentiment de la nature avant le christianisme" (1867), "L'éducation homicide" (1867), "L'éducation libérale" (1873).

BIRÉ, *V. de Laprade, sa vie et ses œuvres* (Paris, s. d.).

PIERRE MARIQUE.

Lapsi (Lat., *labi, lapsus*), the regular designation in the third century for Christians who *relapsed* into heathenism, especially for those who during the persecutions displayed weakness in the face of torture, and denied the Faith by sacrificing to the heathen gods or by other acts. Many of the lapsi, indeed the majority of the very numerous cases in the great persecutions after the middle of the third century, certainly did not return to paganism out of conviction: they simply had not the courage to confess the Faith steadfastly when threatened with temporal losses and severe punishments (banishment, forced labour, or death), and their sole desire was to preserve themselves from persecution by an external act of apostasy, and to save their property, freedom, and life. The obligation of confessing the Christian Faith under all circumstances and of avoiding every act of denial was firmly established in the Church from Apostolic times. The First Epistle of St. Peter exhorts the believers to remain steadfast under the visitations of affliction (i, 6, 7; iv, 16, 17). In his letter to Trajan, Pliny writes that those who are truly Christians will not offer any heathen sacrifices or utter any revilings against Christ. Nevertheless we learn both from "The Shepherd" of Hermas, and from the accounts of the persecutions and martyrdoms, that individual Christians after the second century showed weakness, and fell away from the Faith. The aim of the civil proceedings against Christians, as laid down in Trajan's rescript to Pliny, was to lead them to apostasy. Those Christians were acquitted who declared that they wished to be so no longer and performed acts of pagan religious worship, but the steadfast were punished. In the "Martyrdom of St. Polycarp" (c. iv; ed. Funk, "Patres Apostolici", 2nd ed., I, 319), we read of a Phrygian, Quintus, who at first voluntarily avowed the Christian Faith, but showed weakness at the sight of the wild beasts in the amphitheatre, and allowed the proconsul to persuade him to offer sacrifice. The letter of the Christians of Lyons, concerning the persecution of the Church there in 177, tells us likewise of ten brethren who showed weakness and apostatized. Kept, however, in confinement and stimulated by the example and the kind treatment they received from the Christians who had remained steadfast, several of them repented their apostasy, and in a second trial, in which the renegades were to have been acquitted, they faithfully confessed Christ and gained the martyrs' crown (Eusebius, "Hist. Eccl.", V, ii).

In general, it was a well-established principle in the Church of the second and the beginning of the third century that an apostate, even if he did penance, was not again taken into the Christian community, or admitted to the Holy Eucharist. Idolatry was one of the three capital sins which entailed exclusion from the Church. After the middle of the third century, the question of the lapsi gave rise on several occasions to serious disputes in the Christian communities, and led to a further development of the penitential discipline in the Church. The first occasion on which the question of the lapsi became a serious one in the Church, and finally led to a schism, was the great persecution of Decius (250–1). An imperial edict, which frankly aimed at the extermination of Christianity, enjoined that every Christian must perform an act of idolatry. Whoever refused was threatened with the severest punishments. The officials were instructed to seek out the Christians and compel them to sacrifice,

and to proceed against the recalcitrant ones with the greatest severity (see DECIUS). The consequences of this first general edict of persecution were dreadful for the Church. In the long peace which the Christians had enjoyed, many had become infected with a worldly spirit. A great number of the laity, and even some members of the clergy, weakened, and, on the promulgation of the edict, flocked at once to the altars of the heathen idols to offer sacrifice. We are particularly well-informed about the events in Africa and in Rome by the correspondence of St. Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, and by his treatises, "De catholicæ ecclesiæ unitate" and "De lapsis" ("Cæcilii Cypriani opera omnia", ed. Hartel, I, II, Vienna, 1868–71). There were various classes of lapsi, according to the act by which they fell: (1) *sacrificati*, those who had actually offered a sacrifice to idols; (2) *thurificati*, those who had burnt incense on the altar before the statues of the gods; (3) *libellatici*, those who had drawn up an attestation (*libellus*), or had, by bribing the authorities, caused such certificates to be drawn up for them, representing them as having offered sacrifice, without, however, having actually done so. So far five of these libelli are known to us (one at Oxford, one at Berlin, two at Vienna, one at Alexandria; see Krebs in "Sitzungsberichte der kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien", 1894, pp. 3–9; Idem in "Patrologia Orientalis", IV, Paris, 1907, pp. 33 sq.; Franchi de' Cavalieri in "Nuovo Bullettino di archeologia cristiana", 1895, pp. 68–73). Some Christians were allowed to present a written declaration to the authorities to the effect that they had offered the prescribed sacrifices to the gods, and asked for a certificate of this act (*libellum tradere*): this certificate was delivered by the authorities, and the petitioners received back the attestation (*libellum accipere*). Those who had actually sacrificed (the sacrificati and the thurificati) also received a certificate of having done so. The libellatici, in the narrow sense of the word, were those who obtained certificates without having actually sacrificed. Some of the libellatici, who forwarded to the authorities documents drawn up concerning their real or alleged sacrifices and bearing their signatures, were also called *acta facientes*.

The names of the Christians, who had shown their apostasy by one of the above-mentioned methods, were entered on the court records. After these weak brethren had received their attestations and knew that their names were thus recorded, they felt themselves safe from further inquisition and persecution. The majority of the lapsi had indeed only obeyed the edict of Decius out of weakness: at heart they wished to remain Christians. Feeling secure against further persecution, they now wished to attend Christian worship again and to be readmitted into the communion of the Church, but this desire was contrary to the then existing penitential discipline. The lapsi of Carthage succeeded in winning over to their side certain Christians who had remained faithful, and had suffered torture and imprisonment. These confessors sent letters of recommendation in the name of the dead martyrs (*libelli pacis*) to the bishop in favour of the renegades. On the strength of these "letters of peace", the lapsi desired immediate admittance into communion with the Church, and were actually admitted by some of the clergy inimically disposed to Cyprian. Similar difficulties arose at Rome, and St. Cyprian's Carthaginian opponents sought for support in the capital in their attack against their bishop. Cyprian, who had remained in constant communication with the Roman clergy during the vacancy of the Roman See after the martyrdom of Pope Fabian, decided that nothing should be done in the matter of reconciliation of the lapsi until the persecution should be over and he could return to Carthage. Only those apostates who showed that they were penitent, and had received a personal note (libellus pacis) from a confessor or a martyr, might obtain absolution and admission to communion with the Church and to the Holy Eucharist, if they were dangerously ill and at the point of death. At Rome, likewise, the principle was established that the apostates should not be given up, but that they should be exhorted to do penance, so that, in case of their being again cited before the pagan authorities, they might atone for their apostasy by steadfastly confessing the Faith. Furthermore, communion was not to be refused to those who were seriously ill, and wished to atone for their apostasy by penance.

The party opposed to Cyprian at Carthage did not accept the bishop's decision, and stirred up a schism. When, after the election of St. Cornelius to the Chair of Peter, the Roman priest Novatian set himself up at Rome as anti-pope, he claimed to be the upholder of strict discipline, inasmuch as he refused unconditionally to readmit to communion with the Church any who had fallen away. He was the founder of Novatianism (q. v.). Shortly after Cyprian's return to his episcopal city in the spring of 251, synods were held in Rome and Africa, at which the affair of the lapsi was adjusted by common agreement. It was adopted as a principle that they should be encouraged to repent, and, under certain conditions and after adequate public penance (*exomologesis*), should be readmitted to communion. In fixing the duration of the penance, the bishops were to take into consideration the circumstances of the apostasy, e. g., whether the penitent had offered sacrifice at once or only after torture, whether he had led his family into apostasy or on the other hand had saved them therefrom, after obtaining for himself a certificate of having sacrificed. Those, who of their own accord had actually sacrificed (the sacrificati and thurificati), might be reconciled with the Church only at the point of death. The libellatici might, after a reasonable penance, be immediately readmitted. In view of the severe persecution then imminent, it was decided at a subsequent Carthaginian synod that all lapsi who had undergone public penance should be readmitted to full communion with the Church. Bishop Dionysius of Alexandria adopted the same attitude towards the lapsi as Pope Cornelius and the Italian bishops, and Cyprian and the African bishops. But in the East Novatian's rigid views at first found a more sympathetic reception. The united efforts of the supporters of Pope Cornelius succeeded in bringing the great majority of the Eastern bishops to recognize him as the rightful Roman pontiff, with which recognition the acceptance of the principles relative to the case of the lapsi was naturally united. A few groups of Christians in different parts of the empire shared the views of Novatian, and thus enabled the latter to form a small schismatic community (see NOVATIANISM).

At the time of the great persecution of Diocletian, matters took the same course as under Decius. During this severe affliction which assailed the Church, many showed weakness and fell away, and, as before, performed acts of heathen worship, or tried by artifice to evade persecution. Some, with the collusion of the officials, sent their slaves to the pagan sacrifices instead of going themselves; others bribed pagans to assume their names and to perform the required sacrifices (Petrus Alexandrinus, "Liber de pœnitentia" in Routh, "Reliquiæ Sacr.", IV, 2nd ed., 22 sqq). In the Diocletian persecution appeared a new category of lapsi called the *traditores:* these were the Christians (mostly clerics) who, in obedience to an edict, gave up the sacred books to the authorities. The term *traditores* was given both to those who actually gave up the sacred books, and to those who merely delivered secular works in their stead. As on the previous occasion, the lapsi in Rome, under the leadership of a certain Heraclius, tried forcibly to obtain readmission to communion with the Church without performing

penance, but Popes Marcellus and Eusebius adhered strictly to the traditional penitential discipline. The confusion and disputes caused by this difference among the Roman Christians caused Maxentius to banish Marcellus and later Eusebius and Heraclius (cf. Inscriptions of Pope Damasus on Popes Marcellus and Eusebius in Ihm, "Damasi epigrammata", Leipzig, 1895, p. 51, n. 48; p. 25, n. 18). In Africa the unhappy Donatist schism arose from disputes about the lapsi, especially the traditores (see DONATISTS). Several synods of the fourth century drew up canons on the treatment of the lapsi, e. g., the Synod of Elvira in 306 (can. i–iv, xlvi), of Arles in 314 (can. xiii), of Ancyra in 314 (can. i–ix), and the General Council of Nice (can. xiii). Many of the decisions of these synods concerned only members of the clergy who had committed acts of apostasy in time of persecution.

HEFELE, *Konziliengesch.*, I (2nd ed., Freiburg, 1873), 111 sqq., 155 sqq., 211, 222 sqq., 412 sqq.; DUCHESNE, *Hist. ancienne de l'Eglise*, I (Paris, 1906),397 sqq.; FUNK, *Zur altchristl. Bussdisziplin* in *Kirchengesch. Abhandlungen u. Untersuchungen*, I, 158 sqq.; MÜLLER, *Die Bussinstitution in Karthago unter Cyprian* in *Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch.*, XVI (1896), 1–44, 187–219; STUFLER, *Die Behandlung der Gefallenen zur Zeit der Decischen Verfolgung* in *Zeitschr. für kathol. Theol.* (1907), 577 sqq.; CHABALIER, *Les Lapsi dans l'Eglise d'Afrique au temps de S. Cyprien: Thèse* (Lyons, 1904); SCHÖNAICH, *Die Christenverfolgung des Kaisers Decius* (Jauer, 1907); DE ROSSI, *Roma sotterranea cristiana*, II, 201 sqq.; ALLARD, *Histoire des persécutions*, V, 122 sqq. See also bibliography under CYPRIAN, SAINT.

J. P. KIRSCH.

Lapuente (D'APONTE, DE PONTE, DUPONT), LUIS DE, Venerable, b. at Valladolid, 11 November, 1554; d. there, 16 February, 1624. Having entered the Society of Jesus, he studied under the celebrated Suarez, and professed philosophy at Salamanca. Endowed with exceptional talents for government and the formation of young religious, he was forced by impaired health to retire from offices which he had filled with distinction and general satisfaction. The years that followed were devoted to literary composition. Though not reckoned among Spanish classics, his works are so replete with practical spirituality that they claim for him a place among the most eminent masters of asceticism. Ordained priest in 1580, he became the spiritual director of the celebrated Marina de Escobar, in which office he continued till his death. In 1599 he devoted himself with great charity to the care of the plague-stricken in Villagarcia. Of remarkable innocence of life, he not only avoided all grievous sin, but bound himself by vow, some years before his death, to avoid as far as human weakness permitted even venial faults. Besides a mystical commentary in Latin on the Canticle of Canticles, he wrote in Spanish: "Life of Father Baltasar Alvarez"; "Life of Marina de Escobar"; "Spiritual Directory for Confession, Communion and the Sacrifice of the Mass"; "The Christian Life" (4 vols.), and "Meditations on the Mysteries of Our Holy Faith", by which he is best known to English readers. This last work has been translated into ten different languages, including Arabic. A few years after his death, the Sacred Congregation of Rites admitted the cause for his beatification and canonization.

CORDARA, *Hist. S. J.*, VI, ix; NIEREMBERG, *Varones Ilustres*, IX.

HENRY J. SWIFT.

Laranda, a titular see of Isauria, afterwards of Lycaonia. Strabo (XII, 569), informs us that Laranda had belonged to the tyrant Antipater of Derbe, whence we may infer that it was governed by native princes. The city was taken by storm and destroyed by Perdiccas (Diodorus Siculus, XVIII, 22), afterwards rebuilt. Owing to its fertile territory Laranda became one of the most important cities of the district, also one of the principal centres for the pirates of Isauria. It was the birthplace of the poets Nestor and his son Pisander (Suidas, s. v.). In later times it was a part of the sultanate of Konia, and after the possessions of the Seljuks were divided, it became the capital of Caramania, conquered in 1486 by the Osmanli Sultan Bajazet II. The name Laranda is seldom heard in modern days, the city is generally known as Caraman. It has about 15,000 inhabitants, the majority being Mussulmans, and is one of the chief towns of the vilayet of Konia. Cotton and silk fabrics are made there, and it is a railway-station between Konia and Eregli on the way to Bagdad. There are no ancient ruins. Laranda is mentioned as a suffragan of Iconium by the "Notitiæ Episcopatuum" until about the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Only four of its bishops are known: Neo, mentioned by Eusebius (Hist. Eccl., VI, xix); Paul, present at the Council of Nicæa, 325; Ascholius, at Chalcedon, 451; Sabbas, at Constantinople, 879.

LE QUIEN, *Oriens Christ.*, I, 1081; SMITH, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Geog.*, s. v.; RAMSAY, *Asia Minor, passim.*

S. PÉTRIDÈS.

Lares, formerly a titular archiepiscopal see in proconsular Africa. In ancient times it was a fortified town, mentioned by Sallust (Jugurtha, xc), later it received the name of Colonia Ælia Aug. Lares. At least five of its bishops are known: Hortensian, who took part in 252 and 255 at the Councils of Carthage; Victorinus who with his Donatist colleague Honoratus figured at the conference of Carthage; Quintian who lived at the time of the persecution of Huneric (about 480); Vitulus, who was living in 525 in the time of King Hilderic. St. Augustine (Ep. ccxxix), Victor Vitensis (Hist. Pers. Vand., 6 and 9), Procopius (Bell. Vand., II, 22 and 28), also Arabian and other historians mention the town. It is the Lorbeus of to-day, between Tunis and Tebessa; the ruins cover a large area, which would indicate that once it had been a town of considerable importance. A mosque has taken the place of a church, and the ruins of a basilica are still visible.

GAMS, *Series episcoporum*, I, 466; TOULOTTE, *Géographie de l'Afrique chrétienne proconsulaire* (Paris, 1892), 191–4.

S. VAILHÉ.

La Richardie, ARMAND DE, b. at Périgueux, 7 June, 1686; d. at Quebec, 17 March, 1758. He entered the Society of Jesus at Bordeaux, 4 Oct., 1703, and in 1725 was sent to the Canada mission. He spent the two following years helping Father Pierre Daniel Richer at Lorette, and studying the Huron language. In 1728 he went to Detroit to re-establish the long-interrupted mission to the dispersed Petun-Hurons in the West. Not a solitary professing Christian did he find, but among the aged not a few had been baptized. By 1741 things had greatly changed. The new Indian church, though "seventy cubits long" (105 ft.?) was scarcely spacious enough to contain the fervent congregation of practising Hurons. During the night, 24–25 March, 1746, the father was stricken with paralysis, and on 29 July he was placed in an open canoe and thus conveyed to Quebec.

In 1747 the Hurons insisted on his returning to restore tranquillity to their nation. The father had almost completely recovered from his palsy, and willingly consented. He set out from Montreal on 10 Sept., and reached Detroit on 20 Oct. From this date until 1751, leaving the loyal Hurons in the keeping of Father Potier at the Detroit village, he directed all his energies to reclaiming Nicolas Orontondi's band of insurgent Hurons. These had already in 1740, owing to a bloody feud with the Detroit Ottawas and to the reluctance, if not refusal, of Governor Beauharnais to let the Hurons remove to Montreal, sullenly left Detroit and settled at "Little Lake" (now Rondeau Harbour) near Sandusky. There they had been won over to the English cause, had openly revolted in 1747, and had murdered a party of Frenchmen. Early in the spring of 1748 Orontondi (not Orontony) set

fire to the fort and cabins at Sandusky, and withdrew to the Rivière Blanche, not far from the junction of the Ohio and Wabash Rivers. Until his death, which occurred some time after September, 1749, Orontondi continued to intrigue with the English emissaries, the Iroquois, and the disaffected Miamis. When there was no longer doubt of the renegade leader's demise, de La Richardie resolved on a final attempt at conciliation. He had already at intervals spent months at a time among the fugitives, and now on 7 Sept., 1750, at the peril of his life he started, with only three canoe men for the country of the "Nicolites" as they were then termed. The greater number remained obdurate. It is the descendants of the latter who in July, 1843, removed from their lands at Upper Sandusky, Ohio, to beyond the Mississippi, and now occupy the Wyandot reserve in the extreme north-eastern part of Oklahoma. The father's failing strength obliged his superiors to recall him to Quebec in 1751, and on 30 June he bade a final farewell to the Detroit mission. From the autumn of 1751 until his death he filled various important offices in Quebec College. His Huron name was Ondechaouasti.

Original sources: POTIER, *MS. Journal*, passim; *Census of Hurons, Gramm.*, 149–60; *Paris Archives, Ministère des Colonies, Canada: Corresp. générale*, LIII, c. xi, fol. 207–14; LXXIV, c. xi, fol. 80, 268; LXXV, c. xi, fol. 90, 97, 121, 124, 130, 149, 154, 155, 249, 370; LXXVII, c. xi, fol. 166, LXXXI, fol. 160; *Archives Coloniales, Canada: Correspond. gén.*, XCIII, c. xi, fol. 31, 282; *Collection de MSS. relatifs à la Nouvelle-France*, III (Quebec, 1884), passim; *N. Y. Colonial Docs.*, X, 99–130, 134–45, 245–51; *Wisconsin Hist. Coll.*, XVII, XVIII, passim.

Modern authors: SHEA, *Hist. of Cath. Missions among the Indians* (1855) 202–03; IDEM, *Hist. of Cath. Ch. in U. S.*, I, 1886, 631; III, 1890, 330. THWAITES, *Jes. Rels. and Allied Docs.*, LXVIII, 333; LXXIII, 80; DE ROCHEMONTEIX, *Les Jésuites et la Nouv. France*, I, 345, III, 526.

ARTHUR EDWARD JONES.

Larino (LARINUM), DIOCESE OF, in the province of Campobasso, Southern Italy. Larinum was a city of the Frentani (a Samnite tribe) and a Roman *municipium*. The present city is a mile from the site of the ancient Larinum, destroyed by war and epidemic, and is first mentioned as an episcopal see in 668. Noteworthy among the bishops were Giovanni Leone (1440), a distinguished canonist and theologian; Fra Giacomo de' Petruzzi, a saintly and renowned philosopher; Belisario Baldovino (1555), present at the Council of Trent, founder of the seminary and episcopal palace; the Oratorian Gian Tommaso Eustachi (1612), famous for his sanctity; Carlo M. Pianetti (1706), who restored the cathedral, with its beautiful marble façade; Gian Andrea Tria (1726), historian of Larino. The diocese is a suffragan of Benevento, and has 21 parishes with 79,000 souls, 3 religious houses of men and 1 of women, and 1 school for girls.

CAPPELLETTI, *Le chiese d'Italia*, XIX (Venice, 1857); TRIA, *Storia civile ed ecclesiastiche di Larino* (Rome, 1744).

U. BENIGNI.

Larissa, the seat of a titular archbishopric of Thessaly. The city, one of the oldest and richest in Greece, is said to have been founded by Acrisius, who was killed accidentally by his son, Perseus (Stephanus Byzantius, s. v.). There lived Peleus, the hero beloved by the gods, and his son Achilles; however, the city is not mentioned by Homer, unless it be identified with Argissa of the Iliad (II, 738). The constitution of the town was democratic, which explains why it sided with Athens in the Peloponnesian War. In the neighbourhood of Larissa was celebrated a festival which recalled the Roman Saturnalia, and at which the slaves were waited on by their masters. It was taken by the Thebans and afterwards by the Macedonian kings, and Demetrius Poliorcetes gained possession of it for a time, 302 B. C. It was there that Philip V, King of Macedonia, signed in 197 B. C. a shameful treaty with the Romans after his defeat at Cynoscephalæ, and it was there also that Antiochus III, the Great, won a great victory, 192 B. C. Larissa is frequently mentioned in connexion with the Roman civil wars which preceded the establishment of the empire, and Pompey sought refuge there after the defeat of Pharsalus. First Roman, then Greek until the thirteenth century, and afterwards Frankish until 1460, the city fell into the hands of the Turks, who kept it until 1882, when it was ceded to Greece; it suffered greatly from the conflicts between the Greeks and the Turks between 1820 and 1830, and quite recently from the Turkish occupation in 1897. On 6 March, 1770, Aya Pasha massacred there 3000 Christians from Trikala, who had been treacherously brought there.

Very prosperous under the Turkish sovereignty Larissa, which counted 40,000 inhabitants thirty years ago, has now only 14,000, Greeks, Turks, and Jews; the province of which it is the chief town has a population of 140,000. Christianity penetrated early to Larissa, though its first bishop is recorded only in 325 at the Council of Nicæa. We must mention especially, St. Achilius, in the fourth century, whose feast is on 15 May, and who is celebrated for his miracles. Lequien, "Oriens Christ.", II, 103–112, cites twenty-nine bishops from the fourth to the eighteenth centuries; the most famous, Jeremias II, occupied the patriarchal See of Constantinople in the sixteenth century. As to the archbishops of Latin Rite, about ten names were recorded by Lequien, op. cit., III, 979, and chiefly by Eubel, "Hierarchia catholica medii ævi" (Münster), I, 307; II, 191. The metropolitan See of Larissa depended directly on the pope as Patriarch of the West until 733, when the Emperor Leo III the Isaurian annexed it to the Patriarchate of Constantinople. In the first years of the tenth century it had ten suffragan sees (Gelzer, "Ungedruckte . . . Texte der Notitiæ episcopatuum", Munich, 1900, 557); subsequently the number increased and about the year 1175, under the Emperor Manuel Comnenus, it reached twenty-eight (Parthey, "Hieroclis Synecdemus", Berlin, 1866, 120). At the close of the fifteenth century, under the Turkish domination, there were only ten suffragan sees (Gelzer, op. cit., 635), which gradually grew less and finally disappeared. Since 1882, when Thessaly was ceded to Greece, the Orthodox Diocese of Larissa has been dependent on the Holy Synod of Athens, not Constantinople. Owing to the law of 1900 which suppressed all the metropolitan sees excepting Athens, Larissa was reduced to the rank of a simple bishopric; its title is united with that of Pharsalus and Platamon, two adjoining bishoprics now suppressed.

S. VAILHÉ.

La Roche, ALAIN DE. See ALANUS DE RUPE.

La Roche Daillon, JOSEPH DE, Recollect, one of the most zealous missionaries of the Huron tribe, d. in France, 1656. He landed at Quebec, 19 June, 1625, with the first Jesuits who came to New France, and at once set out with the Jesuit Father Brébeuf for Three Rivers, to meet the Hurons into whose country they hoped to enter. Owing to a report that the Hurons had drowned the Recollect Nicolas Viel, their missionary, the journey was put off. In 1626 La Roche Daillon was among the Hurons, leaving whom he passed to the Neutral Nation after travelling six days on foot. He remained with them for three months, and at one time barely escaped being put to death. This caused his return to the Hurons. In 1628 he went to Three Rivers with twenty Huron canoes, on their way to trade pelts with the French. From Three Rivers he journeyed to Quebec, and on the taking of the city, in 1629, the English sent him back to France. La Roche Daillon published an account of his voyage to and sojourn amongst the Neutrals, describing their country and their customs, and mentioning a kind of oil which seems to be coal oil. Sagard and Leclercq reproduced it in their writings, in a more or less abridged form.

CHAMPLAIN, *Œuvres*, ed. LAVERDIÈRE (Quebec, 1870); SAGARD, *Histoire du Canada*, ed. TROSS (Paris, 1866); LECLERCQ, *Etablissement de la Foi* (Paris, 1691); *Relations des Jésuites, Relation de 1641* (Quebec, 1858); PATREM, *Tableau synoptique de l'histoire de tout l'ordre séraphique* (Paris, 1879).

ODORIC-M. JOUVE.

La Rochefoucauld-Liancourt, FRANÇOIS-ALEXANDRE-FRÉDÉRIC, DUKE OF, b. at La Roche-Guyon, 11 January, 1747; d. at Paris, 27 March, 1827. Opposed during the last years of the reign of Louis XV to the government of Maupeou, and the friend of all the reformers who surrounded Louis XVI, he owed to the influence of these economists the favour of the king. Having little liking for the military profession, he devoted himself to scientific agriculture. During the rage for rural life which characterized the last years of the old regime, La Rochefoucauld made his estate at Liancourt an experimental station, wishing to improve both the soil and the peasantry. He introduced new methods of farming, founded the first model technical school in France (intended for the children of poor soldiers), and started two factories. Politically, he was a partisan of a democratic regime of which the king was to be the head, and throughout his life was faithful to this dream. Deputy for the nobility of Clermont in Beauvaisis at the States-General, he voted unhesitatingly for the "reunion of the three orders". It was he who in the night which followed the taking of the Bastille (14 July, 1789) roused Louis XVI, saying: "Sire, it is not a revolt, it is a revolution." He presided at the Constituent Assembly from 20 July to 3 August, 1789. On the night of 4 August he was one of the most enthusiastic in voting the abolition of titles of nobility and privileges. As grand master of the wardrobe he accompanied Louis XVI from Versailles to Paris on 5 and 6 October, 1789. As president of the committee of mendicancy, he made a supreme effort at the Constituent Assembly to organize public relief; he determined the extent and the limits of the rights of every citizen to assistance, determined the obligations of the State, and established a budget of State assistance which amounted annually to five millions and a half of francs, and which implied the national confiscation of hospital property, of ecclesiastical charitable property, and of the income from private foundations.

Liancourt is one of the most undiscerning representatives of the tendency which led the revolutionary state to destroy all collective forms of charity. Absolutely devoted to the person of Louis XVI as well as to the doctrines of the Revolution, he secured for himself in 1792 the lieutenancy of Normandy and Picardy, so as to prepare for the flight of the king as far as Rouen; but Louis XVI refused to place himself in the hands of constitutional deputies. La Rochefoucauld-Liancourt emigrated shortly after 10 August, and resided in England until 1794, afterwards in the United States (1794–7). He took advantage of his residence in that country to write eight volumes on the United States, to induce Washington to interfere in favour of Lafayette, and to gather ideas upon education and agriculture which he attempted later to apply in France. After 18 Brumaire, Napoleon authorized him to return to his Liancourt estate, which was restored to him. This former duke and peer gloried in being appointed, during the First Empire (1806), general inspector of the "Ecole des arts et métiers" at Châlons, of which his Liancourt school had been a forerunner. The book "Prisons de Philadelphie", which he composed in America and published in 1796, was meant to initiate a penitentiary reform in France; at the Restoration in 1814 he begged but one favour—to be appointed prison inspector. In 1819 he became inspector of one of the twenty-eight *arrondissements* into which France was divided for penitentiary purposes. Louis XVIII gave him back neither the blue ribbon nor the mastership of the wardrobe, and in the House of Peers he sat with the opposition.

La Rochefoucauld-Liancourt was the Franklin of the Revolution. An aristocrat by birth, a liberal in his views, in touch with all the representatives of the new commerce, he availed himself of this concurrence of circumstances to become the leader of every campaign for the people's protection and betterment: improvement of sanitary conditions in hospitals and foundling asylums, reorganization of schools according to the theories of Lancaster, whose book he had translated (Système anglais d'Instruction). He brought into use the method of mutual instruction, and the pupils between 1816 and 1820 increased from 165,000 to 1,123,000. In 1818 he established the first savings bank and provident institution in Paris. On 19 Nov., 1821, he founded the Society of Christian Morals, over which he presided until 1825. It was at times looked upon with suspicion by the police of the Restoration. At its meetings were such men as Charles de Rémusat, Charles Coquerel, Guizot the pedagogue, Oberlin, and Llorente, historian of the Inquisition. Broglie, Guizot, and Benjamin Constant were chairmen in turn, and Dufaure, Tocqueville, and Lamartine made there their maiden speeches. In these meetings provident institutions, rather than charitable ones, were discussed; slavery, lottery, gambling were combatted, and the matter of prison inspection was taken up. When La Rochefoucauld-Liancourt died, the Restoration would not permit the students of Châlons to carry his coffin, and the two chambers were much concerned over such extreme measures. La Rochefoucauld-Liancourt was a typical philanthropist, with all that this word implies of generous intentions and practical innovations; but also with a certain naïve pride, inherited from the philosophy of the eighteenth century, which led him to mistrust the charitable initiative of the Church, and to forget that the Church, the most perfect representative of the spirit of brotherhood, is still called in our modern society to win the victory for this spirit by putting it to practical uses, as she alone can.

FERDINAND-DREYFUS, *Un philanthrope d'autrefois: La Rochefoucauld-Liancourt, 1747–1827* (Paris, 1903).

GEORGES GOYAU.

La Rochejacquelein, HENRI-AUGUSTE-GEORGES DU VERGIER, COMTE DE, French politician; b. at the château of Citran (Gironde), on 28 September, 1805; d. on 7 January, 1867. He belonged to an old illustrious French family, whose name is mentioned in connexion with Saint Louis's Crusade in 1248. His father, Louis de La Rochejacquelein, and his uncle Henri had won fame as royalist generals in the wars of the Vendéans against the National Convention. His mother left interesting memoirs which have been edited many times. Young La Rochejacquelein entered the military academy at Saint-Cyr at the age of sixteen and in 1823 he received a commission as second lieutenant in the cavalry. He took part in the Spanish War (1823) and in the Russo-Turkish War of 1828. In 1825 he had been made a peer, but he resigned shortly after the Revolution of 1830, which brought the younger branch of the House of Bourbon to the throne of France. The Department of Morbi-

COMTE DE LA ROCHEJACQUELEIN

han sent him to the legislature in 1842. He took his seat among the members of the Extreme Right, or Legitimist party, with whom he usually cast his vote, although he occasionally supported liberal measures. In 1848 the "Gazette de France" supported his candidacy for the presidency of the newly established French Republic, but he obtained only an insignificant number of votes. In 1852 he was made a senator by Napoleon III, which caused some astonishment and comment among his friends the Legitimists. In the senate La Rochejacquelein always showed himself an ardent defender of Catholicism, but he may be reproached with having given his support to the whole foreign policy of the imperial Government. He published a number of works on political and economical subjects, among them being: "Considérations sur l'impôt du sel" (Paris, 1844); "Opinion sur le projet de loi relatif à la réforme des pensions" (1844); "Situation de la France" (1849); "A mon pays" (1850); "La France en 1853" (1853); "Question du jour" (1856); "La suspension d'armes" (1859); "La politique internationale et le droit des gens" (1860); "Un schisme et l'honneur" (1861).

Biographie des 900 députés à l'Assemblée nationale (Paris, 1848); *Biographie des 750 députés à l'Assemblée législative* (Paris, 1852).

PIERRE MARIQUE.

La Rochelle, DIOCESE OF (RUPELLENSIS), suffragan of Bordeaux, comprises the entire Department of Charente-Inférieure. The See of Maillezais (see LUÇON) was transferred on 7 May, 1648, to La Rochelle, which diocese just previous to the Revolution, aside from the territory of the former Bishopric of Maillezais, included the present arrondissements of Marennes, Rochefort, La Rochelle, and a part of Saint-Jean-d'Angély. At the Concordat the entire territory of the former See of Saintes (less the part comprised in the Department of Charente, and belonging to the See of Angoulême) and of the See of Luçon was added to it. In 1821 a see was established at Luçon, and had under its jurisdiction, aside from the former Diocese of Luçon, almost the entire former Diocese of Maillezais; so that Maillezais, once transferred to La Rochelle, no longer belongs to the diocese now known as La Rochelle et Saintes.

I. SEE OF LA ROCHELLE.—Mgr Landriot, a well-known religious writer, occupied this see from 1856 to 1867. St. Louis of France is the titular saint of the cathedral of La Rochelle and the patron of the city. St. Eutropius, first Bishop of Saintes, is the principal patron of the present Diocese of La Rochelle. In this diocese are especially honoured: St. Gemme, martyr (century unknown); St. Seronius, martyr (third century); St. Martin, Abbot of the Saintes monastery (fifth century); St. Vaise, martyr about 500; St. Maclovius (Malo), first Bishop of Aleth, Brittany, who died in Saintonge about 570; St. Amand, Bishop of Maastricht (seventh century). From 1534 La Rochelle and the Province of Aunis were a centre of Calvinism. In 1573 the city successfully resisted the Duke of Anjou, brother of Charles IX, and remained the chief fortress of the Huguenots in France. But in 1627 the alliance of La Rochelle with the English proved to Louis XIII and to Richelieu that the political independence of the Protestants would be a menace to France; the famous siege of La Rochelle (5 August, 1627—28 October, 1628), in the course of which the population was reduced from 18,000 inhabitants to 5000, terminated with a capitulation which put an end to the political claims of the Calvinistic minority.

II. ANCIENT SEE OF SAINTES.—Saintes had a certain importance under the Romans, as is proved by many existing monuments. The oldest bishop of known date is Peter, who took part in the Council of Orléans (511). The first bishop, however, is St. Eutropius. Venantius Fortunatus, in a poem written in the second half of the sixth century, makes explicit mention of him in connexion with Saintes. Eutropius was said to be a Persian of royal descent, ordained and sent to Gaul by St. Clement; at Saintes he converted to Christianity the governor's daughter, St. Eustelle, and like her suffered martyrdom. This tradition is noted by Gregory of Tours, with a cautious *ut fertur;* Saintes is thus the only church of Gaul which Gregory traces back to the first century. This evidence is much weakened, says Mgr Duchesne, by Gregory's remark to the effect that no one knew the history of St. Eutropius before the removal of his relics by Bishop Palladius, which took place about 590. At this tardy date seems to have arisen the account of Eutropius as a martyr. Among the bishops of Saintes are mentioned: St. Vivianus (419–52?), once Count of Saintes, later a monk; St. Trojanus, died about 532; St. Concordius (middle of the sixth century); S. Pallais (Palladius), about 580, to whom St. Gregory the Great recommended St. Augustine on his way to England; St. Leontius, bishop in 625; Cardinal Raimond Perauld (1503–05), an ecclesiastical writer, several times nuncio, legate for a crusade against the infidels and the re-establishment of peace between Maximilian and Louis XII; Cardinal François Soderini (1507–16), who died in Rome as dean of the Sacred College, and his nephew Jules Soderini (1516–44); Charles of Bourbon (1544–50), cardinal in 1548, afterwards Archbishop of Rouen, whom Mayenne wished later to make King of France; Pierre Louis de La Rochefoucauld (1782–92), massacred at Paris with his brother, the Bishop of Beauvais, 2 September, 1792, thus closing the list of the bishops of the diocese as it opened, with a martyr.

Several councils were held at Saintes: in 562 or 563, when Bishop Emerius, illegally elected, was deposed and Heraclius appointed in his stead; other councils were held in 579, 1074 or 1075, 1080, 1081, at which last, metropolitan authority over the sees of Lower Brittany was granted to Tours as against the claims of Dol, and William VII gave the church of St. Eutropius to the monks of Cluny; also in 1083, 1088, 1089, 1097. The crypt of St. Eutropius, one of the largest in France, dates from the beginning of the twelfth century. Urban II consecrated it on 20 April, 1096. Kings of France and England, and dukes of Guyenne, enriched the church with numerous foundations. Charles VII made a pilgrimage to it in 1441. Louis XI himself wrote a prayer against dropsy, in honour of St. Eutropius. Through the Middle Ages many pilgrimages were made to the tomb. In 1568 the Calvinists ravaged the crypt, but the tomb of St. Eutropius was so well hidden by the monks that it was thought to be lost; it was not until 19 May, 1843, that it was again discovered. In a Bull of Nicholas V, 1451, it is said that the cathedral of Saintes was the second church ever dedicated to St. Peter. Geoffrey Martel, Count of Anjou, and his wife, Agnes of Burgundy, founded in 1047 the Abbey of Notre-Dame de Saintes for Benedictine nuns, which foundation was sanctioned by a Bull of Leo IX. During seven centuries this monastery had thirty abbesses, most of them daughters of the first families of France. The abbey church, now a military barrack, is Poitou Romanesque of the twelfth century. The Church of Saintes claims the honour of being the first to begin the practice of the Angelus (q. v.); when John XXII heard of this pious custom he solemnly authorized it by two Bulls (1318, 1327). The monastery of "Angeriacum", founded in 768 by Pepin the Short, was the beginning of the town of Saint-Jean-d'Angély. In 1010 Abbot Alduin, while having the walls of the church restored, declared that he found in a cylindrical stone a silver reliquary containing the head of St. John the Baptist; William V, Duke of Aquitaine, had the relic exposed, and King Robert and Queen Constance inspected it. The future fifteenth-century Cardinal Jean de La Balue was Abbot of Saint-Jean-d'Angély.

Bernard Palissy, the famous artist in ceramics (1510–90), was one of the founders of the Protestant Reform Church of Saintes, and his atelier was about 1562 a secret assembly-place of the Huguenots; for this he was summoned before the Parlement. Aside from the Basilica of St. Eutropius, the principal pilgrimages of the diocese are: Our Lady of Corme-Écluse, near Saujon; Our Lady of Pity, at Croix-Gente (twelfth century); Our Lady of Seven Sorrows, at Jaugou.

There were in the Diocese of La Rochelle, when the Associations Law was enforced, Lazarists, Little Brothers of Mary, Marianists, Children of Mary Immaculate, and a local congregation called the Brothers of St. Francis of Assisi, known as "farming brothers"; this congregation, founded in 1841 by Père Deshayes, then superior general of the Missionaries of the Holy Ghost, the Daughters of Wisdom, and the St. Gabriel Brothers, looked after the agricultural instruction of foundlings. Three congregations of women trace their origin to this diocese: the Providence Sisters of St. Joseph, a teaching order founded at La Rochelle in 1658 by Isabelle Mauriet; Providence Sisters of St. Mary, a teaching order founded in 1818, with the mother-house at Saintes; Ursulines of the Sacred Heart, a nursing and teaching order, founded in 1807 by Père Charles Barreaud, with mother-house at Pons. In 1900, before the Associations Law, the religious congregations had in the diocese one crèche, 34 day nurseries, one convalescent home for children, an institute for the blind, an agricultural settlement for boys, 8 orphanages for girls, an industrial room, a society for the preservation of young girls from danger, 14 hospitals, homes, and asylums for the aged, 18 convents of visiting nurses, 2 houses of retreat, and an insane asylum. In 1905 (last year of the Concordat) the Diocese of La Rochelle had 452,-149 inhabitants, 46 parishes, 326 succursal churches, 52 curacies.

Gallia Christiana, Nova, II (1720), 1053, 1093 and *instrum.*, 457–86; DUCHESNE, *Fastes épiscopaux de l'ancienne Gaule*, II, 72–75 and 138–39; BRIAND, *Histoire de l'église santone et aunisienne depuis son origine* (3 vols., La Rochelle, 1845–46); BUNNELL LEWIS, *The antiquities of Saintes* (London, 1887); AUDIAT, *Documents pour l'histoire des diocèses de Saintes et de La Rochelle* (Paris, 1882); IDEM, *Abbaye de Notre-Dame de Saintes, histoire et documents* (Paris, 1884); BRUHAT, *De administratione terrarum Sanctonensis abbatiæ, 1047–1220* (La Rochelle, 1901); AUDIAT, *Le diocèse de Saintes au XVIII^e siècle* (Paris, 1894); PALAYSI, *Bernard Palissy et les débuts de la Réforme en Saintonge* (Cahors, 1899); COURPRON, *Essai sur l'histoire du protestantisme en Aunis et Saintonge, 1685–1787* (Cahors, 1902); BARBOT, *Histoire de La Rochelle*, ed. DENYS D'AUSSY (3 vols., Paris, 1880–90); DE LA GRAVIÈRE, *Les origines de la marine française et la tactique naturelle: le siège de La Rochelle* (Paris, 1891); RODOCANACHI, *Les derniers temps du siège de La Rochelle, relation du nonce apostolique Guidi* (Paris, 1899); LARONZE, *Quas ob causas rupellensis respublica perierit* (La Rochelle, 1890); CHEVALIER, *Topo-Bibl.*, s. v. *Rochelle.*

GEORGES GOYAU.

La Rocque, PAUL. See SHERBROOKE, DIOCESE OF.

Larrey, DOMINIQUE-JEAN, Baron, French military surgeon, b. at Baudéan, Hautes-Pyrénées, July, 1766; d. at Lyons, 25 July, 1842. His parents were so poor that he obtained his preliminary education only through the kindness of the village priest. After the death of his father, when the boy was thirteen years of age, he was sent to his uncle Dr. Oscar Larrey, a successful surgeon of Toulouse. The surgical ability of the family had already been established by his elder brother, Charles-François-Hilaire Larrey, recognized as an able surgeon and writer on surgery. At the age of twenty-one the younger Larrey went to Paris, and after a brilliant competitive examination entered the navy. Later he became a pupil of Dessault. He joined the army in 1792, and the next year established the *ambulance volante* (flying ambulance), a corps of surgeons and nurses who went into battle with the men and tended to their wounds on the battle-field as far as was possible. For this he was made surgeon-in-chief and accompanied Napoleon on his expedition into Egypt. He became a great favourite with Napoleon for his devotion to duty. He was noted not only for his care of the wounded soldiers during and after the battles, but also for his care of the health of the troops at all times. Friends or enemies all received the same devoted attention. For distinguished courage he was made a baron by Napoleon on the field of Wagram in 1809. He was wounded at Austerlitz and at Waterloo. He made many ingenious and important inventions in operations, and significant advances in clinical surgery. His observations in medicine and on the health of troops during campaigns were scarcely less valuable. Some of his suggestions on medicine and surgery are still used. "If ever", said Napoleon, "the soldiers erect a statue it should be to Baron Larrey, the most virtuous man I have ever known." He has two monuments, one erected in 1850 in the court of the Val-de-Grâce military hospital, Paris, and the other in the hall of the Academy of Medicine. The American surgeon Agnew said of him: "As an operator he was judicious but bold and rapid; calm and self-possessed in every emergency; but full of feeling and tenderness. He stands among the military surgeons where Napoleon stands among the generals, the first and the greatest." His attachment to his profession was only exceeded by his patriotism. After the exile of Napoleon, deprived of his honours and emoluments, though solicited by the Emperor of Russia and by Pedro I of Brazil to take charge of their armies with high rank, he refused to leave his native land. One of his special pleasures at the end of his life was a meeting with the Abbé de Grace, the preceptor of his early years, whom he held in high veneration. His works have been a favourite study of the surgeons of all nations during the nineteenth century. Most of them have been translated into all modern languages. His principal works are: "Relation histor. et chirurg. de l'expédition de l'armée d'Orient en Egypte et en Syrie" (Paris, 1803), translated into English and German; "Clinique chirurgicale dans les camps et hôpitaux militaires"; "Surgical Memoirs of Campaigns: Russia, Germany, France" (Philadelphia, 1832); "Choléra Morbus, Mémoire" (Paris, 1831).

The principal sources of material for his life are his works. AGNEW, *Baron Larrey* (Philadelphia, 1861); WERNER, *Larrey, Ein Lebensbild* (Berlin, 1885).

JAMES J. WALSH.

Larue, CHARLES DE, b. 29 July, 1685 (some say 12 July, 1684), at Corbie, in France; d. 5 Oct., 1739, at St. Germain-des-Près. Very early he displayed talent in the study of languages and signs of a religious vocation. He took the habit of St. Benedict in the Abbey of St. Faro at Meaux, and made his religious profession on 21 Nov., 1703. He then studied philosophy and theology, and in 1712 was sent to Paris to assist Dom Bernard de Montfaucon in his literary work The latter soon had a true estimate of his young assistant, and set him to work at editing all the works of Origen, except the "Hexapla". Larue worked with energy; in 1725 printing was begun, and eight years later two volumes appeared with a dedication to Pope Clement XII. In the preface Larue gives the various

opinions of earlier writers on Origen and his works, and states his reasons for making a new edition. The first volume contains the letters of Origen (mostly in fragments), the four books "De principiis" on prayer, an exhortation to martyrdom, and the eight books against Celsus. To this is added "De recta in Deum fide contra Marcionem", which had been published in 1674 under the name of Origen. Larue proves that this book and the books "Contra hæreses" are falsely ascribed to Origen. To each book Larue adds copious explanatory notes. In the preface to the second volume is given an outline of the method followed by Origen in explaining the Holy Scriptures; then follow the commentaries on the Pentateuch, Josue, Judges, Ruth, Kings, Job, and the Psalter. Larue had gathered material for two other volumes, but a stroke of paralysis put an end to his labours. They were edited by his nephew Vincent de Larue, a member of the same congregation.

Tassin, *Gelehrtengesch. der Congr. von St. Maur*, II (Leipzig, 1874), 271; Lama, *Bibl. des écrivains de la Congr. de St. Maur*, no. 451; Kaulen in *Kirchenlex.*, s.v.; Hurter, *Nomenclator.*

Francis Mershman.

La Rue, Charles de, one of the great orators of the Society of Jesus in France in the seventeenth century, b. at Paris, 3 August, 1643; d. there, 27 May, 1725. He entered the novitiate on 7 September, 1659, and being afterwards professor of the humanities and rhetoric, he attracted attention while still young by a poem on the victories of Louis XIV. Corneille translated it and offered it to the king, saying that his work did not equal the original of the young Jesuit. He wrote several tragedies, brought out an edition of Virgil, and wrote several Latin poems. After having several times refused to permit him to go to Canada, his superiors assigned him to preaching; as an orator he was much admired by the court and the king. His funeral orations on the Dukes of Burgundy and Luxemburg, and that on Bossuet, his sermons on "Les Calamités publiques" and "The Dying Sinner" have been regarded as masterpieces by the greatest masters. He preached missions among the Protestants of Languedoc for three years. He was a most virtuous religious, and during his last years endured courageously great infirmities.

P. Vergilii Maronis opera, interpretatione et notis illustravit Carolus Ruæus Soc. Jesu, jussu Christianissimi Regis, ad usum Serenissimi Delphini (Paris, 1675), frequently reprinted in France, England, Italy, Germany (latest Paris, 1864, 3 vols.). All the oratorical works in Migne, *Coll. intégrale et univ. des Orateurs sacrés* (1844–66), XXVIII, col. 199–1570; XXXIII, 1129–1214; *Quaresimale del P. Carlo Della Rue* (Milan, 1858); *Conferenze tenute nell' avento* (Milan, 1853); Nettement, *Oraisons Funèbres de Bossuet, Bourdaloue, de La Rue* (Paris, 1842); *Eloge du P. de La Rue* in *Mercure de France*, June, 1725, 1324–1332; Feller, *Dict. hist.*, V (1839), 350; Sommervogel, *Bibl. de la Compagnie de Jésus*, VII, col. 290–307, contains a complete list of his works.

Abel Champon.

La Salette, in the commune and parish of La Salette-Fallavaux, Canton of Corps, Department of Isère, and Diocese of Grenoble. It is celebrated as the place where, it is said, the Blessed Virgin appeared to two little shepherds; and each year is visited by a large number of pilgrims. On 19 Sept., 1846, about three o'clock in the afternoon in full sunlight, on a mountain about 5918 feet high and about three miles distant from the village of La Salette-Fallavaux, it is related that two children, a shepherdess of fifteen named Mélanie Calvat, called Mathieu, and a shepherd-boy of eleven named Maximin Giraud, both of them very ignorant, beheld in a resplendent light a "beautiful lady" clad in a strange costume. Speaking alternately in French and in patois, she charged them with a message which they were "to deliver to all her people". After complaining of the impiety of Christians, and threatening them with dreadful chastisements in case they should persevere in evil, she promised them the Divine mercy if they would amend. Finally, it is alleged, before disappearing she communicated to each of the children a special secret. The sensation caused by the recital of Mélanie and Maximin was profound, and gave rise to several investigations and reports. Mgr Philibert de Bruillard, Bishop of Grenoble, appointed a commission to examine judicially this marvellous event; the commission concluded that the reality of the apparition should be admitted. Soon several miraculous cures took place on the mountain of La Salette, and pilgrimages to the place were begun. The miracle, needless to say, was ridiculed by free-thinkers, but it was also questioned among the faithful, and especially by ecclesiastics. There arose against it in the Dioceses of Grenoble and Lyons a violent opposition, aggravated by what is known as the incident of Ars. As a result of this hostility and the consequent agitation, Mgr de Bruillard (16 November, 1851) declared the apparition of the Blessed Virgin as certain, and authorized the cult of Our Lady of La Salette. This act subdued, but did not suppress, the opposition, whose leaders, profiting by the succession in 1852 of a new bishop, Mgr Ginoulhiac, to Mgr Bruillard, who had resigned, retaliated with violent attacks on the reality of the miracle of La Salette. They even asserted that the "beautiful lady" was a young woman named Lamerlière, which story gave rise to a widely advertised suit for slander. Despite these hostile acts, the first stone of a great church was solemnly laid on the mount of La Salette, 25 May, 1852, amid a large assembly of the faithful. This church, later elevated to the rank of a basilica, was served by a body of religious called Missionaries of La Salette (q. v.). Since 1891 diocesan priests have replaced these missionaries, driven into exile by persecuting laws.

As said above, the Blessed Virgin confided to each of the two children a special secret. These two secrets, which neither Mélanie or Maximin ever made known to each other, were sent by them in 1851 to Pius IX on the advice of Mgr de Bruillard. It is unknown what impression these mysterious revelations made on the pope, for on this point there are two versions diametrically opposed to each other. Maximin's secret is not known, for it was never published. Mélanie's was inserted in its entirety in a brochure which she herself had printed in 1879 at Lecce, Italy, with the approval of the bishop of that town. A lively controversy followed as to whether the secret published in 1879 was identical with that communicated to Pius IX in 1851, or whether in its second form it was not merely a work of the imagination. The latter was the opinion of wise and prudent persons, who were persuaded that a distinction must be made between the two Mélanies, between the innocent and simple *voyante* of 1846 and the visionary of 1879, whose mind had been disturbed by reading apocalyptic books and the lives of *illuminati*. As Rome uttered no decision the strife was prolonged between the disputants. Most of the defenders of the text of 1879 suffered censure from their bishops. Maximin Giraud, after an unhappy and wandering life, returned to Corps, his native village, and died there a holy death (1 March, 1875). Mélanie Calvat ended a no less wandering life at Altamura, Italy (15 Dec., 1904).

Bez (Canon), *Pèlerinage à la Salette, ou examen critique de l'apparition de la sainte Vierge à deux bergers* (Lyons, 1847); Rousselot, *La vérité sur l'évènement de La Salette du 19 septembre 1846, ou Rapport à Mgr l'évêque de Grenoble sur l'apparition de la sainte Vierge à deux petits bergers sur la montagne de La Salette* (Grenoble, 1848); Idem, *Nouveaux documents sur l'événement de La Salette* (Grenoble, 1850); Bez (Abbé), *M. Vianney, curé d'Ars, et Maximin Giraud, berger de La Salette, ou la vérité récupérant ses droits* (Paris and Lyons, 1851); Rousselot, *Défense de l'événement de La Salette contre de nouvelles attaques* (Grenoble, 1851); Idem, *Un nouveau sanctuaire à Marie ou conclusion de l'affaire de La Salette* (Grenoble, 1853); Nicolas, *La Salette devant la raison* (Paris, 1855); Giraud, *Ma profession de foi sur l'apparition de Notre Dame de La Salette* (Paris, 1866); Calvat, *L'apparition de la très sainte Vierge sur la montagne de La Salette le 19 septembre 1846* (Lecce, 1879), a pamphlet several times reprinted in France; Bertrand, *La Salette, docu-*

ments et bibliographie (Paris, 1889). The chief works published against the apparition of La Salette are the following: DONNADIEU (pseudonym of Abbé DÉLÉON), *La Salette-Fallavaux* (*Fallax Vallis*), *ou la Vallée du Mensonge* (Grenoble, 1852–53); DÉLÉON AND CARTELLIER, *La Salette devant le pape . . . par plusieurs membres du clergé diocésain* (Grenoble, 1854). For the Lamerlière affair, see FAVRE, *Mémoire pour Mlle Constance de Saint-Ferréol de Lamerlière* (Paris, s. d. [1857]); SABBATIER, *Affaire de La Salette, Mlle de Lamerlière contre MM. Déléon et Cortellier* (Grenoble, 1857). The best work on the difficulties relating to the apparition of La Salette is VERDUNOY, *La Salette, étude critique* (Paris, 1906).

LÉON CLUGNET.

La Salette, MISSIONARIES OF.—The Missionaries of La Salette were founded in 1852, at the shrine of Our Lady of La Salette, where some priests banded together to care for the numerous pilgrims frequenting the mountain. In 1858 these priests formed a little community with temporary constitutions, under the immediate charge of the Bishop of Grenoble. In 1876 Right Rev. Mgr Fava gave them more complete rules, and in May, 1890, the Institute was approved by Rome. Finding it hard to recruit their number from the secular clergy, the fathers founded an "Apostolic school" or missionary college in 1876. At present they have about 250 students. Their classical course lasts six years, and after their novitiate they repair to Rome, where the scholasticate is located. Here they complete their philosophical and theological course in the Gregorian University. In 1892 five of the missionaries arrived in the United States with fifteen students. Bishop McMahon of Hartford, Conn., welcomed them into his diocese, and they established themselves in the episcopal city, occupying the former bishop's residence on Collins Street. In 1895 they removed to their present quarters at 85 New Park Ave., Hartford, Conn., close to the church of Our Lady of Sorrows. Hitherto a mission church of the cathedral, it was made a parish and given in charge of the fathers, who began to tend it on Ascension Day of the same year. In 1894, having established themselves in the Springfield Diocese, the fathers received the French parish of St. Joseph, Fitchburg, Mass., from Rt. Rev. Thomas Beaven. In 1895 Rt. Rev. Michael Tierney, successor to Bishop McMahon, requested the fathers to take charge of the mixed parish of St. James, Danielson, Conn. In 1901, at the suggestion of Bishop Beaven of Springfield, the Very Rev. Superior General sent a few students to Poland to prepare themselves for Polish parishes in the Springfield Diocese, and at present the parish at Ware and that of Westfield are in their care. In 1902 they were received into the Diocese of Sherbrooke, Canada, with a parish at Stanstead, P. Q., Canada, and also into the Archdiocese of New York, with a parish at Phœnicia, Ulster Co. At the request of Archbishop Langevin of St. Boniface, Canada, a few fathers were sent from the mother-house in Hartford to establish themselves in West Canada. They now form a separate province with headquarters at Forget, Sask. They tend to the spiritual wants of four flourishing parishes, Forget, Esteven, Ossa, and Weyburn. In 1909, the missionaries deeming their order sufficiently developed, owing to additional foundations in Belgium, Madagascar, Poland, and Brazil, the Very Rev. Superior General petitioned the Holy See to approve their constitutions. The request was granted 29 January, 1909. The students of the Apostolic schools are trained chiefly to combat the great crimes of the day, especially those denounced in the discourse of the Blessed Virgin at La Salette. The spirit of the community is that which pervades the whole apparition of Mary on the Mountain of La Salette—a spirit of prayer and sacrifice.

J. GUINET.

La Salle, JEAN BAPTIST DE. See JOHN BAPTIST DE LA SALLE, SAINT.

La Salle, RENÉ-ROBERT-CAVELIER, SIEUR DE, explorer, b. at Rouen, 1643; d. in Texas, 1687. In his youth he displayed an unusual precocity in mathematics and a predilection for natural science; his outlook upon life was somewhat puritanical. Whether or not he was educated with a view to entering the Society of Jesus is a matter of doubt, though some religious order he must have subsequently joined, for to this fact is assigned the forfeiture of his estates. The career of a churchman was definitively abandoned, however, when, after receiving the feudal grant of a tract of land at La Chine on the St. Lawrence from the Sulpicians, *seigneurs* of Montreal—perhaps through the influence of an elder brother who was a member of the order at that place—he came to Canada as an adventurer and trader in 1666. For three years La Salle remained quietly upon his little estate, mastering Indian dialects and meditating on a southwest passage. Upon the latter quest he set out in 1669 with a party of Sulpicians, who, deeming that there was greater missionary work among the north-western tribes, soon abandoned the expedition. La Salle's subsequent travels on this occasion are shrouded in an obscurity that will perhaps never be dispelled. Whether he was the first white man to gaze upon Niagara, whether he explored the Allegheny valley or the Ohio river, he seems not to have reached the Mississippi, Joliet's undisputed claim to that distinction during La Salle's residence in Canada being regarded, at present, as finally established. Indeed Joliet's announcement, some few years later, that the *Grande Rivière* flowed into the Gulf of Mexico perceptibly stimulated La Salle to fashion and carry out those schemes which must have been taking shape even in the novitiate at Rouen—dreams of acquiring a monopoly of the fur trade and of building up the empire of New France. The French doctrine that the discovery of a river gave an inchoate right to the land drained by its tributaries suggested to La Salle and Governor Frontenac a "plan to effect a military occupation of the whole Mississippi valley . . . by means of military posts which should control the communication and sway the policy of the Indian tribes", as well as present an impassable barrier to the English colonies. The money needed for such a plan drove La Salle to those attempts at a monopoly which engendered such persistent opposition, and which account, partly at least, for the failure of his plans.

A trip to France in the autumn of 1674 followed his erection of Fort Frontenac for the protection of the fur trade at the outlet of Lake Ontario. The king gave him a grant of this fort and the adjacent territory, promised to garrison it at his own expense, and conferred upon him the rank of esquire. Upon his return, La Salle rebuilt the fort, launched upon the Niagara River the "Griffin", a forty-five ton schooner with five guns, in which, with Hennepin, a Franciscan, and the Neapolitan Henri de Tonty, he set sail in the autumn of 1678, passed over Lakes Erie and Huron, and reached the southern extremity of Lake Michigan. Here the gunboat was sent back, unlawfully laden with furs to appease La Salle's creditors, and was never heard from again. The expedition pushed on to the Illinois, where Fort Crèvecœur was built. After waiting through the winter for the return of the "Griffin", La Salle, leaving the faithful Tonty in charge of the fort, resolved to return one thousand miles on foot to Montreal, accompanied by four Frenchmen and an Indian guide. The sufferings of this famous retreat were borne with incredible fortitude, and he was returning with supplies when it was learned that the garrison at Fort Crèvecœur had mutinied, had driven Tonty into the wilderness, and were then cruising about Lake Ontario in the hope of murdering La Salle. The dauntless Frenchman pushed out at once upon the lake, captured the mutineers, sent them back in irons to the governor, and then went to the rescue of Tonty, whom he met at Mackinaw on his return trip after abandoning the

search. For a brief space in 1682 La Salle's fate seems more propitious, when, on 9 April, we catch a glimpse of him planting the fleurs-de-lis on the banks of the Mississippi, and claiming for France the wide territory that it drained. But, five years later, in the wretched failure of an attempt to plant a colony at the mouth of the Mississippi, he was murdered by mutineers from ambush.

La Salle's schemes of empire and of trade were far too vast for his own generation to accomplish, though it was along the lines that he projected that France pursued her colonial policy in the New World in the eighteenth century until finally overthrown by the English in the French and Indian Wars.

Margry, *Mémoires et Documents* (Paris, 1879–88), I, II, III; Shea, *Discovery of the Mississippi;* Charlevoix, *Histoire de la Nouvelle-France* (Paris, 1744; tr. Shea, New York, 1865–72); Leclercq, *Etablissement de la foi dans la Nouvelle-France* (Paris, 1691; tr. Shea, New York, 1881); Parkman, *La Salle and the Discovery of the Great West* (New York, 1869). For full bibliography of the La Salle-Marquette-Joliet controversy, consult Winsor, *Narrative and Critical History of America*, IV (London, 1884–9), 245 sqq.

Jarvis Keiley.

Lasaulx, Ernst von, scholar and philosopher, b. at Coblenz, 16 March, 1805; d. at Munich, 9 May, 1861. His father, Johann Claudius von Lasaulx, was a distinguished architect; his uncle, Johann Joseph Görres (q. v.), was the fiery champion of Catholic liberties; and the young Ernst became imbued with an enthusiasm for the Catholic Faith and for liberty. He first studied at Bonn (1824–30), and later took up classical philology and philosophy at Munich, attaching himself in particular to Schelling, Görres, and Baader, and then spent four years travelling through Austria, Italy, Greece, and Palestine, visiting the places most famous in the history of civilization, both pagan and Christian. His voyage to Athens was made as a member of the suite of Prince Otto of Wittelsbach (Bavaria), who had been elected King of the Hellenes. On his return to his native land he took the doctor's degree at Kiel, in 1835, presenting a dissertation entitled "De mortis dominatu in veteres, commentatio theologica-philosophica", and was appointed *dozent* in classical philology at the University of Würzburg, where he exercised a deep and far-reaching influence on the youth of the university. Meanwhile he married Julie Baader, daughter of the Munich philosopher, Franz Baader.

Upon the arrest (20 November, 1837) of Clemens August, Archbishop of Cologne, whose forcible detention in the fortress of Minden by order of the Prussian Government caused a great stir in Catholic circles both at home and abroad, Lasaulx wrote to his uncle, Görres, calling upon him to protest against the arbitrary act of the "military Government of Berlin against the Archbishop of Cologne". This was the impulse that was responsible for Görres's celebrated "Athanasius". At the same time Lasaulx himself issued the controversial pamphlet "Kritische Bemerkungen über die Kölner Sache", a bold attack on the Prussian Government and the diplomat Josias von Bunsen. In the autumn of 1844 Lasaulx was appointed professor of philology and æsthetics at the University of Munich, despite the vigorous efforts of the Würzburg senate to secure his continued services there. At Munich he quickly became famous as a magnetic and stimulating teacher. When his influence effected the downfall of the minister Abel, the senate of the University applauded his action, but King Louis, on the other hand, vented his displeasure by dismissing Lasaulx from office (28 February, 1847). Demonstrations on the part of the students followed, resulting in the dismissal of eight other members of the university teaching staff. In 1848 Lasaulx, with three of his former colleagues, was elected to the National Assembly at Frankfort, where he identified himself with the Conservative group and again and again eloquently defended the liberties of the Catholic Church among the intellectual *élite* of Germany.

King Maximilian II having at length yielded to the petition of the Munich students to reinstate Lasaulx and the other expelled professors (15 March, 1849), Lasaulx resumed his work as a philosophical writer. In the same year he was elected a member of the Bavarian Chamber of Deputies, where, until his death, his masterly ability in all political controversies found energetic expression. Soon after his death, four of his works were placed on the Index; it was found that in them he had erred on the side of effacing the distinction between the common human religious element in heathenism and the theological expression of Christian revelation. Several years earlier, however, he had declared that, should any errors be found in his works, he would freely submit to the judgment of the Church.

Holland, *Erinnerungen an Ernst von Lasaulx* (Munich, 1861); Stölzle, *Ernst von Lasaulx* (Münster, 1904).

Karl Hoeber.

Lascaris, Constantine, of Constantinople, Greek scholar, b. 1434; d. at Messina in 1501. Made a prisoner by the Turks on the fall of Constantinople, he probably stayed the greater part of seven years in Corfu; he made a visit to Rhodes where he acquired some manuscripts; finally came to Italy and settled at Milan as a copyist of manuscripts. His work on the eight parts of speech presented to Princess Hippolyta Sforza procured from her father a request to teach the princess Greek. Lascaris followed the princess to Naples when she married Alfonso II (1465). The following year he left for Greece, but the vessel stopping at Messina, he was urged to stay there, consented, and died there after many years, bequeathing to the city his seventy-six manuscripts. They remained at Messina until 1679, and were then moved first to Palermo and later to Spain, where they are now in the National Library of Madrid. Constantine Lascaris was above all a tutor and a transcriber of manuscripts. One of his pupils was the future Cardinal Bembo. His industry as a copyist was soon superseded by the art of printing. He was himself the author of the first book printed in Greek, a small grammar (Milan, 1476) entitled "Erotemata".

Legrand, *Bibliographie hellénique*, I (Paris, 1884), lxxi; Iriarte, *Bibliothecæ Matritensis codices græci* (1769); Graux, *Essai sur les origines du fond grec de l'Escurial* (Paris, 1880); *Rapport sur une mission en Espagne* in *Archives des missions*, 3d ser., V, i (Paris, 1877), 124; Sandys, *A History of Classical Scholarship*, II (Cambridge, 1908), 77; Sabbadini, *Le scoperte dei codici latini e greci nei secoli XIV e XV* (Florence, 1905), 67.

Paul Lejay.

Lascaris, Janus (or John), surnamed Rhyndacenus (from Rhyndacus, a country town in Asia Minor), noted Greek scholar, b. about 1445; d. at Rome in 1535. After the fall of Constantinople he was taken to Peloponnesus and to Crete. When still quite young he came to Venice, where Bessarion became his patron, and sent him to learn Latin at Padua. On the death of Bessarion, Lorenzo de' Medici welcomed him to Florence, where Lascaris gave Greek lectures on Thucydides, Demosthenes, Sophocles, and the Greek anthology. Twice Lorenzo sent him to Greece in quest of manuscripts. When he returned the second time (1492) he brought back about two hundred from Mount Athos. Meanwhile Lorenzo had passed away. Lascaris entered the service of France and was ambassador at Venice from 1503 to 1508, at which time he became a member of the Greek Academy of Aldus Manutius; but if the printer had the benefit of his advice, no Aldine work bears his name. He resided at Rome under Leo X, the first pope of the Medici family, from 1513 to 1518, returned under Clement VII in 1523, and Paul III in 1534. Meanwhile he had assisted Louis XII in forming the library of

Blois, and when Francis I had it removed to Fontainebleau, Lascaris and Budé had charge of its organization. We owe to him a number of *editiones principes*, among them the Greek anthology (1494), four plays of Euripides, Callimachus (about 1495), Apollonius Rhodius, Lucian (1496), printed in Florence in Greek capitals with accents, and the *scholia* of Didymas (1517) and of Porphyrius (1518) on Homer, printed in Rome.

LEGRAND, *Bibliographie hellénique*, I (Paris, 1884), cxxxi; III, 411; OMONT, *Catalogue des manuscrits grecs de Fontainebleau* (Paris, 1889); SANDYS, *A History of Classical Scholarship*, II (Cambridge, 1908), 78. PAUL LEJAY.

Las Casas. See CASAS, BARTOLOMÉ DE LAS.

Laski (A LASCO), JOHN, Archbishop of Gnesen and Primate of Poland, b. at Lask, 1456; d. at Gnesen, 19 May, 1531. In 1482 he entered the service of the royal arch-chancellor Kurozwcki, who made him provost of Skalmierz and of the cathedral church in Posen, and canon of Krakow. In 1502 he became royal arch-secretary, in 1505 arch-chancellor, in 1509 coadjutor of Archbishop Boryszewski of Gnesen, and, after the death of the latter in 1510, Archbishop of Gnesen and Primate of Poland, whereupon he resigned as arch-chancellor in 1511. In 1513 he took part in the Fifth General Council of the Lateran, when he delivered an oration in which he urged upon Pope Leo X and the temporal princes to assist Poland and Hungary against the continually increasing inroads of the Turks. Though he had little success in his plea for a crusade, he prevailed upon the pope to take measures against the Teutonic Knights, who had been openly and secretly intriguing against Poland ever since 1466, when it had taken West Prussia and Ermland from them and begun to exercise its suzerainty over East Prussia. During the progress of the Lateran Council, Leo X conferred upon Laski and his successors in the archiepiscopal See of Gnesen the title of *legatus natus*. The Bull conferring the title is dated 25 July, 1515, and is still preserved in the archives of the cathedral chapter of Gnesen (no. 625). It was reprinted in Korytowski's "Arcybiscupi Gniezniensky", II (Posen, 1888), 662. Laski's elevation to the cardinalate by Pope Leo X is said to have been prevented by King Sigismund. Archbishop Laski was a zealous upholder of ecclesiastical discipline within his archdiocese, and a strenuous opponent of Protestantism in Poland. To put a stop to various ecclesiastical abuses, he held two provincial synods at Piotrkow (1510, 12) and a diocesan synod at Gnesen (1513). The seven other provincial synods which he held were intended chiefly to stem the spread of Protestantism in Poland. Four of these were convened at Lencicz in the years 1522, 1523, 1525, and 1527, and three at Piotrkow in 1526, 1532, and 1533.

Many of the legislative measures passed at these synods are printed in the "Constitutiones synodorum metropolitanæ ecclesiæ Gnesnensis" (Krakow, 1630). Most of the canons and decrees of the earlier synods Laski edited in his "Sanctiones ecclesiasticæ tam ex pontificum decretis quam ex constitutionibus synodorum provinciæ excerptæ, in primis autem statuta in diversis provincialibus synodis a se sancita" (Krakow, 1525), in his "Statuta provincialia" (1512), and "Statuta provinciæ Gnesnensis" (1527). After the marriage of King Sigismund of Poland with Barbara Zapolya, in 1512, Archbishop Laski entered into friendly relations with John Zapolya, a brother of Barbara and an aspirant to the Crown of Hungary. He sent his nephew Jerome Laski to Hungary to assist Zapolya with money and troops in his opposition against the rightful King Ferdinand of Hungary. If we may believe his enemies (especially Cardinal Gattinara), he continued to support his nephew even after the latter allied himself with the Turkish Sultan Soliman with the purpose of marching upon Vienna. In 1530 he was cited to Rome by Clement VII to give an account of his actions. His departure was, however, delayed by King Sigismund, and he died the following year after expressing his desire to resign his see. Besides collecting the synodal legislations mentioned above, he made a compilation of the most important laws of Poland while he was arch-chancellor. The work is entitled "Commune inclyti Poloniæ regni privilegiorum, constitutionum et indultuum", etc., and was published at Cracow in 1506. His "Liber beneficiorum archidiœcesis Gnesnensis" was edited by Lukowski, with a biography of the author by Korytowski (Gnesen, 1880–1).

ZEISSBERG, *Johann Laski, Erzbischof von Gnesen, und sein Testament* (Vienna, 1874); HIRSCHBERG, *J. Laski als Verbünder des türkischen Sultans* (Lemberg, 1879); BUKOWSKI, *Dzieje reformacyi w Polsce* (Krakow, 1883). MICHAEL OTT.

Lassberg, BARON JOSEPH MARIA CHRISTOPH VON, a distinguished German antiquary, b. at Donaueschingen, 10 April, 1770; d. 15 March, 1855. He was descended from a pious Catholic family. His father was chief forester in the service of Prince von Fürstenberg. After a brief service in the army, he entered the University of Strasburg and later that of Freiburg im Br. to study law and economics, especially forestry. From 1789 he was in the service of Prince von Fürstenberg, becoming chief warden of the forests in 1804. Princess Elizabeth, who ruled the principality during the minority of her son Karl Egon, showed him marked favour. He became privy councillor in 1806, and accompanied her on her travels through Switzerland, Italy, and England. When the regency ended in 1817, Lassberg resigned his position and retired to private life, residing first on his estate at Eppishusen in Thurgau, and from 1838 at Castle Meersburg on Lake Constance. He now devoted himself zealously to the study of old German literature, and in the pursuit of these studies he collected a superb library of upwards of 12,000 books and 273 valuable manuscripts, among which was the codex of the "Nibelungenlied" (known as the Hohenems MS. and commonly designated as C). After his death this library was presented to the town of Donaueschingen.

Lassberg was very hospitably inclined and many visitors were entertained at Castle Meersburg. Uhland, Lachmann, Gustav Schwab, and other distinguished men of letters were among his friends. He was twice married, his second wife being Maria Anna von Droste-Hülshoff, a sister of the famous poetess Annette (q. v.). His literary work consisted chiefly in editing medieval German poems, many of which were published under the pseudonym of Meister Sepp von Eppishusen. Especially noteworthy is the "Liedersaal", a collection of medieval German poems, chiefly of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, of miscellaneous content. It appeared at St. Gall in four volumes. In the fourth volume the above-mentioned Nibelungen MS. was printed for the first time.

Briefwechsel zwischen Lassberg und Uhland, ed. PFEIFFER (Vienna, 1870); *Erinnerungen an Joseph Freiherrn von Lassberg*, etc. in *Historisch-politische Blätter für das katholische Deutschland*, LIII (Munich, 1864), 425 sqq. and 505 sqq.; MUNCKER in *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, XVII, 780–84.

ARTHUR F. J. REMY.

Lassus, ORLANDUS DE (original name, ROLAND DE LATTRE), composer, b. at Mons, Hainault, Belgium, in 1520 (according to most biographers; but his epitaph gives 1532); d. at Munich, 14 June, 1594. At the age of eight and a half years he was admitted as soprano to the choir of the church of St. Nicholas in his native city. He soon attracted general attention, both on account of his unusual musical talent and his beautiful voice; so much so that he was three times abducted. Twice his parents had him returned to the parental roof, but the third time they consented to allow him to take up his abode at St-Didier, the temporary residence of Ferdinand de Gonzaga, general in command of the army of Charles V and Viceroy of Sicily. At the end of the campaign in the Netherlands, Orlandus followed his patron to Milan and from there to Sicily.

After the change of his voice Orlandus spent about three years at the court of the Marquess della Terza, at Naples. He next went to Rome, where he enjoyed the favour and hospitality, for about six months, of the Cardinal Archbishop of Florence, who was then living there. Through the influence of this prince of the Church, Orlandus obtained the position of choir-master at St. John Lateran, in spite of his extreme youth and the fact that there were many capable musicians available. During his residence in Rome, Lassus completed his first volume of Masses for four voices, and a collection of motets for five voices, all of which he had published in Venice. After a sojourn of probably two years in Rome, Lassus, learning of the serious illness of his parents, hastened back to Belgium only to find that they had died. His native city Mons not offering him a suitable field of activity, he spent several years in travel through France and England and then settled at Antwerp for about two years. It was while here that Orlandus received an invitation from Albert V, Duke of Bavaria, not only to become the director of his court chapel, but also to recruit capable musicians for it in the Netherlands. While in the employment and under the protection of this art-loving prince, Lassus developed that phenomenal productivity as a composer which is unsurpassed in the history of music.

Orlandus de Lassus

For thirty-four years he remained active at Munich as composer and director, first under Albert V, and then under his son and successor, William V. During all this time he enjoyed not only the continued and sympathetic favour of his patrons and employers, but was also honoured by Pope Gregory XIII, who appointed him Knight of the Golden Spur; by Charles IX of France, who bestowed upon him the cross of the Order of Malta; and by Emperor Maximilian, who on 7 December, 1570, raised Lassus and his descendants to the nobility. The imperial document conferring the honour is remarkable, not only as showing the esteem in which the master was held by rulers and nations, but particularly as evidence of the lofty conception on the part of this monarch of the function of art in the social economy. Lassus's great and long-continued activity finally told on his mind and caused a depression and break-down, from which he at first rallied but never fully recovered.

Lassus was the heir to the centuries of preparation and development of the Netherland school, and was its greatest and also its last representative.

While with many of his contemporaries, even the most noted, such as Dufay, Okeghem, Obrecht, and Josquin des Prés, contrapuntal skill is often an end in itself, Lassus, being consummate master of every form of the art and possessing a powerful imagination, always aims at a lofty and truthful interpretation of the text before him. His genius is of a universal nature. His wide culture and the extensive travels of his youth had enabled him to absorb the distinguishing musical traits of every nationality. None of his contemporaries had such a well-defined judgment in the choice of the means of expression which best served his purpose. The lyric, epic, and dramatic elements are alternately in evidence in his work. But he would undoubtedly have been greatest in the dramatic style, had he lived at a later period. Although Lassus lived at the time of the Reformation, when the individual and secular spirit manifested itself more and more in music, and although he interpreted secular poems such as madrigals, *chansons*, and German *lieder*, the contents of which were sometimes rather free (as was not infrequently the case in those times), his distinction lies overwhelmingly in his works for the Church.

The diatonic Gregorian modes form the basis of his compositions, and most frequently his themes are taken from liturgical melodies. The number of works the master has left to posterity exceeds two thousand, in every possible form, and in combinations of from two to twelve voices. Many of them remain in manuscript, but the great majority have been printed at Venice, Munich, Nuremberg, Louvain, Antwerp, or Paris. Among his more famous works must be mentioned his setting of the seven penitential psalms, which for variety, depth, truth of expression, and elevation of conception are unsurpassed. Duke Albert showed his admiration for this work by having it written on parchment and bound in two folio volumes, which the noted painter Hans Mielich illustrated, at the command of the duke, in a most beautiful manner. These, with two other smaller volumes containing an analysis of Lassus's and Mielich's work by Samuel van Quickelberg, a contemporary, are preserved in the court library at Munich. Lassus left no fewer than fifty Masses of his composition. Some of these are built upon secular melodies, as was customary in his time, but the thematic material for most of them has been taken from the liturgical chant. In 1604, his two sons, Rudolph and Ferdinand, also musicians of note, published a collection of 516 motets, under the title of "Magnum opus musicum", which was followed in 1609 by "Jubilus B. Mariæ Virginis", consisting of 100 settings of the Magnificat. The publication of a critical edition of Lassus's complete works in sixty volumes, prepared by Dr. Haberl and A. Sandberger, was begun in 1894.

Bäumker, *Orlandus de Lassus* (Freiburg, 1878); Ambros, *Geschichte der Musik*, III (Leipzig, 1881), 354–70; Delmotte, *Notice biographique sur Roland de Lattre* (Valenciennes, 1835); Matthieu, *Roland de Lattre* (Mons, 1838); Haberl, *Kirchenmusicalisches Jahrbuch* (1894).

Joseph Otten.

Last Supper. See Supper, The Last.

Lataste, Marie, b. at Mimbaste near Dax, France, 21 February, 1822; d. at Rennes, 10 May, 1847; was the youngest child of simple pious peasants. According to her own narrative, written under obedience, she was a poor, lowly, country girl, knowing nothing but what her mother taught her; hence, in the natural order, all her learning consisted in being able to read, write, sew, and spin. Her knowledge in the supernatural order long embraced merely the principal truths of salvation. Little by little the light grew like a vast furnace on which wood is cast, and towards which a mighty wind blows from all sides. The Lord Jesus, the Light of the World, had been the light of her soul. He had brought her up as a mother does her child, with patience and perseverance; if she knew aught she owed it to Him, she had all from Him. A troublesome child, proud, ambitious, and self-contained, she was the constant subject of her mother's anxious prayer, and her first Communion, made in her twelfth year, was the turning point in her life. A strong impression of the Divine presence on the great day, and confirmation received soon after, strengthened her piety and virtue, which thenceforward never faltered. About a year after Marie saw at Mass, during the Elevation, a bright light which seemed to inflame her love for the Eucharistic Lord and to increase as that love increased. Soon, to prepare her for greater favours, she was cast into the crucible of

severe interior trials and temptations, whence docility to her director brought her forth victorious. He allowed her to make a yearly vow of virginity, and the Blessed Sacrament became the central thought of her life. According to her own narrative, towards the end of 1839, when she was seventeen, she saw Christ on the altar. On the Epiphany, 1840, this was repeated, and for three whole years every time she assisted at Mass this grace was granted her. Almost daily she received from the lips of Jesus instructions forming a complete spiritual and doctrinal education. He explained in simple language the principal truths of faith; sometimes He showed her symbolical visions, or taught her in parables. He sent His Mother and angels to her; at times He reproached and humbled her. Her progress in virtue was rapid, her defects disappeared, and she exercised a happy influence on those who approached her. She did not suspect at first that hers was a singular privilege, yet she never mentioned it except to her confessor.

In 1840 M. l'Abbé Pierre Darbins succeeded M. Farbos as curé of Mimbaste. By Divine command Marie revealed her soul to him. Much surprised, he tested his penitent by trying her obedience and humility; he found her wholly submissive. Then he asked the help of the director of the seminary of Dax. They agreed to order her to put in writing everything supernatural she had heard and seen in the past, and all she might hear and see in the future. In due time this was accomplished; but the true text has been so much interpolated by the editor that the "Works of Marie Lataste" are not considered authentic. The Divine Master had made known to her His will, that she should embrace religious life, and in the Society of the Sacred Heart, recently founded and wholly unknown to her and her director. After many objections and delays, she obtained permission and left for Paris, 21 April, 1844, alone, under the guidance of Divine Providence. She was received at the Hôtel Biron by Madame de Boisbaudry, who had her examined by an experienced spiritual guide. She was admitted as lay-sister on 15 May. With great joy she entered upon this new life. Humility, charity, obedience, and fidelity to common life were her chief characteristics. Her sisters' testimony was: "Sister Lataste does everything like every one else, yet no one does anything like her." Still a novice she was sent to Rennes, in the hope that change of air would improve her health. An active life succeeded the quiet of the noviceship; she was infirmarian, refectorian, portress, but her humble virtues shone the more brilliantly; children, strangers, as well as her superiors and her sisters, felt her hidden sanctity. Marie's vows had been postponed in the hope of an improvement in her health. But on Sunday, 9 May, she became suddenly so very ill that the end seemed near. She was allowed to pronounce her vows, just before receiving the last sacraments. Then the pent-up ardours of her soul burst forth in ecstatic joy until her death on 10 May, 1847, at the age of twenty-five. Her memory lives in benediction. Her remains have been secured from desecration and now repose at Roehampton near London.

Vie de Marie Lataste par une religieuse du S. C. (Paris, 1866); Darbins, *La Vie et les Œuvres de Marie Lataste* (Paris, 1866).

Alice Power.

Latera, Flaminius Annibali de, historian, b. at Latera, near Viterbo, 23 Nov., 1733; d. at Viterbo, 27 Feb., 1813. He received his first education from a priest, Paolo Ferranti, and at the age of sixteen entered the Order of Friars Minor Observants in the Roman Province, taking the habit at the convent of St. Bernardine at Orte, 23 January, 1750; a year later on the same day he made his solemn profession. Being in due time ordained priest, he passed his examinations as *lector generalis* (professor), and successively taught theology in various convents—Viterbo, Fano, Velletri, and Rome. From 1790 to 1791 he was definitor general of the order, and from 1794 to 1797 superior of the Roman Province. When the convents in Italy were suppressed by Napoleon I in 1810, Annibali retired to Viterbo, and died there in a private residence.

De Latera during fifty years developed immense activity as a writer. Unfortunately he lived at a time when Franciscan history had just passed through the great and passionate Spader-Ringhieri and Lucci-Marczic controversies, which circumstances had a notable influence on his writings: instead of using his remarkable talents for constructive work, he wrote mostly with a polemical motive. Still his merits are great enough to secure him an honourable place in Franciscan literature. His chief works are (1) "Ad Bullarium Franciscanum a P. Hyacintho Sbaralea Ord. Min. Conv. . . . editum, Supplementum" (Rome, 1780), dedicated to Pope Pius VI, by whose orders it was written to correct the Conventual interpretations of Sbaralea [see "Archiv f. Litt. u. Kirchengeschichte", I (1885), 516–17]. (2) "Manuale de' Frati Minori . . . con un appendice, o sia risposta all' autore (P. Sangallo, O.M. Con.) del Saggio compendioso della dottrina di Giustino Febbronio" (Rome, 1776). This latter work occasioned great controversies, which partly took a violent and abusive form. (3) "Dissertationes critico-historicæ in quarum una Ser. Patriarcha Franciscus Tertii Ordinis institutor, in altera Indulgentiæ Portiunculæ veritas asseritur et vindicatur (Rome, 1784). (4) "Veritas impressionis Sacrorum Stigmatum in corpore Seraphici S. Francisci Assisiensis . . . " (Rome, 1786). (5) "La storia della Indulgenza concessa da Gesu Cristo . . . nella Chiesa della Portiuncula si dimostra vera . . . " (Rome, 1796). The last three books were written against rationalistic attacks of the time, concerning which see Pezzana, "Memorie degli Scrittori e Letterati Parmigiani", VI, pt. I, 127 (Parma, 1825). When the Benedictine Pujati had, by order of Scipio Ricci of unhappy memory, written against the traditional form of the Stations of the Cross, Annibali, with the Franciscans Affo and Tommaso da Cireglio, was charged to answer; he then wrote (6) "La Pratica del pio Esercizio della Via Crucis . . . vendicata dalle obbiezioni di D. Giuseppe Ma Pujati, Monaco Casinese . . . " (Viterbo, 1783; 2nd ed., Viterbo, 1785). (7) "La Difesa dell' antico metodo della Via Crucis e la Censura del nuovo . . . " (against the "Annali ecclesiastici" of Florence) (Viterbo, 1783). An important but little-known work is (8) "Compendio della Storia degli Ordini religiosi esistenti" (4 vols., Rome, 1790–91); 2nd ed. of the same with the title "Storia degli Ordini regolari . . . " (Naples, 1796). (9) A life of St. Collette, in Italian (Rome, 1805; 2nd ed., Rome, 1807). (10) Italian life of St. Hyacintha Mariscotti (Rome, 1805; 2nd ed., Rome, 1807). (11) New edition of "F. Francisci Horantii Hispani (O.F.M.) . . . Locorum Catholicorum . . . libri VII" (2 vols., Rome, 1795–96). (12) Annibali worked at the reform of the Franciscan Breviary, 1784–85, and composed many new offices edited separately at Rome, 1785 (see "Archivum Franc. Hist.", I, Quaracchi, 1908, 45–49). (13) An Italian hymn-book (Viterbo, 1772). After his death appeared (14) "Notizie storiche della Casa Farnese della fu Città di Castro . . . coll' aggiunta di due Paesi Latera e Farnese" (in 2 parts, Montefiascone, 1817–18). We omit some other works, as well as the anonymous and pseudonymous pamphlets of the author.

The biographical notices have been taken from the archives of Ara Cœli, Rome; the bibliographical indications, from the books themselves. *Breve Compendio della Vita di F. Flaminio Annibali da Latera* (s. d., but probably about 1779–80), is nothing but a sad travesty of Annibali, written by one of his literary adversaries.

Livarius Oliger.

Lateran, CANONS REGULAR OF THE. See CANONS AND CANONESSES REGULAR.

Lateran, CHRISTIAN MUSEUM OF, established by Pius IX, in 1854, in the Palazzo del Laterano erected by Sixtus V on part of the site of the ancient Lateran palace destroyed by fire in 1308. In 1843 the "profane" Museum of the Lateran was founded by Gregory XVI, in whose pontificate also was mooted the idea of establishing a museum of Christian antiquities in the same edifice. Nothing of consequence, however, was accomplished until Pius IX, at the date noted, entrusted the task to the two famous archæologists, Father Marchi, S.J., and Giovanni Battista de Rossi. To Marchi was assigned the work of collecting and arranging the sculptured monuments of the early Christian ages, to de Rossi all that concerned ancient Christian inscriptions; a third department of the museum consisted of copies of some of the more important catacomb frescoes. The larger part of the material for the new foundation was drawn from the hall in the Vatican Library set apart by Benedict XIV, in 1750, as the nucleus of a Christian museum, from the storerooms of the Vatican, and from the Roman catacombs. The Roman municipality also contributed a number of Christian monuments from the Capitoline Museum, while many others were recovered from convents, chapels, sacristies, and private collections. Plaster casts were also supplied of certain especially interesting monuments that could not be removed from their original location. The result has been eminently satisfactory, so much so indeed that the Christian Museum of the Lateran contains to-day a collection of monuments the study of which is indispensable to a proper appreciation of the earlier ages of Christianity. The section devoted to early Christian epigraphy, classified by de Rossi, begins with a collection of inscriptions relating to the most ancient basilicas, baptisteries, etc.; then follow in order the Damasan inscriptions, inscriptions with consular dates, those containing allusions to dogma, to the hierarchy, civil matters, and accompanied with such symbols as the anchor, dove, and monogram. Still another section is occupied by monuments with inscriptions classified according to their topography. The most interesting, perhaps, of all the inscribed monuments of the museum is that containing the famous epitaph of Abercius, one fragment of which was presented to Leo XIII by the Sultan Abdul Hamid II, the other by Professor (now Sir William) Ramsay. The sculptured monuments include a fine collection of fourth and fifth century sarcophagi, the statue of St. Hippolytus, and an admirable third-century statue of the Good Shepherd. The third section of the museum consists of copies, not always accurate, of some of the most interesting paintings discovered in the Roman catacombs.

NORTHCOTE AND BROWNLOW, *Roma Sotterranea* (London, 1878–79); NORTHCOTE, *Epitaphs of the Catacombs* (London, 1878); MARUCCHI, *Guida del Museo Cristiano Lateranense* (Rome, 1898).

MAURICE M. HASSETT.

Lateran, SAINT JOHN.—THE BASILICA.—This is the oldest, and ranks first among the four great "patriarchal" basilicas of Rome. The site was, in ancient times, occupied by the palace of the family of the Laterani. A member of this family, P. Sextius Lateranus, was the first plebeian to attain the rank of consul. In the time of Nero, another member of the family, Plautius Lateranus, at the time *consul designatus* was accused of conspiracy against the emperor, and his goods were confiscated. Juvenal mentions the palace, and speaks of it as being of some magnificence, "regiæ ædes Lateranorum". Some few remains of the original buildings may still be traced in the city walls outside the Gate of St. John, and a large hall decorated with paintings was uncovered in the eighteenth century within the basilica itself, behind the Lancellotti Chapel. A few traces of older buildings also came to light during the excavations made in 1880, when the work of extending the apse was in progress, but nothing was then discovered of real value or importance. The palace came eventually into the hands of Constantine, the first Christian emperor, through his wife Fausta, and it is from her that it derived the name by which it was then sometimes called, "Domus Faustæ". Constantine must have given it to the Church in the time of Miltiades, not later than about 311, for we find a council against the Donatists meeting within its walls as early as 313. From that time onwards it was always the centre of Christian life within the city; the residence of the popes and the cathedral of Rome. The latter distinction it still holds, though it has long lost the former. Hence the proud title which may be read upon its walls, that it is "Omnium urbis et orbis ecclesiarum mater, et caput".

It seems probable, in spite of the tradition that Constantine helped in the work of building with his own hands, that there was not a new basilica erected at the Lateran, but that the work carried out at this period was limited to the adaptation, which perhaps involved the enlargement, of the already existing basilica or great hall of the palace. The words of St. Jerome "basilica quondam Laterani" (Ep. lxxiii, P. L., XXII, col. 692) seem to point in this direction, and it is also probable on other grounds. This original church was probably not of very large dimensions, but we have no reliable information on the subject. It was dedicated to the Saviour, "Basilica Salvatoris", the dedication to St. John being of later date, and due to a Benedictine monastery of St. John the Baptist and St. John the Evangelist which adjoined the basilica and whose members were charged at one period with the duty of maintaining the services in the church. This later dedication to St. John has now in popular usage altogether superseded the original one. A great many donations from the popes and other benefactors to the basilica are recorded in the "Liber Pontificalis", and its splendour at an early period was such that it became known at the "Basilica Aurea", or Golden Church. This splendour drew upon it the attack of the Vandals, who stripped it of all its treasures. St. Leo the Great restored it about 460, and it was again restored by Hadrian I, but in 896 it was almost totally destroyed by an earthquake ("ab altari usque ad portas cecidit"). The damage was so extensive that it was difficult to trace in every case the lines of the old building, but these were in the main respected and the new building was of the same dimensions as the old. This second church lasted for four hundred years and was then burnt down. It was rebuilt by Clement V and John XXII, only to be burnt down once more in 1360, but again rebuilt by Urban V.

Through these various vicissitudes the basilica retained its ancient form, being divided by rows of columns into aisles, and having in front an atrium surrounded by colonnades with a fountain in the middle. The façade had three windows, and was embellished with a mosaic representing Christ as the Saviour of the world. The porticoes of the atrium were decorated with frescoes, probably not dating further back than the twelfth century, which commemorated the Roman fleet under Vespasian, the taking of Jerusalem, the Baptism of the Emperor Constantine and his "Donation" to the Church. Inside the basilica the columns no doubt ran, as in all other basilicas of the same date, the whole length of the church from east to west, but at one of the rebuildings, probably that which was carried out by Clement V, the feature of a transverse nave was introduced, imitated no doubt from the one which had been, long before this, added at S. Paolo fuori le Mura. It was probably at this time also that the church was enlarged. When the popes returned to Rome from their long absence at Avignon they found

APSE, ST. JOHN LATERAN, ROME

the city deserted and the churches almost in ruins. Great works were begun at the Lateran by Martin V and his successors. The palace, however, was never again used by them as a residence, the Vatican, which stands in a much drier and healthier position, being chosen in its place. It was not until the latter part of the seventeenth century that the church took its present appearance, in the tasteless restoration carried out by Innocent X, with Borromini for his architect. The ancient columns were now enclosed in huge pilasters, with gigantic statues in front. In consequence of this the church has entirely lost the appearance of an ancient basilica, and is completely altered in character.

Some portions of the older buildings still survive. Among these we may notice the pavement of medieval Cosmatesque work, and the statues of St. Peter and St. Paul, now in the cloisters. The graceful *baldacchino* over the high altar, which looks so utterly out of place in its present surroundings, dates from 1369. The *stercoraria*, or throne of red marble on which the popes sat, is now in the Vatican Museum. It owes its unsavoury name to the anthem sung at the ceremony of the papal enthronization, "De stercore erigens pauperem". From the fifth century there were seven oratories surrounding the basilica. These before long were thrown into the actual church. The devotion of visiting these oratories, which held its ground all through the medieval period, gave rise to the similar devotion of the seven altars, still common in many churches of Rome and elsewhere. Between the basilica and the city wall there was in former times the great monastery, in which dwelt the community of monks whose duty it was to provide the services in the basilica. The only part of it which still survives is the cloister, surrounded by graceful columns of inlaid marble. They are of a style intermediate between the Romanesque proper and the Gothic, and are the work of Vassellectus and the Cosmati. The date of these beautiful cloisters is the early part of the thirteenth century.

The ancient apse, with mosaics of the fourth century, survived all the many changes and dangers of the Middle Ages, and was still to be seen very much in its original condition as late as 1878, when it was destroyed in order to provide a larger space for the ordinations and other pontifical functions which take place in this cathedral church of Rome. The original mosaics were, however, preserved with the greatest possible care and very great success, and were re-erected at the end of the new and deeper apse which had been provided. In these mosaics, as they now appear, the centre of the upper portion is occupied by the figure of Christ surrounded by nine angels. This figure is extremely ancient, and dates from the fifth, or it may be even the fourth century. It is possible even that it is the identical one which, as is told in ancient tradition, was manifested to the eyes of the worshippers on the occasion of the dedication of the church: "Imago Salvatoris infixa parietibus primum visibilis omni populo Romano apparuit" (Joan. Diac., "Lib. de Ecclesia Lat.", P. L., CXCIV, 1543–1560). If it is so, however, it has certainly been retouched. Below is seen the *crux gammata*, surmounted by a dove which symbolizes the Holy Spirit, and standing on a hill whence flow the four rivers of the Gospels, from whose waters stags and sheep come to drink. On either side are saints, looking towards the Cross. These last are thought to belong originally to the sixth century, though they were repaired and altered in the thirteenth by Nicholas IV, whose effigy may be seen prostrate at the feet of the Blessed Virgin. The river which runs below is more ancient still, and may be regarded as going back to Constantine and the first days of the basilica. The remaining mosaics of the apse are of the thirteenth century, and the signatures of the artists, Torriti and Camerino, may still be read upon them. Camerino was a Franciscan friar; perhaps Torriti was one also.

The pavement of the basilica dates from Martin V and the return of the popes to Rome from Avignon. Martin V was of the Colonna family, and the columns are their badge. The high altar, which formerly occupied the position customary in all ancient basilicas, in the centre of the chord of the apse, has now beyond it, owing to the successive enlargements of the church, the whole of the transverse nave and of the new choir. It has no saint buried beneath it, since it was not, as were almost all the other great churches of Rome, erected over the tomb of a martyr. It stands alone among all the altars of the Catholic world in being of wood and not of stone, and enclosing no relics of any kind. The reason for this peculiarity is that it is itself a relic of a most interesting kind, being the actual wooden altar upon which St. Peter is believed to have celebrated Mass during his residence in Rome. It was carefully preserved through all the years of persecution, and was brought by Constantine and Sylvester from St. Pudentiana's, where it had been kept till then, to become the principal altar of the cathedral church of Rome. It is now, of course, enclosed in a larger altar of stone and cased with marble, but the original wood can still be seen. A small portion was left at St. Pudentiana's in memory of its long connexion with that church, and is still preserved there. Above the High Altar is the canopy or *baldacchino* already mentioned, a Gothic structure resting on four marble columns, and decorated with paintings by Barna of Siena. In the upper part of the *baldacchino* are preserved the heads of the Apostles Peter and Paul, the great treasure of the basilica, which until this shrine was prepared to receive them had always been kept in the "Sancta Sanctorum", the private chapel of the Lateran Palace adjoining. Behind the apse there formerly extended the "Leonine" portico; it is not known which pontiff gave it this name. At the entrance there was an inscription commemorating the dream of Innocent VIII, when he saw the church of the Lateran upheld by St. Francis of Assisi. On the opposite wall was hung the *tabula magna*, or catalogue of all the relics of the basilica, and also of the different chapels and the indulgences attached to them respectively. It is now in the archives of the basilica.

The Baptistery.—The baptistery of the church, following the invariable rule of the first centuries of Christianity, was not an integral part of the church itself, but a separate and detached building, joined to the church by a colonnade, or at any rate in close proximity to it. The right to baptize was the peculiar privilege of the cathedral church, and here, as elsewhere, all were brought from all parts of the city to receive the sacrament. There is no reason to doubt the tradition which makes the existing baptistery, which altogether conforms to these conditions, the original baptistery of the church, and ascribes its foundation to Constantine. The whole style and appearance of the edifice bear out the claim made on its behalf. There is, however, much less ground for saying that it was here that the emperor was baptized by St. Sylvester. The building was originally entered from the opposite side from the present doorway, through the portico of St. Venantius. This is a vestibule or atrium, in which two large porphyry columns are still standing and was formerly approached by a colonnade of smaller porphyry columns leading from the church. The baptistery itself is an octagonal edifice with eight immense porphyry columns supporting an architrave on which are eight smaller columns, likewise of porphyry, which in their turn support the octagonal drums of the lantern. In the main the building has preserved its ancient form and characteristics, though it has been added to and adorned by many popes. Sixtus III carried out the first of these restorations

and adornments, and his inscription recording the fact may still be seen on the architrave. Pope St. Hilary (461–468) raised the height, and also added the chapels round. Urban VIII and Innocent X repaired it in more recent times.

In the centre of the building one descends by several steps to the basin of green basalt which forms the actual baptismal font. There is no foundation for the idea that the Emperor Constantine was himself actually baptized in this font by Pope St. Sylvester. That is a confusion which has arisen from the fact that he was the founder of the baptistery. But although he had embraced Christianity and had done so much for the advancement of the Church, the emperor, as a matter of fact, deferred the actual reception of the sacrament of baptism until the very end of his life, and was at last baptized, not by Sylvester, but by Eusebius, in whose diocese of Nicomedia he was then, after the foundation of Constantinople, permanently residing (Von Funk, "Manual of Church History", London, 1910, I, 118–119; Duchesne, "Liber Pontificalis", Paris, 1887, I, cix–cxx). The mosaics in the adjoining oratories are both ancient and interesting. Those in the oratory of St. John the Evangelist are of the fifth century, and are of the conventional style of that period, consisting of flowers and birds on a gold ground, also a Lamb with a cruciform nimbus on the vault. The corresponding mosaics of the chapel of St. John the Baptist disappeared in the seventeenth century, but we have a description of them in Panvinio. The mosaics in the chapel of St. Venantius (the ancient vestibule) are still extant, and are of considerable interest. They date from the seventh century, and a comparison between the workmanship of these mosaics and of those in the chapel of St. John offers an instructive lesson on the extent to which the arts had deteriorated between the fifth and the seventh centuries. The figures represent, for the most part, Dalmatian saints, and the whole decoration was originally designed as a memorial to Dalmatian martyrs, whose relics were brought here at the conclusion of the Istrian schism.

The Lateran Palace.—From the beginning of the fourth century, when it was given to the pope by Constantine, the palace of the Lateran was the principal residence of the popes, and continued so for about a thousand years. In the tenth century Sergius III restored it after a disastrous fire, and later on it was greatly embellished by Innocent III. This was the period of its greatest magnificence, when Dante speaks of it as beyond all human achievements. At this time the centre of the piazza in front, where now the obelisk stands, was occupied by the palace and tower of the Annibaldeschi. Between this palace and the basilica was the equestrian statue of Marcus Aurelius, then believed to represent Constantine, which now is at the Capitol. The whole of the front of the palace was taken up with the "Aula Concilii", a magnificent hall with eleven apses, in which were held the various Councils of the Lateran during the medieval period. The fall of the palace from this position of glory was the result of the departure of the popes from Rome during the Avignon period. Two destructive fires, in 1307 and 1361 respectively, did irreparable harm, and although vast sums were sent from Avignon for the rebuilding, the palace never again attained its former splendour. When the popes returned to Rome they resided first at Santa Maria in Trastevere, then at Santa Maria Maggiore, and lastly fixed their residence at the Vatican. Sixtus V then destroyed what still remained of the ancient palace of the Lateran and erected the present much smaller edifice in its place.

An apse lined with mosaics and open to the air still preserves the memory of one of the most famous halls of the ancient palace, the "Triclinium" of Leo III, which was the state banqueting hall. The existing structure is not ancient, but it is possible that some portions of the original mosaics have been preserved. The subject is threefold. In the centre Christ gives their mission to the Apostles, on the left he gives the keys to St. Sylvester and the Labarum to Constantine, while on the right St. Peter gives the stole to Leo III and the standard to Charlemagne. The private rooms of the popes in the old palace were situated between this "Triclinium" and the city walls. The palace is now given up to the Pontifical Museum of Christian Antiquities.

For the history of the basilica, the student should consult primarily the two quarto volumes of the *Liber Pontificalis*, edited by Duchesne (Paris, 1887 sqq.). Other monographs are Joannes Diaconus, *Liber de Ecclesia Lateranensi* in *P. L.*; Alemanni, *De Lateranensibus parietinis* (Rome, 1625); Raspondi, *De basilica et patriarchio Lateranensi* (Rome, 1656); Crescimbeni and Baldeschi, *Stato della S. Chiesa papale Lateranense nell' anno 1723* (Rome, 1723); Severano, *Le sette chiese di Roma;* Ugonio, *Historia delle Stazioni di Roma;* Panvinio, *De Septem urbis ecclesiis;* Piazza, *Stazioni di Roma.* The latter four works were published in Rome in the sixteenth or seventeenth century.

Among recent books the best are: Armellini, *Le chiese di Roma* (Rome, 1891); Marucchi, *Basiliques et Eglises de Rome* (Rome, 1902); and in particular, de Fleury, *Le Latran au moyen âge*, (Paris, 1877). There is a large number of plans and manuscripts in the archives of the basilica. For special points consult also de Rossi, *Musaici delle chiese di Roma anteriori al secolo XV* (Rome, 1872); de Montault, *La grande pancarte de la basilique de Latran* in *Revue de l'art chrétien* (Paris, 1886); Gerspach, *La Mosaïque apsidale des Sancta Sanctorum du Latran* in *Gazette des beaux arts*, 1880; Bartolini, *Sopra l'antichissimo altare di legno in Roma* (1852).

Arthur S. Barnes.

Lateran Councils, a series of five important councils held at Rome from the twelfth to the sixteenth century. From the reign of Constantine the Great until the removal of the papal Court to Avignon, the Lateran palace and basilica served the bishops of Rome as residence and cathedral. During this long period the popes had occasion to convoke a number of general councils, and for this purpose they made choice of cities so situated as to reduce as much as possible the inconveniences which the bishops called to such assemblies must necessarily experience by reason of long and costly absence from their sees. Five of these councils were held in the Lateran palace, and are known as the First, Second, Third, Fourth, and Fifth Lateran Councils, held respectively in 1123, 1139, 1179, 1215, and 1512–17.

First Lateran Council (1123).—The Council of 1123 is reckoned in the series of œcumenical councils. It had been convoked in December, 1122, immediately after the Concordat of Worms, which agreement between pope and emperor had caused general satisfaction in the Church. It put a stop to the arbitrary conferring of ecclesiastical benefices by laymen, re-established freedom of episcopal and abbatial elections, separated spiritual from temporal affairs, and ratified the principle that spiritual authority can emanate only from the Church; lastly, it tacitly abolished the exorbitant claim of the emperors to interfere in papal elections. So deep was the emotion caused by this concordat, the first ever signed, that in many documents of the time the year 1122 is mentioned as the beginning of a new era. For its more solemn confirmation, and in conformity with the earnest desire of the Archbishop of Mainz, Callistus II convoked a council to which all the archbishops and bishops of the West were invited. Three hundred bishops and more than six hundred abbots assembled at Rome in March, 1123; Callistus II presided in person. Both originals (*instrumenta*) of the Concordat of Worms were read and ratified, and twenty-two disciplinary canons were promulgated, most of them reinforcements of previous conciliary decrees. Canons iii and xxi forbid priests, deacons, subdeacons, and monks to marry or to have concubines; it is also forbidden them to keep in their houses any women other than those sanctioned by the ancient canons. Marriages of clerics are null *pleno jure*, and those who have contracted them are subject to penance. Canon vi: Nullity of the ordinations per-

formed by the heresiarch Burdinus (Antipope Gregory VIII) after his condemnation. Canon xi: Safeguard for the families and possessions of crusaders. Canon xiv: Excommunication of laymen appropriating offerings made to the Church, and those who fortify churches as strongholds. Canon xvi: Against those who molest pilgrims on their way to Rome. Canon xvii: Abbots and religious are prohibited from admitting sinners to penance, visiting the sick, administering extreme unction, singing solemn and public Masses; they are obliged to obtain the holy chrism and holy oils from their respective bishops.

SECOND LATERAN COUNCIL (1139).—The death of Pope Honorius II (February, 1130) was followed by a schism. Petrus Leonis (Pierleoni), under the name of Anacletus II, for a long time held in check the legitimate pope, Innocent II, who was supported by St. Bernard and St. Norbert. In 1135 Innocent II celebrated a Council at Pisa, and his cause gained steadily until, in January, 1138, the death of Anacletus helped largely to solve the difficulty. Nevertheless, to efface the last vestiges of the schism, to condemn various errors and reform abuses among clergy and people, Innocent, in the month of April, 1139, convoked, at the Lateran, the tenth œcumenical council. Nearly a thousand prelates, from most of the Christian nations, assisted. The pope opened the council with a discourse, and deposed from their offices those who had been ordained and instituted by the antipope and by his chief partisans, Ægidius of Tusculum and Gerard of Angoulême. As Roger, King of Sicily, a partisan of Anacletus who had been reconciled with Innocent, persisted in maintaining in Southern Italy his schismatical attitude, he was excommunicated. The council likewise condemned the errors of the Petrobrusians and the Henricians, the followers of two active and dangerous heretics, Peter of Bruys and Arnold of Brescia. The council promulgated against these heretics its twenty-third canon, a repetition of the third canon of the Council of Toulouse (1119) against the Manichæans. Finally, the council drew up measures for the amendment of ecclesiastical morals and discipline that had grown lax during the schism. Twenty-eight canons pertinent to these matters reproduced in great part the decrees of the Council of Reims, in 1131, and the Council of Clermont, in 1130, whose enactments, frequently cited since then under the name of the Lateran Council, acquired thereby increase of authority. Canon iv: Injunction to bishops and ecclesiastics not to scandalize anyone by the colours, the shape, or extravagance of their garments, but to clothe themselves in a modest and well-regulated manner. Canons vi, vii, xxi: Condemnation and repression of marriage and concubinage among priests, deacons, subdeacons, monks, and nuns. Canon x: Excommunication of laymen who fail to pay the tithes due the bishops, or who do not surrender to the latter the churches of which they retain possession, whether received from bishops, or obtained from princes or other persons. Canon xii fixes the periods and the duration of the Truce of God. Canon xiv: Prohibition, under pain of deprivation of Christian burial, of jousts and tournaments which jeopardize life. Canon xx: Kings and princes are to dispense justice in consultation with the bishops. Canon xxv: No one must accept a benefice at the hands of a layman. Canon xxvii: Nuns are prohibited from singing the Divine Office in the same choir with monks or canons. Canon xxviii: No church must be left vacant more than three years from the death of the bishop; anathema is pronounced against those (secular) canons who exclude from episcopal election "persons of piety"—i. e. regular canons or monks.

THIRD LATERAN COUNCIL (1179).—The reign of Alexander III was one of the most laborious pontificates of the Middle Ages. Then, as in 1139, the object was to repair the evils caused by the schism of an antipope. Shortly after returning to Rome (12 March, 1178) and receiving from its inhabitants their oath of fidelity and certain indispensable guarantees, Alexander had the satisfaction of receiving the submission of the antipope Callistus III (John de Struma). The latter, besieged at Viterbo by Christian of Mainz, eventually yielded and, at Tusculum, made his submission to Pope Alexander (29 August, 1178), who received him with kindness and appointed him Governor of Beneventum. Some of his obstinate partisans sought to substitute a new antipope, and chose one Lando Sitino, under the name of Innocent III. For lack of support he soon gave up the struggle and was relegated to the monastery of La Cava. In September, 1178, the pope in agreement with an article of the Peace of Venice, convoked an œcumenical council at the Lateran for Lent of the following year and, with that object, sent legates to different countries. This was the eleventh of the œcumenical councils. It met in March, 1179. The pope presided, seated upon an elevated throne, surrounded by the cardinals, and by the prefects, senators, and consuls of Rome. The gathering numbered three hundred and two bishops, among them several Latin prelates of Eastern sees. There were in all nearly one thousand members. Nectarius, abbot of the Cabules, represented the Greeks. The East was represented by Archbishops William of Tyre and Heraclius of Cæsarea, Prior Peter of the Holy Sepulchre, and the Bishop of Bethlehem. Spain sent nineteen bishops; Ireland, six; Scotland, only one; England, seven; France, fifty-nine; Germany, seventeen; Denmark and Hungary, one each. The bishops of Ireland had at their head St. Laurence, Archbishop of Dublin. The pope consecrated, in the presence of the council, two English bishops, and two Scottish, one of whom had come to Rome with only one horse, the other on foot. There was also present an Icelandic bishop who had no other revenue than the milk of three cows, and when one of these went dry his diocese furnished him with another.

Besides exterminating the remains of the schism, the council undertook the condemnation of the Waldensian heresy and the restoration of ecclesiastical discipline, which had been much relaxed. Three sessions were held, on 5, 14, and 19 March, in which twenty-seven canons were promulgated, the most important of which may be summarized as follows: Canon i: To prevent schisms in future, only the cardinals should have the right to elect the pope, and two-thirds of their votes should be required for the validity of such election. If any candidate, after securing only one-third of the votes, should arrogate to himself the papal dignity, both he and his partisans should be excluded from the ecclesiastical order and excommunicated. Canon ii: Annulment of the ordinations performed by the heresiarchs Octavian and Guy of Crema, as well as those by John de Struma. Those who have received ecclesiastical dignities or benefices from these persons are deprived of the same; those who have freely sworn to adhere to the schism are declared suspended. Canon iii: It is forbidden to promote anyone to the episcopate before the age of thirty. Deaneries, archdeaconries, parochial charges, and other benefices involving the care of souls shall not be conferred upon anyone less than twenty-five years of age. Canon iv regulates the retinue of members of the higher clergy, whose canonical visits were frequently ruinous to the rural priests. Thenceforward the train of an archbishop is not to include more than forty or fifty horses; that of a bishop, not more than twenty or thirty; that of an archdeacon, five or seven at the most; the dean is to have two. Canon v forbids the ordination of clerics not provided with an ecclesiastical title, i. e. means of proper support. If a bishop ordains a priest or a deacon without assigning him a certain title on which he can subsist, the bishop shall provide such cleric with means of liveli-

hood until he can assure him an ecclesiastical revenue, that is, if the cleric cannot subsist on his patrimony alone. Canon vi regulates the formalities of ecclesiastical sentences. Canon vii forbids the exaction of a sum of money for the burial of the dead, the marriage benediction, and, in general, for the administration of the sacraments. Canon viii: The patrons of benefices shall nominate to such benefices within six months after the occurrence of a vacancy. Canon ix recalls the military orders of the Templars and the Hospitallers to the observation of canonical regulations, from which the churches dependent on them are in no wise exempt. Canon xi forbids clerics to receive women in their houses, or to frequent, without necessity, the monasteries of nuns. Canon xiv forbids laymen to transfer to other laymen the tithes which they possess, under pain of being debarred from the communion of the faithful and deprived of Christian burial. Canon xviii provides for the establishment in every cathedral church of a school for poor clerics. Canon xix: Excommunication aimed at those who levy contributions on churches and churchmen without the consent of the bishop and clergy. Canon xx forbids tournaments. Canon xxi relates to the "Truce of God". Canon xxiii relates to the organization of asylums for lepers. Canon xxiv consists of a prohibition against furnishing the Saracens with material for the construction of their galleys. Canon xxvii enjoins on princes the repression of heresy.

Fourth Lateran Council (1215).—From the commencement of his reign Innocent III had purposed to assemble an œcumenical council, but only towards the end of his pontificate could he realize this project, by the Bull of 19 April, 1213. The assembly was to take place in November, 1215. The council did in fact meet on 11 November, and its sessions were prolonged until the end of the month. The long interval between the convocation and the opening of the council, as well as the prestige of the reigning pontiff, were responsible for the very large number of bishops who attended it; it is commonly cited in canon law as "the General Council of Lateran", without further qualification, or, again, as "the Great Council". Innocent III found himself on this occasion surrounded by seventy-one patriarchs and metropolitans, including the Patriarchs of Constantinople and of Jerusalem, four hundred and twelve bishops, and nine hundred abbots and priors. The Patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria were represented by delegates. Envoys appeared from Emperor Frederick II, from Henry, Latin Emperor of Constantinople, from the Kings of France, England, Aragon, Hungary, Cyprus, and Jerusalem, and from other princes. The pope himself opened the council with an allocution the lofty views of which surpassed the orator's power of expression. He had desired, said the pope, to celebrate this Pasch before he died. He declared himself ready to drink the chalice of the Passion for the defence of the Catholic Faith, for the succour of the Holy Land, and to establish the liberty of the Church. After this discourse, followed by moral exhortation, the pope presented to the council seventy decrees or canons, already formulated, on the most important points of dogmatic and moral theology. Dogmas were defined, points of discipline were decided, measures were drawn up against heretics, and, finally, the conditions of the next crusade were regulated.

The fathers of the council did little more than approve the seventy decrees presented to them; this approbation, nevertheless, sufficed to impart to the acts thus formulated and promulgated the value of œcumenical decrees. Most of them are somewhat lengthy and are divided into chapters. The following are the most important: Canon i: Exposition of the Catholic Faith and of the dogma of Transubstantiation. Canon ii: Condemnation of the doctrines of Joachim of Flora and of Amaury. Canon iii: Procedure and penalties against heretics and their protectors. Canon iv: Exhortation to the Greeks to reunite with the Roman Church and accept its maxims, to the end that, according to the Gospel, there may be only one fold and only one shepherd. Canon v: Proclamation of the papal primacy recognized by all antiquity. After the pope, primacy is attributed to the patriarchs in the following order: Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem. (It is enough to remind the reader how long an opposition preceded at Rome this recognition of Constantinople as second in rank among the patriarchal sees.) Canon vi: Provincial councils must be held annually for the reform of morals, especially those of the clergy. Canon viii: Procedure in regard to accusations against ecclesiastics. Until the French Revolution, this canon was of considerable importance in criminal law, not only ecclesiastical but even civil. Canon ix: Celebration of public worship in places where the inhabitants belong to nations following different rites. Canon xi renews the ordinance of the council of 1179 on free schools for clerics in connexion with every cathedral. Canon xii: Abbots and priors are to hold their general chapter every three years. Canon xiii forbids the establishment of new religious orders, lest too great diversity bring confusion into the Church. Canons xiv–xvii: Against the irregularities of the clergy—incontinence, drunkennness, the chase, attendance at farces and histrionic exhibitions. Canon xviii: Priests, deacons, and subdeacons are forbidden to perform surgical operations. Canon xix forbids the blessing of water and hot iron for judicial tests or ordeals. Canon xxi, the famous "Omnis utriusque sexus", which commands every Christian who has reached the years of discretion to confess all his, or her, sins at least once a year to his, or her, own (i. e. parish) priest. This canon did no more than confirm earlier legislation and custom, and has been often, but wrongly, quoted as commanding for the first time the use of sacramental confession. Canon xxii: Before prescribing for the sick, physicians shall be bound, under pain of exclusion from the Church, to exhort their patients to call in a priest, and thus provide for their spiritual welfare. Canons xxiii–xxx regulate ecclesiastical elections and the collation of benefices. Canons xxvi, xliv, and xlviii: Ecclesiastical procedure. Canons l–lii: On marriage, impediments of relationship, publication of banns. Canons lxxviii, lxxix: Jews and Mohammedans shall wear a special dress to enable them to be distinguished from Christians. Christian princes must take measures to prevent blasphemies against Jesus Christ. The council, moreover, made rules for the projected crusade, imposed a four years' peace on all Christian peoples and princes, published indulgences, and enjoined the bishops to reconcile all enemies. The council confirmed the elevation of Frederick II to the German throne and took other important measures. Its decrees were widely published in many provincial councils.

Fifth Lateran Council (1512–17).—When elected pope, Julius II promised under oath that he would soon convoke a general council. Time passed, however, and this promise was not fulfilled. Consequently, certain dissatisfied cardinals, urged, also, by Emperor Maximilian and Louis XII, convoked a council at Pisa and fixed 1 September, 1511, for its opening. This event was delayed until 1 October. Four cardinals then met at Pisa provided with proxies from three absent cardinals. Several bishops and abbots were also there, as well as ambassadors from the King of France. Seven or eight sessions were held, in the last of which Pope Julius II was suspended, whereupon the prelates withdrew to Lyons. The pope hastened to oppose to this *conciliabulum* a more numerously attended council, which he convoked, by the Bull of 18 July, 1511, to assemble 19 April, 1512, in the church of St. John Lateran. The Bull was at

once a canonical and a polemical document. In it the pope refuted in detail the reasons alleged by the cardinals for their Pisa *conciliabulum*. He declared that his conduct before his elevation to the pontificate was a pledge of his sincere desire for the celebration of the council; that since his elevation he had always sought opportunities for assembling it; that for this reason he had sought to re-establish peace among Christian princes; that the wars which had arisen against his will had no other object than the re-establishment of pontifical authority in the States of the Church. He then reproached the rebel cardinals with the irregularity of their conduct and the unseemliness of convoking the Universal Church independently of its head. He pointed out to them that the three months accorded by them for the assembly of all bishops at Pisa was too short, and that said city presented none of the advantages requisite for an assembly of such importance. Finally, he declared that no one should attach any significance to the act of the cardinals. The Bull was signed by twenty-one cardinals. The French victory of Ravenna (11 April, 1512) hindered the opening of the council before 3 May, on which day the fathers met in the Lateran Basilica. There were present fifteen cardinals, the Latin Patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, ten archbishops, fifty-six bishops, some abbots and generals of religious orders, the ambassadors of King Ferdinand, and those of Venice and of Florence. Convoked by Julius II, the assembly survived him, was continued by Leo X, and held its twelfth, and last, session on 16 March, 1517. In the third session Matthew Lang, who had represented Maximilian at the Council of Tours, read an act by which that emperor repudiated all that had been done at Tours and at Pisa. In the fourth session the advocate of the council demanded the revocation of the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges. In the eighth (17 December, 1513), an act of King Louis XII was read, disavowing the Council of Pisa and adhering to the Lateran Council. In the next session (5 March, 1514) the French bishops made their submission, and Leo X granted them absolution from the censures pronounced against them by Julius II. In the tenth session (4 May, 1515) the pope published four decrees; the first of these sanctions the institution of *montes pietatis*, or pawn shops, under strict ecclesiastical supervision, for the purpose of aiding the necessitous poor on the most favourable terms; the second relates to ecclesiastical liberty and the episcopal dignity, and condemns certain abusive exemptions; the third forbids, under pain of excommunication, the printing of books without the permission of the ordinary of the diocese; the fourth orders a peremptory citation against the French in regard to the Pragmatic Sanction. The latter was solemnly revoked and condemned, and the concordat with Francis I approved, in the eleventh session (19 December, 1516). Finally, the council promulgated a decree prescribing war against the Turks and ordered the levying of tithes of all the benefices in Christendom for three years.

OTHER LATERAN COUNCILS.—Other councils were held at the Lateran, among the best known being those in 649 against the Monothelite heresy, in 823, 861, 900, 1102, 1105, 1110, 1111, 1112, and 1116. In 1725, Benedict XIII called to the Lateran the bishops directly dependent on Rome as their metropolitan see, i. e. archbishops without suffragans, bishops immediately subject to the Holy See, and abbots exercising quasi-episcopal jurisdiction. Seven sessions were held between 15 April and 29 May, and divers regulations were promulgated concerning the duties of bishops and other pastors, concerning residence, ordinations, and the periods for the holding of synods. The chief objects were the suppression of Jansenism and the solemn confirmation of the Bull "Unigenitus", which was declared a rule of faith demanding the fullest obedience.

Coll. Regia conciliorum, XXVII, col. 32.120, 434; MARCA, *Concordantia sacerdotii et imperii*, II (Paris, 1663), 363, 436; MANSI, *Conc. ampliss. collectio*, XXI, col. 277, 523; XXII, col. 34, 210; ALEXANDER, *Hist. eccles.*, VII (Venice, 1778), 299–302; 347–58; LESSIUS, *Discussio decreti magni concilii Lateranensis* (Mainz, 1613); WIDDRINGTONUS, *Discussio discussionis decreti Lateranenis* (London, 1618); WALCH AND BUDDÉE, *Commentatio historico-theologica de conciliis Lateranensibus rei christianæ noxiis* (Jena, 1725); HEFELE, *Conciliengeschichte*, V (Freiburg im Br., 1886), 378, 438, 710, 872; RIVINGTON, *The Primitive Church and the See of Peter* (London, 1894); PASTOR, *History of the Popes*, tr. ANTROBUS, V (London, 1902), passim.

H. LECLERCQ.

Latin, ECCLESIASTICAL.—In the present instance these words are taken to mean the Latin we find in the official text-books of the Church (the Bible and the Liturgy), as well as in the works of those Christian writers of the West who have undertaken to expound or defend Christian beliefs.

Characteristics.—Ecclesiastical differs from classical Latin especially by the introduction of new idioms and new words. (In syntax and literary method, Christian writers are not different from other contemporary writers.) These characteristic differences are due to the origin and purpose of ecclesiastical Latin. Originally the Roman people spoke the old tongue of Latium, known as *prisca latinitas*. In the third century B. C., Ennius and a few other writers trained in the school of the Greeks undertook to enrich the language with Greek embellishments. This attempt was encouraged by the cultured classes in Rome, and it was to these classes that henceforth the poets, orators, historians, and literary coteries of Rome addressed themselves. Under the combined influence of this political and intellectual aristocracy was developed that classical Latin which has been preserved for us in greatest purity in the works of Cæsar and of Cicero. The mass of the Roman populace in their native ruggedness remained aloof from this hellenizing influence, and continued to speak the old tongue. Thus it came to pass that after the third century B. C. there existed side by side in Rome two languages, or rather two idioms: that of the literary circles or hellenists (*sermo urbanus*) and that of the illiterate (*sermo vulgaris*); and the more highly the former developed the greater grew the chasm between them. But in spite of all the efforts of the purists, the exigencies of daily life brought the writers of the cultured mode into continual touch with the uneducated populace, and constrained them to understand its speech and make it understand them in turn; so that they were obliged in conversation to employ words and expressions forming part of the vulgar tongue. Hence arose a third idiom, the *sermo cotidianus*, a medley of the two others, varying in the mixture of its ingredients with the various periods of time and the intelligence of those who used it.

Origins.—Classical Latin did not long remain at the high level to which Cicero had raised it. The aristocracy, who alone spoke it, were decimated by proscription and civil war, and the families who rose in turn to social position were mainly of plebeian or foreign extraction, and in any case unaccustomed to the delicacy of the literary language. Thus the decadence of classical Latin began with the age of Augustus, and went on more rapidly as that age receded. As it forgot the classical distinction between the language of prose and that of poetry, literary Latin, spoken or written, began to borrow more and more freely from the popular speech. Now it was at this very time that the Church found herself called on to construct a Latin of her own; and this in itself was one reason why her Latin should differ from the classical. There were two other reasons however: first of all the Gospel had to be spread by preaching, that is, by the spoken word; moreover the heralds of the good tidings had to construct an idiom that would appeal, not alone to the literary classes, but to the whole people. Seeing that they sought to win the masses to the Faith, they had to come down to their level and employ a speech that

was familiar to their listeners. St. Augustine says this very frankly to his hearers: "I often employ", he says, "words that are not Latin, and I do so that you may understand me. Better that I should incur the blame of the grammarians than not be understood by the people" (In Psal. cxxxviii, 20). Strange though it may seem, it was not at Rome that the building up of ecclesiastical Latin began. Until the middle of the third century the Christian community at Rome was in the main a Greek-speaking one. The Liturgy was celebrated in Greek, and the apologists and theologians wrote in Greek until the time of St. Hippolytus, who died in 235. It was much the same in Gaul, at Lyons and at Vienne, at all events until after the days of St. Irenæus. In Africa, Greek was the chosen language of the clerics, to begin with, but Latin was the more familiar speech for the majority of the faithful, and it must have soon taken the lead in the Church, since Tertullian, who wrote some of his earlier works in Greek, ended by employing Latin only. And in this use he had been preceded by Pope Victor, who was also an African, and who, as St. Jerome assures us, was the earliest Christian writer in the Latin language.

But even before these writers various local Churches must have seen the necessity of rendering into Latin the texts of the Old and New Testaments, the reading of which formed a main portion of the Liturgy. This necessity arose as soon as the Latin-speaking faithful became numerous, and in all likelihood it was felt first in Africa. For a time improvised oral translations sufficed, but soon written translations were required. Such translations multiplied. "It is possible to enumerate", says St. Augustine, "those who have translated the Scriptures from Hebrew into Greek, but not those who have translated them into Latin. In sooth, in the early days of faith whoso possessed a Greek manuscript and thought he had some knowledge of both tongues was daring enough to undertake a translation" (De doct. christ., II, xi). From our present point of view the multiplicity of these translations, which were destined to have so great an influence on the formation of ecclesiastical Latin, helps to explain the many colloquialisms which it assimilated, and which are found even in the most famous of these texts, that of which St. Augustine said: "Among all translations the Itala is to be preferred, for its language is most accurate, and its expression the clearest" (De doct. christ., II, xv). While it is true that many renderings of this passage have been given, the generally accepted one, and the one we content ourselves with mentioning here, is that the Itala is the most important of the Biblical recensions from Italian sources, dating from the fourth century, used by St. Ambrose and the Italian authors of that day, which have been partially preserved to us in many manuscripts and are to be met with even in St. Augustine himself. With some slight modifications its version of the deuterocanonical works of the Old Testament was incorporated into St. Jerome's "Vulgate".

Elements from African Sources.—But even in this respect Africa had been beforehand with Italy. As early as A. D. 180 mention is made in the Acts of the Scillitan martyrs of a translation of the Gospels and of the Epistles of St. Paul. "In Tertullian's time", says Harnack, "there existed translations, if not of all the books of the Bible, at least of the greater number of them." It is a fact, however, that none of them possessed any predominating authority, though a few were beginning to claim a certain respect. And thus we find Tertullian and St. Cyprian using those by preference, as appears from the concordance of their quotations. The interesting point in these translations made by many hands is that they form one of the principal elements of Church Latin; they make up, so to say, the popular contribution. This is to be seen in their disregard for complicated inflexions, in their analytical tendencies, and in the alterations due to analogy. Pagan *littérateurs*, as Arnobius tells us (Adv. nat., I, xlv–lix), complained that these texts were edited in a trivial and mean speech, in a vitiated and uncouth language.

But to the popular contribution the more cultivated Christians added their share in forming the Latin of the Church. If the ordinary Christian could translate the "Acts of St. Perpetua", the "Pastor" of Hermas, the "Didache", and the "First Epistle" of Clement it took a scholar to put into Latin the "Acta Pauli" and St. Irenæus's treatise "Adversus hæreticos", as well as other works which seem to have been translated in the second and third century. It is not known to what country these translators belonged, but, in the case of original works, Africa leads the way with Tertullian, who has been rightly styled the creator of the language of the Church. Born at Carthage, he studied, and perhaps taught, rhetoric there: he studied law and acquired a vast erudition; he was converted to Christianity, raised to the priesthood, and brought to the service of the Faith an ardent zeal and a forceful eloquence to which the number and character of his works bear witness. He touched on every subject, apologetics, polemics, dogma, discipline, exegesis. He had to express a host of ideas which the simple faith of the communities of the west had not yet grasped. With his fiery temperament, his doctrinal rigidness, and his disdain for literary canons, he never hesitated to use the pointed word, the everyday phrase. Hence the marvellous exactness of his style, its restless vigour and high relief, the loud tones as of words thrown impetuously together: hence, above all, a wealth of expressions and words, many of which came then for the first time into ecclesiastical Latin and have remained there ever since. Some of these are Greek words in Latin dress—*baptisma, charisma, extasis, idololatria, prophetia, martyr*, etc.—some are given a Latin termination—*dæmonium, allegorizare, Paracletus*, etc. —some are law terms or old Latin words used in a new sense—*ablutio, gratia, sacramentum, sæculum, persecutor, peccator*. The greater part are entirely new, but are derived from Latin sources and regularly inflected according to the ordinary rules affecting analogous words—*annunciatio, concupiscentia, christianismus, coæternus, compatibilis, trinitas, vivificare*, etc. Many of these new words (more than 850 of them) have died out, but a very large portion are still to be found in ecclesiastical use; they are mainly those that met the need of expressing strictly Christian ideas. Nor is it certain that all of these owe their origin to Tertullian, but before his time they are not to be met with in the texts that have come down to us, and very often it is he who has naturalized them in Christian terminology.

The part St. Cyprian played in this building of the language was less important. The famous Bishop of Carthage never lost that respect for classical tradition which he inherited from his education and his previous profession of rhetor; he preserved that concern for style which led him to the practice of the literary methods so dear to the rhetors of his day. His language shows this even when he is dealing with Christian topics. Apart from his rather cautious imitation of Tertullian's vocabulary, we find in his writings not more than sixty new words, a few Hellenisms—*apostata, gazophylacium*—a few popular words or phrases—*magnalia, mammona*—or a few words formed by added inflections—*apostatare, clarificatio*. In St. Augustine's case it was his sermons preached to the people that mainly contributed to ecclesiastical Latin, and present it to us at its best; for, in spite of his assertion that he cares nothing for the sneers of the grammarians, his youthful studies retained too strong a hold on him to permit of his departing from classical speech more than was strictly necessary. He was the first to find fault with the use of certain words common at the time, such as *dolus* for *dolor, efforiet* for *florebit, ossum*

for *os*. The language he uses includes, besides a large part of classical Latin and the ecclesiastical Latin of Tertullian and St. Cyprian, borrowings from the popular speech of his day—*incantare, falsidicus, tantillus, cordatus*—and some new words or words in new meanings—*spiritualis, adorator, beatificus, ædificare*, meaning to edify, *inflatio*, meaning pride, *reatus*, meaning guilt, etc. It is, we think, useless to pursue this inquiry into the realm of Christian inscriptions and the works of Victor of Vito, the last of these Latin writers, as we should only find a Latin peculiar to certain individuals rather than that adopted by any Christian communities. Nor shall we delay over Africanisms, i. e. characteristics peculiar to African writers. The very existence of these characteristics, formerly so strongly held by many philologists, is nowadays generally questioned. In the works of several of these African writers we find a pronounced love for emphasis, alliteration, and rhythm, but these are matters affecting style rather than vocabulary. The most that can be said is that the African writers take more account of Latin as it was spoken (*sermo cotidianus*), but this speech was no peculiarity of Africa.

St. Jerome's Contribution.—After the African writers no author had such influence on the upbuilding of ecclesiastical Latin as St. Jerome had. His contribution came mainly along the lines of literary Latin. From his master, Donatus, he had received a grammatical instruction that made him the most literary and learned of the Fathers, and he always retained a love for correct diction, and an attraction towards Cicero. He prized good writing so highly that he grew angry whenever he was accused of a solecism; one-half of the words he uses are taken from Cicero, and it has been computed that besides employing, as occasion required, the words introduced by earlier writers, he himself is responsible for three hundred and fifty new words in the vocabulary of ecclesiastical Latin; yet of this number there are hardly nine or ten that may fitly be considered as barbarisms on the score of not conforming to the general laws of Latin derivatives. "The remainder", says Gœlzer, "were created by employing ordinary suffixes and were in harmony with the genius of the language." They are both accurately formed and useful words, expressing for the most part abstract qualities necessitated by the Christian religion and which hitherto had not existed in the Latin tongue, e. g., *clericatus, impœnitentia, deitas, dualitas, glorificatio, corruptrix*. At times, also, to supply new needs, he gives new meanings to old words—*conditor*, creator, *redemptor*, saviour of the world, *prædestinatio, communio*, etc. Besides this enriching of the lexicon, St. Jerome rendered no less service to ecclesiastical Latin by his edition of the Vulgate. Whether he made his translation from the original text or adapted previous translations after correcting them, he diminished, by that much, the authority of the many popular versions which could not fail to be prejudicial to the correctness of the language of the Church. By this very same act he popularized a number of Hebraisms and modes of speech—*vir desideriorum, filii iniquitatis, hortus voluptatis, inferioris a Daniele*, inferior to Daniel—which completed the shaping of the peculiar physiognomy of church Latin.

After St. Jerome's time ecclesiastical Latin may be said to be fully formed on the whole. If we trace the various steps of the process of producing it we find (1) that the ecclesiastical rites and institutions were first of all known by Greek names, and that the early Christian writers in the Latin language took those words consecrated by usage and embodied them in their works either *in toto* (e. g., *angelus, apostolus, ecclesia, evangelium, clerus, episcopus, martyr*) or else translated them (e. g., *verbum, persona, testamentum, gentilis*). It sometimes even happened that words bodily incorporated were afterwards replaced by translations (e. g., *chrisma* by *donum, hypostasis* by *substantia* or *persona, exomologesis* by *confessio, synodus* by *concilium*). (2) Latin words were created by derivations from existing Latin or Greek words by the addition of suffixes or prefixes, or by the combination of two or more words together (e. g., *evangelizare, Incarnatio, consubstantialis, idololatria*). (3) At times words having a secular or profane meaning are employed without any modification in a new sense (e. g., *fidelis, depositio, scriptura, sacramentum, resurgere*, etc.). With respect to its elements, ecclesiastical Latin consists of spoken Latin (*sermo cotidianus*) shot through with a quantity of Greek words, a few primitive popular phrases, some new and normal accretions to the language, and, lastly, various new meanings arising mainly from development or analogy.

With the exception of some Hebraic or Hellenist expressions popularized through Bible translations, the grammatical peculiarities to be met with in ecclesiastical Latin are not to be laid to the charge of Christianity; they are the result of an evolution through which the common language passed, and are to be met with among non-Christian writers. In the main the religious upheaval which was colouring all the beliefs and customs of the Western world did not unsettle the language as much as might have been expected. Christian writers preserved the literary Latin of their day as the basis of their language, and if they added to it certain neologisms it must not be forgotten that the classical writers, Cicero, Lucretius, Seneca, etc., had before this to lament the poverty of Latin to express philosophical ideas, and had set the example of coining words. Why should later writers hesitate to say *annunciatio, incarnatio, prædestinatio*, when Cicero had said *monitio, debitio, prohibitio*, and Livy, *coercitio*? Words like *deitas, nativitas, trinitas* are not more odd than *autumnitas, olivitas*, coined by Varro, and *plebitas*, which was used by the elder Cato.

Development in the Liturgy.—Hardly had it been formed when church Latin had to undergo the shock of the invasion of the barbarians and the fall of the Empire of the West; it was a shock that gave the death-blow to literary Latin as well as to the Latin of everyday speech on which church Latin was waxing strong. Both underwent a series of changes that completely transformed them. Literary Latin became more and more debased; popular Latin evolved into the various Romance languages in the South, while in the North it gave way before the Germanic tongues. Church Latin alone survived, thanks to the religion of which it was the organ and with which its destinies were linked. True, it lost a portion of its sway; in popular preaching it gave way to the vernacular after the seventh century; but it could still claim the Liturgy and theology, and in these it served the purpose of a living language. In the liturgy ecclesiastical Latin shows its vitality by its fruitfulness. Africa is once more in the lead with St. Cyprian. Besides the singing of the Psalms and the readings in public from the Bible, which made up the main portion of the primitive liturgy and which we already know, it shows itself in set prayers, in a love for rhythm, for well-balanced endings that were to remain for centuries during the Middle Ages the main characteristics of liturgical Latin. As the process of development went on, this love of harmony held sway over all prayers; they followed the rules of metre and prosody to begin with, but rhythmical cursus gained the upper-hand from the fourth to the seventh, and from the eleventh to the fifteenth, century.

As is well known, the *cursus* consists in a certain arrangement of words, accents, and sometimes whole phrases, whereby a pleasing modulated effect is produced. The prayer of the "Angelus" is the simplest example of this; it contains all three kinds of *cursus* that are to be met with in the prayers of the Missal and the 'Breviary: (1) the *cursus planus*, "nostris infunde"; (2) the *cursus tardus*, "incarnationem cognovi-

mus"; (3) the *cursus velox*, "gloriam perducamur." So great was their influence over the language that the *cursus* passed from the prayers of the liturgy into some of the sermons of St. Leo and a few others, into papal Bulls from the twelfth to the fifteenth century, and into many Latin letters written during the Middle Ages. Besides the prayers, hymns make up the most vital thing in the Liturgy. From St. Hilary of Poitiers, to whom St. Jerome attributes the earliest, down to Leo XIII, who composed many hymns, the number of hymn writers is very great, and their output, as we learn from recent research, is beyond computing. Suffice it to say that these hymns originated in popular rhythms founded on accent; as a rule they were modelled on classical metres, but gradually metre gave way to beat or number of syllables and accent. (See HYMNODY AND HYMNOLOGY.) Since the Renaissance, rhythm has again given way to metre; and many old hymns were even retouched, under Urban VIII, to bring them into line with the rules of classical prosody.

Besides this liturgy which we may style official, and which was made up of words of the Mass, of the Breviary, or of the Ritual, we may recall the wealth of literature dealing with a variety of historical detail, such as the "Peregrinatio ad Loca sancta" formerly attributed to Silvia, many collections of rubrics, ordines, sacramentaries, ordinaries, or other books of a religious bearing, of which so many have been edited of late years in England either by private individuals or by the Surtees' Society and the Bradshaw Society. But the most we can do is to mention this brilliant liturgical efflorescence.

Development in Theology.—Wider and more varied is the field theology opens up for ecclesiastical Latin; so wide that we must restrict ourselves to pointing out the creative resources which the Latin we speak of has given proof of since the beginning of the study of speculative theology, i. e., from the writings of the earliest Fathers down to our own day. More than elsewhere, it has here shown how capable it is of expressing the most delicate shades of theological thought, or the keenest hair-splitting of decadent Scholasticism. Need we mention what it has done in this field? The expressions it has created, the meanings it has conveyed are only too well known. Whereas the major part of these expressions were legitimate, were necessary and successful—*transsubstantiatio, forma, materia, individuum, accidens, appetitus*—there are only too many that show a wordy and empty formalism, a deplorable indifference for the sobriety of expression and for the purity of the Latin tongue—*aseitas, futuritio, beatificutivum, terminatio, actualitas, hœcceitas*, etc. It was by such words as these that the language of theology exposed itself to the jibes of Erasmus and Rabelais, and brought discredit on a study that was deserving of more consideration. With the Renaissance, men's minds became more difficult to satisfy, readers of cultured taste could not tolerate a language so foreign to the genius of the classical Latinity that had been revived. It became necessary even for renowned theologians, like Melchior Cano in the preface to his "Loci Theologici", to raise their voices against the demands of their readers as well as against the carelessness and obscurity of former theologians. It may be laid down that about this time classic correctness began to find a place in theological as well as in liturgical Latin.

Present Position.—Henceforth correctness was to be the characteristic of ecclesiastical Latin. To the terminology consecrated for the expression of the faith of the Catholic Church it now adds as a rule that grammatical accuracy which the Renaissance gave back to us. But in our own age, thanks to a variety of causes, some of which arise from the evolution of educational programmes, the Latin of the Church has lost in quantity what it has gained in quality. Latin retains its place in the Liturgy, and rightly so, the better to point out and watch over, in the very bosom of the Church, that unity of belief in all places and throughout all times which is her birthright. But in the devotional hymns that accompany the ritual the vernacular alone is used, and these hymns are gradually replacing the liturgical hymns. All the official documents of the Church, Encyclicals, Bulls, Briefs, institutions of bishops, replies from the Roman Congregations, acts of provincial councils, are written in Latin. Within recent years, however, solemn Apostolic letters addressed to one or other nation have been in their own tongue, and various diplomatic documents have been drawn up in French or in Italian. In the training of the clergy, the necessity of discussing modern systems, whether of exegesis or philosophy, has led almost everywhere to the use of the national tongue. Manuals of dogmatic and moral theology are written in Latin, in Italy, Spain, and France, but often, save in the Roman universities, the oral explanation thereof is given in the vernacular. In German- and English-speaking countries most of the manuals are in their own tongue, and nearly always the explanation is in the same languages.

COOPER, *Word Formation in the Roman sermo plebeius* (Boston and London, 1895); HARNACK, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur* (Leipzig, 1904); SCHANZ, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*, III (Munich, 1896); DUCHESNE, *Histoire ancienne de l'Eglise*, I (Paris, 1906); KOFFMANE, *Geschichte des Kirchenlateins* (Breslau, 1879, 1881); MONCEAUX, *Histoire littéraire de l'Afrique chrétienne* (Paris, 1901–05); RÖNSCH, *Itala und Vulgata* (2nd ed. Marburg, 1875); WORDSWORTH, SANDAY AND WHITE, *Old Biblical Latin Texts* (Oxford, 1883–88); CONDAMIN, *De Tertulliano . . . præcipuo Christianæ linguæ artifice* (Lyons, 1877); BAYARD, *Le latin de saint Cyprien* (Paris, 1902); GŒLZER, *Latinité de saint Jérôme* (Paris, 1884); IDEM, *Histoire du latin du III^e au VII^e siècle* in *Revue International de l'Enseignement* (Paris, 1908); RÉGNIER, *De la latinité des sermons de saint Augustin* (Paris, 1886); DEGERT, *Quid ad mores ingeniaque Afrorum cognoscenda conferant sancti Augustini sermones* (Paris, 1894); EBERT, *Geschichte der Christleben Litteratur* (Leipzig, 1874, French tr., Paris, 1883); CABROL, *Introduction aux études liturgiques* (Paris, 1906); CHEVALIER, *Poésie liturgique du moyen âge* (Paris, 1893); SCHWANE, *Histoire des Dogmes, V, VI*, French tr., DEGERT (Paris, 1904); SIMLER, *Des Sommes de théologie* (Paris, 1871); ZELL, *Commentatio de latinitate studiose colenda* (Freiburg, 1870); GUIBERT, *Le Latin dans les séminaires* (Paris, 1909).

ANTOINE DEGERT.

Latin Church.—The word Church (*ecclesia*) is used in its first sense to express the whole congregation of Catholic Christendom united in one Faith, obeying one hierarchy in communion with itself. This is the sense of Matt., xvi, 18; xviii, 17; Eph., v, 25, 27, etc. It is in this sense that we speak of the *Church* without qualification, say that Christ founded one Church, and so on. But the word is also constantly applied to the various individual elements of this union. As the whole is *the* Church, the universal Church, so are its parts the Churches of Corinth, Asia, France, etc. This second use of the word also occurs in the New Testament (Acts, xv, 41; II Cor., xi, 28; Apoc., i, 4, 11, etc.). Any portion then that forms a subsidiary unity in itself may be called a local Church. The smallest such portion is a diocese—thus we speak of the Church of Paris, of Milan, of Seville. Above this again we group metropolitical provinces and national portions together as unities, and speak of the Church of Africa, of Gaul, of Spain. The expression Church of Rome, it should be noted, though commonly applied by non-Catholics to the whole Catholic body, can only be used correctly in this secondary sense for the local diocese (or possibly the province) of Rome, mother and mistress of all Churches. A German Catholic is not, strictly speaking, a member of the Church of Rome, but of the Church of Cologne, or Munich-Freising, or whatever it may be, in union with and under the obedience of the Roman Church (although, no doubt, by a further extension *Roman Church* may be used as equivalent to *Latin Church* for the patriarchate).

The word is also used very commonly for the still greater portions that are united under their patriarchs, that is for the patriarchates. It is in this

sense that we speak of the Latin Church. The Latin Church is simply that vast portion of the Catholic body which obeys the Latin patriarch, which submits to the pope, not only in papal, but also in patriarchal matters. It is thus distinguished from the Eastern Churches (whether Catholic or Schismatic), which represent the other four patriarchates (Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem), and any fractions broken away from them. The Latin patriarchate has always been considerably the largest. Now, since the great part of Eastern Christendom has fallen into schism, since vast new lands have been colonized, conquered or (partly) converted by Latins (America, Australia, etc.), the Latin part of the Catholic Church looms so enormous as compared with the others that many people think that every one in communion with the pope is a Latin. This error is fostered by the Anglican branch theory, which supposes the situation to be that the Eastern Church is no longer in communion with Rome. Against this we must always remember, and when necessary point out, that the constitution of the Catholic Church is still essentially what it was at the time of the Second Council of Nicæa (787; see also canon xxi of Constantinople IV in 869 in the "Corp. Jur. can.", dist. xxii, c. vii). Namely, there are still the five patriarchates, of which the Latin Church is only one, although so great a part of the Eastern ones have fallen away. The Uniate Churches, small as they are, still represent the old Catholic Christendom of the East in union with the pope, obeying him as pope, though not as their patriarch. All Latins are Catholics, but not all Catholics are Latins. The old frontier passed just east of Macedonia, Greece (Illyricum was afterwards claimed by Constantinople), and Crete, and cut Africa west of Egypt. All to the west of this was the Latin Church.

We must now add to Western Europe all the new lands occupied by Western Europeans, to make up the present enormous Latin patriarchate. Throughout this vast territory the pope reigns as patriarch, as well as by his supreme position as visible head of the whole Church. With the exception of very small remnants of other uses (Milan, Toledo, and the Byzantines of Southern Italy), his Roman Rite is used throughout, according to the general principle that rite follows the patriarchate, that local bishops use the rite of their patriarch. The medieval Western uses (Paris, Sarum, and so on), of which people at one time made much for controversial purposes, were in no sense really independent rites, as are the remnants of the Gallican use at Milan and Toledo. They were only the Roman Rite with very slight local modifications. From this conception we see that the practical disappearance of the Gallican Rite, however much the archæologist may regret it, is justified by the general principle that rite should follow patriarchate. Uniformity of rite throughout Christendom has never been an ideal among Catholics; but uniformity in each patriarchate is. We see also that the suggestion, occasionally made by advanced Anglicans, of a Uniate Anglican Church with its own rite and to some extent its own laws (for instance with a married clergy) is utterly opposed to antiquity and to consistent canon law. England is most certainly part of the Latin patriarchate. When Anglicans return to the old Faith they find themselves subject to the pope, not only as head of the Church, but also as patriarch. As part of the Latin Church England must submit to Latin canon law and the Roman Rite just as much as France or Germany. The comparison with Eastern Uniates rests on a misconception of the whole situation. It follows also that the expression *Latin* (or even *Roman*) *Catholic* is quite justifiable, inasmuch as we express by it that we are not only Catholics but also members of the Latin or Roman patriarchate. A Uniate on the other hand is a Byzantine, or Armenian, or Maronite Catholic. But a person who is in schism with the Holy See is not, of course, admitted by Catholics to be any kind of Catholic at all.

ADRIAN FORTESCUE.

Latin Language, USE OF, IN THE LITURGY. See LITURGY.

Latin Literature, CHRISTIAN.—EARLY CENTURIES. —The Latin language was not at first the literary and official organ of the Christian Church in the West. The Gospel was announced by preachers whose language was Greek, and these continued to use Greek, if not in their discourses, at least in their most important acts. Irenæus, at Lyons, preached in Latin, or perhaps in the Celtic vernacular, but he refuted heresies in Greek. The Letter of the Church of Lyons concerning its martyrs is written in Greek; so at Rome, a century earlier, is that of Clement to the Corinthians. In both cases the language of those to whom the letters were addressed may have been designedly chosen; nevertheless, a document that may be called a domestic product of the Roman Church—the "Shepherd" of Hermas, was written in Greek. At Rome in the middle of the second century, Justin, a Palestinian philosopher, opened his school, and suffered martyrdom; Tatian wrote his "Apologia" in Greek; at Rome in the third century Hippolytus compiled his numerous works in Greek. And Greek is not only the language of books, but also of the Roman Christian inscriptions, the greater number of which, down to the third century, are written in Greek. The most ancient Latin document emanating from the Roman Church is the correspondence of its clergy with Carthage during the vacancy of the Apostolic See following on the death of Pope Fabian (20 January, 250). One of the letters is the work of Novatian, the first Christian writer to use the Latin language at Rome. But even at this epoch, Greek is still the official language: the original epitaphs of the popes are still composed in Greek. We have those of Anterus, of Fabian, of Lucius, of Gaius, and the series brings us down to 296. That of Cornelius, which is in Latin, seems to be later than the third century. In Africa Latin was always the literary language of Christianity, although Punic was still used for preaching in the time of St. Augustine, and some even preached in the Berber language. These latter, however, had no literature; cultivated persons, as well as the cosmopolitan population of the seaports used Greek. The oldest Christian document of Africa, the Acts of the Scillitan Martyrs, was translated into Greek, as were some of the works of Tertullian, perhaps by the author himself, and certainly with the object of securing for them a wider diffusion. The Acts of Sts. Perpetua and Felicitas, originally written in Latin, were translated into Greek. In Spain all the known documents are written in Latin, but they appear very late. The Acts of St. Fructuosus, a martyr under Valerian, are attributed by some critics to the third century. The first Latin Christian document to which a quite certain date can be assigned is a collection of the canons of the Council of Elvira, about 300.

Side by side with literary works, the Church produced certain writings necessary to her life. In this category must be placed the most ancient Christian documents written in Latin, the translations of the Bible made either in Africa or in Italy. Beginning with the second century, Latin translations of technical works written in Greek became numerous—treatises on medicine, botany, mathematics, etc. These translations served a practical purpose, and were made by professionals; consequently they had no literary merit, and aimed at an almost servile exactitude resulting in the retention of many peculiarities of the original. Hellenisms, a very questionable feature in the literary works of preceding centuries, were frequent in these translations. The early Latin versions of the Bible had the characteristics common to all

texts of this group; Hellenisms abounded in them, and even Semitisms filtered in through the Greek. In the fourth century, when St. Jerome made his new Latin version of the Scriptures, the partisans of the older versions to justify their opposition praised loudly the harsh fidelity of these inelegant translations (Augustine, "De doct. christ.", II, xv, in P. L., XXXIV, 46). These versions no doubt exercised a great influence upon the imagination and the style of Christian writers, but it was an influence rather of invention and inspiration than of expression. The incorrectness and barbarisms of the Fathers have been much exaggerated: profounder knowledge of the Latin language and its history has shown that they used the language of their time, and that in this respect there is no difference worth mentioning between them and their pagan contemporaries. No doubt some of them were men of defective education, writers of incorrect prose and popular verse, but there have been such in every age; the author of the "Bellum Hispaniense", the historian Justinus, Vitruvius, are profane authors who cared little for purity or elegance of style. Tertullian, the Christian author most frequently accused of barbarism, for his time, is by no means incorrect. He possesses strong creative power, and his freedom is mostly in the matter of vocabulary; he either invents new words or uses old ones in very novel ways. His style is bold; his imagination and his passion light it up with figures at times incoherent and in bad taste; but his syntax contains, it may be said, almost no innovations. He multiplies constructions as yet rare and adds new constructions, but he always respects the genius of the language. His work contains no Semitisms, and the Hellenisms which his critics have pointed out in it are neither frequent nor without warrant in the usage of his day. This, of course, does not apply to his express or implicit citations from the Bible. At the other extreme, chronologically, of Latin Christian literary development, a pope like Gelasius gives evidence of considerable classical culture; his language is novel chiefly in its choice of words, but many of these neoterisms were in his time no longer new, and had their origin in the technical usage of the Church and the Roman law.

In the historical development of Christian Latin literature three periods may be distinguished: that of the Apologists, lasting until the fourth century; that of the Fathers of the Church (the fourth century); and the Gallo-Roman period. The first period is characterized by its dominant tone of apology, or defence of the Christian religion. In fact, most of the earliest Christian writers wrote apologies, e. g. Minucius Felix, Tertullian, Arnobius, Lactantius. In face of paganism and the Roman State they plead the cause of Christianity, and they do it each according to his character, and each with his own line of arguments. Minucius Felix represents, in a way, the transition from the traditional philosophy of the cultured classes to the popular preaching of Christianity and in this approaches closely to some of the Greek apologists, converts from philosophy to Christianity, e. g. Justin, seeking at the same time to harmonize their inherited mental culture with their faith. Even the dialogue form they use is meant to retain the reader in that philosophic world with which Plato and Cicero had familiarized him. Tertullian, perhaps identical with the jurisconsult mentioned in the "Digest" of Justinian, lifts out boldly arguments of a legal order and examines the juridical bases of the persecution. Arnobius, rhetorician and philosopher, is first and foremost a product of the school; he exhibits the resources of amplification and displays the erudition of a scholiast. Lactantius is a philosopher, only more profoundly penetrated by Christianity than were the earlier apologists. He is also very particular about the maintenance of social order, good government, and the State. His writings are well adapted to a society that has recently been shaken by a long period of anarchy and is in process of reconstruction. In this way the early Christian Latin literature presents all the varieties of apology. There are here mentioned only those apologies which formally present themselves as such; to them should be added some of St. Cyprian's works—the treatises on idols, and "ad Donatum", the letter to Demetrianus, works which attack special weaknesses of polytheism, the vices of pagan society, or discuss the calamities of Rome.

These writers do not confine their activity to controversy with the pagans. The extent and variety of the works of Tertullian and St. Cyprian are well known. At Rome, Novatian touches, in his treatises, on questions which more particularly interest the faithful, their religious life or their beliefs. Victorinus of Pettau, in the mountains of Styria, introduced Biblical exegesis into Latin literature, and began that series of commentaries on the Apocalypse which so influenced the imagination, and echoed so powerfully among the artists and writers, of the Middle Ages. The same visions were embodied in the verses of Commodianus, the first Christian poet; but in a second work he took his place among the apologists and combatted paganism. In their other works St. Cyprian and Tertullian kept always in view the apologetic interest; indeed, this is the most noteworthy trait of the early Christian Latin literature. We may call attention here to another characteristic: many Latin writers of this time, Minucius Felix, Tertullian, Cyprian, Arnobius, perhaps Commodianus, were Africans, for which peculiarity two causes may be assigned. On the one hand, Gaul and Italy had long employed the Greek language, while Spain was backward, and Christianity developed there but feebly at this period. On the other hand, Africa had become a centre of profane literature; Apuleius, the greatest profane writer of the age, was an African; Carthage possessed a celebrated school which is called in one inscription by the same name, *studium*, which was afterwards applied to the medieval universities. There is no doubt that the second was the more potent cause.

The second period of Christian literature covers broadly speaking, the fourth century—i. e. from the Edict of Milan (313) to the death of St. Jerome (420). It was then that the great writers of the Church flourished, those known pre-eminently as "the Fathers", both West and East. Though the term *patristic* belongs to the whole period here under consideration, as contrasted with the term *scholastic* applied to the Middle Ages, it may nevertheless be restricted to the period we are now describing. Literary productiveness was no longer the almost exclusive privilege of one country; it was spread throughout all the Roman West. Notwithstanding this diffusion, all the Latin writers are closely related; there are no national schools; the writers and their works are all caught up in the general current of church history. There is truly a Christian West, all parts of which possess nearly the same importance, and are closely united, in spite of differences of climate and temperament. And this West is beginning to stand off from the Greek East, which tends to follow its own particular path. The causes of Western cohesion were various, but it was principally rooted in community of interests and the similarity of questions arising immediately after the peace of the Church. At the beginning of the fourth century Christological problems agitated the Church. The West came to the aid of the orthodox communities of the East, but knew little of Arianism until the Teutonic invasions. When the conflict concerning the use of the basilicas at Milan arose, the Arians do not appear as the people of Milan; they are Goths (Ambrose, Ep. xii, 12, in P. L., XVI, 997). In the fourth century the great personages of the West are champions of the faith of Nicæa—Hilary of Poitiers, Lucifer of Cagliari, Phœbadius of Agen, Am-

brose, Augustine. Nevertheless, the West has errors of its own: Novatianism, a legacy from the preceding age; Donatism in Africa; Manichæism, which came from the East, but developed chiefly in Africa and Gaul; Priscillianism, akin to Manichæism, and the firstfruits of Spanish mysticism. Manichæism has a complex character, and, in truth, appears to be a distinct religion. All other errors of the West have a bearing on discipline or morals, on practical life, and do not arise from intellectual speculation. Even in the Manichæan controversy, moral questions occupy a large place. Moreover, the characteristic and most important heresy of the Latin countries bears upon a problem of Christian psychology and life—the reconciliation of human liberty with the action of Divine grace. This problem, raised by Pelagius, was solved by Augustine. Another characteristic of this period is the universality of the gifts and the activity displayed by its greatest writers; Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine are in turn moralists, historians, and orators; Ambrose and Augustine are poets; Augustine is the universal genius, not only of his own time, but of the Latin Church—one of the greatest men of antiquity, to whom Harnack, without exaggeration, has found none comparable in ancient history except Plato. In him Christianity reached one of the highest peaks of human thought.

This second period may be again subdivided into three generations. First, the reign of Constantine after the peace of the Church (313–37), when Juvencus composed the Gospel History (*Historia Evangelica*) in verse; from the preceding period he had inherited the influence of Hosius of Cordova. Second, the time between the death of Constantine and the accession of Theodosius (337–79). In this generation apologetic assumes an aggressive tone with Firmicus Maternus, and appeals to the secular arm against paganism; Christianity, by many held responsible for the gathering misfortunes of the empire, is defended by Augustine in "The City of God"; Ambrose and Prudentius protest against the retention of paganism in official ceremonies; great bishops like Hilary of Poitiers, Zeno of Verona, Optatus of Mileve, Lucifer of Cagliari, Eusebius of Vercelli, take part in the controversies of the day; Marius Victorinus combines the erudition of a philologian with the subtlety of a theologian. The third generation was that of St. Jerome, under Theodosius and his son (380–420), a generation rich in intellect—Ambrose, Prudentius, Sulpicius Severus, Rufinus, Jerome, Paulinus of Nola, Augustine, the secondary poets Proba, Damasus, Cyprian; the Spanish theologians Pacianus and Gregory of Elvira; Philastrius of Brescia and Phœbadius of Agen. The long-lived Augustine overlapped this period; at the same time by the sheer force of genius he is both the last great thinker of antiquity in the West and the first great thinker of the Middle Ages.

Early Christian literature in the West may be regarded as ending with the accession of Theodoric (408). Thenceforth until the Carlovingian renascence there arises in the various barbarian kingdoms a literature which has for its chief object the education of the new-comers and the transmission of some of the ancient culture into their new civilization. This brings us to the last of our three periods, which may conveniently be called the Gallo-Roman, and comprises about two generations, from 420 to 493. It is dominated by one school, that of Lérins, but already the splintering of the old social and political unity is at hand in the new barbarian nationalities rooted on provincial soil. In Augustine's old age, and after his death, a few disciples and partisans of his teachings remain: Orosius, a Spaniard; Prosper of Aquitaine, a Gallo-Roman; Marius Mercator, an African. Later, Victor Vitensis tells the story of the Vandal persecution; in him Roman Africa, overrun by barbarians, furnishes almost the only writer of the second half of the century. To the list of African authors must be added the names of two bishops of Mauretania mentioned by Gennadius—Victor and Voconius. In Gaul a pleiad of writers and theologians develops at Lérins or within the radius of that monastery's influence—Cassian, Honoratus, Eucherius of Lyons, Vincent of Lérins, Hilary of Arles, Valerian of Cemelium, Salvianus, Faustus of Riez, Gennadius. Here we might mention Arnobius the younger, and the author of the "Prædestinatus". No literary movement in the West, before Charlemagne, was so important or so prolonged. Gaul was then truly the scene of manifold intellectual activity; in addition to the writers of Lérins, that country reckons one polygrapher, Sidonius Apollinaris, one philosopher, Claudian Mamertus, several poets, Claudius Marius Victor, Prosper, Orientius, Paulinus of Pella, Paulinus of Périgueux, perhaps also Cœlius Sedulius. Against this array Italy can offer only two preachers, St. Peter Chrysologus and Maximus of Turin, and one great pope, Leo I, still greater by his deeds than by his writings, whose name recalls a new influence of the Church of Rome on the intellectual movement of the time, but a juridical rather than a literary influence. Early in the fifth century Innocent I appears to have been occupied with a first compilation of the canon law. He and his successors intervene in ecclesiastical affairs with letters, some of which have the size and scope of veritable treatises. Spain is still poorer than Italy, even counting Orosius (already mentioned among the disciples of Augustine) and the chronicler Hydatius. The island peoples, which in the preceding period had produced the heresiarch Pelagius, deserve mention at this date also for the works attributed to St. Patrick.

A first general characteristic of Christian literature, common to both East and West, is the space it devotes to bibliographical questions, and the importance they assume. This fact is explained by the very origins of Christianity: it is a religion not of one book, but of a collection of books, the date, source, authenticity, and canonicity of which are matters which it is important to determine. In Eusebius's "History of the Church" it is obvious with what care he pursues the inquiry as to the books of Scripture cited and recognized by his Christian predecessors. In this way there grows up a habit of classifying documents and references, and of describing in prefaces the nature of the several books. The Bible is not the only object of these minute studies; every important and complex work attracts the attention of editors. Let it suffice to recall the formation of the collection of St. Cyprian's letters and treatises, a more or less official catalogue of which, the "Cheltenham Catalogue", was drawn up in 359, after a lengthy elaboration, the successive stages of which are still traceable in several manuscripts. Questions of authenticity play a large part in the dissensions of St. Jerome and Rufinus. Apocryphal writings, fabricated in the interest of heresy, engendered controversies between the Church and the heretical sects. Another illustration of the same literary interest is to be found in the inquiry instituted at the end of the fourth century as to the Canons of Sardica, called Canons of Nicæa. The "Retractationes" of St. Augustine is a work unique in the history of ancient bibliography, not to speak of its psychologic interest, a peculiar quality of all Christian literature in the West.

In part, therefore, Christian Latin literature naturally assumes a character of immediate utility. Catalogues are drawn up, lists of bishops, lists of martyrs (*Depositiones episcoporum et martyrum*), catalogues of cemeteries, later on church inventories, "Provinciales", or lists of dioceses according to countries. Besides these archive documents, in which we recognize an imitation of Roman bureaucratic customs, certain literary genres bear the same stamp. The accounts of pilgrimages have as much of the guide-book as of the

narrative in them. History had already been reduced to a number of stereotyped scenes by the profane masters, and had been incorporated, at Alexandria, in that elementary literature which condensed all knowledge into a minimum of dry formulæ. The "Chronicle" of St. Jerome, really only a continuation of that of Eusebius, is in turn continued by a series of special writers, and even a Sulpicius Severus betrays the influence of the new form of chronicle. While in these departments of literature the West but imitates the East, it follows at the same time its own practical tendencies. Indeed, the Latin writers make no pretence to originality; they take their materials from their Eastern brethren. Five of them, Hilary, Jerome, Rufinus, Cassian, and Marius Mercator, have been described as hellenizing Westerns. St. Ambrose is generally considered an authentic representative of the Latin mind, and this is true of the bent of his genius and of his exercise of authority as the head of a Church; but no one, perhaps, translated more frequently from the Greek writers, or did it with more spirit or more care. It is an acknowledged fact that his exegesis is taken from St. Basil's "Hexaemeron" and from a series of treatises on Genesis by Philo. The same holds good in respect to his dogmatic or mystical treatises: the "De mysteriis", written in his last years, before 397, is largely taken from Cyril of Jerusalem and a treatise of Didymus of Alexandria published a little before 381, while the "De Spiritu Sancto", written before Easter, 381, is a compilation from Athanasius, Basil, Didymus, and Epiphanius, from a recension of the "Catecheses" of Cyril made after 360, and from some theological discourses which had been delivered by Gregory of Nazianzus less than a twelvemonth previously (380). St. Augustine is less erudite; his learning, if not his philosophy, is more Latin than Greek. But it is the strength of his genius which makes him the most original of the Latin Fathers.

One influence, however, no Christian writer in the West escaped, that of the literary school and the literary tradition. From the beginning similarities of style with Fronto and Apuleius appear numerous and distinctly perceptible in Minucius Felix, Tertullian, and Zeno of Verona; owing, perhaps, to the fact that all writers, sacred and profane, adopted then the same fashions, particularly imitation of the old Latin writers. To its traditional character also, early Christian Latin literature owes two characteristics more peculiarly its own: it is oratorical, and it is moral. From remote antiquity there had existed a moral literature, more exactly a preaching, which brought certain truths within the reach of the masses, and by the character of its audience was compelled to employ certain modes of expression. On this common ground the Cynic and the Stoic philosophies had met since the third century before Christ. From the still extant remains of Teles and Bion of Borysthenes we can form some idea of this style of preaching. From this source the satire of Horace borrows some of its themes. This Cynico-Stoic morality finds expression also in the Greek of Musonius, Epictetus, and some of Plutarch's treatises, likewise in the Latin of Seneca's letters and *opuscula*. Its decidedly oratorical character it owes to the fact that with the beginning of the Christian era rhetoric became the sole form of literary culture and of teaching. This tradition was perpetuated by the Fathers. It furnished them the forms most needed for their work of instruction: the letter, developed into a brief treatise or reasoned exposition of opinion in the correspondence of Seneca with Lucilius; the treatise in the shape of a discourse or as Seneca again calls it a *dialogus;* lastly, the sermon itself, in all its varieties of conference, funeral oration, and homily. Indeed, homily (*homilia*) is a technical term of the Cynic and Stoic moralists. And the aforesaid literary tradition not only dominates the method of exposition, but also furnishes some of the themes developed, commonplaces of popular morality, modified and adapted, but still recognizable. Without repudiating this indebtedness of Christian literature to pagan literary form, one cannot help seeing in its double character, oratorical and moral, the peculiar stamp of Roman genius. This explains the constant tone of exhortation which makes most works of ecclesiastical writers so monotonous and tiresome. Exegesis borrows from Greek and Jewish literature the system of allegory, but it lends to these parables a moralizing and edifying turn. Hagiography finds its models in biographies like those of Plutarch, but always accentuates their panegyrical and moral tone. Some compensation is to be found in the autobiographical writings, the personal letters, memoirs, and confessions. In the "Confessions" of St. Augustine we have a work the value of which is unique in the literature of all time.

Although its oratorical methods are chosen with an eye to the character of its public, there is nothing popular in the form of Christian Latin literature, nothing even corresponding to the freedom of the primitive translations of the Bible. In prose, the work of Lucifer of Cagliari stands almost alone, and reveals the aforesaid rhetorical influence almost as much as it does the writer's incorrectness. The Christian poets might have wandered somewhat more freely from the beaten path; nevertheless, they were content to imitate classical poetry in an age when prosody, owing to the changes in pronunciation, had ceased to be a living thing. Juvencus was more typical than Prudentius. The verses of the Christian poets are as artificial as those of good scholars in our own time. Commodianus, out of sheer ignorance, supplies the defects of prosody with the tonic accent. Indeed, a new type of rhythm, based on accent, was about to develop from the new pronunciation; St. Augustine gives an example of it in his "psalmus abecedarius". It may therefore be said that from the point of view of literary history the work of the Latin Christian writers is little more than a survival and a prolongation of the early profane literature of Rome. It counts among its celebrities some gifted writers and one of the noblest geniuses that humanity has produced, St. Augustine.

CASPARI, *Ungedruckte, unbeachtete und wenig beachtete Quellen zur Geschichte des Taufsymbols und der Glaubensregel*, III (Christiania, 1875), 267; DUCHESNE, *Histoire ancienne de l'Eglise*, I, 324; MONCEAUX, *Histoire littéraire de l'Afrique chrétienne*, I, 66; DUCHESNE, *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions, 1891*, 39; IDEM, *Le concile d'Elvire* in *Mélanges Renier* (Paris, 1887), 159; KOFFMANN, *Geschichte des Kirchenlateins, I, Bis auf Augustinus-Hieronymus* (Breslau, 1879–1881), 2 fasc. the only ones issued; DU CANGE, *Glossarium ad scriptores mediæ et infimæ latinitatis* (Paris, 1678); RONSCH, *Itala und Vulgata, Das Sprach-idiom der Itala und der Vulgata* (Marburg, 1875); HOPPE, *Syntax und Stil des Tertullianus* (Leipzig, 1903), cf. *Revue Critique*, I (1905), 107; most of the studies in Wölffin's *Archiv für lat. Lexikographie und Grammatik* on the ecclesiastical writers, e. g., *Minucius Felix*, VII(1892), 467; *Priscillian*, III (1886), 309; *Lucifer of Cagliari*, III (1886), 1; the *Peregrinatio ad loca sancta of Silvia (Etheria)*, IV (1887), 259; XV (1907), 233; XV (1908), 549; *Gelasius*, XII (1902), 1; *Saint Benedict*, IX (1896), 493; *Jordanes*, XI (1899), 361; see GELZER, *La latinité de Saint Jérôme* (Paris, 1884); BONNET, *Le latin de Grégoire de Tours* (Paris, 1890), of great general importance. See the historians of Latin literature (BÄHR, TEUFFEL, EBERT, SCHANZ), the patrologies and the histories of Christian literature (HARNACK, NIRSCHL, ALZOG, BARDENHEWER), also the articles of this encyclopedia, relative to patrology, theology, Christian writers, and heresies. See the articles on all writers mentioned, also ACHELIS, *Die Martyrologien* (Berlin, 1900); BAUMSTARK, *Das Verzeichniss der römischen Cömiterien in Röm. Quartalschrift*, XV (1901), 1; DUCHESNE, *Les Provinciaux* in *Mélanges de l'Ecole de Rome*, XXIV (1904), 75; LEJAY, *Revue d'histoire et de littérature religieuses*, VII (1902), 357; STEINACKER, *Ueber die älteste päpstliche Registerwesen* in *Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreich. Geschichtsforschung*, XXIII (1901), 1; HARNACK, *Die "Retractationes"* in *Sitzungsberichte* of the Berlin Academy, 21 December, 1905; VON WILAMOWITZ, *Antigonos von Carystos*, p. 296 (on Christian preaching).

PAUL LEJAY.

II. SIXTH TO TWENTIETH CENTURY.—During the Middle Ages the so-called church Latin was to a great

extent the language of poetry, and it was only on the advent of the Renaissance that classical Latin revived and flourished in the writings of the neo-Latinists, as it does even to-day though to a more modest extent. To present to the reader an account of Latin poetry in a manner at once methodical and clear is not an easy task; a strict adherence to chronology interferes with clearness of treatment, and an arrangement according to the different kinds of poetry would demand a repeated handling of some of the poets. However, the latter method is preferable because it enables us to trace the historical development of this literature.

A. *The Latin Drama.*—Both in its inception and its subsequent development Latin dramatic poetry displays a peculiar character. "In no domain of literature", says W. Creizenach in the opening sentence of his well-known work on the history of the drama, "do the Middle Ages show so complete a suspension of the tradition of classical antiquity as in the drama." Terence was indeed read and taught in the schools of the Middle Ages, but the true dramatic art of the Roman poet was misunderstood. Nowhere do we find evidence that any of his comedies were placed on the stage in schools or elsewhere; for this an adequate conception of classical stage-craft was wanting. The very knowledge of the metres of Terence was lost in the Middle Ages, and, just as the difference between comedy and tragedy was misunderstood, so also the difference between these and other kinds of poetical composition was no longer understood. It is thus clear why we can speak of imitations of the Roman writer only in rare and completely isolated cases, for example, in the case of the nun Hroswitha of Gandersheim in the tenth century. But even she shared the mistaken views of her age concerning the comedies of Terence, having no idea that these works were written for the stage nor indeed any conception of the dramatic art. Her imitations therefore can be regarded only as literary dramas on spiritual subjects, which exercised no influence whatever on the subsequent development of the drama (see HROSWITHA). Two centuries later we find an example of how Plautus fared at the hands of his poetical imitators. The fact that, like Seneca, Plautus is scarcely ever mentioned among the school-texts of the Middle Ages makes it easier to understand how at the close of the twelfth century Vitalis of Blois came to recast the "Amphitruo" and the "Querulus", a later sequel to the "Aulularia", into satirical epic poems.

That the drama might therefore never have developed in the Middle Ages were it not for the effective stimulus supplied by the ecclesiastical liturgy is quite conceivable. Liturgy began by assuming more solemn forms and finally gave rise to the religious drama which was at first naturally composed in the liturgical Latin language, but subsequently degenerated into a mixture of Latin and the vernacular, until it finally assumed an entirely vernacular form. The origin of the drama may be traced to the so-called Easter celebrations which came into life when the strictly ecclesiastical liturgy was developed into a dramatic scene by the introduction of hymns and sequences in a dialogue form. A further step in the development was reached when narration in John, xx, 4 sqq., was translated into action and the Apostles Peter and John were represented as hastening to the tomb of the risen Saviour. This form appears in a Paschal celebration at St. Lambrecht and another at Augsburg, both dating back to the twelfth century. This expansion of the Easter celebration by the introduction of scenes participated in by the Apostles spread from Germany over Holland and Italy, but seems to have found a less sympathetic reception in France. The third and final step in the development of the Easter celebrations was the inclusion of the apparition of the risen Christ. Among others a Nuremberg antiphonary of the thirteenth century contains all three scenes, joined together so as to give unity of action, thus possessing the character of a little drama. Of such Paschal celebrations, which still formed a part of the ecclesiastical liturgy, 224 have been already discovered: 159 in Germany, 52 in France, and the remainder in Italy, Spain, and Holland. The taste for dramatic representations, awakened in the people by the Easter celebrations, was fostered by the clergy, and by bringing out the human side of such characters as Pilate, Judas, the Jews, and the soldiers, a true drama was gradually created.

That the Easter plays were originally composed in Latin is proved by numerous still existing examples, such as those of "Benediktbeuren", "Klosterneuburg", and the "Mystery of Tours"; gradually, however, passages in the vernacular were introduced, and finally this alone was made use of. Passion-plays were first produced in connexion with the Easter plays, but soon developed into independent dramas, generally in the mother-tongue. As late as 1537 the passion-play "Christus Xylonicus" was written in Latin by Barthélemy de Loches of Orléans. As the Easter plays developed from the Easter celebrations, so Christmas plays developed from the ecclesiastical celebrations at Christmas. In these the preparatory season of Advent also was symbolized in the predictions of the Prophets. Similarly the plays of the Three Kings originated in connexion with the Feast of the Epiphany; there the person of Herod and the Massacre of the Innocents are the materials for a very effective drama. It was but natural that all the plays dealing with the Christmas season should be brought together into a connected whole or cycle, beginning with the play of the Shepherds, continuing in that of the Three Kings, and ending with the Massacre of the Innocents. That this combination of plays actually existed we have abundant manuscript evidence; particularly famous is the Freising cycle.

The transition to the so-called eschatological plays —the climax of the history of the Redemption—was easy. Two such plays enjoy a special celebrity, "The Wise and Foolish Virgins", which appeared in France in the twelfth century, and "The Appearance and Disappearance of Antichrist", written by a German poet about 1160. The latter, which is also entitled "The Roman Emperor of the German Nation and Antichrist", has also been regarded as an Easter play, because the arrival of Antichrist was expected at Easter. The second title agrees better with the contents of the play. The poet, who must have been a learned scholar, drew his inspiration from the politico-religious constitution of the Roman Empire as it existed in the golden period of Frederick Barbarossa, and from the Crusades. This ambitious play with its minute directions for representation is divided into two main actions—the realization of a Christian world-empire under the German nation, and the doings of Antichrist and his final overthrow by the Kingdom of Christ. The unity and conception of the two parts is indicated by the fact that the nations appearing in the first part suggest to the spectator what will be their attitude towards Antichrist. The drama was intended to convey the impression that the German people alone could fulfil the world-wide office of the Roman Empire and that the Church needed such a protector.

The extension of the ecclesiastical plays by the introduction of purely worldly elements led gradually to the disappearance of spiritual influence, the decay of which may also be gathered from the gradual adoption of the vernacular for these plays. While the first bloom of the neo-Latin drama is thus attributable to the influence of the Church, its second era of prosperity was purely secular in character and began with the labours of the so-called Humanists in Italy, who called into life the literary drama. Numerous as they were, we do not meet with a single genuine dramatist among

them; still many sporadic attempts at play-writing were made by them. The pagan classics were naturally adopted as models—Seneca for tragedy, as is shown by the plays of Mussato, Loschi, or Dati, and especially the "Progne" of Corraro. On the other hand Plautus and Terence found more numerous imitators, whose works did not degenerate into ribaldry, as is seen from the attempts of Poggio, Beccadelli, Bruni, Fidelfo, etc. These humanistic attempts attained a measure of success in the school drama. A beginning was made with the production of the ancient dramas in the original text; such productions were introduced into the curriculum of the Liège school of the Hieronymites and they are occasionally mentioned at Vienna, Rostock, and Louvain. A permanent school-stage was erected in Strasburg by the Protestant rector, John Sturm, who wished that "all the comedies of Plautus and Terence should be produced, if possible, within half a year."

The second step in the development was the imitation of the classical drama, which may be traced to Wimpfeling's "Stylpho"; produced for the first time at Heidelberg in 1470, this play was still produced in 1505, a proof of its great popularity. A glorification and defence of classical studies was found in the comedy of "Codrus" by Kerkmeister, master of the Münster grammar school. The contrast between humanistic studies and medieval methods, which does not come into prominence in Wimpfeling's "Stylpho", forms here the main theme. Into the same category falls a comedy by Bebel, demonstrating the superiority of humanistic culture over medieval learning. Into these plays important current events are introduced, such as the war of Charles VII against Naples, the Turkish peril, the political situation after the Battle of Guinegate (1513), etc. The best-known of these dialogue writers were Jacob Locher, Johann von Kitzcher, and Hermann Schottenius Hessus.

Another hybrid class of drama was the allegorical festival plays, which were fitted out as show-pieces after the fashion of the Italian mask-comedies. A brilliant example of this class is the "Ludus Dianæ", in which Conrad Celtes (1501) panegyrizes the preeminence of the emperor in the chase. Similar to that of the festival plays was the development of the so-called moralities in the Netherland schools of rhetoric. These represented the strife between the good and the bad principles (*virtus et voluptas*) for the soul of man, e. g., Locher's "Spectaculum de judicio Paridis" or the well-known dramatized version of the "Choice of Hercules". Side by side with these semi-dramatic plays proceeded the attempts to follow more closely the ancient dramatic form in the school drama with its varied contents. Reuchlin with his three-act comedy, which treats as subject the wonderful skull of Sergius, may be regarded as the real founder of the school drama. With "Henno", his second and still more famous drama, the humanistic comedy became naturalized in Germany. The great master of this art is unquestionably George Macropedius (i.e., Langhveldt), with his three farces "Aluta" (1535), "Andriska" (1537), and "Bassarus" (1540). A further development led to the religious school drama, which generally drew its subject-matter from Holy Writ. To further his own objects Luther had counselled the dramatization of Biblical subjects, and tales from the Bible were thus by free treatment of the incidents made to mirror the conditions of the time, while containing occasional satirical sallies. Among the numerous writers of this class must be mentioned before all as the pioneer, the Netherlander Wilhelm Graphäus (Willem van de Voldergrott), who became a Protestant: his much-discussed "Acolastus" (the story of the prodigal son), which follows the Protestant tendency of representing the uselessness of good works and justification by faith alone, was reprinted at least forty-seven times in various countries between 1529 and 1585, frequently translated, and produced everywhere.

This species of drama was cultivated by the Catholics also, who introduced greater variety of subject-matter by including lives of the saints. Thus Cornelius Crocus wrote a "St. Joseph in Egypt", Petrus Papeus a "[Good?] Samaritan", and George Holonius several martyr-plays. The founder of the school drama in Germany was Sixt Birk (Xistus Betulius): his "Susanna", "Judith", and "Eva" have primarily an educative aim, but are coupled with Protestant tendencies. His example was followed by a fair number of imitators: George Buchanan (1582), a Scotchman, wrote "Jephthe" and "Baptistes", and the bellicose Naogeorgus treats with still more bitterness the differences between Catholics and Protestants in his "Hamanus", "Jeremias", and "Judas Iscariot". Among the polemical dramatists on the Catholic side Cornelius Laurimanus and Andreas Fabricius must be mentioned.

Although the number of the Biblical school-dramas was not small, it was far surpassed by the number of the moralities. As has been said, these originated in the Netherlands, and it was the Maastricht priest, Christian Ischyrius (Sterck), who freely adapted the famous English morality "Everyman". This is the dramatized and widely circulated "Ars moriendi" and represents the importance of a good preparation for death. The same subject in a somewhat more detailed form is treated by Macropedius in his "Hecastus" (1538). The conclusion of the drama is an exposition of justification by faith in the merits of Christ. This inclination of the Catholic poet towards Luther's teaching found great applause among Protestants, and fostered the development of polemico-satirical sectarian plays, as Naogeorgus's "Mercator" (1539) shows. The Catholic standpoint also found its exposition in the moralities, for example in the "Miles Christianus" of Laurimanus (1575), the "Euripus" of the Minorite Levin Brecht, the "Pornius" of Hannardus Gamerius, the "Evangelicus fluctuans" (1569) of Andreas Fabricius, who had composed his "Religio patiens" three years earlier in the service of the Counter-Reformation. Still more bitter now grew the polemics in the dramas, which borrowed their material from contemporary history. The most notorious of this class is the "Pamachius" of the pope-hater, Thomas Naogeorgus, who found many imitators.

Towards the end of the sixteenth century materials derived from ancient popular legends and history first came into greater vogue, and gradually led to the Latin historical drama, of which we find numerous examples at the famous representations given at the Strasburg academy under its founder Sturm. This example found ready imitation, especially wherever the influence of the English comedy-writers had made itself felt. In this way Latin drama enjoyed a period of prosperity everywhere until the seventeenth century. The best-known dramatic poet of the latter half of the sixteenth century was the unfortunate Nicodemus Frischlin. Examples of every kind of school drama may be found among his works: "Dido" (1581), "Venus" (1584), and "Helvetiogermani" (1588), owe their subjects to the ancient classical period; "Rebecca" (1576), "Susanna" (1577), his incomplete Christianized drama of "Ruth", after the manner of Terence, the "Marriage of Cana", and a "Prologue to Joseph", treat Biblical topics; German legend is represented by "Hildegardis", the wife of Charlemagne, whose fate is copied from that of St. Geneviève; of a polemico-satirical nature are "Priscianus vapulans" (1578), a mockery of medieval Latin, and "Phasma" (1580), in which the sectarian spirit of the age is scourged. A play of an entirely original character is his "Julius redivivus": Cicero and Cæsar ascend from the lower world to Germany, and express their wonder at German discoveries (gunpowder, printing). All these

attempts at a Latin school drama, in so far as they served educational purposes, were most zealously welcomed in the schools of the regular orders (especially those of the Jesuits), and cultivated with great success. Thus the purely external side of the dramatic art developed from the crudest of beginnings to the brilliant settings of the so-called *ludi cæsarii*. With the suppression of the Society of Jesus the school drama came to a rapid end, and no serious attempt has been since made to revive it and restore it to its former position. However from time to time new plays have been produced both in Europe and America, and the "St. John Damascene", written by Father Harzheim of the Society of Jesus, is worthy to take its place among the best productions of the Jesuit dramatists.

B. *Latin Lyrical Poetry.*—This division of Latin poetry falls naturally into two classes: secular and religious. The former includes the poems of itinerant scholars and the Humanists, the latter hymnody. The development of vagrant scholars (*clerici vagi*) is connected with the foundation of the universities, as students wandered about to visit these newly founded institutions of learning. From the middle of the twelfth century imperial privileges protected these travelling scholars. The majority intended to devote themselves to theology, but comparatively few reached orders. The remainder found their callings as amanuenses or tutors in noble families, or degenerated into loose-living goliards or into wandering scholars who became a veritable plague during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, as they wandered, begging, from place to place, demanded hospitality in monasteries and castles and like the wandering minstrels paid with their songs, jugglery, buffoonery, and tales. Proud of their scholarly attainments, they used Latin in their poetical compositions, and thus arose a special literature, the goliardic poetry. Of this two great collections are still extant, the "Benediktbeuren" collection and the so-called Harleian MS. (no. 978) at Cambridge. The arrangement of "Carmina burana", as their first publisher, Schmeller, named them, was upon a uniform plan, according to which they were divided into serious, comic, and dramatic pieces. Songs celebrating the spring and the winter, in which sentiments of love also find expression, follow one another in great variety. Together with these are pious hymns of enthusiasm for the Crusades or of praise for the Blessed Virgin. We also find the most riotous drinking-songs, often of a loose, erotic nature, nor are diatribes of a satirical nature wanting: these soured and dissolute, though educated, tramps delighted especially in lampoons against the pope, bishops, and nobles, inveighing with bitter sarcasm against the avarice, ambition, and incontinence of the clergy. In this Professor Schönbach sees the influence of the Catharists.

Concerning the composers of this extensive literature nothing can be stated with certainty. The poems were in a certain sense regarded as folk-songs, that is as common property and international in the full sense of the word. Some representative poets are indeed mentioned, e. g., Golias, Primas, Archipoeta, but these are merely assumed names. Particularly famous among the poems is the "Confessio Goliæ", which was referred to the Archipoeta, and may be regarded as the prototype of the goliardic songs: strophes 12–17 (*Meum est propositum in taberna mori*) are even to-day sung as a drinking-song in German student circles. The identity of the Archipoeta has been the subject of much investigation, but so far without success. Paris was an important centre of these itinerant poets, particularly in the time of Abelard (1079–1142), and it was probably thence that they derived the name of goliards, Abelard having been called Golias by St. Bernard. From Paris their poetry passed to England and Germany, but in Italy it found little favour. At a later period, when the goliardic songs had become known everywhere, the origin of their title appears to have grown obscure, and thus emerged a Bishop Golias—a name referred to the Latin *gula*—to whom a parody on the Apocalypse and biting satires on the pope were ascribed. There even appeared poets as *filius* or *puer* or *discipulus de familia Goliæ*, and frequent mention is made of a goliardic order with the titles of abbot, prior, etc. Apart from their satirical attitude towards ecclesiastical life, the goliards showed their free, and at times heretical, views in their parodies of religious hymns, their irreverence in adapting ecclesiastical melodies to secular texts and their use of metaphors and expressions from church hymns in their loose verses.

In outward form the poetry of the goliards resembled the ecclesiastical sequences, rhyme being combined with an easily sung rhythm and the verses being joined into strophes. Singularly rapid in its development, its decay was no less sudden. The cause of its decline is traceable partly to the conditions of the time and partly to the character of the goliardic poets. In a burlesque edict of 1265 the goliards were compared to bats—neither quadrupeds nor birds. This was indeed a not inapt comparison, for their unfortunate begging rendered them odious to clergy and laity alike. Forgetting their higher educational parts, they found it necessary to ally themselves more and more closely with the strolling players and thus became subject to the ecclesiastical censures repeatedly decreed by synods and councils against these wandering musicians. Thus, regarded virtually as outlaws, they are heard of no more in France after the thirteenth century, although they are referred to in the synods of Germany until the following century. Together with the poets gradually disappeared their songs, and only a few are preserved in the *Kommersbücher* of the student world. Yet the influence of their poetry on the secular German lyric, and perhaps also on the outer form of religious poetry, was both stimulating and permanent. In this fact lies their principal literary importance and they are valuable as illustrations of the literary culture of the time.

Quite distinct in subject and form is the lyric poetry of the humanistic period, the era of the revival of classical learning. The work of a few scattered poets, it could not attain the popularity won by the goliardic poetry, even had its form not been exclusively an imitation of ancient classical versification. From the beginning of the sixteenth century the Catholic humanist, Vida, had been engaged among other works on the composition of odes, elegies, and hymns: he belonged to the *poetæ urbani* of the Medici period of Leo X, many of whom wrote lyrical, in addition to their epical, pieces. Johannes Dantiscus, who died in 1548 as Bishop of Ermland, composed thirty religious hymns after the fashion of the older ones in the Breviary, without any trace of classical imitation. Even the renowned Nicolaus Copernicus composed seven odes embodying the beautiful Christian truths associated with Advent and Christmas. Among the Humanists of France, John Salmon (Salmonius Macrinus) was named the French Horace, and among the numerous other names those of Erixius with his "Carmina" (1519) and Théodore de Bèze with his "Poemata" (1548) deserve special mention. In Belgium and the Netherlands Johannes Secundus (Jan Nicolai Everaerts, d. 1536) was conspicuous as a lyrical poet. From Holland Latin poetry found an entrance also into the Northern Empire under the patronage of Queen Christina, while even Iceland had its representative in the Protestant Bishop Sveinsson (1605–74), who among other works published a rich collection of poems to the Blessed Virgin in the most varied ancient classical metres.

As in the domain of drama, so also in that of lyrical poetry, Humanism showed itself most fruitful in Germany, particularly in connexion with the dissemination of the new doctrine of Luther. "Thus among the

neo-Latinist poets we meet a large number of preachers, school-rectors, university and grammar-school professors, who translated the Psalms into Horatian metres, converted ecclesiastical and edifying songs of every type into the most divine ancient strophes, and finally, in an immeasurable number of occasional poems, celebrated in verse princes and potentates, religious and secular festivals, the consecration of churches, christenings, marriage, interments, installations, occasions of public rejoicing and calamity" (Baumgartner). The Jesuits were as distinguished for their fruitful activity in the field of lyrical poetry as in the school drama. With Sarbiewski (q.v.), the Polish Horace, were associated by Urban VIII for the revision of the old hymns in the Breviary Famian Strada, Tarquinius Galuzzi, Hieronymus Petrucci, and Cardinal Robert Bellarmine. In addition to Balde (q. v.) there were among the German Jesuit poets a notable number of lyricists. Of the many names we may mention Jacob Masen, Nicola Avancini, Adam Widl, and John Bissel, who must be numbered among the best-known imitators of Horace. In the Netherlands, France, Italy, England, Portugal, and Spain, their number was not smaller, nor their achievements of less value. For example the Dutch Hosschius (de Hossche, 1596–1669) excels both Balde and Sarbiewski in purity of language and smoothness of verse. Simon Rettenbacher (1634–1706), the Benedictine imitator of Balde, whose lyrics show a true poetic gift, also deserves a place among the neo-Latinist writers of odes. The nineteenth century added but one name to the list of Latin lyricists, that of Leo XIII, whose poems evince an intimate knowledge of ancient classical literature. The other trend of neo-Latinist lyric poetry embraces religious hymnody. "The whole career of ecclesiastical and devotional hymnody from its cradle to the present day may be divided into three natural periods, of which the first is the most important, the second the longest, and the third the most insignificant." Such is the division of Latin ecclesiastical hymnody (q. v.) given by the greatest authority, the late Father Guido Dreves, formerly a member of the Society of Jesus.

C. *The neo-Latin Epic.*—The epic forms, as is natural, the largest part of our inheritance of Christian Latin poetry. As a lucid treatment according to any regular division of the subject-matter is difficult, we shall content ourselves with a chronological sketch of it. The foundation of the Benedictine Order was in every respect an event of prime importance. The Benedictines advanced the interests of culture, not only to supply the needs of life, but also to embellish it. Thus among the earliest companions of St. Benedict we already find a poet, Marcus of Monte Cassino, who in his distich sang the praises of the deceased founder of his order. During the sixth century, while the foundations of a rich literature were being thus laid the culture formerly so flourishing in Northern Africa had almost died out. The imperial governor, Flavius Cresconius Corippus, and Bishop Verecundus were still regarded as poets of some merit: but the former lacked poetic inspiration, the latter, poetic form. Among the Visigoths in Spain, however, we find true poets, e. g., St. Eugenius II with his version of the Hexaemeron. In Gaul in the sixth century flourished the most celebrated poet of his age, Venantius Fortunatus. Most original is his "Epithalamium" on the marriage of Sigebert I of Austrasia to the Visigothic princess Brunehaut, Christian thought being clothed in ancient mythological forms. About 250 more or less extensive poems of Venantius are extant, including a "Life of St. Martin" in more than two thousand hexameter verses. Most of his composition are occasional poems. In addition to his well-known hymns "Vexilla regis" and "Pange lingua", his elegies treating of the tragical fate of the family of Radegundis found the greatest appreciation. About the same period there sprang up in the British Isles a rich harvest of Latin culture. One of the most eminent poets is St. Aldhelm, a scion of the royal house of Wessex: his great work "De laudibus virginum", containing 3000 verses, attained a wide renown which it long enjoyed. The Venerable Bede also cultivated Latin poetry, writing a eulogy of St. Cuthbert in 976 hexameters.

Ireland transmitted the true Faith, together with higher culture, to Germany. The earliest pioneers were Saints Columbanus and Gall: the former is credited with some poems, the latter founded Saint-Gall. The real apostle of Germany, St. Boniface, left behind some hundreds of didactic verses. The seeds sown by this saint flourished and spread under the energetic Charlemagne, who succeeded, without neglecting his extensive affairs of state, in making his Court a Round Table of Science and Art, at which Latin was the colloquial speech. The soul of this learned circle was Alcuin, who showed his knowledge of classical antiquity in two great epic poems, the "Life of St. Willibrord" and the history of his native York. In command of language and skill of versification as well as in the number of poems transmitted to posterity, Theodulf the Goth surpassed all members of the Round Table. Movements similar to that at Charlemagne's Court are observed in the contemporary monastic schools of Fulda, Reichenau, and Saint-Gall. It will suffice to mention a few of the chief names from the multitude of poets. Walafrid Strabo's "De visionibus Wettini", containing about 1000 hexameters, is justly regarded as the precursor of Dante's "Divine Comedy". His verses on the equestrian statue of Theodoric, "Versus de imagine tetrici", are of literary importance, because he represents the king as a tyrant hating God and man. Highly interesting also for the art of gardening is his great poem "Hortulus", in which he describes the monastery garden with its various herbs etc. Contemporary with Walafrid and characterized by the same spirit were the poets Ermoldas, Nigellus, Ermenrich, Sedulius Scottus, etc. As a "real gem from the treasury of old manuscripts" F. Rückert describes the elegy on Hathumod, the first Abbess of Gandersheim, written by the Benedictine Father Agius. From the same monk of Corwey we have the poem "On the translation of St. Liborius" and a poetical biography of Charlemagne. A peculiar work was written by Albert Odo of Cluny under the title "Occupatio": it is an epico-didactic poem against pride and debauchery, which he demonstrates to be the chief vices in the history of the world.

The golden age of Saint-Gall begins with the end of the ninth century, after which opens the epoch of the four famous Notkers and the five not less renowned Ekkehards. The first Ekkehard is the author of the well-known "Waltharius" which Ekkehard IV revised. About the time when the "Waltharius" was revised, there appeared another epic poem "Ruodlieb"—a romance in Latin hexameters by an unknown author, describing the adventurous fate of the hero—which is unfortunately only partly extant. The name of the poet who in 1175 composed in Latin hexameters the first "animal" epic, "Ecbasis cuiusdam captivi per tropologiam", is also unknown. The frame-work of the poem is the story of a monk who runs away from the monastery but is brought back again under the form of a calf. The "Fable of the Bees" forms the "animal" epic in which the enmity of the wolf and fox is the central point. In the twelfth century this "animal" epic received an extension, probably from Magister Nivardus of Flanders, under the title "Ysengrimus" or "Renardus vulpes": from the poem thus extended an extract was made later, and this is the last product of the "animal" epic in the thirteenth century. Like Charlemagne Otto the Great (936–73) sought to make his Court the centre of science, art, and literature. The most brilliant representative of this period is the nun Hroswitha, pupil of

the emperor's niece Gerberga. It was in the epic that she achieved her first poetic successes: these were her well-known "Legends", which were followed by two long epic poems in praise of the imperial house (see HROSWITHA).

The chroniclers and historians of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries but seldom use verse in their narratives, their works being intended above all else for strictly historical purposes. Histories in verse, however, were not wanting. Thus Flodoard records in legendary fashion almost the whole ecclesiastical history of the first ten centuries. Walter of Speyer wrote during the same period the first "Legend of St. Christopher", and an unknown poet composed "The Epic of the Saxon War" (of Henry IV). Other poets wrote on the Crusades, Walter of Châtillon even ventured on an "Alexandreis", while Hildebert produced a "Historia Mahumetis" in verse.

The Humanists of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries are characterized by a closer approach to ancient classical form. Marbod (d. 1123) was a scholarly poet, and left behind a considerable number of legends and didactic aphorisms. His younger contemporary Hildebert of Tours also wrote a fair number of religious poems: more important are the two "Roman Elegies", in which he treats of the remains of ancient Rome and the sufferings of the papal capital under Paschal II. Most artistic in its conception and execution, is his fragment "Liber mathematicus", in which the tragical complications caused by the superstitious fear arising from an unfavourable horoscope are depicted. That the medieval Scholastics could combine theological knowledge with humanistic culture may be seen from the works of the two scholars John of Salisbury and Alanus de Insulis. That the influence of this humanistic culture was unfortunately not always for good, the notorious prurient narratives of Matthew of Vendôme prove. In the days of the goliards there were also poets who depicted in verse contemporary events. Thus the achievements of Barbarossa were sung by no less than three poets.

Humanism attained its full bloom in the era of the Renaissance, which began in Italy. Dante gives strong evidence of this movement, as does even more strongly Francesco Petrarch, whose epic "Africa" enjoyed wide renown. Giovanni Boccaccio, a contemporary of the preceding, belongs rather to Italian literature, although he also cultivated Latin poetry. The humanistic movement found favourable reception and encouragement everywhere. In Florence there sprang up about the Augustinian monk, Luigi Marsigli (d. 1394), a kind of literary academy for the cultivation of ancient literature while in the following century the city of the Medici developed into the literary centre of all Italy. Most representatives of the new movement preserved their close connexion with the Church, although a few isolated forerunners of the great revolt of the sixteenth century already made their appearance. The seeds of this religious revolution were sown by the lampoons and libidinous poems of such men as Poggio Bracciolini, Antonio Beccadelli, and Lorenzo Valla. Maffeo Vegio on the other hand followed the purely humanistic direction of the true Renaissance; he added a thirteenth book to Virgil's "Æneid", making the poem conclude with the death of Æneas. He also composed poetic versions of the "Death of Astyanax" and "The Golden Fleece", and still later composed a "Life of St. Anthony". An epic eulogizing the elder Hunyadi was begun by the Hungarian Janus Pannonius, but unfortunately left unfinished. A legendary poem of an entirely original character is the "Josephina", written in twelve cantos by John Gerson, the learned chancellor of the University of Paris. It reminds us of a similar poem by Hroswitha, though the apocryphal narratives taken from the so-called Gospel of St. James are marked by greater depth. Humanism was planted in Germany by Petrarch during his residence there as ambassador to Charles IV, with whom he corresponded after his departure. The interest in humanistic studies was also spread by Æneas Silvius at the Council of Basle.

As in Italy, the movement rapidly developed everywhere, evincing at first a religious tendency but afterwards becoming hostile to the Church. In the century preceding the "Reformation", indeed, the foremost representatives of Humanism remained true to the ancient Faith. Conrad Celtes, although his four books of "Amores" are a reflection of his dissolute life, sang later of Catholic truths and the lives of the saints. Similarly Willibald Pirkheimer (d. 1528) among many others, notwithstanding his satire "Eccius desolatus", remained faithful to the Church. On the other hand Eoban Hessus, Crotus Rubeanus, and above all Ulrich von Hutten espoused the cause of the new doctrine in their highly satirical writings. A somewhat protean character was displayed by Desiderius Erasmus of Rotterdam, whose early works include hymns to Christ and the Virgin Mary. "Laus stultitiæ", a satire on all the estates after the fashion of Brant's "Narrenschiff", was written in seven days to cheer his sick friend, Thomas More. In England especially at the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, the humanistic movement developed along the same lines as in Germany. The first direction was given to the movement mainly by Thomas More, whose "Utopia" (1515) is world renowned. In Italy the Renaissance movement continued into the sixteenth century. Sadolet's poem on "The Laocoon Group" is known throughout the literary world, while his epic on the heroic death of Caius Curtius is equally finished. Not less famous is Vida's "Christiad": he also wrote didactic poems on "Silk-worms" and "Chess". Among the more important works of this period must also be included Jacopo Sannazaro with his classically finished epic "De partu Virginis", at which he laboured for twenty years. His "Nænia" on the death of Christ also merits every praise. The example of Vida and Sannazaro spurred numerous other poets to undertake extensive epical works, of which none attained the excellence of their models.

In other countries also the new literary movement continued, although it produced richer fruit in the field of dramatic and lyric poetry than in epic poetry. The singular attempt of Laurenz Rhodomannus to compose a "Legend of Luther" in opposition to the Catholic legend deserves mention on account of its peculiarity. Among the works of the dramatists we also meet with more or less ambitious attempts at epic verse. This is especially true of the dramatists of the Society of Jesus. J. Masen's "Sarcotis", for example, enjoys a certain fame as the proto-type of Milton's "Paradise Lost" and Vondel's "Lucifer". Biedermann and Avancini also composed small epic narratives. Balde produced many epical works; his "Batrachomyomachia" is an allegorical treatment of the Thirty Years' War, and his "Obsequies" of Tilly bring to light many interesting particulars concerning the great general. He also celebrated in verse the heroic death of Dampierre and Bouquois. Not least among his works is his "Urania Victrix". But, instead of accumulating further names, let us bring forward just a few of the more important poems: the "Puer Jesus" of Tommaso Ceva must be placed in the front rank of idyllic compositions; the "Life of Mary" (2086 distichs) of the Brazilian missionary, Venerable Joseph de Anchieta, is a model for similar works. During the nineteenth century the Latin epic more or less centred around the endowment of the rich native of Amsterdam, Jacob Henry Hoeufft, who founded a competitive prize for Latin poetry. Peter Esseiva, a Swiss, is the best-known prize winner: he celebrated in beautiful classical verse and brilliant Latin such mod-

ern inventions as the railroad, etc., and also treated strictly religious and light topics (e. g., in "The Flood", "The Grievances of an Old Maid"). Leo XIII was the last writer who wrote short epical poems in addition to his odes. Baumgartner, the author of "Weltliteratur", assigns to Latin Christian poetry the well-merited praise: "It still contains creative suggestions and offers the noblest of intellectual enjoyment."

BAUMGARTNER, *Geschichte der Weltliteratur*, IV (Freiburg, 1900); SALZER, *Illustrierte Geschichte der deutschen Literatur* (Vienna), publication not yet completed; DREVES, *Die Kirche in ihren Liedern* (Kempten, 1908); HARTUNG, *Andreas Gryphius und das Drama der Jesuiten* (Halle, 1907); CREIZENACH, *Geschichte des neueren Dramas*, I, II (Halle, 1893–1901); HEINZEL, *Beschreibung des geistlichen Schauspiels im deutschen Mittelalter* (Hamburg, 1898); GOEDEKE, *Grundriss* (2nd ed.); SCHMIDT, *Die Bühnenverhältnisse des deutschen Schuldramas* (Berlin, 1903); SCHEID, *Der Jesuit J. Masen* (Cologne, 1898); IDEM, *Jakob Balde* in *Historische-politische Blätter*, CXIII, 19; SWOBODA, *Odonis abbatis Cluniacensis Occupatio* (Leipzig, 1900).

N. SCHEID.

Latin Literature in the Church, CLASSICAL.— I. This article deals only with the relations of the classical literature, chiefly Latin, to the Catholic Church. When Christianity at first appeared in Rome the instruction of youth was largely confined to the study of poets and historians, chief among whom at a very early date appear Horace and Virgil. Until the peace of the Church, early in the fourth century, the value and use of classical studies were, of course, not even questioned. The new converts to Christianity brought with them such mental cultivation as they had received while pagans. Their knowledge of mythology and ancient traditions they used as a means of attacking paganism; their acquirements as orators and writers were placed at the service of their new Faith. They could not conceive how a thorough education could be obtained under conditions other than those under which they had grown up. Tertullian forbade Christians to teach, but admitted that school attendance by Christian pupils was unavoidable (De idol., 10). In fact, his rigorous views were not carried out even so far as the prohibition of teaching is concerned. Arnobius taught rhetoric, and was very proud of having numerous Christian colleagues (Adv. nat., II, 4). One of his disciples was Lactantius, himself a rhetorician and imperial professor at Nicomedia. Among the martyrs, we meet with school teachers like Cassianus (Prudent., "Perist.", 9) whom his pupils stabbed to death with a stylus; Gorgonis, another humble teacher, whose epitaph in the Roman catacombs dates from the third century (De Rossi, "Roma Sotterranea", II, 810). During the fourth century, however, there sprang up an opposition between profane literature and the Bible. This opposition is condensed in the accepted translation, dating from St. Jerome, of Psalm lxx, 15–16, "Quoniam non cognovi litteraturam, introibo in potentias Domini; Domine memorabor justitiæ tuæ solius". One of the variants of the Greek text (γραμματίας for πραγματίας) was perpetuated in this translation. The opposition between Divine justice, i. e., the Law and literature, became gradually an accepted Christian idea.

The persecution of Julian led Christian writers to express more definitely their views on the subject. It produced little effect in the West. However, Marius Victorinus, one of the most distinguished professors in Rome, chose "to give up the idle talk of the school rather than deny the Word of God" (Augustine, "Conf.", VIII, 5). Thenceforth, Christians studied more closely and more appreciatively their own literature, i. e., the Biblical writings. St. Jerome discovers therein a Horace, a Catullus, an Alcæus (Epist. 30). In his "De doctrina christiana" St. Augustine shows how the Scriptures could be turned to account for the study of eloquence; he analyses periods of the Prophet Amos, of St. Paul, and shows excellent examples of rhetorical figures in the Pauline Epistles (Doctr. chr., IV, 6–7). The Church, therefore, it seemed ought to have given up the study of pagan literature. She did not do so. St. Augustine suggested his method only to those who wished to become priests, and even for these he did mean to make it obligatory. Men of less marked ability were to use the ordinary method of instruction. The "De doctrina christiana" was written in the year 427, at which time his advancing age and the increasing strictness of monastic life might have inclined Augustine to a rigorous solution. St. Jerome's scruples and the dream he relates in one of his letters are quite well known. In this dream he saw angels scourging him and saying: "Thou art not a Christian, thou art a Ciceronian" (Epist. 25). He finds fault with ecclesiastics who find too keen a pleasure in the reading of Virgil; he adds, nevertheless, that youths are indeed compelled to study him (Epist. 21). In his quarrel with Rufinus he declares that he has not read the profane authors since he left school; "but I admit that I read them while there. Must I then drink the waters of Lethe that I may forget?" (Adv. Ruf., I, 30).

In defending himself the first figure that occurs to him is taken from mythology. What these eminent men desired was not so much the separation but the combination of the treasures of profane literature and of Christian truths. St. Jerome recalls the precept of Deuteronomy: "If you desire to marry a captive, you must first shave her head and eyebrows, shave the hair on her body and cut her nails; so must it be done with profane literature, after having removed all that was earthly and idolatrous, unite with her and make her fruitful for the Lord" (Epist. 83). St. Augustine uses another Biblical allegory. For him, the Christian who seeks his knowledge in the pagan authors resembles the Israelites who despoil the Egyptians of their treasures in order to build the tabernacle of God. As to St. Ambrose, he has no doubts whatever. He quotes quite freely from Seneca, Virgil, and the "Consolatio" of Servius Sulpicius. He accepts the earlier view handed down from the Hebrew apologists to their Christian successors, viz., that whatever is good in the literature of antiquity comes from the Sacred Books. Pythagoras was a Jew or, at least, had read Moses. The pagan poets owe their flashes of wisdom to David and Job. Tatian, following earlier Jews had learnedly confirmed this view, and it recurs, more or less developed, in the other Christian apologists. In the West Minucius Felix gathered carefully into his "Octavius" whatever seemed to show harmony between the new doctrine and ancient learning. This was a convenient argument and served more than one purpose.

But this concession pre-supposed that pagan studies were subordinate to Christian truth, the "Hebraica veritas". In the second book of his "De doctrina christiana", St. Augustine explains how pagan classics lead to a more perfect apprehension of the Scriptures, and are indeed an introduction to them. In this sense St. Jerome, in a letter to Magnus, professor of eloquence at Rome, recommends the use of profane authors; profane literature is a captive (Epist. 85). Indeed, men neither dared nor were able to do without classical teaching. Rhetoric continued to inspire a kind of timid reverence. The panegyrists, for example, do not trouble themselves about the emperor's religion, but addressed him as pagans would a pagan and draw their literary embellishments from mythology. Theodosius himself did not dare to exclude pagan authors from the school. A professor like Ausonius pursued the same methods as his pagan predecessors. Ennodius, deacon of Milan under Theodoric, and later Bishop of Pavia, inveighed against the impious person who carried a statue of Minerva to a disorderly house, and himself under pretext of an "epithalamium" wrote light and trivial verses. It is true that Christian society at the time of the barbarian

invasions repudiated mythology and ancient culture, but it did not venture to completely banish them. In the meantime the public schools of antiquity were gradually closed. Private teaching took their place, but even that formed its pupils, e. g. Sidonius Appollinaris, according to the traditional method. Christian asceticism, however, developed a strong feeling against secular studies. As early as the fourth century St. Martin of Tours finds that men have better things to do than studying. There are lettered monks at Lérins, but their scholarship is a relic of their early education, not acquired after their monastic profession. The Rule of St. Benedict prescribes reading, it is true, but only sacred reading. Gregory the Great condemns the study of literature so far as bishops are concerned. Isidore of Seville condenses all ancient culture into a few data gathered into his withered herbarium known as the "Origines", just enough to prevent all further study in the original sources. Cassiodorus alone shows a far wider range and makes possible a deeper and broader study of letters. His encyclopedic grasp of human knowledge links him with the best literary traditions of pagan antiquity. He planned a close union of secular and sacred science, whence ought to issue a complete and truly Christian method of teaching. Unfortunately the invasions of the barbarians followed and the Institutiones of Cassiodorus remained a mere project.

II. At this period, i. e. about the middle of the sixth century, the first indications of classical culture were seen in Britain and a little later, towards the close of the century, in Ireland. Thenceforth a growing literary movement appears in these islands. The Irish, at first scholars and then teachers, create a culture which the Anglo-Saxons develop. This culture places profane literature and science at the service of theology and exegesis. They seem to have devoted themselves chiefly to grammar, rhetoric, and dialectics. Whence did the Irish monks draw the material of their learning? It is quite unlikely that manuscripts had been brought to the island between 350 and 450, to bring about very much later a literary renaissance. The small ecclesiastical schools almost everywhere preserved elementary teaching, reading and writing. But Irish scholarship went far beyond that. During the sixth and seventh centuries, manuscripts were still being copied in continental Europe. The writing of this period is uncial or semi-uncial. Even after eliminating fifth-century manuscripts there still remains a fair number of manuscripts in this style of writing. We find among these profane works practically useful writings, glossaries, treatises on land-surveying, medicine, the veterinary art, juridical commentaries. On the other hand, the numerous ecclesiastical manuscripts prove the persistence of certain scholarly traditions. The continuations of sacred studies sufficed to bring about the Carlovingian revival. It was likewise a purely ecclesiastical culture which in their turn the Irish brought back to the continent in the sixth and seventh centuries. The chief aim of these Irish monks was to preserve and develop religious life; for literature as such they did nothing. When we examine closely the scattered items of information, especially the hagiological indications, their importance is peculiarly lessened, for we find that the teaching in question generally concerns Scripture or theology. Even St. Columbanus does not seem to have organized literary studies in his monasteries. The Irish monks had a personal culture which they did not make any effort to diffuse, for which remarkable fact two general reasons may be given. The times were too barbarous, and the Church of Gaul had too long a road to travel to meet the Church of Ireland. Moreover, the disciples of the Irish were men enamoured of ascetic mortification, who shunned an evil world and sought a life of prayer and penance. For such minds, beauty of language and verbal rhythm were frivolous attractions. Then, too, the material equipment of the Irish religious establishments in Gaul scarcely admitted any other study than that of the Scriptures. Generally these establishments were but a group of huts surrounding a small chapel.

Thus, until Charlemagne and Alcuin, intellectual life was confined to Great Britain and Ireland. It revived in Gaul with the eighth century, when the classic Latin literature was again studied with ardour. This is not the place to treat of the Carlovingian renaissance nor to attempt the history of the schools and studies of the Middle Ages. It will be sufficient to point out a few facts. The study of classical texts for their own sake was at that period very uncommon. The pagan authors were read as secondary to Scripture and theology. Even towards the close of his life, Alcuin forbade his monks to read Virgil. Statius is the favourite poet, and, ere long, Ovid whose licentiousness is glossed over by allegorical interpretation. Mediocre abstracts and compilations, products of academic decadence, appear among the books frequently read, e. g. Homerus latinus (Ilias latina), Dictys, Dares, the distichs ascribed to Cato. Cicero is almost overlooked, and two distinct personages are made of Tullius and Cicero. However, until the thirteenth century the authors read and known are not a few in number. At the close of the twelfth century, in the early years of the University of Paris, the principal known authors are: Statius, Virgil, Lucian, Juvenal, Horace, Ovid (with exception of the erotic poems and the satires), Sallust, Cicero, Martial, Petronius (judged as combining useful information and dangerous passages), Symmachus, Solinus, Sidonius, Suetonius, Quintus Curtius, Justin (known as Trogus Pompeius), Livy, the two Senecas (including the tragedies), Donatus, Priscian, Boethius, Quintilian, Euclid, Ptolemy (Haskins, "Harvard Studies", XX, 75). In the thirteenth century the influence of Aristotle restricted the field of reading.

There are, however, a few real Humanists among the medieval writers. Einhard (770–840), Rabanus Maurus (776–856), the ablest scholar of his time, and Walafrid Strabo (809–849) are men of extensive and disinterested learning. Servatus Lupus, Abbot of Ferrières (805–862), in his quest for Latin manuscripts labours as zealously as any scholar of the fifteenth century. At a later period Latin literature is more or less felicitously represented by such men as Remigius of Auxerre (d. 908), Gerbert (later Pope Sylvester II, d. 1003), Liutprand of Cremona (d. about 972), John of Salisbury (1110–1180), Vincent of Beauvais (d. 1264), Roger Bacon (d. 1294). Naturally enough medieval Latin poetry drew its inspiration from Latin poetry. Among the imitations must be mentioned the works of Hroswitha (or Roswitha), Abbess of Gandersheim (close of the tenth century), whom Virgil, Prudentius, and Sedulius inspired to celebrate the acts of Otho the Great. She is of particular interest in the history of the survival of Latin literature, because of her comedies after the manner of Terence. It has been said that she wished to cause the pagan author to be totally forgotten, but so base a purpose is not reconcilable with her known simplicity of character. A certain facility in the dialogue and clearness of style do not offset the lack of ideas in her writings; they exhibit only too clearly the fate of classical culture in the Middle Ages. Hroswitha imitates Terence, indeed, but without understanding him, and in a ridiculous manner. The poems on actual life of Hugh of Orléans, known as "Primas" or "Archipoeta" are far superior, and betray genuine talent as well as an intelligent grasp of Horace.

During the Middle Ages the Church preserved secular literature by harbouring and copying its works in monasteries, where valuable libraries existed as early as the ninth century; in Italy, at Monte Cassino (founded in 529), and at Bobbio (founded in 612 by

Columbanus); in Germany at Saint Gall (614), Reichenau (794), Fulda (744), Lorsch (763), Hersfeld (768), Corvey (822), Hirschau (830); in France at St. Martin's of Tours (founded in 372, but later restored), Fleury or Saint-Benoît-sur-Loire (620), Ferrières (630), Corbie (662), Cluny (910). The reforms of Cluny and later of Clairvaux were not favourable to studies, as the chief aim of the reformers was to combat the secular spirit and re-establish strict religious observances. This influence is in harmony with the tendencies of scholasticism. Consequently, from the twelfth century and especially the thirteenth, the copying of manuscripts became a secular business, a source of gain. To Gudeman ("Grundriss zur Geschichte der klassischen Philologie", Leipzig, 1909, p. 160) we owe the following list of the most ancient or most useful manuscripts of the Latin classics for the Middle Ages. Eighth–ninth centuries: Cicero's Orations, Horace, the philosopher Seneca, Martial. Ninth century: Terence, Lucretius, Cicero, Sallust, Livy, Ovid, Lucan, Valerius-Maximus, Columella, Persius, Lucan, the philosopher Seneca, Pliny the Elder, Quintus Curtius, the Thebaid of Statius, Silius Italicus, Pliny the Younger, Juvenal, Tacitus, Suetonius, Florus, Claudian. Ninth–Tenth centuries: Persius, Quintus Curtius, Cæsar, Cicero, Horace, Livy, Phædrus, Persius, Lucan, the philosopher Seneca, Valerius Flaccus, Martial, Justin, Ammianus Marcellinus. Tenth century: Cæsar, Catullus, Cicero, Sallust, Livy, Ovid, Lucan, Persius, Quintus Curtius, Pliny the Elder, Quintilian, Statius, Juvenal. Eleventh century: Cæsar, Sallust, Livy, Ovid, Tacitus, Apuleius. Thirteenth century: Cornelius Nepos, Propertius, Varro, "De lingua latina".

This list, however, furnishes only incomplete information. An author like Quintus Curtius is represented by numerous manuscripts in every century; another, like Lucretius, was not copied anew between the ninth century and the Renaissance. Moreover, it was customary to compile manuscripts of epitomes and anthologies, some of which have preserved the only extant fragments of ancient authors. The teaching of grammar was very deficient; this may, perhaps, account for the backwardness of philological science in the Middle Ages. Latin grammar is reduced to an abridgment of Donatius, supplemented by the meagre commentaries of the teacher, and replaced since the thirteenth century by the "Doctrinale" of Alexander de Villedieu (de Villa Dei).

III. The Renaissance brought to light the hidden treasures of the Middle Ages. Prior to this period, classical culture had been an individual, isolated fact. From the fourteenth century on it became collective and social. The attitude of the Church towards this movement is too important to be treated within the brief limits of this article (see Humanism; Renaissance; Leo X; Pius II; etc.). As to Latin studies, in particular, the Church continued to influence very actively their development At the beginning of the modern era Latin was the court language of sovereigns, notably of the Italian chanceries. The Roman curia ranks with Florence and Naples, among the first for the eminence, fame, and grace of its Latinists. Poggio was a papal secretary. Bembo and Sadoleto became cardinals. Schools and universities soon yielded to the influence of the Humanists (see Humanism). In France, the Netherlands, and Germany the study of the ancient classics was more or less openly influenced by tendencies hostile to the Church and Christianity. But the Jesuits soon made Latin the basis of their teaching, organized the same in a systematic way and introduced compulsory and daily construing of Cicero. The newly founded Louvain University (1426) became a centre of Latin studies, owing chiefly to the Ecole du Lis founded in 1437 and especially to the Ecole des Trois Langues (Greek, Latin, Hebrew), opened in 1517. It was at the Ecole du Lis that Jan van Pauteran (Despauterius) taught, the author of a Latin grammar destined to survive two centuries, but unfortunately too clearly dependent on Alexander de Villedieu's above-mentioned "Doctrinale". In the seventeenth century Port Royal introduced a few reforms in the method of teaching, substituted French for Latin in the recitations, and added to the programme of studies. But the general lines of education remained the same.

In the nineteenth century, classical philology revived as a historical science. The men who brought about this progress were mainly Germans, Dutch, and English. The Catholic Church had no share in this labour until towards the close of the century. In the middle of the nineteenth century sprang up in France a controversy of a pedagogical nature, concerning the use of the Latin classics in Christian schools. Abbé Gaume insisted that Christians, especially future priests, should obtain their literary training from the reading and interpretation of the Fathers of the Church, and he went so far as to call classical education the canker-worm (*ver rongeur*) of modern society. Dupanloup, superior of the Paris seminary of Notre-Dame des Champs, later Bishop of Orléans, took up the defence of the classical authors, whereupon there broke out a long polemical controversy which belongs to the history of Catholic Liberalism. Louis Veuillot answered Dupanloup, but the Holy See was silent and the French bishops did not alter the curriculum of their "petits séminaires" or preparatory schools for the clergy. Veuillot withdrew from the discussion in 1852. Dübner edited a collection of patristic texts so graded as to serve all Christian schools from the elementary to the upper classes. Less positive attempts were made to introduce selections from the principal ecclesiastical writers of Christian antiquity (Nourisson, for the state lycées and colleges; Monier, for the Catholic colleges). In Belgium Guillaume urged the simultaneous comparative study of a Christian and a pagan author. Both in Belgium and France the traditional use of the pagan authors has held its own in most educational houses; in this respect, the Jesuit schools and the government institutions do not differ. In recent times attacks have been aimed, not merely at pagan authors, but in general at all mental training in Latin. The leaders of this new opposition are on the one hand the so-called "practical" men, i. e. representatives of the natural and applied sciences, and on the other declared adversaries of the Catholic Church, many of whom hold the opinion that the study of Latin makes men more ready to receive the teachings of Faith. Once again, therefore, the destinies of the Church and of the Latin classics are brought into connexion. On this subject see the various articles of The Catholic Encyclopedia concerning schools, studies, education, the history of philology, etc.

Sandys, *History of Classical Scholarship: The Survival of the Latin Classics*, I (Cambridge, 1903–8), ch. xxxii; Boissier, *La fin du paganisme*, I (Paris, 1891) 233–398; Lejay, *Litteratura* in *Revue de philologie de littérature et d'histoire ancienne*, XVI (1892), 22; Roger, *L'enseignement des lettres classiques d'Ausone à Alcuin* (Paris, 1905); Chatelain, *Uncialis scriptura codicum latinorum* (Paris, 1902); Traube, *Vorlesungen und Abhandlungen*, I (Munich, 1909); Haskins, *A List of Text-Books from the close of the twelfth century* in *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, XX (1909), 75; Lagrange, *Vie de Mgr Dupanloup* (Paris, 1907).

Paul Lejay.

Latini, Brunetto, Florentine philosopher and statesman, b. at Florence, c. 1210; the son of Buonaccorso Latini, d. 1294. A notary by profession, Brunetto shared in the revolution of 1250, by which the Ghibelline power in Florence was overthrown, and a Guelph democratic government established. In 1260, he was sent by the Commune as ambassador to Alfonso X of Castile, to implore his aid against King Manfred and the Ghibellines, and he has left us in his "Tesoretto" (II, 27–50), a dramatic account of how, on his return

journey, he met a scholar from Bologna who told him that the Guelphs had been defeated at Montaperti and expelled from Florence. Brunetto took refuge at Paris, where a generous fellow-countryman enabled him to pursue his studies while carrying on his profession of notary. To this unnamed friend he now dedicated his "Trésor". After the Guelph triumph of 1266 and the establishment of a new democratic constitution, Brunetto returned to Florence, where he held various offices, including that of secretary to the Commune, took an active and honoured part in Florentine politics, and was influential in the counsels of the Republic. Himself a man of great eloquence, he introduced the art of oratory and the systematic study of political science into Florentine public life. He was buried in the church of Santa Maria Maggiore. Among the individuals who had come under his influence was the young Dante Alighieri, and, in one of the most pathetic episodes of the "Inferno" (canto XV), Dante finds the sage, who had taught him "how man makes himself eternal", among the sinners against nature.

Brunetto's chief work, "Li Livres dou Trésor", is a kind of encyclopedia in which he "treats of all things that pertain to mortals". It was written in French prose during his exile, and translated into Italian by a contemporary, Bono Giamboni. Mainly a compilation from St. Isidore of Seville and other writers, it includes compendiums of Aristotle's "Ethics" and Cicero's treatise on rhetoric. The most interesting portion is the last, "On the Government of Cities", in which the author deals with the political life of his own times. The "Tesoretto", written before the "Trésor", is an allegorical didactic poem in Italian, which undoubtedly influenced Dante. Brunetto finds himself astray in a wood, speaks with Nature in her secret places, reaches the realm of the Virtues, wanders into the flowery meadow of Love, from which he is delivered by Ovid. He confesses his sins to a friar and resolves to amend his life, after which he ascends Olympus and begins to hold converse with Ptolemy. It has recently been shown that the "Tesoretto" was probably dedicated to Guido Guerra, the Florentine soldier and politician who shares Brunetto's terrible fate in Dante's "Inferno". Brunetto also wrote the "Favolello", a pleasant letter in Italian verse to Rustico di Filippo on friends and friendship. The other poems ascribed to him, with the possible exception of one canzone, are spurious.

CHABAILLE, *Li Livres dou Trésor par Brunetto Latini, publié pour la première fois* (Paris, 1863); GAITER, *Il Tesoro di Brunetto Latini volgarizzato da Bono Giamboni* (4 vols., Bologna, 1878–83); ZANNONI, *Il Tesoretto e il Favoletto* [sic] *di Ser Brunetto Latini* (Florence, 1824); WIESE, *Der Tesoretto und Favolello B. Latinos, kritischer Text* in *Zeitschr. f. romanische Philologie* (Halle, 1883), VII; SUNDBY, *Della Vita e delle Opere di Brunetto Latini*, tr. RENIER, with appendixes by DEL LUNGO and MUSSAFIA (Florence, 1884); SCHERILLO, *Alcuni capitoli della biografia di Dante* (Turin, 1896); ZINGARELLI, *Dante* (Milan, 1903).

EDMUND G. GARDNER.

Latitudinarians. See LOW CHURCH.

La Trappe.—This celebrated abbey of the Order of Reformed Cistercians is built in a solitary valley, surrounded by forests, and watered by numerous streams which form, in the vicinity, a number of beautiful lakes. The location is eighty-four miles from Paris, and nine miles from the little town of Mortagne in the Department of Orne and the Diocese of Séez, within the ancient Province of Normandy. At its beginning it was only a small chapel, built in 1122 in pursuance of a vow made by Rotrou II, Count of Perche, who, a few years afterwards, constructed a monastery adjoining, to which he invited the religious of Breuil-Benoît, an abbey belonging to the Order of Savigny, then in great renown for fervour and holiness; and in 1140 the monastery of La Trappe was erected into an abbey. In 1147 Savigny, with all its affiliated monasteries, was united to the Order of Cîteaux, and from this time forth La Trappe was a Cistercian abbey, immediately depending on the Abbot of Clairvaux. During several centuries La Trappe remained in obscurity and, as it were, lost in the vast multitude of monasteries that claimed Cîteaux for their mother. But in the course of the fifteenth century La Trappe, on account of its geographical situation, became a prey to the English troops, during the wars between France and England, and in the sixteenth century, it, like all the other monasteries, had the misfortune to be given "in commendam"; after this the religious had nothing further to preserve than the mournful ruins of a glorious past.

However, the hour was soon to come when the monastery was to have a bright return to its primitive fervour. The author of this reform was de Rancé, fourteenth commendatory Abbot of La Trappe, who, as regular abbot, employed all his zeal in this great enterprise, the noble traditions of the holy founders of Cîteaux being again enforced. The good odour of sanctity of the inhabitants of La Trappe soon made the monastery celebrated amongst all Christian nations. On 13 February, 1790, a decree of the Government was directed against the religious orders of France, and the Abbey of La Trappe was suppressed; but the religious, who had taken the road to exile under their abbot, Dom Augustin de Lestrange, were one day to see the doors reopen to them. In 1815, the abbey, which had been sold as national property, was repurchased by Dom Augustin, but on their return the Trappists found nothing besides ruin; they rebuilt their monastery on the foundations of the old one, and on 30 August, 1832, the new church was solemnly consecrated by the Bishop of Séez. In 1880 the Trappists were again expelled; they, however, soon returned, to the great joy and satisfaction of the working classes and the poor. Under the able administration of the present abbot, Dom Etienne Salasc, the forty-fifth abbot since the foundation, and the fourteenth since the reform of de Rancé, the monastery has been entirely rebuilt: the new church, which is greatly admired, was consecrated on 30 August, 1895. The different congregations of Trappists are now united in a single order, the official name being the "Order of Reformed Cistercians", but for a long time they will continue to be known by their popular name of "Trappists" (see CISTERCIANS).

Bossuet was a frequent visitor at La Trappe, in order to spend a few days in retreat with his friend, the Abbot de Rancé; James II of England, when a refugee in France, went there to look for consolation. Dom Mabillon, after his long quarrels with de Rancé, visited him there to make peace with him. The Count of Artois, afterwards Charles X, spent several days at the abbey; and in 1847 Louis Philippe wished likewise to visit this celebrated monastery. Amongst those who have contributed to the glory of the abbey in modern times we will only mention Father Robert, known to the world as Dr. Debreyne, one of the most renowned physicians of France, and held in high repute for his numerous medico-theological works.

MANRIQUE, *Annales Cistercienses, 1140, 1148;* JONGELINUS, *Notitia Abbatiarum O. Cist.*, I, 86; JANAUSCHEK, *Orig. Cist.*, I, 265, and introduction; *Gallia Christiana*, XI; GAILLARDIN, *Histoire de La Trappe* (Paris, 1844); DE CHARENCEY, *Cartulaire de l'Abbaye de N. D. de La Trappe* (Alençon, 1889); *Histoire de N. D. de La Trappe*, by a religious of the monastery (Paris, 1895); M. P., *La Trappe mieux connue* (Paris, 1834); M. L. D. B., *Histoire civile, religieuse et littéraire de l'Abbaye de La Trappe* (Paris, 1824); *La Trappe, par un Trappiste de Sept Fons* (Paris, 1870); PFANNENSCHMIDT, *Illustrierte Geschichte der Trappisten* (Paderborn, 1873); *Description de l'Abbaye de La Trappe, en forme de lettre* (Paris, 1671).

EDMOND M. OBRECHT.

Latreille, PIERRE-ANDRÉ, a prominent French zoologist; b. at Brives, 29 November, 1762; d. in Paris, 6 Feb., 1833. Left destitute by his parents in 1778, the boy found benefactors in Paris, and was adopted by the Abbé Haüy, the famous mineralogist.

He studied theology and was ordained priest in 1786, after which he retired to Brives and spent his leisure in the study of entomology. In 1788 he returned to Paris, where he lived till driven out by the Revolution. Although not a pastor, he was arrested with several other priests, sentenced to transportation, and sent in a cart to Bordeaux in the summer of 1792. Before the vessel sailed, however, Latreille made the acquaintance of a physician, a fellow-prisoner, who had obtained a specimen of the rare beetle, *Necrobia ruficollis*. It was through this discovery that Latreille became acquainted with the naturalist, Bory de Saint-Vincent, who obtained his release.

He was again arrested in 1797 as an *émigré*, but was once more saved by influential friends. In 1799 he was placed in charge of the entomological department of the Museum of Natural History in Paris, and was elected a Member of the Academy in 1814. In 1829 he was appointed professor of entomology to succeed Lamarck. From 1796 to 1833 he published a great number of works on natural history. He was the real founder of modern entomology.

His lesser treatises and articles for various encyclopedias are too numerous for detailed mention here; details of them will be found in "Biographie générale", XXIX, and in Carus-Engelmann, "Bibliotheca zool.", II (Leipzig, 1861). In his "Précis des caractères génériques des Insectes" (Brives, 1795), and "Genera Crustaceorum et Insectorum" (4 vols., Paris, 1806–09), Latreille added very largely to the number of known genera, and he rendered an incomparable service to science by grouping the genera into families, which are treated in the complete work "Histoire naturelle générale et particulière des Crustacés et Insectes" (14 vols., Paris, 1802–05). But his two most conspicuous writings on this subject of natural classification are: "Considérations sur l'ordre naturel des animaux" (Paris, 1810), and "Familles naturelles du règne animal" (Paris, 1825). His last work was "Cours d'Entomologie" (2 vols., Paris, 1831–33).

GERSTAECKER in BRONN, *Klassen und Ordnungen*, V (1) (Leipzig, 1866); WASMANN in *Natur und Offenbarung*, XXX (Münster, 1880); KNELLER, *Das Christentum und die Vertreter der neueren Naturwissenschaft* (Freiburg, 1904); BURCKHARDT, *Geschichte der Zoologie* (Leipzig, 1907).

J. H. ROMPEL.

Latria (λατρεία) in classical Greek originally meant "the state of a hired servant" (Æsch., "Prom.", 966), and so service generally. It is used especially for Divine service (Plato, "Apol.", 23 B). In Christian literature it came to have a technical sense for the supreme honour due to God alone, in contradistinction to the inferior honour due to His servants, the angels and saints. This latter was styled "dulia" (q. v.). Etymologically, however, there is no reason why latria should be preferred to designate supreme honour; and indeed the two words were often used indiscriminately. The distinction is due to St. Augustine, who says: "Latria . . . ea dicitur servitus quæ pertinet ad colendum Deum" (De Civ. Dei, X, i). (See ADORATION; WORSHIP.)

T. B. SCANNELL.

Latulipe, ELIE ANICET. See TEMISCAMING, VICARIATE APOSTOLIC OF.

Lauda Sion.—The opening words (used as a title) of the sequence composed by St. Thomas Aquinas, about the year 1264, for the Mass of Corpus Christi. (See CORPUS CHRISTI, FEAST OF.) That the sequence was written for the Mass is evidenced by the sixth stanza:

Dies enim solemnis agitur
In qua mensæ prima recolitur
Hujus institutio.

("for on this solemn day is again celebrated the first institution of the Supper"). The authorship of the sequence was once attributed to St. Bonaventure; and Gerbert, in his "De cantu et musica sacra", declaring it redolent of the style and rhythmic sweetness characteristic of the verse of this saint, moots the question whether the composition of the Mass of the feast should not be ascribed to him, and of the Office to St. Thomas. The fact that another Office had been composed for the local feast established by a synodal decree of the Bishop of Liège in 1246 also led some writers to contest the ascription to St. Thomas. His authorship has been proved, however, beyond question, thinks Martène (De antiq. rit. eccl., IV, xxx), by the dissertation of Noël Alexandre, which leaves no doubt (*minimum dubitandi scrupulum*) in the matter. There is also a clear declaration (referred to by Cardinal Thomasius) of the authorship of St. Thomas, in a Constitution issued by Sixtus IV (1471–1484), and to be found in the third tome of the "Bullarium novissimum Fratrum Prædicatorum". In content the great sequence, which is partly epic, but mostly didactic and lyric in character, summons all to endless praise of the Blessed Sacrament of the Altar (lines 1–15); assigns the reason for the commemoration of its institution (lines 16–30); gives in detail the Catholic doctrine of the Sacrament (lines 31–62): "Dogma datur Christianis", etc.; shows the fulfilment of ancient types (lines 63–70): "Ecce panis angelorum", etc.; prays the Good Shepherd to feed and guard us here and make us sharers of the Heavenly Table hereafter (lines 71–80): "Bone pastor, panis vere" etc. Throughout the long poem the rhythmic flow is easy and natural, and, strange to say, especially so in the most didactic of the stanzas, despite a scrupulous theological accuracy in both thought and phrase. The saint "writes with the full panoply under his singing-robes"; but always the melody is perfect, the condensation of phrase is of crystalline clearness, the unction is abundant and, in the closing stanzas, of compelling sweetness. A more detailed description of the content of the "Lauda Sion" is not necessary here, since both Latin text and English version are given in the Baltimore "Manual of Prayers", p. 632.

In form, the sequence follows the rhythmic and stanzaic build of Adam of St. Victor's "Laudes crucis attollamus", which is given by present-day hymnologists as the type selected by St. Thomas for the "Lauda Sion". Thus the opening stanzas of both sequences have the form:



which is continued through five stanzas. In the sixth stanza the form changes in the "Lauda Sion" to: "Dies enim solemnis agitur" etc., as quoted above; and in the "Laudes crucis" to the identical (numerical) rhythms of:

Dicant omnes et dicant singuli,
Ave salus totius sæculi
Arbor salutifera.

Both sequences then revert to the first form for the next stanza, while in the following stanza both alter the form to:



in which all three lines are in the same rhythm. Both again revert to the first form, the "Lauda Sion" having ten such stanzas, the "Laudes crucis" twelve. We next come to a beautiful stanzaic feature of the sequences of Adam, which is imitated by the "Lauda Sion". The stanzaic forms thus far noticed have comprised three verses or lines. But now, as if the fervour of his theme had at length begun to carry the poet beyond

his narrow stanzaic limits, the lines multiply in each stanza. Thus, the following four stanzas in both sequences have a form which, as it has in various ways become notable in the "Lauda Sion", may be given here in the text of one of its stanzas:

Ecce panis angelorum
Factus cibus viatorum;
Vere panis filiorum
Non mittendus canibus.

Finally, both sequences close with two stanzas having each five lines, as illustrated by the penultimate stanza of the "Lauda Sion":

Bone pastor, panis vere,
Jesu, nostri miserere;
Tu nos pasce, nos tuere,
Tu nos bona fac videre
In terra viventium.

It is clear from the above detailed comparison of the two sequences that St. Thomas, following the form of the "Laudes crucis" throughout all its rhythmic and stanzaic variations, composed a sequence which could be sung to a chant already in existence; but it is not a necessary inference from this fact that St. Thomas directly used the "Laudes crucis" as his model. In form the two sequences are indeed identical (except, as already noted, that one has two stanzas more than the other). But identity of form is also found in the "Lauda Sion" and Adam's Easter sequence, "Zyma vetus expurgetur", which Clichtoveus rightly styles "admodum divina", and whose spirit and occasional phraseology approximate much more closely to those of the "Lauda Sion". This is especially notable in the sixth stanza, where the first peculiar change of rhythm occurs, and where in both sequences the application of the theme to the feast-day is made directly and formally. Thus (in "Lauda Sion"): "Dies enim solemnis agitur", etc.; and (in "Zyma vetus"): "Hæc est dies quam fecit Dominus" (This is the day which the Lord hath made). It may well be surmised that Adam desired to include this famous liturgical text in his Easter sequence of "Zyma vetus expurgetur", even at the expense of altering the rhythm with which he had begun his poem; and St. Thomas, copying exactly the new rhythmic form thus introduced, copied also the spirit and pungency of its text. The same thing is not true, however, of the corresponding stanza of the "Laudes crucis", which gives us merely similarity of form and not of content or of spirit. Other verbal correspondences between the "Zyma vetus" and the "Lauda Sion" are observable in the closing stanzas. It may be said, then, that the "Lauda Sion" owes not only its poetic form, but much also of its spirit and fire, and not a little even of its phraseology, to various sequences of Adam, whom Guéranger styles "le plus grand poète du moyen âge". Thus, for instance, the two lines (rhythmically variant from the type set in the first stanza) of the "Lauda Sion":

Vetustatem novitas,
Umbram fugat veritas,

were directly borrowed from another Easter sequence of Adam's, *Ecce dies celebris*, in which occurs the double stanza:

Lætis cedant tristia,
Cum sit major gloria,
Quam prima confusio.
Umbram fugat veritas,
Vetustatem novitas,
Luctum consolatio—

while the "Pascha novum Christus est" of the Easter sequence of Adam, and the "Paranymphi novæ legis Ad amplexum novi Regis" of his sequence of the Apostles, find a strong echo in the "Novum pascha novæ legis" of the "Lauda Sion".

The plainsong melody of the "Lauda Sion" includes the seventh and eighth modes. Its purest form is found in the recently issued Vatican edition of the Roman Gradual. Its authorship is not known; and, accordingly, the surmise of W. S. Rockstro that the text-authors of the five sequences still retained in the Roman Missal probably wrote the melodies also (and therefore that St. Thomas wrote the melody of the "Lauda Sion"), and the conviction of a writer in the "Irish Ecclesiastical Record", August, 1888 (St. Thomas as a Musician), to the same effect, are incorrect. Shall we suppose that Adam of St. Victor composed the melody? The supposition, which would of course date the melody in the twelfth century, is not an improbable one. Possibly it is of older date; but the peculiar changes of rhythm suggest that the melody was composed either by Adam or by some fellow-monk of St. Victor's Abbey; and the most notable rhythmic change is, as has been remarked above, the inclusion of the intractable liturgical text: "Hæc dies quam fecit Dominus"—a change demanding a melody appropriate to itself. Since the melody dates back at least to the twelfth century, it is clear that the "local tradition" ascribing its composition to Pope Urban IV (d. 1264), who had established the feast-day and had charged St. Thomas with the composition of the Office, is not well-based: "Contemporary writers of Urban IV speak of the beauty and harmony of his voice and of his taste for music and the Gregorian chant; and, according to a local tradition, the music of the Office of the Blessed Sacrament—a composition as grave, warm, penetrating, splendid as the celestial harmonies—was the work of Urban IV" (Cruls, "The Blessed Sacrament", tr., Preston, p. 76). In addition to the exquisite plainsong melody mention should be made of Palestrina's settings of the "Lauda Sion", two for eight voices (the better known of which follows somewhat closely the plainsong melody), and one for four voices; and also of the noble setting of Mendelssohn.

The "Lauda Sion" is one of the five sequences (out of the thousand which have come down to us from the Middle Ages) still retained in the Roman Missal. Each of the five has its own special beauty; but the "Lauda Sion" is peculiar in its combination of rhythmic flow, dogmatic precision, phrasal condensation. It has been translated, either in whole or in part, upwards of twenty times into English verse; and a selection from it, the "Ecce panis angelorum", has received some ten additional versions. Amongst Catholic versions are those of Southwell, Crashaw, Husenbeth, Beste, Oakeley, Caswall, Wallace, Aylward, Wackerbarth, Henry. Non-Catholic versions modify the meaning where it is too aggressively dogmatic and precise. E. C. Benedict, however, in his "Hymn of Hildebert", etc., gives a literal translation into verse, but declares that it is to be understood in a Protestant sense. On the other hand, as the editor of "Duffield's Latin Hymns" very sensibly remarks, certain stanzas express "the doctrine of transubstantiation so distinctly, that one must have gone as far as Dr. Pusey, who avowed that he held 'all Roman doctrine', before using these words in a non-natural sense." The admiration tacitly bestowed on the sequence by its frequent translation, either wholly or in part, by non-Catholic pens, found its best expression in the eloquent Latin eulogy of Daniel (Thesaurus Hymnologicus, II, p. 88), when, speaking of the hymns of the Mass and Office of Corpus Christi, he says: "The Angelic Doctor took a single theme for his singing, one filled with excellence and divinity and, indeed, angelic, that is, one celebrated and adored by the very angels. Thomas was the greatest singer of the venerable Sacrament. Neither is it to be believed that he did this without the inbreathing of God (*quem non sine numinis afflatu cecinisse credas*), nor shall we be surprised that, having so wondrously, not to say uniquely, absolved this one spiritual and wholly heavenly theme, he should thenceforward sing no more. One only offspring was his—but it was a lion (*Peperit semel, sed leonem*)."

KAYSER, *Beiträge zur Geschichte und Erklärung der alten Kirchenhymnen*, II (Paderborn and Münster, 1886), 77; JULIAN, *Dictionary of Hymnology* (New York, 1892), s. v. for references to MSS. and translations; DREVES AND BLUME, *Analecta Hymnica* (Leipzig), x, 123; xxxvii, 58; xxxix, 226, 229; xl, 311; xlii, 104, 151, for poems founded on the *Lauda Sion*, and xxxvii, 269 (no. 312) for a sequence in honour of St. Thomas Aquinas, beginning *Lauda Sion increatam; Ecclesiastical Review*, IV, 443, for text and translation, notes and comment.

H. T. HENRY.

Laudianus Codex. See MANUSCRIPTS OF THE BIBLE.

Lauds.—In the Roman Liturgy of to-day Lauds designates an office composed of psalms and canticles, usually recited after Matins.

I. THE TERM LAUDS AND THE HOUR OF THE OFFICE.—The word *Lauds* (i. e. praises) explains the particular character of this office, the end of which is to praise God. All the Canonical Hours have, of course, the same object, but Lauds may be said to have this characteristic *par excellence*. The name is certainly derived from the three last psalms in the office (cxlviii, cxlix, cl), in all of which the word *laudate* is repeated frequently, and to such an extent that originally the word *Lauds* designated not, as it does nowadays, the whole office, but only the end, that is to say, these three psalms with the conclusion. The title Αἶνοι (praises) has been retained in Greek. St. Benedict also employs this term to designate the last three psalms: *post hæc* [viz, the canticle] *sequantur Laudes* (Regula, cap. xiii). In the fifth and sixth centuries the Office of the Lauds was called *Matutinum*, which has now become the special name of another office, the Night Office or Vigils, a term no longer used (see MATINS). Little by little the title Lauds was applied to the whole office, and supplanted the name of Matins. In the ancient authors, however, from the fourth to the sixth or seventh century, the names *Matutinum*, *Laudes matutinæ*, or *Matutini hymni*, are used to designate the office of daybreak or dawn, the Office of Matins retaining its name of Vigils. The reason of this confusion of names is, perhaps, that originally Matins and Lauds formed but a single office, the Night Office terminating only at dawn.

In the liturgy, the word *Lauds* has two other meanings: It sometimes signifies the Alleluia of the Mass; thus a Council of Toledo (IV Council, c. xii) formally pronounced: "Lauds are sung after the Epistle and before the Gospel" (for this interpretation compare Mabillon, "De Liturgia gall.", I, iv). Saint Isidore says: "Laudes, hoc est, Alleluia, canere" (De div. offic., xiii). The word *Lauds* also designates the public acclamations which were sung or shouted at the accession of princes, a custom which was for a long time observed in the Christian Church on certain occasions.

II. THE OFFICE IN VARIOUS LITURGIES.—In the actual Roman Liturgy, Lauds are composed of four psalms with antiphons (in reality there are usually seven, but, following the ordinary rules, psalms without the Gloria and antiphon are not counted separately), a Canticle, Capitulum, Hymn, Versicle, the Benedictus with Antiphon, Oratio, or Collect, and, on certain days, the *Preces*, or Prayers and Versicles. The psalms, unlike those of Matins and Vespers, are not taken in the order of the Psalter, but are chosen in accordance with special rules without reference to their position in the Psalter. Thus the psalm "Miserere mei Deus" (Ps. l) is said every day on which a feast does not occur. The psalms "Deus, Deus meus" (Ps. lxii) and "Deus misereatur nostri et benedicat nobis" (Ps. lxvi), and finally the last three psalms, "Laudate Dominum de cœlis", "Cantate Domino canticum novum", and "Laudate Dominum in sanctis ejus" (Pss. cxlviii–cl), are recited every day without exception. As we have remarked, it is from these last that this office derives its name. It will be noticed that, in general, the other psalms used at Lauds have also been chosen for special reasons, because one or other of their verses contains an allusion either to the break of day, or to the Resurrection of Christ, or to the prayer of the morning, which, as we shall presently point out, are the *raison d'être* of this office. Such are the verses: "Deus Deus meus ad te de luce vigilo"; "Deus misereatur nostri . . . illuminet vultum suum super nos"; "Mane astabo tibi et videbo"; "Emitte lucem tuum et veritatem tuam"; "Exitus matutinum et vespere delectabis"; "Mane sicut herba transeat, mane floreat et transeat"; "Ad annuntiandum mane misericordiam tuam", etc. Another characteristic of this office are the canticles which take place between the psalms lxii–lxvi and the last three psalms. This collection of seven canticles from the Old Testament (Canticle "Benedicite", Canticle of Isaias, Canticle of Ezechias, Canticle of Anne, the two Canticles of Moses, the Canticle of Habacuc) is celebrated, and is almost in agreement with that of the Eastern Church. St. Benedict borrowed it from the Roman Church and, having designed the plan of the Office of Lauds in accordance with that of the Church of Rome, prescribed a special canticle for each day: "Canticum unumquodque die suo ex prophetis, sicut psallit Ecclesia Romana, dicatur" (Reg., xiii).

To these canticles the Roman Liturgy adds, as the finale to this office, that of Zachary, "Benedictus Dominus Deus Israel", which is recited every day and which is also a canticle to the Light, viz. Christ: "Illuminare his qui in tenebris et in umbra mortis sedent". The hymns of Lauds, which in the Roman Church were only added later, also form an interesting collection; they generally celebrate the break of day, the Resurrection of Christ, and the spiritual light which He has made to shine on earth. They are very ancient compositions, and are probably anterior to Saint Benedict. In the Ambrosian Office, and also in the Mozarabic, Lauds retain a few of the principal elements of the Roman Lauds—the Benedictus, canticles from the Old Testament, and the psalms cxlviii, cxlix, cl, arranged, however, in a different order (cf. Dom G. Morin, op. cit. in bibliography). In the Benedictine Liturgy, the Office of Lauds resembles the Roman Lauds very closely, not only in its use of the canticles which St. Benedict admits, as we have already remarked, but also in its general construction. The Greek office corresponding to that of Lauds is the ὄρθρος, which also signifies "morning"; its composition is different, but it nevertheless retains a few elements of the Western Lauds—notably the canticles and the three psalms, cxlviii–cl, which in the Greek Liturgy bear the name Αἶνοι or Praises, corresponding to the Latin word *Laudes* (cf. "Dict. d'archéol. chrét. et de lit.", s. v. Ainoi; "Horologion", Rome, 1876, p. 55).

III. LAUDS IN THE EARLY CHRISTIAN AGES AND THEIR ORIGIN.—Lauds, or, to speak more precisely, the Morning Office or Office of Aurora corresponding to Lauds, is incontestably one of the most ancient offices and can be traced back to Apostolic times. In the sixth century St. Benedict gives us a very detailed description of them in his Rule (chap. xii and xiii): the psalms (almost identical with those of the Roman Liturgy), the canticle, the last three psalms, the capitulum, hymn, versicle, the canticle Benedictus, and the concluding part. St. Columbanus and the Irish documents give us only very vague information on the Office of Lauds (cf. "Regula S. Columbani", c. vii, "De cursu psalmorum" in P. L., LXXX, 212). An effort has been made to reconstruct it in accordance with the Antiphonary of Bangor, but this document, in our opinion, gives us but an extract, and not the complete office (cf. Cabrol in "Dict. d' archéol. et de lit.", s. v. Bangor, Antiphonaire de). St. Gregory of Tours also makes several allusions to this office, which he calls *Matutini hymni;* he gives us, as its constitutive parts, psalm l, the Benedicite, the three

CONVENT OF MAR SABA, FROM BROOK OF CEDRON

(ONCE KNOWN AS THE GREAT LAURA)

psalms, cxlviii–cl, and the versicles ("Hist. Francorum", II, vii, in P. L., LXXI, 201, 256, 1034 etc. Cf. Bäumer-Biron, "Hist. du brév. rom.", I, 229–30). At an earlier period than that of the fifth and fourth centuries, we find various descriptions of the Morning Office in Cassian, in Melania the Younger, in the "Peregrinatio Ætheriæ", St. John Chrysostom, St. Hilary, Eusebius (Bäumer-Biron, op. cit., I, 81, 114, 134, 140, 150–68, 208, 210).

Naturally, in proportion as we advance, greater varieties of the form of the Office are found in the different Christian provinces. The general features, however, remain the same; it is the office of the dawn (Aurora), the office of sunrise, the morning office, the morning praises, the office of cock-crow (*Gallicinium, ad galli cantus*), the office of the Resurrection of Christ. Nowhere better than at Jerusalem, in the "Peregrinatio Ætheriæ", does this office, celebrated at the very tomb of Christ, preserve its local colour. The author calls it *hymni matutinales;* it is considered the principal office of the day. There the liturgy displays all its pomps; the bishop used to be present with all his clergy, the office being celebrated around the Grotto of the Holy Sepulchre itself; after the psalms and canticles had been sung, the litanies were chanted, and the bishop then blessed the people. (Cf. Dom Cabrol, "Etude sur la Peregrinatio Silviæ, les Eglises de Jerusalem, la discipline et la liturgie au IV^{e} siècle", Paris, 1895, pp. 39, 40. For the East cf. "De Virginitate", xx, in P. G., XXVIII, 275.) Lastly, we again find the first traces of Lauds in the third, and even in the second, century in the Canons of Hippolytus, in St. Cyprian, and even in the Apostolic Fathers, so much so that Bäumer does not hesitate to assert that Lauds together with Vespers are the most ancient office, and owe their origin to the Apostles (Bäumer-Biron, op. cit., I, 58; cf. 56, 57, 64, 72 etc.).

IV. Symbolism and Reason of This Office.—It is easy to conclude from the preceding what were the motives which gave rise to this office, and what its signification is. For a Christian the first thought which should present itself to the mind in the morning, is the thought of God; the first act of his day should be a prayer. The first gleam of dawn recalls to our minds that Christ is the true Light, that He comes to dispel spiritual darkness, and to reign over the world. It was at dawn that Christ rose from the tomb, Conqueror of Death and of the Night. It is this thought of His Resurrection which gives to this office its whole signification. Lastly, this tranquil hour, before day has commenced, and man has again plunged into the torrent of cares, is the most favourable to contemplation and prayer. Liturgically, the elements of Lauds have been most harmoniously combined, and it has preserved its significance better than other Hours.

Bona, *De Divina Psalmodia*, v, in *Opp. omnia* (Antwerp, 1677), pp. 705 sqq.; *Commentarius historicus in Romanum Breviarium* (Venice, 1724), 102; Probst, *Brevier u. Breviergebet* (Tübingen, 1868), pp. 146, 173, 184, 188; Idem, *Lehre u. Gebet in den drei ersten Jahrh.* (Tübingen, 1871); Bäumer, *Hist. du bréviaire*, French tr. Biron, I (Paris, 1905), 58, 164, etc.; Batiffol, *Hist. du brév. romain* (Paris, 1893), 22 sqq.; Duchesne, *Christian Worship* (London, 1904), 448–9; Hotham in *Dict. Christ. Antiq.*, s. v. *Office, The Divine;* Scudamore, *ibid.*, s. v. *Hours of Prayer;* Morin, *Les Laudes du dimanche du IV^{e} au VII^{e} siècle*, in *Revue Bénédictine* (1889), 301–4; Bingham, *Works* (Oxford, 1855), IV, 342, 548, etc. See also Breviary; Hours, Canonical; Vigils; Matins.

F. Cabrol.

Laura.—The Greek word *laura* (λαύρα) is employed by writers from the end of the fifth century to distinguish the monasteries of Palestine of the semi-eremitical type. The word signifies a narrow way or passage, and in later times the quarter of a town. We find it used in Alexandria for the different portions of the city grouped around the principal churches; and this latter sense of the word is in conformity with what we know of the Palestinian laura, which was a group of hermitages surrounding a church.

Although the term *laura* has been almost exclusively used with regard to Palestine, the type of monastery which it designated existed, not only there, but in Syria and Mesopotamia; in Gaul; in Italy; and among the Celtic monks. The type of life led therein might be described as something midway between the purely eremitical—inaugurated by St. Paul the first hermit—and the purely cenobitical life. The monk lived alone though dependent on a superior, and was only bound to the common life on Saturdays and Sundays, when all met in church for the solemn Eucharistic Liturgy. This central church was the origin of what was afterwards called the *cœnobium*, or the house of the imperfect, or of "the children". There the future solitary was to pass the time of his probation, and to it he might have to return if he had not the strength for the full rigour of the solitary life. The lauras of Palestine were originated by St. Chariton, who died about 350. He founded the Laura of Pharan, to the north-east of Jerusalem, and that of Douka, north-east of Jericho. But most of the lauras in the vicinity of Jerusalem owed their existence to a Cappadocian named Sabas. In 483 he founded the monastery which still bears his name, Mar Saba. It stands on the west bank of Cedron and was once known as the Great Laura. We know that in 814 the Laura of Pharan was still flourishing, and it appears that on Mount Athos this type of life was followed till late in the tenth century. It gave way, however, to the cenobitic, and no monastery now extant can be said really to resemble the ancient lauras.

Krüll in *Real Encylopädie der Christlicher Alterthümer*, s. v. *Laura;* Butler, *The Lausiac History of Palladius*, I (Part 2, London, 1901); Génier, *Vie de Euthyme le grand.—Les moines et l'église en Palestine au V^{e} siècle* (Paris, 1909).

R. Urban Butler.

Laurence Johnson, Blessed. See William Filby, Blessed.

Laurentie, Pierre-Sébastien, French publicist; b. at Houga, in the Department of Gers, France, 21 January, 1793; d. 9 February, 1876. He went to Paris in the early part of 1817, and on 17 June of the same year entered the famous pious and charitable association known as "La Congrégation". Through the patronage of the Royalist writer Michaud, Laurentie became connected with the editorial staff of "La Quotidienne", in 1818; and in 1823 he was appointed Chief Inspector of Schools (inspecteur général des études), with the functions of which office he was able to combine his work as a publicist. His earliest writings won for him a great reputation. They were: "De l'éloquence publique et de son influence" (1819); "Etudes littéraires et morales sur les historiens latins" (1822); "De la justice au XIX^{e} siècle" (1822); "Introduction à la philosophie" (1826); "Considérations sur les constitutions démocratiques" (1826). The complaint was made against the last-named of these works, that it was aimed at the Villèle Ministry, and censured its legislation in regard to the press. This charge, together with the attacks on the Ministry which appeared in "La Quotidienne" and the fact of Laurentie's friendly relations with Lamennais, led to Laurentie's dismissal from the office of Chief Inspector of Schools (5 November, 1826). "La Quotidienne" supported the Martignac Ministry until it issued the decrees of 16 June, 1828, against the Jesuits, and the *petits séminaires*. Laurentie vigorously opposed these decrees. He purchased the old Benedictine college of Ponlevoy, which had existed for more than seven centuries and which, with the colleges of Juilly, Sorèze, and Vendôme, Napoleon had permitted to continue in existence side by side with the university. Laurentie's plan was to take advantage of this exceptional official authorization (which constituted a breach in the wall of the state university monopoly) to insure the prosperous existence of one independent

educational institution. His work, "Sur l'étude et l'enseignement des lettres", published in 1828, was understood to embody the programme which he proposed to follow at Ponlevoy.

After 1830, Laurentie, defeated politically, devoted all his efforts as a publicist to three great causes: (1) freedom of education; (2) Legitimism; (3) the defence of religion. (1) For the first of these, we may mention his "Lettres sur l'éducation" (1835–37), his "Lettres sur la liberté d'enseignement" (1844), and the part he played, in 1849 and 1850, in regard to the commission which prepared the Falloux Law; also his treatise, "L'Esprit chrétien dans les études" (1852), his book on "Les Crimes de l'éducation française" (1872), and his successful efforts for freedom of higher education (1875). (2) In support of the second of these causes he wrote the pamphlet, "De la légitimité et de l'usurpation" (1830), the book "De la révolution en Europe" (1834), "De la démocratie et des périls de la société" (1849), "La Papauté" (1852), "Les Rois et le Pape" (1860), "Rome et le Pape" (1860), "Rome" (1861), "Le Pape et le Czar" (1862), "L'Athéisme social et l'Eglise, schisme du monde nouveau" (1869). Inspired by the same cause, Laurentie also contributed, under the Monarchy of July, to "Le Rénovateur" and "La Quotidienne". Again, between 1848 and 1876, the battle for the principle of Legitimism went on day after day in the columns of the Royalist "L'Union", and in connexion with this campaign Laurentie's "Histoire des ducs d'Orléans" was published in 1832, handling the Orléans family with great severity, and followed by the ten volumes of his "Histoire de France" (1841–55), a kind of historical illustration of his political doctrines. (3) As early as 1836 Laurentie conceived the idea, in defence of religion, of a Catholic encyclopedia which he prefaced with a Catholic theory of the sciences. In 1862 he published a pamphlet attacking scientific atheism. His "Histoire de l'Empire Romain" (1862) is an apology for infant Christianity, and his "Philosophie de la prière" (1864) contains the outpouring of a devout soul.

As an octogenarian, Laurentie was the confidant of the Comte de Chambord, whose rights he daily championed in "L'Union". His "Souvenirs", left unfinished at his death, were published by his grandson in 1893. "He was an honour to his party and to the press", wrote Louis Veuillot. From the beginning to the end of his career he was an anti-Gallican monarchist, never seeking in his theory of the Throne and the Altar a means of making the Altar subservient to the Throne, but advocating the liberty of the Church and of education.

LAURENTIE, *Souvenirs inédits* (Paris, 1893); GRANDMAISON, *La Congrégation*, 1801–1830 (Paris, 1889), 209–74; VEUILLOT, *Derniers mélanges*, III (Paris, 1909), 82, 83

GEORGES GOYAU.

Laurentius, ANTIPOPE. See SYMMACHUS, SAINT, POPE.

Lausanne and Geneva, DIOCESE OF (LAUSANNENSIS ET GENEVENSIS), in Switzerland, immediately subject to the Holy See.

I. LAUSANNE.—According to the most recent investigations, particularly those of Marius Besson, the origin of the See of Lausanne can be traced to the ancient See of Windisch (Vindonissa). Bubulcus, the first Bishop of Windisch, appeared at the imperial Synod of Epao in Burgundy, in 517 (Maassen, "Concilia ævi merov." in "Mon. Germ. Hist.: Leg.", III, I, Hanover, 1893, 15–30). The second and last known Bishop of Windisch was Gramatius (Grammatius), who signed the decrees of the Synod of Clermont in 535 (Maassen, l. c., pp. 65–71), of Orléans, 541 (Maassen, l. c., 86–99), and that of Orléans, 549 (Maassen, l. c., 99–112). Hitherto it has generally been believed that shortly after this the see was transferred from Windisch to Constance (q. v.). Besson has made it probable that, between 549 and 585, the see was divided and the real seat of the bishops of Windisch transferred to Avenches (Aventicum), while the eastern part of the diocese was united with Constance. According to the Synod of Mâcon, 585 (Maassen, l. c., 163–73), St. Marius seems to have been the first resident Bishop of Avenches. The Chartularium of Lausanne (ed. G. Waitz in "Mon. Germ.: Scriptores", XXIV, Hanover, 1879, 794; also in "Mémoires et documents publ. par la Société de la Suisse Romande", VI, Lausanne, 1851, 29) affirms that St. Marius was born in the Diocese of Autun about 530, was consecrated Bishop of Avenches in May, 574, and died 31 December, 594. (For his epitaph in verse, formerly in the church of St. Thyrsius at Lausanne, see "Mon. Germ.: Script.", XXIV, 795.) To him we are indebted for a valuable addition (455–581) to the Chronicle of St. Prosper of Aquitaine (P. L., LXXII, 793–802; also in "Mon. Germ.: Auctores Antiquissimi", XI, Berlin, 1894, 232–39). The See of Avenches may have been transferred to Lausanne by Marius, or possibly not before 610.

Lausanne was originally a suffragan of Lyons (certainly about the seventh century), later of Besançon, from which it was detached by the French Concordat of 1801. In medieval times the diocese extended from the Aar, near Soleure, to the northern end of the Valley of St. Imier, thence along the Doubs and the ridge of the Jura to where the Aubonne flows into the Lake of Geneva, and thence along the north of the lake to Villeneuve, whence the boundary-line followed the watershed between Rhône and Aar to the Grimsel, and down the Aar to Attiswil. Thus the diocese included the town of Soleure and part of its territory, that part of the Canton of Berne which lay on the left bank of the River Aar, also Biel, the Valley of St. Imier, Jougne, and Les Longevilles in the Franche-Comté, the counties of Neuchâtel and Valangin, the greater part of the Canton de Vaud, the Canton of Fribourg, the County of Gruyère, and most of the Bernese Oberland. The present Diocese of Lausanne includes the Cantons of Fribourg, Vaud, and Neuchâtel.

Of the bishops who in the seventh century succeeded St. Marius almost nothing is known. Between 594 and 800 only three bishops are known: Arricus, present at the Council of Chalon-sur-Saône (Maassen, l. c., 208–14), Protasius, elected about 651, and Chilmegisilus, about 670. From the time of Charlemagne until the end of the ninth century the following bishops of Lausanne are mentioned: Udalricus (Ulrich), a contemporary of Charlemagne; Fredarius (about 814); David (827–50), slain in combat with one of the lords of Degerfelden; Hartmann (851–78); Hieronymus (879–92). The most distinguished among the subsequent bishops are: Heinrich von Lenzburg (d. 1019), who rebuilt the cathedral in 1000; Hugo (1019–37), a son of Rudolf III of Burgundy, in 1037 proclaimed the "Peace of God"; Burkart von Oltingen (1057–89), one of the most devoted adherents of Henry IV, with whom he was banished, and made the pilgrimage to Canossa; Guido von Merlen (1130–44), a correspondent of St. Bernard; St. Amadeus of Hauterive, a Cistercian (1144–59), who wrote homilies in honour of the Blessed Virgin (P. L., CLXXXVIII, 1277–1348); Boniface, much venerated (1231–39), formerly a master in the University of Paris and head of the cathedral school at Cologne, resigned because of physical ill-treatment, afterwards auxiliary bishop in Brabant (see Ratzinger in "Stimmen aus Maria-Laach", L, 1896, 10–23, 139–57); the Benedictine Louis de la Palud (1432–40), who took part in the Councils of Constance (1414), Pavia-Siena (1423), Basle (1431—) and at the last-named was chosen, in January, 1432, Bishop of Lausanne, against Jean de Prangins, the chapter's choice; Palud was later vice-chamberlain of the conclave whence Amadeus VIII of

LIBRARY

Savoy emerged as the anti-pope, Felix V, by whom he was made a cardinal; George of Saluzzo, who published synodical constitutions for the reform of the clergy; Cardinal Giuliano della Rovere (1472–76), who in 1503 ascended the papal throne as Julius II.

Meanwhile the bishops of Lausanne, who had been Counts of Vaud since the time of Rudolf III of Burgundy (1011), and until 1218 subject only to imperial authority, were in 1270 made princes of the Holy Roman Empire, but their temporal power only extended over a small part of the diocese, namely, over the city and district of Lausanne, as well as a few towns and villages in the Cantons of Vaud and Fribourg; on the other hand, the bishops possessed many feoffees among the most distinguished of the patrician families of Western Switzerland. The guardians of the ecclesiastical property (*advocati, avoués*) of the see were originally the counts of Genevois, then the lords of Gerenstein, the dukes of Zähringen, the counts of Kyburg, lastly, the counts (later dukes) of Savoy. These guardians, whose only duty originally was the protection of the diocese, enlarged their jurisdiction at the expense of the diocesan rights and even filled the episcopal see with members of their families. Wearisome quarrels resulted, during which the city of Lausanne, with the aid of Berne and Fribourg, acquired new rights, and gradually freed itself from episcopal suzerainty. When Bishop Sebastian de Montfaucon (1517–60) took sides with the Duke of Savoy in a battle against Berne, the Bernese used this as a pretext to seize the city of Lausanne. On 31 March, 1536, Hans Franz Nägeli entered Lausanne as conqueror, abolished Catholicism, and began a religious revolution. The bishop was obliged to fly, the ecclesiastical treasure was taken to Berne, the cathedral chapter was dissolved (and has never been re-established), while the cathedral was given over to Protestantism. Bishop Sebastian died an exile in 1560, and his three successors were likewise exiles. It was only in 1610, under Bishop Johann VII of Watteville, that the see was provisionally re-established at Fribourg, where it has since remained.

The Cantons of Vaud, Neuchâtel, and Berne, were entirely lost to the See of Lausanne by the Reformation. By the French Constitution Civile du Clergé (1790) the parishes of the French Jura fell to the Diocese of Belley, and this was confirmed by the Concordat of 1801. In 1814 the parishes of Soleure, in 1828 those of the Bernese Jura, and in 1864 also that district of Berne on the left bank of the Aar were attached to the See of Basle. In compensation, Pius VII assigned, in a papal brief of 20 September, 1819, the city of Geneva and twenty parishes belonging to the old Diocese of Geneva (which in 1815 had become Swiss) to the See of Lausanne. The bishop (in 1815 Petrus Tobias Yenni) retained his residence at Fribourg, and since 1821 has borne the title and arms of the bishops of Lausanne and Geneva. His vicar general resides at Geneva, and is always parish priest of that city.

LAUSANNE

II. GENEVA (GENAVA, or GENEVA, also JANUA and GENUA), capital of the Swiss canton of the same name, situated where the Rhone issues from the Lake of Geneva (*Lacus Lemanus*), first appears in history as a border town, fortified against the Helvetians, which the Romans took in 120 B. C. In A. D. 443 it was taken by Burgundy, and with the latter fell to the Franks in 534. In 888 the town was part of the new Kingdom of Burgundy, and with it was taken over in 1033 by the German Emperor. According to legendary accounts found in the works of Gregorio Leti ("Historia Genevrina", Amsterdam, 1686) and Besson ("Mémoires pour l'histoire ecclésiastique des diocèses de Genève, Tarantaise, Aoste et Maurienne", Nancy, 1759; new ed. Moutiers, 1871), Geneva was Christianized by Dionysius Areopagita and Paracodus, two of the seventy-two disciples, in the time of Domitian; Dionysius went thence to Paris, and Paracodus became the first Bishop of Geneva. This legend, however, is fictitious, as is that which makes St. Nazarius the first Bishop of Geneva, an error arising out of the similarity between the Latin names *Genava* (Geneva) and *Genua* (Genoa, in Italy). The so-called "Catalogue de St. Pierre", which gives St. Diogenus (Diogenes) as the first Bishop of Geneva, is untrustworthy.

A letter of St. Eucherius to Salvius makes it almost certain that St. Isaac (c. 400) was the first bishop. In 440 St. Salonius appears as Bishop of Geneva; he was a son of St. Eucherius, to whom the latter dedicated his "Instructiones"; he took part in the Councils of Orange (441), Vaison (442), and Arles (about 455), and is supposed to be the author of two small commentaries, "In parabolas Salomonis", and on Ecclesiastes (published in P. L., LII, 967 sqq., 993 sqq. as works of an otherwise unknown bishop, Salonius of Vienne). Little is known about the following bishops: Theoplastus (about 475), to whom St. Sidonius Apollinaris addressed a letter; Domitianus (before 500), under whom the Burgundian Princess Sedeleuba, a sister of Queen Clotilda, had the remains of the martyr and St. Victor of Soleure transferred to Geneva, where she built a basilica in his honour; St. Maximus (about 512–41), a friend of Avitus, Archbishop of Vienne, and Cyprian of Toulon, with whom he was in correspondence (Wawra in "Tübinger Theolog. Quartalschrift", LXXXV, 1905, 576–94). Bishop Pappulus sent the priest Thoribius as his substitute to the Synod of Orléans (541). Bishop Salonius II is only known from the signatures of the Synods of Lyons (570) and Paris (573), and Bishop Cariatto, installed by King Guntram in 584, was present at the two Synods of Valence and Mâcon in 585.

From the beginning the See of Geneva was a suffragan of Vienne. The bishops of Geneva had been princes of the Holy Roman Empire since 1154, but had to maintain a long struggle for their independence against the guardians (*advocari*) of the see, the counts of Geneva and, later, the counts of Savoy. In 1290 the latter obtained the right of installing the *vicedominus* of the diocese—the official who exercised minor jurisdiction in the town in the bishop's name. In 1387 Bishop Adhémar Fabry granted the town its great charter, the basis of its communal self-government, which every bishop on his accession was expected to confirm. When the line of the counts of Geneva became extinct, in 1394, and the House of Savoy came into possession of their territory, assuming, after 1416, the title of Duke, the new dynasty sought by every means to bring the city of Geneva under their power, particularly by elevating members of their own family to the episcopal see. The city protected itself by union with the Swiss Federation (*Eidgenossenschaft*), uniting itself, in 1526, with Berne and Fribourg. The Reformation plunged Geneva into new entanglements: while Berne favoured the introduction of the new teaching, and demanded liberty of preaching for the Reformers Farel and Froment, Catholic Fribourg, in 1534, renounced its alliance with Geneva. Calvin went to Geneva in 1536 and began systematically to preach his doctrine there. By his theocratic "Reign of Terror" he succeeded in forcing himself upon Geneva as absolute ruler, and converted the city into a Protestant Rome. As early as 1532 the bishop had been obliged to leave his residence, never to return; in 1534 he fixed his see at Gex, in 1535 at Annecy. The Apostolic zeal and devotion of St. Francis de Sales, who was Bishop of Geneva from 1602 to 1621, restored to Catholicism a large part of the diocese.

THE CATHEDRAL, GENEVA

Formerly the Diocese of Geneva extended well into Savoy, as far as Mont Cenis and the Great St. Bernard. Nyon, also, often erroneously considered a separate diocese, belonged to Geneva. Under Charlemagne Tarantaise was detached from Geneva, and became a separate diocese. Before the Reformation the See of Geneva ruled over 8 chapters, 423 parishes, 9 abbeys, and 68 priories. In 1802 the diocese was united with that of Chambéry. At the Congress of Vienna the territory of Geneva was extended to cover 15 Savoyard and 6 French parishes, with more than 16,000 Catholics; at the same time it was admitted to the Swiss Federation. The Congress expressly provided —and the same proviso was included in the Treaty of Turin (16 March, 1816)—that in these territories transferred to Geneva the Catholic religion was to be protected, and that no changes were to be made in existing conditions without agreement with the Holy See. Pius VII next (1819) united the city of Geneva and 20 parishes with the Diocese of Lausanne, while the rest of the ancient Diocese of Geneva (outside of Switzerland) was reconstituted, in 1822, as the Diocese of Annecy. The Great Council of Geneva (cantonal council) afterwards ignored the responsibilities thus undertaken; in imitation of Napoleon's "Organic Articles" (see ARTICLES, THE ORGANIC), it insisted upon the "Placet", or previous approval of publication, for all papal documents. Catholic indignation ran high at the civil measures taken against Marilley, the parish priest of Geneva, and later bishop of the see. Still greater indignation was aroused among the Catholics by the injustice created by the *Kulturkampf*, which obliged them to contribute to the budget of the Protestant Church and to that of the Old Catholic Church, while for their own religious needs they did not receive the smallest pecuniary aid from the public treasury. On 30 June, 1907, most of the Catholics of Geneva voted for the separation of Church and State. By this act of separation they were assured at least a negative equality with Protestants and Old Catholics. Since then the Canton of Geneva has given aid to no creed out of either the state or the municipal revenues. The Protestants, however, have been favoured, for to them a lump compensation of 800,000 francs (about $160,000) was paid at the outset, whereas the Catholics—in spite of the international agreements assuring financial support to their religion, either from the public funds or from other sources—received nothing.

III. LAUSANNE AND GENEVA.—Bishop Yenni's (d. 8 December, 1845) successor was Etienne Marilley. Deposed, in 1848, by the Cantons of Berne, Geneva, Vaud, and Neuchâtel, owing to serious differences with the Radical regime at Fribourg, he was kept a prisoner for fifty days in the castle of Chillon, on the Lake of Geneva, and then spent eight years in exile at Divonne (France); he was allowed to return to his diocese 19 December, 1856. In 1864 Pius IX appointed the vicar-general of Geneva, Gaspard Mermillod, auxiliary bishop, and in 1873 Vicar Apostolic, of Geneva, thus detaching the Genevese territory from the diocese and making it a vicariate. This new Apostolic vicariate was, however, not recognized by either the State Coun-

cil of Geneva or the Swiss Federal Council, and Mermillod was banished from Switzerland by a decree of 17 February, 1873. When the Holy See condemned this measure, the Government answered on 12 December, 1873, by expelling the papal nuncio. After Bishop Marilley had resigned his diocese (1879) Monsignor Cossandey, provost of the theological seminary at Fribourg, was elected Bishop of Lausanne and Geneva, and after his death, Mermillod. Thus the Apostolic Vicariate of Geneva was given up, the conflict with the Government ended, and the decree of expulsion against Mermillod was revoked. When, in 1890, Leo XIII made Mermillod a cardinal, he removed to Rome. The Holy See then appointed the present bishop, Monsignor Joseph Deruaz, and he was consecrated at Rome, 19 March, 1890, by his predecessor. Mgr. Deruaz was born 13 May, 1826, at Choulex in the Canton of Geneva, studied theology at Fribourg and Annecy, and was ordained priest in 1850. For a time he was vicar at Grand Sacconex, near Geneva, and then curé at Rolle, in the Canton of Vaud, and at Lausanne. He was present at the Vatican Council with Bishop Marilley. As bishop he worked in the spirit of conciliation, and was successful in remedying the ills of the *Kulturkampf* in the Canton of Geneva.

Statistics.—The present Diocese of Lausanne-Geneva comprises the Cantons of Fribourg, Geneva, Vaud, and Neuchâtel, with the exception of certain parishes on the right bank of the Rhone belonging to the Diocese of Sion (Sitten). According to Büchi (see bibliography) and the "Dictionnaire géographique de la Suisse" (Neuchâtel, 1905), III, 49 sqq., the diocese numbers approximately 434,049 Protestants and 232,056 Catholics; consequently, the latter form somewhat more than one-third of the whole population of the bishopric. The Catholics inhabit principally the Canton of Fribourg (excepting the Lake District) and the country parishes transferred to Geneva in 1815, four communes in the Canton of Neuchâtel, and ten in the Canton of Vaud. The Catholic population in the Cantons of Fribourg and Geneva consists principally of farmers, in both the other cantons it is also recruited from the labouring classes. The Catholics are distributed among 193 parishes, of which 162 are allotted to Lausanne, 31 to Geneva. The number of secular priests is 390, those belonging to orders 70. The religious orders and congregations are almost entirely in the Canton of Fribourg. The Capuchins have monasteries at Fribourg and Bulle, and hospices at Romont and Landeron; since 1861 the Carthusians have been in possession of their old convent of Val-Sainte, suppressed in the eighteenth century. The Franciscans conduct the German classes in the Fribourg Gymnasium. The Marists and the Congregation of the Divine Saviour (Societas Divini Salvatoris) have establishments at Fribourg. The female congregations represented in the diocese are: Cistercians at Maigrauge, near Fribourg, and Fille-Dieu, near Romont; Dominicans at Estavayer; Sisters of Charity (Hospital Sisters) at Fribourg, Estavayer, and Neuchâtel, (Theodosians of the Holy Cross) at Fribourg, Ueberstorf, St. Wolfgang and Neuchâtel, (of St. Vincent de Paul) at Fribourg, Chatel-St-Denis, Billens, and Tafers; Capucines at Montorge, near Fribourg. The Visitandines and the Ursulines conduct each a girls' school at Fribourg; the Teaching Sisters of the Holy Cross, of Menzingen and Ingenbohl, conduct several schools for girls (among them the Academy of the Holy Cross at Fribourg attached to the university); they are also employed as teachers in many of the village schools. The Filles de l'Œuvre de St. Paul (not properly religious) have, among other works, a Catholic bookstore at Fribourg, and a well-arranged printing house. Among the more important educational establishments of the diocese, besides those already mentioned, are: the University of Fribourg [see FRIBOURG (SWITZERLAND), UNIVERSITY OF]; the theological seminary of St. Charles at Fribourg, with seven ecclesiastical professors; the cantonal school of St. Michel, also at Fribourg, which comprises a German and French gymnasium, a *Realschule* (corresponding somewhat to the English first-grade schools) and commercial school, as well as a lyceum, the rector of which is a clergyman. This school has at present (1910) about 800 pupils, with 40 ecclesiastical and as many lay professors. Three other cantonal universities exist in the diocese: Geneva (founded by Calvin in 1559, and in 1873 raised to the rank of a university with five faculties); Neuchâtel (1866, academy; 1909, university); Lausanne (1537, academy; university since 1890, with five faculties). Geneva and Lausanne both have cantonal Protestant theological faculties, Neuchâtel a "Faculté de théologie de l'église indépendante de l'état". For the government of the diocese there are, besides the bishop, two vicars-general, one of whom lives at Geneva, the other at Fribourg. There are, moreover, a *provicarius generalis*, who is also chancellor of the diocese, and a secretary. The cathedral chapter of Lausanne (with 32 canons) was suppressed at the time of the Reformation, and has never been re-established, in consequence of which the choice of a bishop rests with the Holy See. In 1512 Julius II established a collegiate chapter in the church of St. Nicholas at Fribourg, which is immediately subject to the Holy See, with a provost appointed by the Great Council, also a dean, a cantor, and ten prebends. This collegiate church takes the place of the diocesan cathedral, still lacking, since the cathedral of St. Pierre at Geneva and that of Notre Dame at Lausanne were given over to Protestantism at the time of the Reformation.

Besides works cited under CALVINISM and FRIBOURG, see:—
On Lausanne, SCHMITT, *Mémoires historiques sur le diocèse de Lausanne*, ed. GREMAUD in *Mémorial de Fribourg*, V, VI (Fribourg, 1858–59); GENOUD, *Les Saints de la Suisse française* (Bar-le-Duc, 1882); DELLION, *Dictionnaire hist. et statist. des paroisses cath. du canton de Fribourg* (13 vols., Fribourg, 1884–1903); SECRÉTAN, *Hist. de la cathédrale de Lausanne* (Lausanne, 1889); DUPRAZ, *La Cathédrale de Lausanne* (Lausanne, 1906); STAMMLER, *Der Domschatz von Lausanne* (Bern, 1894), French tr. by GALLEY (Lausanne, 1902); BÜCHI, *Die kath. Kirche in der Schweiz* (Munich, 1902), 56–67; DOUMERGUE, *Lausanne au temps de la Réformation* (Lausanne, 1903); HOLDER, *Les Visites pastorales dans le diocèse de Lausanne depuis la fin du 16e siècle jusqu'à vers le milieu du 19e siècle* (Fribourg, 1903); BESSON, *Recherches sur les origines des évêchés de Genève, Lausanne, Sion et leurs premiers titulaires jusqu'au déclin du 6e siècle* (Fribourg and Paris, 1906) (contains a copious bibliography, pp. 230–44); IDEM, *Contribution à l'histoire du diocèse de Lausanne sous la domination franque, 534–888* (Fribourg, 1908); *Directorium Diœcesis Lausannensis et Genevensis in annum 1910* (Fribourg, 1910).
On Geneva, cf. the older literature in CHEVALIER, *Topo-Bibl.*, 1284 sqq. Also, FLEURY, *Histoire de l'église de Genève* (3 vols., Geneva, 1880–81); LAFRASSE, *Etude sur la liturgie dans l'ancien diocèse de Genève* (Geneva and Paris, 1904); DUCHESNE, *Fastes épiscopaux de l'ancienne Gaule*, I (2nd ed., Paris, 1907), 225 sqq.; DE GIRARD, *Le Droit des catholiques romains de Genève au budget des cultes* (Geneva, 1907); DE LA RIVE, *La Séparation de l'Eglise et de l'Etat à Genève* (Paris, 1909); MARTIN, *La Situation du catholicisme à Genève 1815–1907* (Lausanne, 1909); S[PEISER], *Genf und die katholische Kirche im 19. Jahrhundert* republished from the *Neuen Zürcher Nachrichten* (1909), nos. 344, 345.

GREGOR REINHOLD.

Lauzon, JEAN DE, fourth governor of Canada, b. at Paris, 1583; d. there, 16 Feb., 1666. He was the son of François de Lauzon and Isabelle Lotin. In 1613 he was councillor of the Parlement of Paris; master of petitions (1623); appointed by Cardinal Richelieu Intendant of the Company of New France, he was lauded by Champlain for obtaining the restoration of Quebec taken by the Kertk brothers (1629). Lauzon's position enabled him to secure for his sons immense domains in Canada, including the seigniories of Lauzon (opposite Quebec), de la Citière, with sixty leagues of frontage on the right shore of the St. Lawrence, and the Island of Montreal, later ceded to La Dauversière, one of the founders of Ville Marie. His important office and services merited him a good reception as governor (1651). Times were critical. Lauzon,

scholar, able magistrate and financier, organized the regular administration of civil and criminal justice, and provided, from the fur-trade at Tadoussac, for the civil and military list, besides furnishing pensions for the Jesuits, Ursulines, and hospital-nuns. But unused to war and already aged, he could not subdue the Iroquois, whose audacious cruelty made several victims under the walls of Quebec. Although his eldest son, Jean, destined like Dollard to an heroic death, represented him wherever danger threatened, Lauzon resigned before the expiration of a second term of office (1656), leaving the government *ad interim* to a younger son, Charles de Lauzon-Charny. Lauzon is credited for his probity, virtue, exemplary life, and great zeal for God's interests and the conversion of savages; but he lacked experience, decision under trials, and had assumed the direction of the colony under too adverse circumstances.

FERLAND, *Cours d'histoire du Canada* (Quebec, 1882); ROY, *Histoire de la seigneurie de Lauzon* (Levis, 1897); GARNEAU, *Histoire du Canada* (Montreal, 1882); ROCHEMONTEIX, *Les Jésuites et la Nouvelle-France* (Paris, 1896).

LIONEL LINDSAY.

Lauzon, PIERRE DE, a noted missionary of New France in the eighteenth century, b. at Poitiers, 26 Sept., 1687; d. at Quebec, 5 Sept., 1742. Though sometimes mentioned as Jean, in his official acts he invariably signed Pierre. He joined the Jesuits at Limoges, 24 Nov., 1703, and after ordination was sent to Canada in 1716. From 1716 to 1718 he was Father Daniel Richer's assistant at Lorette, where he studied the Huron-Iroquois language. He did missionary duty at Sault St. Louis (Caughnawaga) from 1718 to 1731, with the exception of the scholastic year 1721–22, when he replaced Father François Le Brun as instructor in the royal school of hydrography in the college at Quebec, as the exhausting labours of the mission had undermined his health. His Iroquois Indians clamoured for his return, and on 12 May, 1722, they formally petitioned Governor Vaudreuil and the Intendant Bégon to that effect. These in turn, persuaded that it was he alone who, on the occasion of a change in the village site, had prevented two-thirds of the Indians from moving away and settling within easy reach of the English, urged the superior to send him back, and in 1722 he returned to Sault St. Louis. It was none too soon, for the spirit of revolt was spreading among the Caughnawaga Iroquois, in consequence of a menace of again quartering upon them a French garrison, an ever prolific cause of debauchery and disorder. He made his solemn profession of the four vows at Sault St. Louis on 2 Feb., 1721.

In 1723 he was named superior of the Caughnawaga mission, and the ability he displayed in governing during the nine succeeding years determined the general, Francis Retz, to place him in 1732 over the whole Canada mission. This, according to established custom in Canada entailed the duties of rector of the college at Quebec. During his term of office, which lasted seven years, he crossed over to France (1733) in quest of recruits. Among those whom he brought back with him was the saintly Father Jean-Pierre Aulneau, massacred in 1736 at the Lake of the Woods. Mgr Dosquet of Quebec, returned at the same time, bringing with him three Sulpicians. The party embarked 29 May and reached Quebec 16 Aug., after a distressing voyage of eighty days. Terrific winds and pestilential disease marked the long journey. De Lauzon, besides ministering to the sick, as did the other priests on board, was appointed boatswain's mate, for the ecclesiastics did not shirk their share of the work. In September, 1739, he resumed his missionary labours with the Caughnawaga Iroquois, but owing to failing strength he was recalled to Quebec in 1741, where, after a short illness of two and a half days, he died in the following year.

JONES, *Aulneau Collect.*, passim; MSS. documents, and catalogues in *St. Mary's College Archives; Paris Archives, Ministère des Colonies, Canada, corresp. gén.*, XXXIX, xi, fol. 320; *Archives de la Marine, Canada, corresp. gén.*, LXXVII, xi, fol. 102; THWAITES, *Wisc. Hist. Coll.*, XVI, 395.

ARTHUR EDWARD JONES.

Lavabo, the first word of that portion of Ps. xxv said by the celebrant at Mass while he washes his hands after the Offertory, from which word the whole ceremony is named.

The principle of washing the hands before celebrating the holy Liturgy—at first an obvious practical precaution of cleanness, then interpreted also symbolically—occurs naturally in all rites. In the Eastern rites this is done at the beginning as part of the vesting; it is generally accompanied by the same fragment of Ps. xxv (vv. 6–12) said in the West after the Offertory. But in the "Apost. Const.", VIII, 11, the hands of the celebrants are washed just before the dismissal of the catechumens (Brightman, 13), in the Syriac and Coptic rites after the creed (ib., 82 and 162). Cyril of Jerusalem also mentions a washing that takes place in sight of the people (Cat. Myst., v). So also in the Roman Rite the celebrant washes his hands before vesting, but with another prayer ("Da, Domine, virtutem", etc., in the Missal among the "Orationes ante Missam"). The reason of the second washing, during the Mass, at Rome was no doubt the special need for it after the long ceremony of receiving the loaves and vessels of wine from the people at the Offertory (all of which is absent from the Eastern rites). The first Roman Ordines describe a general washing of hands by the celebrant and deacons, who have received and carried the offerings to the altar, immediately after they have done so ("Ordo Rom. I", 14; "Ordo of St. Amand" in Duchesne, "Origines du Culte", 443, etc.; in the St. Amand Ordo the Pontiff washes his hands both before and after the Offertory). There is as yet no mention of any psalm or prayers said at the time. In the Gallican Rite the offerings were prepared before Mass began, as in the East; so there was no Offertory nor place for a Lavabo later. At Milan there is now an Offertory borrowed from Rome, but no washing of hands at this point; the Mozarabic Liturgy also has a Romanizing Offertory and a washing, but without any prayer ("Missale Mixtum", P. L., LXXXV, 538). The Roman Rite had in the Middle Ages two washings of the hands at the Offertory, one just before, while the deacon spread the corporal on the altar, one immediately after the incensing that follows the offertory (Durandus, "Rationale", IV, 28; Benedict XIV, "De SS. Missæ Sacrif.", II, 11). The first of these has now disappeared. The second was accompanied by the verses 6–12 of Psalm xxv. This psalm is first mentioned by the medieval commentators (e. g. Durandus, loc. cit.). No doubt it was said from very early times as a private devotion obviously suitable for the occasion. We have noted that it accompanies the washing before the Liturgy in the Byzantine Rite. Benedict XIV notes that as late as his time (eighteenth century) "in some churches only some verses are said" (loc. cit.), although the Missal requires that all (that is from v. 6 to the end) be recited. Cyril of Jerusalem (loc. cit.) already explains the washing as a symbol of purity of the soul; all the medieval writers (Durandus, loc. cit.; St. Thomas Aquinas, "Summa Theol.", III, Q. lxxxiii, art. 5, ad 1^{um}; etc.) insist on this idea.

The present rule is this: At high Mass (or sung Mass), as soon as the celebrant has incensed the altar after the Offertory and has been incensed himself at the Epistle side, he remains there while his hands are washed by the acolytes, who must be waiting by the credence-table. The first acolyte pours water from the cruet over his fingers into the little dish provided, the second then hands him the towel to dry the fingers. Meanwhile he says: "Lavabo inter innocentes", etc., to the end of the psalm, with "Gloria Patri" and "Sicut erat". The Gloria is left out in Masses for the

dead and in Masses *de tempore* from Passion Sunday to Holy Saturday exclusively ("Ritus celebrandi", VII, 6, in the Missal). A bishop at high Mass wears the "precious" mitre (*mitra pretiosa*) while he is incensed and washes his hands (Cærim. Episc., II, 8, 64); in this case a larger silver jug and basin are generally used, though the "Cærimoniale Episcoporum" does not mention them. At low Mass, since there is no incense, the celebrant goes to the Epistle side and washes his hands in the same way immediately after the prayer "Veni sanctificator". For his convenience the altar-card on the Epistle side contains the prayer said when the water is blessed before it is put into the chalice ("Deus qui humanæ substantiæ") and the verses "Lavabo", etc.

GIHR, *Das heilige Messopfer* (Freiburg im Br., 1897), 502–05; BENEDICT XIV, *De SS. Missæ Sacrificio*, II, 11 (ed. SCHNEIDER, Mainz, 1879, pp. 146–48); DURANDUS, *Rationale divinorum officiorum*, IV, 28, DE HERDT, *S. Liturgiæ praxis*, I (9th ed., Louvain, 1894), 307–08; 464–65; DUCHESNE, *Origines du Culte chrétien* (Paris, 1898), 167, 443.

ADRIAN FORTESCUE.

Laval, DIOCESE OF (VALLIS GUIDONIS) includes the Department of La Mayenne. Until 1855 the territory of this diocese was annexed to Le Mans. Since the seventeenth century the creation of a See of Laval had been under consideration. A constitutional bishopric existed there for a short time during the Revolution; and two titular incumbents, Vilar and Dorlodot, occupied the position. In 1846 the creation of the see was decided upon, but was not carried out until after the death of Bishop Bouvier of Le Mans in 1854. A Bull of Pius IX, 30 June, 1855, established the See of Laval. The apologist Emile Bougaud (q. v.) was consecrated Bishop of Laval in February, 1888, and died a few months later. The request of the Holy See in 1904 for the resignation of Bishop Pierre Victor Geay (1896–1904) was one of the reasons assigned by the French Republic for breaking with the pope and preparing the separation of Church and State. During the French Revolution, Laval was captured by the Vendeans on 22 October, 1793, after which the diocese became the seat of the "Chouannerie", a movement similar to the Vendean but less aristocratic, the "Chouans" consisting almost entirely of peasants who wore a picture of the Sacred Heart of Jesus on their arm or their breast and fought for the liberty of their priests and for the royalist cause, without, however, avoiding frequent acts of brigandage. They were organized into bands by a certain Jean Cottereau, called Jean Chouan (1757–1794) and after his death continued their adventurous resistance till 1796. For the principal saints venerated in the Diocese of Laval, see LE MANS; only those whose memories are closely associated with the present confines of the diocese are here mentioned: St. Constantianus, a monk of Micy, who founded the monastery of Lassay, at the same time that St. Erneus, St. Bohemad, and St. Alveus, also monks of Micy, were founding the monasteries of Ceaulée, Saint-Bomer, Saint Auvieu in the forest of Passais, on the borders of the Departments of Mayenne and l'Orne (sixth century), the deacons Sts. Serenus and Serenic, hermits of Saulges, who belong to the seventh century. Blessed Merolus, a native of Evron and chorepiscopus of Saulges, later Bishop of Le Mans, is of the eighth century, and the hermit St. Simeon of Vaucé of the ninth. Bernier (1764–1806), Bishop of Orléans, one of the negotiators of the concordat and Cardinal de Cheverus, Bishop of Boston, Mass. and Archbishop of Bordeaux (1768–1836), were natives of the diocese.

Two councils were held at Laval in 1207 and 1242 and four at Château Gontier in 1231, 1253, 1268 and 1336 for the restoration of discipline. The principal pilgrimages in the diocese are: Notre-Dame de Priz at Laval, a shrine of great antiquity; Notre-Dame de l'Epine at Evron. About 648 a pilgrim bearing a reliquary containing a relic of the Blessed Virgin stopped at a sanctuary which had been erected in her honour by St. Thuribius, second Bishop of Le Mans, and hung the reliquary on a hawthorn bush. Subsequent miracles, it is said, induced St. Hadouindus, Bishop of Le Mans, to build there a second shrine and a monastery. In the last half century more than 100,000 people visited Notre-Dame de l'Epine. Notre-Dame des Freux at Bellebranche, Notre-Dame d'Avénières, and Notre-Dame de Courbefosse at Fougerolles date from the twelfth century. Notre-Dame des Bois at Contest dates from the fifteenth century. Notre-Dame de la Mariette at Beaumont, Notre-Dame de la Crue at St-Martin du Limet, and Notre-Dame du Chêne at St-Martin de Connée, date from the sixteenth century. Notre-Dame de la Tremblaye at Daon (since 1660), Notre-Dame de Bon Secours at Craon Saint Nicholas (since 1709), and since 1871 two important pilgrimages, Notre-Dame Auxiliatrice de la Ducraie at Burest and Notre-Dame d'Espérance at Pontmain.

Before the application of the Associations Law of 1901, there were Jesuits, Fathers of the Sacred Heart of Jesus and of the Immaculate Heart of Mary, and various orders of teaching brothers in this diocese. The Trappists are still at the monastery of Notre Dame du Port Salut, at Entrammes. The principal communities of women originating in this diocese are: the Ursulines of Château Gontier, founded in 1630 for teaching; the Hospitaller nuns of the Mercy of Jesus founded at Château Gontier in 1674; the Sisters of Our Lady of Mercy, hospitaller nuns founded in 1816 by Thérèse Agathe Rondeau, a poor working woman known as "Good Mother Thérèse"; the Sisters of Charity of Notre-Dame, teachers and hospitallers, founded in 1682 by Madame Thulard. The mother-house of this community established at Evron in 1901, counts 1700 members and 184 institutions in the Diocese of Laval and 137 outside the diocese. In 1908 there remained twenty communities of women in this see. At the close of the nineteenth century the religious orders maintained here 27 infant schools, 2 institutes for the deaf and dumb, 1 orphanage for boys and 6 for girls; 4 work rooms, 12 hospitals or alms houses; 6 houses whose members care for the sick in their homes and 4 houses for retreats. In 1908 the Diocese of Laval numbered 305,457 inhabitants; 31 parishes; 265 "succursales"; 210 vicariates, and 705 secular priests.

COUANIER DE LAUNAY, *Vie De Mgr C. Wicart, premier évêque de Laval, et histoire de l'érection de cet évêché* (Laval, 1888); BOUILLIER, *Recherches historiques sur l'église et la paroisse de la Trinité de Laval* (ibid., 1845); COUANIER DE LAUNAY, *Légendaire ou vies des saints du diocèse de Laval* (ibid., 1891); IDEM, *Pèlerinages et Sanctuaires dédiés à la Sainte Vierge dans le diocèse de Laval* (ibid., s. d.); CHEVALIER, *Topobibl.*, pp. 1647–48.

GEORGES GOYAU.

Laval FRANÇOIS DE MONTMORENCY, first bishop of Canada, b. at Montigny-sur-Avre, 30 April, 1623, of Hugues de Laval and Michelle de Péricard; d. at Quebec on 6 May, 1708. He was a scion of an illustrious family, whose ancestor was baptized with Clovis at Reims, and whose motto reads: "Dieu ayde au premier baron chrestien." He studied under the Jesuits at La Flèche, and learned philosophy and theology at their college of Clermont (Paris), where he joined a group of fervent youths directed by Father Bagot. This congregation was the germ of the Seminary of Foreign Missions, famous in the history of the Church, and of which the future seminary of Quebec was to be a sister institution. His two older brothers having died in battle, François inherited the family title and estate. But he resisted all worldly attractions and a mother's entreaties, and held fast to his vocation. After ordination (1647), he filled the office of archdeacon at Evreux. The renowned Jesuit missionary, Alexander de Rhodes, having obtained

from Innocent X the appointment of three vicars Apostolic for the East, Laval was chosen for the Tonquin mission. The Portuguese Court opposed the plan, and from 1655 to 1658 the future bishop lived at the "Hermitage" of Caen, in the practice of piety and good works, emulating the example of the prominent figures of that period of religious revival, Olier, Vincent of Paul, Bourdoise, Eudes, and others, several of whom were his intimate friends. This solitude was a fitting preamble to his apostolic career. Appointed Vicar Apostolic of New France, with the title of Bishop of Petræa, Laval was consecrated on 8 Dec., 1658, by the papal nuncio Piccolomini in the abbatial church of St-Germain-des-Prés, Paris. He landed on 16 June, 1659, at Quebec, which then counted hardly 500 inhabitants, the whole French population of Canada not exceeding 2200 souls.

Laval's first relation to the pope (1660) breathes admiration for the natural grandeur of the country, courage and hope for the future, and praise for the zeal of the Jesuits. From the outset he had to assert his authority, which was contested by the Archbishop of Rouen, from whose province came most of the colonists, and whose pretensions were favoured by the court. Laval claimed jurisdiction directly from Rome. This conflict, which caused trouble and uncertainty, was ended when the See of Quebec was definitively erected by Clement X into a regular diocese depending solely on Rome (1674). But the hardest struggle, the trial of a life-time, was against the liquor-traffic with the Indians. The problem, on whose solution depended the civilization and salvation of the aborigines and the welfare of New France, was rendered more arduous by the intense passion of the savage for firewater and the lawless greed of the white trader. Laval, after exhausting persuasive measures and consulting the Sorbonne theologians, forbade the traffic under pain of excommunication. The civil authorities pleaded in the interest of commerce, the eternal obstacle to temperance. First d'Avaugour relaxed the severity of prohibition, but, through Laval's influence at court, was recalled. De Mésy, who owed his appointment to the bishop, first favoured, but then violently opposed his authority, finally dying repentant in his arms. His successors, envious of clerical authority and overpartial to commercial interests, obtained from the king a mitigated legislation. Thus, the Intendant Talon and Frontenac, notwithstanding their statesmanship and bravery, were imbued with Gallicanism and too zealous for their personal benefit. The viceroy de Tracy, however, seconded the bishop's action.

At this period the Diocese of Quebec comprised all North America, exclusive of New England, the Atlantic sea-board, and the Spanish colonies to the West, a territory now divided into about a hundred dioceses. Laval's zeal embraced all whom he could reach by his representatives or by his personal visitations. In season and out of season, he made long and perilous journeys by land and water to minister to his flock. His fatherly kindness sustained the far-off missionary. "His heart is always with us", writes the Jesuit Dablon. He was a protector and guide to the religious houses of Quebec and Montreal. He was deeply attached to the Jesuits, his former teachers, and recalled to Canada in 1670 the Franciscan Récollets, who had first brought thither the Gospel. By the solemn baptism of Garakontié, the Iroquois chief, an efficacious promoter of the true Faith was secured among his barbarous fellow-countrymen, who received the black-robed Jesuit and gave many neophytes. Laval's foresight made him foster the most cherished devotions of the Church: belief in the Immaculate Conception, the titular of his cathedral, and the cult of the Holy Family, which flourished on Canadian soil (Encyclical of Leo XIII). He was a devout client of St. Anne, whose shrine at Beaupré was rebuilt in 1673. As a patron of education Laval occupies a foremost rank. At that early period, with a handful of colonists and scanty resources, he organized a complete system of instruction: primary, technical, and classical. His seminary (1663) and little seminary (1668) trained candidates for the priesthood.

An industrial school, founded at St-Joachim (1678), provided the colony with skilled farmers and craftsmen. To these institutions, and particularly to the seminary, destined to become the university which bears his name, he gave all his possessions, including the seigniory of Beaupré and Isle Jésus. In view of the future he built the seminary on a relatively large scale, which excited the envy and criticism of Frontenac. No regular parishes having been yet established, the clergy were attached to the seminary, and thence radiated everywhere for parochial or mission work, even as far as the Illinois. The tithes, after much discussion and opposition, had finally been limited to the twenty-sixth bushel of grain harvested, an enactment still legally in force in the Province of Quebec. These tithes were paid to the seminary, which, in return, provided labourers for Christ's vineyard.

Laval's patriotism was remarkable. The creation of the Sovereign Council in lieu of the Company of New France was greatly due to his influence, and conduced to the proper administration of justice, to the progress of colonization, and the defence of the country against the ever-increasing ferocity and audacity of the Iroquois. He later concurred in obtaining the regiment of Carignan for the last-named object (1665). Exhausted by thirty years of a laborious apostolate, and convinced that a younger bishop would work more efficaciously for God's glory and the good of souls, he resigned in 1688. His successor, Abbé de St-Vallier, a virtuous and generous prelate, did not share all his views regarding the administration. Laval might have enjoyed a well-earned retreat in France, whither he had sailed for the fourth time. He preferred returning to the scene of his labours, where many opportunities occurred of displaying his zeal during the many years of St-Vallier's absence, five of which were spent in captivity in England. During that period, the seminary was twice burned (1701 and 1705) to Laval's intense sorrow, and rebuilt through his energy and generosity. The end was near. The last three years he spent in greater retirement and humility, and died in the odour of sanctity.

His reputation for holiness, though somewhat dimmed after the Conquest, revived during the nineteenth century, and, the cause of his canonization having been introduced (1890), he now enjoys the title of Venerable. Laval has been accused of attachment to his own authority and disregard for the rights of civil authority, a reproach that savours somewhat of the Gallican spirit of the rulers of the time, and of the historians who endorsed their prejudices. The truth is that he had to protect his flock from the greed and selfishness of worldly potentates for whom material interests were often paramount; to defend the immunities of the Church against a domineering Frontenac, who pretended to arraign clerics before his tribunal, and oblige missionaries to secure a passport for each change of residence, and refused the bishop the rank due to his dignity and sanctioned by the king, in the council of which the prelate was the chief founder, the soul and life. In an age when churchmen like Mazarin and Richelieu virtually ruled the State, Laval's authority, always exercised for the country's weal, was probably not exorbitant. He was loyal to the Crown when superior rights were not contradicted, and received nought but praise from the *Grand Monarque*. The charge of ambition and arbitrariness is equally groundless. In the Sovereign Council, Laval showed prudence, wisdom, justice, moderation. His influence was always beneficent. Although firm and inflexible in the accomplishment of duty, he was ready to consult and follow competent advice. He was of

the race of Hildebrand, and to him likewise might have been applied the text: "Dilexisti justitiam et odisti iniquitatem." His sole ambition was to be a bishop according to God's heart. His spirit and practice of mortification and penance, his deep humility, his lively faith, his boundless charity towards the poor, rank him among the most holy personages.

GOSSELIN, *Vie de Mgr de Laval* (Quebec, 1890); GARNEAU, *Histoire du Canada* (Montreal, 1882); FERLAND, *Cours d'histoire du Canada* (Quebec, 1882); ROCHEMONTEIX, *Les Jésuites et la Nouvelle-France* (Paris, 1896); MARIE DE L'INCARNATION, *Lettres* (Tournai, 1876); *Souvenir des fêtes du Monument Laval* (Quebec, 1908).

LIONEL LINDSAY.

La Valette, JEAN PARISOT DE, forty-eighth Grand Master of the Order of the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem; b. in 1494; d. in Malta, 21 August, 1568. He came from an old family of Southern France, several members of which had been *capitouls* (chief magistrates) in Toulouse. When still very young he entered the Order of St. John as a knight of the Language of Provence. After the taking of Rhodes by the Sultan Soliman (1522), the order had, in 1530, settled in Malta which, with the city of Tripoli, the emperor Charles V had made over to them in full sovereignty. Here the knights devoted themselves to fighting the corsairs of Barbary, who were upheld by the Turkish Sultan. During this struggle La Valette made his first campaign, and soon rose to the highest ranks in the order. In 1537 he was appointed commander and governor of Tripoli. In that city, exposed to the attacks of the famous Dragut, chief of all the corsairs of Africa, La Valette displayed his power of organization, re-establishing discipline among the Christian and Moorish troops, driving useless persons out of the town, and punishing blasphemers. He was no longer in Tripoli when it was taken by Dragut in 1556.

La Valette was unanimously chosen (18 Aug., 1557) to succeed Claude de la Sangle as grand master. He re-established his authority over the provinces of Germany and of Venice, which had refused to pay the taxes levied by general chapters, but was unable to secure from the Council of Trent a confirmation of the order's privileges, and the restitution of commanderies usurped by Protestants. Lastly, he ardently devoted himself to fighting the Moslems. In 1560 he formed an alliance with Juan de la Cerda, Admiral of Philip II, to recover Tripoli, but the Spanish squadron wasted time in the useless conquest of the island of Jerba. The Moors of Barbary, commanded by Pialé and Dragut, destroyed 22 warships of the Christians, and 14,000 Christians were killed or died of disease. Thanks to La Valette's intrepidity, the galleys of the order were able to save several Christian ships and to capture many corsairs. At his own private expense La Valette had two galleys built and the wealthier commanders followed his example. The vessels of the order were commanded by experienced navigators, like Romegas, who knew all the ports and even the smallest bays of the Mediterranean.

This naval strength soon made itself feared by the Moors of Barbary and even by the Turks. The Knights of Malta having aided Garcia of Toledo to take possession of Valez de la Gomera (southeast of the present Spanish military station of Peñon-de-Valez in the Rif), the alarmed Moors appealed to Constantinople. Before long the Maltese squadron gained a bloody victory between the islands of Zante and Cephalonia, and captured a Turkish galleon manned by 200 janizaries and laden with precious merchandise; and within five years they had taken 50 Turkish vessels. The Sultan Soliman, exasperated, ordered all his available vessels to assemble before Malta, where Dragut and the corsairs were invited to join them. Spies were sent to examine the fortifications. Don Garcia de Toledo, Viceroy of Sicily, having obtained secret information of all this, warned La Valette and endeavoured to induce Philip II to assist in the defence of Malta. La Valette summoned all the knights of Christendom, raised 2000 men in Italy, and obtained from Don Garcia two companies of Spanish troops. The inhabitants of Malta were organized as a militia; every priory sent money, and 600 knights from all the provinces of the order hastened to the rescue. La Valette displayed extraordinary activity, planning fortifications, helping the diggers with his own hands, inspecting magazines, and attending to the smallest details. He told the assembled knights that they had now entered upon a struggle between the Gospel and the Koran. After receiving Holy Communion, all vowed to shed their blood in defence of the Faith. But the Order of Malta was poorly supported in this crisis by the Christian princes. The King of Spain alone promised assistance, which, however, was not ready when the Turkish fleet, commanded by Mustapha, appeared before Malta on 18 May, 1565. It consisted of 159 warships manned by 30,000 janizaries or spahis, and a large number of vessels were employed to carry the siege train. The defenders of Malta were 700 knights, with 8500 mercenaries and enrolled citizens and peasants.

Mustapha attacked the fort of St. Elmo, and Dragut joined him with 13 galleys. In spite of the Maltese artillery, in spite of the heroism of the besieged, the Turks succeeded in taking that fort on 23 June, after an assault lasting seven hours. Thousands of Turks and the famous Dragut died in the encounter. Mustapha, exasperated by the resistance, ordered the hearts of the wounded knights to be torn out of their bodies. La Valette, on his side, had all the Turkish prisoners beheaded and forbade any more prisoners to be taken. From that time the town proper and all the forts were surrounded. On 18 August the Turks tried to enter by a breach in the wall, but were driven back after six hours' fighting. La Valette himself, pike in hand, charged them, leading his knights. On 23 August another assault resulted in the taking of the Castille bastion, but La Valette spent that night constructing new defences. At last, on 7 September, the relieving fleet of Don Garcia de Toledo arrived. After four months of fighting, Mustapha, disheartened, raised the siege; he had lost more than 20,000 men, and abandoned his heavy artillery. Malta was saved, and the heroism of La Valette at last awakened Europe from its torpor. All the princes sent their congratulations; the pope offered him a cardinal's hat, which he refused; 300 noblemen, among them Brantôme, came and offered him their services. To protect the island from any future attack, the grand master had another town built upon the site of Fort St. Elmo (1566). This was the city of Valette (or Valletta), which made Malta impregnable, and which was still sufficiently strong in 1798 to check Bonaparte. The last years of Valette's life were saddened by conflicts with the pope, but at the time of his death, in his seventy-fourth year, he was busy preparing "for some great deed of war and of conquest" (Brantôme).

BRANTÔME, *Grands capitaines françois*, V (Paris, 1866), 215–39; IDEM, *Des Couronnels françois: Récit du voyage de Brantôme à Malte* (Paris, 1870), 407–410; *Colección de documentos inéditos*, XXVI, XXIX (Madrid, 1870) (letters of La Valette); VERLOT, *Histoire des chevaliers hospitaliers*, III, IV (Paris, 1726); FORNERON, *Histoire de Philippe II*, I (Paris, 1881), 376–89.—For bibliography of the siege of Malta, see POHLER, *Bibliotheca Historico-militaris*, I (Leipzig, 1880), 163–64.

LOUIS BRÉHIER.

Laval University of Quebec.—The University of Laval was founded in 1852 by the Seminary of Quebec; the royal charter granted to it by Queen Victoria was signed at Westminster, 8 December, 1852. By the Bull "Inter varias sollicitudines", 15 April, 1876, Pius IX completed the university by according it canonical erection together with the most extensive privileges. In virtue of this Bull the university has as its protector at Rome the Cardinal Prefect of Propaganda. The control of doctrine and discipline de-

volves upon a superior council composed of the archbishop and bishops of the Province of Quebec, under the presidency of the Archbishop of Quebec, who is himself chancellor of the university. By the terms of the royal charter the Visitor of the Laval University is always the Catholic Archbishop of Quebec, who has the right of veto in regard to all regulations and appointments. This shows in what a broad spirit the English Government permits the Catholic French Canadians, without other supervision than that of an archbishop of their Church and nationality, to organize their university education. The royal charter indeed guarantees liberty of higher education. By this charter the office of rector, the most important in the university, belongs of right to the superior of the Seminary of Quebec. This position is temporary, since the superior of the seminary, who is elected for three years and is eligible for re-election after this term, cannot hold office for more than six consecutive years, except with special authorization from the ecclesiastical authorities. The charter also provides for the establishment of a council which, conjointly with the rector, shall conduct the administration of the university. This council is composed of all the directors of the seminary and of the three oldest professors of each faculty. It is empowered to make whatever statutes and rules it judges suitable, on the sole condition that these enactments contain nothing contrary to the laws of the United Kingdom or to those of Canada.

LAVAL UNIVERSITY, MONTREAL

The university comprises the four faculties of theology, law, medicine, and arts. Each faculty is provided with a special council which discusses and submits to the university council all questions which most directly interest one or the other of these faculties. The professors of the faculty of theology are named by the visitor; all the others are appointed by the council. The degrees which may be obtained by students in each of these faculties are those of bachelor, master, licentiate, and doctor. Good conduct is an essential condition for securing degrees. In order that the greatest number of classical colleges may profit by its right of conferring diplomas granted by the royal charter, and may also take a more direct interest in its work, the university received, in virtue of a provision of this charter, the power to affiliate with itself such public educational establishments of the province as it may desire on the conditions laid down by the council. At present all the houses of secondary education in the Province of Quebec, except the Jesuit College at Montreal, have sought and obtained this affiliation. The College of St. Dunstan, Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, has also secured for its students the advantages and privileges attached to the examinations for the university baccalaureate. To Laval University are also affiliated the Polytechnic School of Montreal, the School of Dental Surgery, the School of Pharmacy, the French Veterinary School, and the Central School of Surveying of Quebec.

Conformably to a decision of the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda, dated 1 February, 1876, an extension of the faculties of the university was made in favour of Montreal, the archbishop of which was named vice-chancellor of the university. The decree "Jamdudum" of 2 February, 1889, modified in some respects the constitution of the Montreal branch of the university. The direction of this branch is now confided to a vice-rector proposed to the university council of Quebec by the bishops of the ecclesiastical Province of Montreal. The branch has thus become nearly independent of the mother university.

The academic year comprises nine months, and is divided into three terms. Instruction is given by titular professors, associate professors, and instructors. Only the titular professors are professors in the required sense of the charter, and as such may be members of the university council. The physical museum for the use of the faculty of arts at Quebec is very complete. It includes nearly fifteen hundred instruments in all the branches of physics, among them most of the apparatus for the demonstration of recent discoveries. The mineralogical museum is rich in specimens. Especially remarkable is a valuable general collection of Canadian minerals and rocks. The geological museum contains more than two thousand specimens. In the botanical museum there are a complete collection of Canadian woods used in industry, and having a commercial value, several collections of exotic woods, among others a very remarkable collection of woods sold in the English markets, and a fine collection of artificial fruits and mushrooms. The herbarium of the University of Quebec contains more than twelve thousand plants. The zoological museum contains the most important Canadian mammals. The ornithological collection comprises nearly eight hundred species, represented by more than fifteen thousand individuals. The collection of rapacious birds or birds of prey is nearly complete as regards Canadian species, not including several rare exotic specimens. The entomological collection now numbers more than fifteen thousand species of insects from all parts of the world; the numismatic museum, over eleven thousand coins and medals; the library, nearly one hundred and fifty thousand volumes. Students and strangers have access to it for purposes of study every day except Sunday. The Art Gallery contains nearly four hundred pictures, many of them of great value. Among them are canvases signed by renowned artists such as Salvator Rosa, Lesueur, Lanfranc, Poussin, Van Dyck, Puget, Vernet, Romanelli, Albano, Parrocel, Lebrun, etc.

The principal building of the University at Quebec, generally called Laval University, is that in which the courses in law and arts are held and in which the museums and the library are located. It is five stories high and more than three hundred feet long. The theological faculty resides in a more recent edifice two hundred and sixty feet long and five stories high. It accommodates over one hundred students, besides forty professors attached to the establishment. The names of the rectors of the university since its foundation are as follows: Abbé L. J. Casault, Mgr E. A.

Taschereau, Mgr M. E. Méthot, Mgr T. E. Hamel, Mgr J. C. K. Laflamme, Mgr O. E. Mathieu, and Abbé A. Gosselin. During 1908–09 four hundred and twenty-one students attended the various faculties, while the number who followed the courses at Montreal was much larger.

O. E. Mathieu.

Lavant (Lavantina), an Austrian bishopric in the southern part of Styria, suffragan of Salzburg. The original seat of the bishopric lay in the eastern part of Carinthia in the valley of the Lavant. It was here that Eberhard II, Archbishop of Salzburg, established, 20 Aug., 1212, at St. Andrä, with the consent of Pope Innocent III and Emperor Frederick II, a collegiate chapter, the canons of which followed the Rule of St. Augustine; its members were chosen from the cathedral chapter of Salzburg. On account of the great remoteness and the difficulty of travelling, the archbishop, about the year 1223, asked Pope Honorius III to allow him to found a bishopric at St. Andrä. After the pope had had the archbishop's request examined by commissioners, and had given his consent, Eberhard drew up the deed of foundation, 10 May, 1228, wherein he secured the possession of the episcopal chair for himself and his successors in perpetuity. He named as first bishop his court chaplain Ulrich, who had formerly been priest of Haus, in Styria (d. 1257).

In the deed of foundation of the new bishopric, no boundaries were defined. In a deed of Archbishop Frederick II of Salzburg of 1280, seventeen parishes, situated partly in Carinthia and partly in Styria, were described as belonging to Lavant; the extent of the diocese was rather small, but the bishops also attended to the office of vicar-general of the Archbishops of Salzburg for some scattered districts; they also frequently attended to the office of *Vicedom* (bishop's deputy in secular affairs) at Friesach. The tenth bishop, Dietrich Wolfhauer (1318–32), is mentioned in deeds as the first prince-bishop; he was also secretary of Frederick III the Handsome, of Austria, and was present at the battle of Mühldorf in 1322. Since the twenty-second bishop, Theobald Schweinbeck (1446–63), the bishops have borne without intermission the title of prince. The following prominent bishops deserve special mention: the humanist Johann I von Rott (1468–82), died as Prince-Bishop of Breslau; Georg II Agrikola (1570–84), who after 1572 was also at the same time Bishop of Seckau; Georg III Stobäus von Palmburg (1584–1618), a worthy promotor of the Counter-Reformation; Maximilian Gandolph Freiherr von Kienburg (1654–65), did much towards increasing the financial resources of the diocese.

By the new regulations under Emperor Joseph II, several bishoprics were added to the Diocese of Lavant. Prince-Archbishop Michael Brigido of Laibach in 1788 ceded a number of parishes in the southern part of what is now the Diocese of Lavant; and the district of Völkermarkt, which was afterwards again detached, was added to the bishopric at that time. The present extent of the diocese was brought about by the circumscription of 1 June, 1859. The valley of the Lavant and the district of Völkermarkt in Carinthia fell to Gurk; in consequence of which the District of Marburg was transferred from Seckau to Lavant; since then the diocese comprises the whole of southern Styria. By the decree of the Congregation of the Consistory of 20 May, 1857, the see of the bishop was removed from St. Andrä to Marburg; the parish church of St. John the Baptist in that place being erected into a cathedral, and the title "of Lavant" being preserved. On 4 Sept., 1859, Bishop Anton Martin Slomschek (1846–62) made his solemn entry into Marburg. His successors, Jakob Maximilian Stepischnegg (1862–89), and Michael Napotnik (since 1889) have shown great zeal for the promotion of the spiritual life by introducing religious orders and founding educational and charitable institutions and clubs. But the most beneficial work done for the religious life of the diocese was that of the diocesan synods, held by Stepischnegg (1883), and by Napotnik, who followed his example (1896, 1900, 1903, and 1906).

The bishopric is divided into 24 deaneries, and numbered (1909) 223 parishes, 200 chaplaincies (48 unoccupied), 7 unoccupied offices and benefices, 375 priests engaged in the cure of souls, 39 secular priests and 53 regular clergy in other positions, 37 clergy without office, 675 churches and chapels, and 521,896 souls. The cathedral chapter, which is four-fifths Slovene and one-fifth German, consists of one mitred cathedral provost, one mitred cathedral dean, and five canons. The old cathedral chapter, which was composed of the canons of the Augustinian order, was dissolved in 1808, and its property was assigned to the "Religionsfond" founded by Joseph II; in 1825 a new cathedral chapter was provisionally erected, and definitively so in 1847. Besides the actual canons, there are six stalls for honorary canons (four temporarily vacant). The council is composed of six advisors; the prince-bishop is the president. In the theological diocesan college there are eleven lecturers; the episcopal priests' seminary numbers (1909) 4 classes, with 42 students; the "Maximilianum-Viktorinum", an episcopal seminary for boys, 8 classes, with 80 students. Eight clerical teachers taught in 7 state schools.

In the diocese there are the following establishments of religious orders: 1 monastery of Minorites of Sts. Peter and Paul, at Pettau (founded 1239), with nine fathers; 4 Franciscan monasteries, with 31 fathers, 23 lay brothers, and 5 clerical novices; 1 Capuchin monastery at Cilli (founded 1611), with 6 fathers, and 4 lay brothers; 2 mission houses of the Fathers of St. Vincent de Paul, with 8 priests, and 10 lay brothers; 1 Trappist abbey, Maria Erlösung, at Reichenburg (founded 1881 by French Trappists), with 21 fathers, and 48 brothers. Orders of women: Sisters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, 82, in 6 establishments, who are dedicated to the nursing of the sick; School Sisters of the Third Order of St. Francis of Assisi, 1 motherhouse, 14 affiliated houses, 190 sisters; School Sisters from the mother-house of Algersdorf, Graz, 9, with 1 institution; 1 magdalen asylum, with 17 canonesses, and 15 lay sisters; Sisters of Mercy of the Holy Cross, 3, with one establishment; Sisters of the Teutonic Order, 9, with one hospital; 1 Carmelite Convent of Perpetual Adoration (10 sisters). The School Sisters conduct a training school for female teachers, 1 lyceum, 11 girls' schools, 5 boarding-schools, 6 kindergartens, 2 orphan asylums, 2 schools of domestic economy, and one home for servant-girls. There are 36 Catholic clubs and confraternities in the diocese, besides 25 associations for the building and adornment of churches.

The most prominent ecclesiastical buildings in the diocese are: the cathedral and parish church of St. John the Baptist, at Marburg, which was begun in the middle of the twelfth century as a Romanesque basilica, rebuilt after 1520 in the Gothic style, again restored after the fire in 1601, and once more in 1885; the provostship and parish church of St. Georg, at Pettau, erected in the Gothic style about 1314; the abbey and parish church of St. Daniel, at Cilli, dates from the middle of the sixteenth century; and the shrine of St. Maria der Wüste, in the neighbourhood of Marburg (built 1628), in the baroque style.

Tangl, *Reihe der Bischöfe von Lavant* (Klagenfurt, 1841); Stepischnegg, *Georg III. Stobäus von Palmburg, Fürstbischof von Lavant* in *Archiv. für Kunde österreichischer Geschichtsquellen* (1856); *Gesta et Statuta Synod. diœcesanæ, 1896* (Marburg, 1897); *Die Zweite Diœcesansynode* (Marburg, 1896); *Ecclesiæ Lavantinæ Synodus diœcesana 1903* (Marburg, 1904); *Synodus diœcesana 1906* (Marburg, 1907); *Kirchliches Verordnungsblatt für die Lavanter Diœcese; Personalstand des Bistums Lavant in Steiermark für das Jahr 1909* (Marburg, 1909).

Joseph Lins.

Laverdière, CHARLES-HONORÉ, French-Canadian historian, b. at Chateau-Richer, Province of Quebec, 1826; d. at Quebec, 1873. After his ordination (1851) he was attached to the Quebec Seminary, where he had studied the classics and theology, and he remained there till his death. He utilized his varied talents in teaching belles-lettres, physics, chemistry, mathematics, music, and drawing. His favourite pursuits were Canadian history and archæology. Although his original writings were few, including a school history of Canada and some historical pamphlets, he supervised the re-editing of several most important works, which are the very sources of Canadian history. Conspicuous among these are the "Relations des Jésuites" (1858), with erudite and exhaustive analytical tables; the "Journal des Jésuites" (1871); and finally, the realization of his most ardent wish, "Les Œuvres de Champlain" of which he wrote the introduction and countless annotations of great historical exactness and value. He often spent a day in verifying a single date or the spelling of a name. When the recently completed edition was entirely destroyed by fire, Laverdière calmly remarked that some misprints that had escaped his vigilance might be avoided in a new edition. His thorough knowledge of plain-song enabled him to publish a series of liturgical works. He was of a mild and amiable character, esteemed by all who knew him. His mastery of Canadian history, especially the period from 1500 to 1700, gave his assertions great authority.

Annuaire de l'Université Laval (Quebec, 1874); FAUCHER DE ST-MAURICE, *L'Abbé Charles-Honoré Laverdière* (Quebec, 1874).

LIONEL LINDSAY.

Lavérendrye, PIERRE GAULTIER DE VARENNES, SIEUR DE, discoverer of the Canadian West, b. at Three Rivers, Quebec, 17 Nov., 1685; d. at Montreal, 6 Dec., 1749. His early manhood was passed as a soldier in the service of France, and he was wounded on the battlefield of Malplaquet. Later he returned to his native country and engaged in the fur trade. As a step towards the exploration of the Pacific, or the Western Sea as it was then called, he established three trading posts west of Lake Superior, i. e. Forts St. Pierre, on Rainy River (1731), St. Charles on the Lake of the Woods (1732), and Maurepas, at the mouth of the Winnipeg River (1734). A sincere Christian, and having at heart his own religious interests as well as those of his men, he had taken with him Father Charles M. Mesaiger, a Jesuit, who did not go farther than the Lake of the Woods, where he was succeeded, in the summer of 1735, by Father Jean P. Aulneau de La Touche.

This young priest having temporarily left for the east (8 June, 1736) with Lavérendrye's eldest son, Jean-Baptiste, and nineteen "voyageurs", in quest of much needed provisions, the entire party was slain on an island of the Lake of the Woods on the very day of their departure. Lavérendrye prudently resisted the pressing solicitations of the natives, burning to avenge on the Sioux, the authors of the massacre, the wrong done to the French. Then, in spite of his many debts occasioned by explorations and establishments for which he had no other funds than the desultory returns of the fur trade in an unorganized country, he went on with the task entrusted to his patriotism by the French court. On 24 September, 1738, he reached the exact spot where now stands Winnipeg, and, ascending the Assiniboine to the present site of Portage la Prairie, he built there a post which he called Fort La Reine. Thence he made for the south, and by the end of 1738 he was at a Mandan village on the Upper Missouri. Early in the spring of the following year, he sent north one of his sons, who discovered Lakes Manitoba, Dauphin, Winnipegosis, and Bourbon, and erected a fort on Lake Dauphin. Meantime Lavérendrye had had to repair to Montreal to come to an understanding with his creditors. On his return to the west he took with him the Jesuit Father Claude G. Coquart, the first priest to see the confluence of the Assiniboine with the Red River and reside at what is now Portage la Prairie (1741). In the spring of 1742 he commissioned two of his sons, Pierre Gauthier, *dit* the Chevalier, and François, to explore the country as far west as they could possibly go. In the company of savages who had never seen a white man, they reached, after many perils, one of the spurs of the Rocky Mountains, which they partially scaled (12 Jan.,1743). The desertion of their native guides, terrified at the unexpected discovery of a village of their traditional enemies, alone prevented further progress. The explorers must have penetrated to a point in the northwest corner of what is now Montana. Lavérendrye was naturally endowed, it is true, with indomitable energy, but he was struggling against too heavy odds. Dragged before the law courts by the Montreal merchants whom he could not pay, and accused by others of thinking more of filthy lucre than of discoveries, and ill sustained by the Paris authorities, he had to give up his work (1744), after consecrating to it the thirteen best years of his life. Gradually his worth became recognized at Paris, and honours were bestowed upon him by the French king. He was on the eve of resuming his explorations when he died, and was buried in the vault of Notre-Dame, Montreal.

An upright man and a good Christian, Lavérendrye was considerably more than a mere explorer. No less than six fur-trading stations attested to his efficiency as an organizer. On the other hand, the numerous personnel of "voyageurs" whom these posts necessitated eventually gave rise to that wonderful race, the Métis, which was in after years to play such an important part in the history of Central Canada.

DUGAS, *L'Ouest Canadien* (Montreal, 1896); LAUT, *Pathfinders of the West* (Toronto, 1904); PRUD'HOMME, *Pierre G. de Varennes, Sieur de La Vérendrye* (Ottawa, 1905); BURPEE, *The Search for the Western Sea* (Toronto, 1908); MARSH, *Where the Buffalo roamed* (Toronto, 1908); MORICE, *Dictionnaire historique des Canadiens et des Métis Français de l'Ouest* (Quebec, 1908); IDEM, *History of the Catholic Church in Western Canada* (Toronto, 1910).

A. G. MORICE.

Laverlochère, JEAN-NICOLAS, missionary, b. at St. Georges d'Espérance, Grenoble, France, 6 Dec., 1812; d. at Temiscaming, Canada, 4 Oct., 1884. He began his religious life as a lay brother in the Congregation of the Oblates, but feeling called to evangelize the natives of Canada, he was allowed to study for the priesthood, and was ordained 5 May, 1844, at L'Acadie, near Montreal. He was sent in succession to Abittibbi, Moose Factory, and other posts on Hudson Bay, where he laboured for the conversion of the native tribes. Alone, or in collaboration with others, he published a number of devotional books in Indian. His letters in the "Annales de la Propagation de la Foi" attracted wide attention, and his reputation as a zealous missionary spread throughout Catholic Europe to such an extent that he was ultimately recognized as the Apostle of Hudson Bay. A stroke of palsy interrupted his labours in the course of 1851.

SOULLERIN, *Le Père Laverlochère* (Paris, s. d.); *Annales de la Propagation de la Foi*, passim.

A. G. MORICE.

Lavialle, PETER JOSEPH. See LOUISVILLE, DIOCESE OF.

Lavigerie, CHARLES-MARTIAL-ALLEMAND, French cardinal, b. at Huire near Bayonne, 13 Oct., 1825; d. at Algiers, 27 Nov., 1892. He studied at the diocesan seminary of Larressore, then went to St. Nicolas-du-Chardonnet in Paris, and finally to St. Sulpice. Ordained on 2 June, 1849, he devoted the first years of

his priesthood to higher studies at the newly founded Ecole des Carmes, taking at the Sorbonne the doctorates of letters (1850), and of theology (1853), to which he added later the Roman doctorates of civil and canon law. Appointed chaplain of Sainte-Geneviève in 1853, associate professor of church history at the Sorbonne in 1854, and titular of the chair in 1857, Lavigerie did not confine his activity to his chaplaincy or chair, but took a leading part in the organization of the students' cercles catholiques, and of l'œuvre des écoles d'Orient. As director of the latter he collected large sums for the benefit of the Oriental Christians persecuted by the Druses, and even went to Syria to superintend personally the distribution of the funds (1860). His brilliant services were rewarded by rapid promotion, first in 1861 to the Roman Rota, and two years later to the See of Nancy. From the beginning of his episcopate he displayed that genius of organization which is the characteristic of his life. The foundation of colleges at Vic, Blamont, and Lunéville; the establishment at Nancy of a higher institute for clerics and of a Maison d'étudiants for law students; the organization of the episcopal curia: the publication of the "Recueil des Ordonnances épiscopales, statuts et règlements du diocèse de Nancy", were but the first fruits of a promising episcopate, when he was transferred to Algiers on 27 March, 1867.

CARDINAL LAVIGERIE
Léon Bonnat, Paris Salon, 1888

As Archbishop of Algiers he promptly reversed the policy of neutrality towards the Moslems imposed upon his predecessors by the French authorities, and inaugurated a strong movement of assimilation and conversion. With the help of the White Fathers and of the White Sisters, whom he founded for the purpose, he established and maintained at great cost orphan asylums, industrial schools, hospitals, and agricultural settlements, wherein the Arabs could be brought under the influence of the Gospel. Appointed as early as 1868 Apostolic Delegate of Western Sahara and the Sudan, he began in 1874 the work of southward expansion which was to bring his heroic missionaries into the very heart of the Dark Continent, and result in the erection of five vicariates Apostolic in Equatorial Africa. To those many burdens—made heavier by the consequences (felt even in Algeria) of the Franco-Prussian war, the withdrawal of government financial support, and the threatened extension to the African colonies of anti-religious legislation passed in France—Lavigerie added other cares: the administration of the Diocese of Constantina, 1871; the foundation at St. Anne of Jerusalem of a clerical seminary for the Oriental missions, 1878, and, after the occupation of Tunis by France, the government of that vicariate. Cardinal in 1881, he became the first primate of the newly restored See of Carthage in 1884, retaining meanwhile the See of Algiers. "I shall not seek one day's rest" was the remark of Lavigerie when he landed on African soil. He carried out that promise to the letter. While Notre-Dame d'Afrique at Algiers, the Basilica of St. Louis at Carthage, and the Cathedral of St. Vincent de Paul at Tunis will stand as monuments of his prodigious activity in Africa, his labours ranged far beyond the vast territories placed under his jurisdiction. Klein (Le Cardinal Lavigerie, p. 268) describes minutely the many ways in which he served the best interests of France in, and out of, Africa. He will, however, be best remembered by the leading rôle he played in furthering the policy of Leo XIII with regard to French Catholics, and in promoting the anti-slavery movement.

Tinctured with Gallicanism through his early association with the Sorbonne, Lavigerie modified his views during his stay at Rome, and his attitude at the Vatican Council is fully expressed by the promise he made his clergy "to be with Peter". When Leo XIII, by his Encyclicals "Nobilissima Gallorum gens" of 8 Feb., 1884, and "Sapientiæ æternæ" of 3 Feb., 1890, directed the French Catholics to rally to the Republic, he generously put aside other political affiliations and again "was with Peter". A great sensation was created when at Algiers, on 12 Nov., 1890, he proclaimed before a vast assemblage of French officials the obligation for French Catholics of sincerely adhering to the republican form of government. The famous "toast d'Alger" was the object of harsh criticism and even vituperation from the monarchist element. With his usual vehemence Cardinal Lavigerie answered by his "Lettre à un catholique", in which he not only impugned the pretenders —the Comte de Chambord, the Comte de Paris, and Prince Napoléon—but even hinted that monarchy was an outgrown institution. In this he may have gone too far, but in the main point it was proved later by Cardinal Rampolla's letter of 28 November, 1890, and Pope Leo's Encyclical "Inter innumeras" of 16 Feb., 1892, that Lavigerie had been the self-sacrificing spokesman of the pope.

The suppression of slavery had been the subject of Lavigerie's first pastoral letter at Algiers. When Leo XIII in his Encyclical to the bishops of Brazil (5 May, 1888) appealed to the world in behalf of the slaves, the Primate of Carthage was the first to respond. In spite of age and infirmities he visited the capitals of Europe, telling of the horrors of African slavery and urging the formation of anti-slavery societies. The international "Conférence" of Brussels, 1890, practically adopted Lavigerie's suggestions as to the best means of achieving the desired abolition, and the "Congrès de Paris", called the same year by the cardinal himself, showed great enthusiasm and verified Lavigerie's saying: "pour sauver l'Afrique intérieure, il faut soulever la colère du monde."

After the "toast d'Alger" and the "Congrès de Paris", Lavigerie, broken in health, retired to Algiers. His last two years were saddened by the often unjust criticism of his cherished project—the "frères pionniers du Sahara"—the death of many of his missionaries, and, above all, the passing of Uganda under the control of the sectarian Imperial East-African Company. He died at Algiers as preparations were being made for the twenty-fifth anniversary of his African episcopate. The daily press throughout the world eulogized him, who had forbidden all eulogies at his funeral, and the "Moniteur de Rome" rightly

summarized his life by saying that, in a few years of incredible activity, he had laid out work for generations. An able scholar and an orator of the first order, Lavigerie was also a writer. Besides some scholastic productions destined for his pupils at the École des Carmes (1848), we have from his pen a doctorate thesis: "Essai sur l'école chrétienne d'Edesse" (Paris, 1850); several contributions to the "Bibliothèque pieuse et instructive à l'usage de la jeunesse chrétienne" (Paris, 1853); "Exposé des erreurs doctrinales du Jansénisme" (Paris, 1858), an abridgment of his lessons at the Sorbonne; "Decreta concilii provincialis Algeriensis in Africa" (1873); a large number of discourses, pamphlets, or reports, some of which were embodied in the two volumes of his "Œuvres choisies" (Paris, 1884); "Documents pour la fondation de l'œuvre antiesclavagiste" (St. Cloud, 1889), etc.

BAUNARD, *Le Cardinal Lavigerie* (Paris, 1896 and 1898); KLEIN, *Le Cardinal Lavigerie et ses œuvres d'Afrique* (Tours, 1891 and 1897); DE LACOMBE, *Le Card. Lavigerie* in *Le Correspondant* (Sept., 1909); DE COLEVILLE, *Le Cardinal Lavigerie* (Paris, 1905); PAGES, *Le Cardinal Lavigerie, sa vie, ses écrits, sa doctrine* in *Gloires Sacerdotales Contemporaines* (Paris, s. d.); GRUSSENMEYER, *Vingt-cinq années d'episcopat* (Paris, 1888). See also PIOLET, *Les Missions d'Afrique* (Paris, 1908), and such periodicals as the *Bulletin des Missions d'Alger*, the *Missions d'Afrique des Pères Blancs*, the *Bulletin officiel de la Société antiesclavagiste de France*.

J. F. SOLLIER.

Lavigne, CHARLES. See TRINCOMALI, DIOCESE OF.

Lavoisier, ANTOINE-LAURENT, chemist, philosopher, economist; b. in Paris, 26 August, 1743; guillotined 8 May, 1794. He was the son of Jean-Antoine Lavoisier, a lawyer of distinction, and Emilie Punctis, who belonged to a rich and influential family, and who died when Antoine-Laurent was five years old. His early years were most carefully guarded by his aunt, Mlle Constance Punctis, to whom he was devotedly attached; and through her assistance he was secured the advantage of a good education. He attended the Collège Mazarin, which was noted for its faculty of science, and here he studied mathematics and astronomy under Abbé de la Caille, who had built an observatory at the college after having won renown by measuring an arc of the meridian at the Cape of Good Hope, by determining the length of the second's pendulum, and by his catalogue of the stars. Young Lavoisier also received instruction from Bernard de Jussieu in botany, from Guettard in geology and mineralogy, and from Rouelle in chemistry. In logic he was influenced by the writings of Abbé de Condillac, as he frequently acknowledges in his "Traité Elémentaire de Chimie". He began his career by entering the profession of the law, but soon abandoned this to return to his favourite studies of chemistry and mineralogy. His first scientific communication to the Academy was upon the composition and properties of gypsum and plaster of Paris, and this is to-day a classic and a valuable contribution to our knowledge of crystallizing cements. He early learned to look to the balance for help in the definition of facts, and found its great value particularly when he began to study the phenomena we now know under the terms *combustion* or oxidation, and *reduction* or deoxidation.

The most advanced chemical philosophers of his day taught that there was something in every combustible substance which was driven out by the burning, that the reduction of an oxide of a metal to the metallic state meant the absorption of this substance or principle, which Stahl had called phlogiston. Lavoisier studied the teaching of the phlogistonists, but having also a mastery of physics and of pneumatic experimentation he became dissatisfied with their theory. He seized upon two important discoveries, that of oxygen by Priestley (1774), and that of the compound nature of water by Cavendish (1781) and by a masterly stroke of genius reconciled discordant appearances and threw the light of day upon every phase of the world's reacting elements. His theory, for a long time thereafter known as the antiphlogists' theory, was really the reverse of that of the phlogistonists, and was simply that something ponderable was absorbed when combustion took place; that it was obtained from the surrounding air; that the increase in the weight of a metallic substance when burned was equal to the decrease in the weight of the air used; that most substances thus burning were converted into acids, or metals into metallic oxides. Priestley had called this absorbed substance or gas dephlogisticated air; Scheele called it empyreal air; Lavoisier "air strictly pure" or "very respirable air" as distinct from the other and non-respirable constituent of the atmosphere. Later, he called it oxygen because it was acid-making (ὀξύς, and γείνομαι).

So great a change ensued in experimental chemistry, and in theory and nomenclature, and such a mass of facts was co-ordinated and explained by Lavoisier that he has been justly called "the father of modern chemistry".

ANTOINE-LAURENT LAVOISIER

He was the first to explain definitely, the formation of acids and salts, to enunciate the principle of conservation as set forth by chemical equations, to develop quantitative analysis, gas analysis, and calorimetry, and to create a consistent system of chemical nomenclature. He made deep researches in organic chemistry, and studied the metabolism of organic compounds. His memoirs and contributions to the Academy were of extraordinary number and variety. His life in other fields was romantic, full of interest and a social triumph, but sadly destined to end in tragedy. Happily married, and having the aid of his wife even to the extent of employing her in the prosecution and recording of his experiments, he drew around his fireside and to his library at the State Gunpowder Works a circle of brilliant French savants and distinguished travellers from other lands. Early in his career he felt the need of increasing his resources to meet the necessities caused by his scientific experiments. With this in view he became a deputy *fermier-général*, whereby his income was much increased. But joining this association of State-protected tax-collectors only prepared the way for many years of bitter attack and a share of the public odium attaching to their privilege. He headed many public commissions requiring scientific investigation, he aimed at bringing France to such a state of agricultural and industrial expansion that the peasant and the working-man would have profitable employment and the small landed proprietor relief from burdensome taxes hitherto purposely increased to make grants to corrupt favourites of the Court. Having incurred the hatred of Marat he found himself, together with his fellow *fermiers-général*, growing more and more unpopular during the terrible days of the Revolution. Finally in 1794 he was imprisoned with twenty-seven others. A farcical trial speedily followed, in which he was charged with "incivism" in that he had damaged public health by adding water to tobacco. He and his companions, amongst them Jacques Alexis Paulze, his father-in-law, were con-

demned to death. Lavoisier, who was devotedly attached to him, was obliged to stand and see M. Paulze's head fall under the guillotine, 8 May, 1794. Lavoisier was then 51 years old. His biographers say little as to his last hours. Grimaux relates that all the condemned men were silent and carried themselves with dignity and courage in the face of death. What Lavoisier's sentiments were can be assumed from a passage in Grimaux (p. 53) who had been the first biographer to obtain access to Lavoisier's papers. "Raised in a pious family which had given many priests to the Church, he had held to his beliefs. To Edward King, an English author who had sent him a controversial work, he wrote, 'You have done a noble thing in upholding revelation and the authenticity of the Holy Scriptures, and it is remarkable that you are using for the defence precisely the same weapons which were once used for the attack.'" His goods and chattels and all his scientific instruments were listed and appropriated on the day following his execution, though Mme Lavoisier succeeded in having some restored to her. She was childless and long survived him.

THORPE in *Contemporary Review, Antoine Laurent Lavoisier* (Dec., 1890); GRIMAUX, *Lavoisier 1743–1794* (Paris, 1888); THORPE, *Priestley, Cavendish, Lavoisier and La Revolution Chimique* in *Brit. Assoc. Address* (Leeds, 1890); BERTHELOT, *La Revolution Chimique* (Paris, 1890); KOPP, *Entdeckung der Chemie in der neueren Zeit* (1874); HÖFER, *Histoire de la Chimie*, II, 490; VON MEYER, *Geschichte der Chemie* (Leipzig, 1888); LAVOISIER, *Mémoires de Chimie* (1805); *Œuvres de Lavoisier*, published by the Ministry of Public Instruction (Paris, 1864–8); DUMAS, *Leçons sur la Philosophie Chimique*.

C. F. MCKENNA.

Law.—I. CONCEPT OF LAW.—A. By law in the widest sense is understood that exact guide, rule, or authoritative standard by which a being is moved to action or held back from it. In this sense we speak of law even in reference to creatures that are incapable of thinking or willing and to inanimate matter. The Book of Proverbs (ch. viii) says of Eternal Wisdom that it was present when God prepared the heavens and when with a certain law and compass He enclosed the depths, when He encompassed the sea with its bounds and set a law to the waters that they should not pass their limits. Job (xxviii, 25 sqq.) lauds the wisdom of God Who made a weight for the winds and weighed the water by measure, Who gave a law for the rain and a way for the sounding storms.

Daily experience teaches that all things are driven by their own nature to assume a determinate, constant attitude. Investigators of the natural sciences hold it to be an established truth that all nature is ruled by universal and constant laws and that the object of the natural sciences is to search out these laws and to make plain their reciprocal relations in all directions. All bodies are subject, for example, to the law of inertia, i. e. they persist in the condition of rest or motion in which they may be until an external cause changes this condition. Kepler discovered the laws according to which the planets move in elliptical orbits around the sun, Newton the law of gravitation by which all bodies attract in direct proportion to their mass and inversely as to the square of the distance between them. The laws which govern light, heat, and electricity are known to-day. Chemistry, biology, and physiology have also their laws. The scientific formulæ in which scholars express these laws are only laws in so far as they state what processes actually take place in the objects under consideration, for law implies a practical rule according to which things act. These scientific formulæ exert of themselves no influence on things; they simply state the condition in which these things are. The laws of nature are nothing but the forces and tendencies to a determinate, constant method of activity implanted by the Creator in the nature of things, or the unvarying, homogeneous activity itself which is the effect of that tendency. The word *law* is used in this latter sense when it is asserted that a natural law has been changed or suspended by a miracle. For the miracle does not change the nature of things or their constant tendency; the Divine power simply prevents the things from producing their natural effect, or uses them as means to attaining an effect surpassing their natural powers. The natural tendency to a determinate manner of activity on the part of creatures that have neither the power to think nor to will can be called law for a twofold reason: first, because it forms the decisive reason and the controlling guide for the activities of such creatures, and consequently as regards irrational creatures fulfils the task which devolves upon law in the strict sense as regards rational beings; and further, because it is the expression and the effect of a rational lawgiving will. Law is a principle of regulation and must, like every regulation, be traced back to a thinking and willing being. This thinking and willing being is the Creator and Regulator of all things, God Himself. It may be said that the natural forces and tendencies placed in the nature of creatures, are themselves the law, the permanent expression of the will of the Eternal Overseer Who influences creatures and guides them to their appointed ends, not by merely external influences but by their innate inclinations and impulses.

B. In a stricter and more exact sense law is spoken of only in reference to free beings endowed with reason. But even in this sense the expression law is used sometimes with a wider, sometimes with a more restricted meaning. By law are at times understood all authoritative standards of the action of free, rational beings. In this sense the rules of the arts, poetry, grammar, and even the demands of fashion or etiquette are called laws. This is, however, an inexact and exaggerated mode of expression. In the proper and strict sense laws are the moral norms of action, binding in conscience, set up for a public, self-governing community. This is probably the original meaning of the word *law*, whence it was gradually transferred to the other kinds of laws (natural laws, laws of art). Law can in this sense be defined with St. Thomas Aquinas (Summa Theol., I–II, Q. xc, a. 4) as: A regulation in accordance with reason promulgated by the head of a community for the sake of the common welfare.

Law is first a regulation, i. e. a practical principle, which aims at ordering the actions of the members of the community. To obtain in any community a unified and systematized co-operation of all there must be an authority that has the right to issue binding rules as to the manner in which the members of the community are to act. The law is such a binding rule and draws its constraining or obligatory force from the will of the superior. Both because the superior wills and so far as he wills, is law binding. Not every regulation of the superior, however, is binding, but only those in accordance with reason. Law is the criterion of reasonable action and must, therefore, itself be reasonable. A law not in accordance with reason is a contradiction. That the Divine laws must of necessity be reasonable and just is self-evident, for the will of God is essentially holy and just and can only command what is in harmony with the Divine wisdom, justice, and holiness. Human laws, however, must be subordinate to the Divine law, or at least, must not contradict it, for human authority is only a participation in the supreme Divine power of government, and it is impossible that God could give human beings the right to issue laws that are unreasonable and in contravention of His will. Further, law must be advantageous to the common welfare. This is a universally acknowledged principle. That the Divine laws are advantageous to the common welfare needs no proof. The glory of the Creator is, truly, the final goal of the Divine laws, but God desires to attain this glory by the happiness of mankind. Human laws must also be useful to the common wel-

fare. For laws are imposed upon the community as such, in order to guide it to its goal; this goal, however, is the common welfare. Further, laws are to regulate the members of the community. This can only come about by all striving to attain a common goal. But this goal can be no other than the common welfare. Consequently all laws must in some way serve the common welfare. A law plainly useless or a fortiori injurious to the community is no true law. It could have in view only the benefit of private individuals and would consequently subordinate the common welfare to the welfare of individuals, the higher to the lower.

Law therefore is distinguished from a command or precept by this essential application to the common welfare. Every law is a form of command but not every command is a law. Every binding rule which a superior or master gives to his subordinates is a command; the command, however, is only a law when it is imposed upon the community for the attainment of the common welfare. In addition, the command can be given for an individual person or case. But law is a permanent, authoritative standard for the community, and it remains in force until it is annulled or set aside. Another condition of law is that it should proceed from the representative of the highest public authority, be this a single person, several persons, or finally the totality of all the members of the community, as in a democracy. For law is, as already said, a binding rule which regulates the community for the attainment of the common welfare. This regulation pertains either to the whole community itself or to those persons in the highest position upon whom devolves the guidance of the whole community. No order or unity would be possible if private individuals had the liberty to impose binding rules on others in regard to the common welfare. This right must be reserved to the supreme head of the community. The fact that law is an emanation of the highest authority, or is issued by the presiding officer of the community by virtue of his authority, is what distinguishes it from mere counsels, requests, or admonitions, which presuppose no power of jurisdiction and can, moreover, be addressed by private persons to others and even to superiors. Laws, finally, must be promulgated, i. e. made known to all. Law in the strict sense is imposed upon rational, free beings as a controlling guide for their actions; but it can be such only when it has been proclaimed to those subject to it. From this arises the general axiom: *Lex non promulgata non obligat*—a law which has not been promulgated is not binding. But it is not absolutely necessary to promulgation that the law be made known to every individual; it suffices if the law be proclaimed to the community as such, so that it can come to the notice of all members of the community. Besides, all laws do not require the same kind of promulgation. At present, laws are considered sufficiently promulgated when they are published in official journals (State or imperial gazettes, law records, etc.).

In addition to the moral law as treated above, it is customary to speak of moral laws in a wider sense. Thus it is said it is a moral law that no one is willingly deceived, that no one lies without a reason, that every one strives to learn the truth. But it is only in an unreal and figurative sense that these laws are called moral. They are in reality only the natural laws of the human will. For although the will is free, it remains subject to certain inborn tendencies and laws, within which bounds alone it acts freely, and these laws are called moral only because they bear on the activities of a free will. Therefore they are not expressed by an imperative "must". They merely state that by reason of inborn tendencies, men are accustomed to act in a given way, and that such laws are observed even by those who have no knowledge of them.

To understand still better the significance of moral law in the strict sense, henceforth the sole sense intended in this article, two conditions of such law should be considered. It exists first in the intellect and will of the lawgiver. Before the lawgiver issues the law he must apprehend it in his mind as a practical principle, and at the same time perceive that it is a reasonable standard of action for his subjects and one advantageous to the common welfare. He must then have the will to make the observance of this principle obligatory on those under him. Finally, he must make known or intimate to those under him this principle or authoritative standard as the expression of his will. Strictly construed, legislation in the active sense consists in this last act, the command of the superior to the inferiors. This command is an act of the reason, but it necessarily presupposes the aforesaid act of the will and receives from the latter its entire obligatory force. The law, however, does not attain this obligatory force until the moment it is made known or proclaimed to the community. And this brings us to the point that law can be considered objectively, as it exists apart from the lawgiver. At this stage law exists either in the mind of the subjects or in any permanent token which preserves the memory of it, e. g. as found in a collection of laws. Such outward tokens, however, are not absolutely necessary to law. God has written the natural moral law, at least in its most general outlines, in the hearts of all men, and it is obligatory without any external token. Further, an external, permanent token is not absolutely necessary for human laws. It suffices if the law be made known to the subjects, and such knowledge can be attained by oral tradition.

II. Obligation Imposed by Law.—Law (in the strict sense) and command are pre-eminently distinguished from other authoritative standards of action, inasmuch as they imply obligation. Law is a bond imposed upon the subjects by which their will is bound or in some way brought under compulsion in regard to the performance or the omission of definite actions. Aristotle, therefore, said long ago that law has a compelling force. And St. Paul (Rom., xiii, 1 sqq.) teaches that we are bound to obey the ordinances of the authorities not only through fear but also for conscience' sake. In what then does this obligation which law imposes upon us consist? Modern ethical systems which seek to construct a morality independent of God and religion, are here confronted by an inexplicable riddle. The utmost pains have been taken to construct a true obligation without regard to God. According to Kant our reason itself is the final source of obligation, it obliges us of itself, it is nomothetic and autonomous, and the absolute form in which it commands us is the categorical imperative. We are obliged to fulfil the law only on account of itself or because it is the law of our reason; to do something because another has commanded us is not moral, even should this other be God. This view is entirely untenable. We do not owe obedience to the laws of Church and State because we bind ourselves thereto, but because their superior authority obliges us. The child owes obedience to its parents not because it engages so to do but because the authority of the parents obliges it. Whoever asserts that man can bind only himself, strikes at the root of all authority and asserts the principle of anarchism. Authority is the right to issue to others binding, obligatory regulations. Whoever maintains that none can put more than himself under obligation denies, thereby, all authority. What is said of human authority is equally valid of the Divine authority. We owe adoration, obedience, and love to God, not because we engage so to do, but because God obliges us by His commands. The assertion that to do something because God has commanded us is heteronomy (subjection to the law of another) and therefore not moral, implies in principle

the destruction of all religion, which in its essence rests upon the subjection of the creature to his Creator.

The adherents of the Kantian autonomy can also be asked whether man binds himself of necessity or voluntarily? If voluntarily, then he can at any moment annul this obligation; consequently, in a practical sense, no obligation exists. If of necessity, the question arises whence comes this necessity to bind oneself unconditionally? To this question Kant has no answer to give. He refers us to an undemonstrable and incomprehensible necessity. He says: "All human reason is incapable of explaining how pure reason may be practical (imposing obligation). . . . Thus, it is true, we do not comprehend the practical, unconditioned necessity of the moral imperative, but we do, however, comprehend its incomprehensibility, which is all that can, in fairness, be demanded from a philosophy that seeks to reach the principles which mark the limit of human reason" ["Grundleg. zur Metaphys. der Sitten", ed. Hartenstein, IV (1838), 91–93]. Kant, who without hesitation sets aside all Christian mysteries, in this way imposes upon us in philosophy a mystery of his own invention. Kant's views contain a germ of truth, which, however, they distort until it can no longer be recognized. In order that a human law may be obligatory upon us we must have in ourselves from the beginning the conviction that we are to do good and avoid evil, that we are to obey rightful authority, etc. But the further question now arises, whence do we receive this conviction? From God, our Creator. Just as our whole being is an image of God, so also is our reason with its powers and inborn tendencies an image of the Divine Reason, and our cognitions which we involuntarily form in consequence of natural tendency are a participation in the Divine wisdom,—are, it may be said, a streaming in of the Divine light into the created reason. This is, indeed, not to be so understood as though we had innate ideas, but rather that the ability and inclination are inborn in us by virtue of which we spontaneously form universal concepts and principles, both in the theoretical and practical order, and easily discern that in these practical principles the will of the Supreme Director of all things manifests itself.

The Kantian philosophy has now but few adherents; most champions of independent ethics seek to explain the origin of duty by experience and development. Typical of writers on ethics of this school are the opinions of Herbert Spencer. This philosopher of evolution believed that he had discovered already in animals, principally in dogs, evidences of conscience, especially the beginnings of the consciousness of duty, the idea of obligation. This consciousness of duty is further developed in men by the accumulation of experiences and inheritance. Duty presents itself to us as a restraint of our actions. There are, however, several varieties of such restraints. The inner restraint is developed by induction, inasmuch as we discern by repeated experience that certain actions have useful, others injurious results. In this way we are attracted to the one, and frightened away from the other. Added to this is the external restraint, the fear of evil results or punishments which threaten us from without and are threefold in form. In the earliest stages of development man has to abstain from actions through fear of the anger of uncivilized associates (social sanction). At a higher stage man must avoid many actions, because such would be punished by a powerful and bold associate who has succeeded in making himself chief (state sanction). Finally, we have in addition the fear of the spirits of the dead, especially of the dead chiefs, who, it was believed, lingered near and still inflicted punishment upon many actions displeasing to them (religious sanction). The external restraint, i. e. the fear of punishment, created in mankind, as yet little developed, the concept of compulsion, of obligation in relation to certain actions. This concept originally arose only in regard to actions which were quickly followed by external punishments. Gradually, by association of ideas, it was also connected with other actions until then performed or avoided purely on account of their natural consequences. Through evolution, however, he goes on to say, the idea of compulsion, owing only to confusion or false generalization, tends to disappear and eventually is found only in rare cases. Spencer claimed to have found, even to-day, here and there men who regularly do good and avoid evil without any idea of compulsion. Most modern writers on ethics, who do not hold to a positive Christian point of view, adopt these Spencerian ideas, e. g. Laas, von Gizycki, Paulsen, Leslie, Fouillée, and many others. Spencer and his followers are nevertheless wrong, for their explanation of duty rests on entirely untenable premises. It presupposes that the animal has already a conscience, that man does not differ essentially from the animal, that he has gradually developed from a form of animal, that he possesses no essentially higher spiritual powers, etc. Moreover, their explanation of duty is meaningless. No one will assert of a man that he acts from duty if he abstains from certain actions through fear of police penalties, or the anger of his fellow-men. Besides, what is the meaning of an obligation that is only an accidental product of evolution, destined to disappear with the progress of the latter, and for disregarding which we are responsible to no superior?

In contrast with these modern and untenable hypotheses the Christian theistic conception of the world explained long since the origin and nature of duty in a fully satisfactory manner. From eternity there was present to the Spirit of God the plan of the government of the world which He had resolved to create. This plan of government is the eternal law (*lex æterna*) according to which God guides all things towards their final goal: the glorifying of God and the eternal happiness of mankind. But the Creator does not move creatures, as men do, simply by external force, by pressure, or impact, and the like, but by tendencies and impulses which He has implanted in creatures and, what is more, in each one according to its individual nature. He guides irrational creatures by blind impulses, inclinations, or instincts. He cannot, however, guide in this way rational, free men, but only (as is suited to man's nature) by moral laws which in the act of creation He implanted in the human heart. As soon as man attains to the use of reason he forms, as already indicated, on account of innate predispositions and tendencies, the most general moral principles, e. g. that man is to do good and avoid evil, that man is to commit no injustice, etc. He also easily understands that these commands do not depend on his own volition but express the will of a higher power, which regulates and guides all things. By these commands (the natural moral law) man shares in a rational manner in the eternal law; they are the temporal expression of the eternal, Divine law. The natural moral law is also the foundation and root of the obligation of all positive laws. We recognize that we cannot violate the natural moral law, and the positive laws that are rooted in it, without acting in opposition to the will of God, rebelling against our Creator and highest Master, offending Him, turning away from our final end, and incurring the Divine judgment. Thus man feels himself to be always and everywhere bound, without losing his freedom in a physical sense, to the order appointed him by God. He can do evil but he ought not. If of his own will he violates God's law he brings guilt upon himself and deserves punishment in the eyes of the all-wise, all-holy, and absolutely just God. Obligation is this necessity, arising from this knowledge, for the human will to do good and avoid evil.

III. Classification of Laws.—A. The actual, direct effect of law is obligation. According to the

varieties of duty imposed, law is classified as: commanding, prohibitive, permissive, and penal. Commanding laws (*leges affirmativæ*) make the performance of an action, of something positive, obligatory; prohibitive laws (*leges negativæ*), on the other hand, make obligatory an omission. The principle holds good for prohibitive laws, at least if they are absolute, like the commands of the natural, moral law, ("Thou shalt not bear false witness", "Thou shalt not commit adultery", etc.) that they are always and for ever obligatory (*leges negativæ obligant semper et pro semper*—negative laws bind always and forever), i. e. it is never permissible to perform the forbidden action. Commanding laws, however, as the law that debts must be paid, always impose an obligation, it is true, but not for ever (*leges affirmativæ obligant semper, sed non pro semper*—affirmative laws are binding always but not forever), that is, they continue always to be laws but they do not oblige one at every moment to the performance of the action commanded, but only at a certain time and under certain conditions. All laws which inflict penalties for violation of the law are called penal, whether they themselves directly define the manner and amount of penalty, or make it the duty of the judge to inflict according to his judgment a just punishment. Laws purely penal (*leges mere pœnales*) are those which do not make an action absolutely obligatory, but simply impose penalty in case one is convicted of transgression. Thus they leave it, in a certain sense, to the choice of the subject whether he will abstain from the penal action, or whether, if the violation is proved against him, he will submit to the penalty. The objection cannot be raised that purely penal laws are not actual laws because they create no bounden duty, for they oblige the violator of the law to bear the punishment if the authorities apprehend and convict him. Whether a law is a purely penal law or not is not so easy to decide in an individual case. The decision depends on the will of the lawgiver and also upon the general opinion and custom of a community.

B. In treating of promulgation a distinction has to be made between natural moral law and positive law. The first is proclaimed to all men by the natural light of reason; positive laws are made known by special outward signs (word of mouth or writing). The natural moral law is a law inseparable from the nature of man; positive law, on the contrary, is not. In regard to the origin or source of law, a distinction is made between Divine and human laws according as they are issued directly by God Himself or by men in virtue of the power granted them by God. If man in issuing a law is simply the herald or messenger of God, the law is not human but Divine. Thus the laws which Moses received from God on Mount Sinai and proclaimed to the people of Israel were not human but Divine laws. A distinction is further made between the laws of Church and State according as they are issued by the authorities of the State or of the Church. Laws are divided as to origin into prescriptive and statute law. Prescriptive, or customary, law includes those laws which do not come into existence by direct decree of the lawgiving power, but by long continued custom of the community. Yet every custom does not give rise to a law or a right. In order to become law a custom must be universal or must, at least, be followed freely and with the intention of raising it to law by a considerable part of the population. It must further be a custom of long standing. Finally, it must be useful to the common welfare, because this is an essential requisite of every law. Custom receives its binding, obligatory force from the tacit or legal approval of the lawgiver, for every true law binds those upon whom it is imposed. Only he can impose a binding obligation on a community on whom the supervision of it or the power of jurisdiction over it devolves. If the legislative power belongs to a people itself it can impose obligation upon itself as a whole, if it has not this power the obligation can only be formed with the consent of the lawgiver (see CUSTOM).

A classification of law, as limited to law administered in the courts, and familiar to Roman jurisprudence, is that of law in the strict sense and equity (*jus strictum et jus æquum et bonum*). Equity is often taken as synonymous with natural justice. In this sense we say that equity forbids that anyone be judged unheard. Frequently, however, we speak of equity only in reference to positive laws. A human lawgiver is never able to foresee all the individual cases to which his law will be applied. Consequently, a law though just in general, may, taken literally, lead in some unforeseen cases to results which agree neither with the intent of the lawgiver nor with natural justice, but rather contravene them. In such cases the law must be expounded not according to its wording but according to the intent of the lawgiver and the general principles of natural justice. A reasonable lawgiver could not desire this law to be followed literally in cases where this would entail a violation of the principles of natural justice. Law in the strict sense (*jus strictum*) is, therefore, positive law in its literal interpretation; equity, on the contrary, consists of the principles of natural justice so far as they are used to explain or correct a positive human law if this is not in harmony with the former. For this reason Aristotle (Ethica Nicomachea, V, x) calls equity the correction (ἐπανόρθωμα) of statute or written law.

ST. THOMAS, *Summa Theologica*, I–II, Q. xc sqq.; SUAREZ, *De legibus et legislatore Deo*, I; LAYMANN, *Theologia moralis*, I, tract. iv; BOUQUILLON, *Theologia fundamentalis*, no. 52 sqq.; TAPARELLI, *Saggio teoretico di diritto naturale*, I, s. 93 sqq.; MEYER, *Grundsätze der Sittlichkeit und des Rechts* (1868); IDEM, *Institutiones juris naturalis*, I (Freiburg, 1906), no. 218 sqq.; WERNZ, *Jus Decretalium*, I (Rome, 1898), 79 sqq.; SCHIFFINI *Philosophia moralis*, I (Turin, 1891), 104 sqq.; LEHMKUHL, *Theologia moralis*, I, 67 sqq.; RICKABY, *Moral Philosophy or Ethics and Natural Law* (London, 1888); AUSTIN, *The Duties and Rights of Man* (London, 1888); CATHREIN, *Moralphilosophie*, I (Freiburg, 1904), 332 sqq.; SCHLEIERMACHER, *Ueber den Unterschied von Sittengesetz und Naturgesetz* (Berlin, 1825); ZELLER, *Begriff und Begründung der sittlichen Gesetze* (Berlin, 1883); LACKNER, *Wie unterscheidet sich das Sittengesetz vom Naturgesetz;* SPENCER, *Principles of Ethics: I, Data of Ethics* (London, 1881), vii; PAULSEN, *System der Ethik*, I (Berlin, 1900), 320 sqq.

V. CATHREIN.

Law, CANON.—This subject will be treated under the following heads: I. General Notion and Divisions. II. Canon Law as a Science. III. Sources of Canon Law. IV. Historical Development of Texts and Collections. V. Codification. VI. Ecclesiastical Law. VII. The Principal Canonists.

I. GENERAL NOTIONS AND DIVISIONS.—Canon law is the body of laws and regulations made by or adopted by ecclesiastical authority, for the government of the Christian organization and its members. The word *adopted* is here used to point out the fact that there are certain elements in canon law borrowed by the Church from civil law or from the writings of private individuals, who as such had no authority in ecclesiastical society. Canon is derived from κανών, i. e. a rule or practical direction (not to speak of the other meanings of the word, such as list or catalogue), a term which soon acquired an exclusively ecclesiastical signification. In the fourth century it was applied to the ordinances of the councils, and thus contrasted with the word νόμοι, the ordinances of the civil authorities; the compound word "Nomocanon" was given to those collections of regulations in which the laws formulated by the two authorities on ecclesiastical matters were to be found side by side. At an early period we meet with expressions referring to the body of ecclesiastical legislation then in process of formation: *canones, ordo canonicus, sanctio canonica;* but the expression "canon law" (*jus canonicum*) becomes current only about the beginning of the twelfth century, being used in contrast with the "civil law" (*jus*

civile), and later we have the "Corpus juris canonici", as we have the "Corpus juris civilis". Canon law is also called "ecclesiastical law" (*jus ecclesiasticum*); however, strictly speaking, there is a slight difference of meaning between the two expressions: canon law denotes in particular the law of the "Corpus Juris", including the regulations borrowed from Roman law; whereas ecclesiastical law refers to all laws made by the ecclesiastical authorities as such, including those made after the compiling of the "Corpus Juris" (Sägmüller, "Kirchenrecht", 3). Contrasted with the imperial or Cæsarian law (*jus cæsareum*), canon law is sometimes styled pontifical law (*jus pontificium*), often also it is termed sacred law (*jus sacrum*), and sometimes even Divine law (*jus divinum:* c. 2, De privil.), as it concerns holy things, and has for its object the wellbeing of souls in the society divinely established by Jesus Christ.

Canon law may be divided into various branches, according to the points of view from which it is considered: (1) If we consider its sources, it comprises Divine law, including natural law, based on the nature of things and on the constitution given by Jesus Christ to His Church; and human or positive law, formulated by the legislator, in conformity with the Divine law. We shall return to this later, when treating of the sources of canon law. (2) If we consider the form in which it is found, we have the written law (*jus scriptum*) comprising the laws promulgated by the competent authorities, and the unwritten law (*jus non scriptum*), or even customary law, resulting from practice and custom; the latter however became less important as the written law developed. (3) If we consider the subject matter of the law, we have the public law (*jus publicum*) and private law (*jus privatum*). This division is explained in two different ways by the different schools of writers: for most of the adherents of the Roman school, e. g. Cavagnis (Instit. jur. publ. eccl., Rome, 1906, I, 8), public law is the law of the Church as a perfect society, and even as a perfect society such as it has been established by its Divine founder: private law would therefore embrace all the regulations of the ecclesiastical authorities concerning the internal organization of that society, the functions of its ministers, the rights and duties of its members. Thus understood, the public ecclesiastical law would be derived almost exclusively from Divine and natural law. On the other hand, most of the adherents of the German school, following the idea of the Roman law (Inst., I, i, 4; "Publicum jus est quod ad statum rei Romanæ spectat: privatum quod ad privatorum utilitatem"), define public law as the body of laws determining the rights and duties of those invested with ecclesiastical authority, whereas for them private law is that which sets forth the rights and duties of individuals as such. Public law would, therefore, directly intend the welfare of society as such, and indirectly that of its members; while private law would look primarily to the wellbeing of the individual and secondarily to that of the community.

(4) Public law is divided into external law (*jus externum*) and internal law (*jus internum*). External law determines the relations of ecclesiastical society with other societies, either secular bodies (the relations therefore of the Church and the State) or religious bodies, that is, interconfessional relations. Internal law is concerned with the constitution of the Church and the relations subsisting between the lawfully constituted authorities and their subjects. (5) Considered from the point of view of its expression, canon law may be divided into several branches, so closely allied, that the terms used to designate them are often employed almost indifferently: common law and special law; universal law and particular law; general law and singular law (*jus commune et speciale; jus universale et particulare; jus generale et singulare*). It is easy to point out the difference between them: the idea is that of a wider or a more limited scope; to be more precise, common law refers to things, universal law to territories, general law to persons; so regulations affecting only certain things, certain territories, certain classes of persons, being a restriction or an addition, constitute special, particular, or singular law, and even local or individual law. This exceptional law is often referred to as a privilege (*privilegium, lex privata*), though the expression is applied more usually to concessions made to an individual. The common law, therefore, is that which is to be observed with regard to a certain matter, unless the legislator has foreseen or granted exceptions; for instance, the laws regulating benefices contain special provisions for benefices subject to the right of patronage. Universal law is that which is promulgated for the whole Church; but different countries and different dioceses may have local laws limiting the application of the former and even derogating from it. Finally, different classes of persons, the clergy, religious orders, etc., have their own laws which are superadded to the general law.

(6) We have to distinguish between the law of the Western or Latin Church, and the law of the Eastern Churches, and of each of them. Likewise, between the law of the Catholic Church and those of the non-Catholic Christian Churches or confessions, the Anglican Church and the various Oriental schismatical Churches. (7) Finally, if we look to the history or chronological evolution of canon law, we find three epochs: from the beginning to the "Decretum" of Gratian exclusively; from Gratian to the Council of Trent; from the Council of Trent to our day. The law of these three periods is referred to respectively as the ancient, the new, and the recent law (*jus antiquum, novum, novissimum*), though some writers prefer to speak of the ancient law, the law of the Middle Ages, and the modern law (Laurentius, "Instit.", n.4).

II. Canon Law as a Science.—As we shall see in treating of the gradual development of the material of canon law (see below, IV), though a legislative power has always existed in the Church, and though it has always been exercised, a long period had necessarily to elapse before the laws were reduced to a harmonious systematic body, serving as a basis for methodical study and giving rise to general theories. In the first place, the legislative authority makes laws only when circumstances require them and in accordance with a definite plan. For centuries, nothing more was done than to collect successively the canons of councils, ancient and recent, the letters of popes, and episcopal statutes; guidance was sought for in these, when analogous cases occurred, but no one thought of extracting general principles from them or of systematizing all the laws then in force. In the eleventh century certain collections group under the same headings the canons that treat of the same matters; however, it is only in the middle of the twelfth century that we meet in the "Decretum" of Gratian the first really scientific treatise on canon law. The School of Bologna had just revived the study of Roman law; Gratian sought to inaugurate a similar study of canon law. But, while compilations of texts and official collections were available for Roman law, or "Corpus juris civilis", Gratian had no such assistance. He therefore adopted the plan of inserting the texts in the body of his general treatise; from the disordered mass of canons, collected from the earliest days, he selected not only the law actually in force (eliminating the regulations which had fallen into desuetude, or which were revoked, or not of general application) but also the principles; he elaborated a system of law which, however incomplete, was nevertheless methodical. The science of canon law, i. e. the methodical and co-ordinated knowledge of ecclesiastical law, was at length established.

Gratian's "Decretum" was a wonderful work; wel-

comed, taught and glossed by the decretists at Bologna and later in the other schools and universities, it was for a long time the text-book of canon law. However his plan was defective and confusing, and, after the day of the glosses and the strictly literal commentaries, it was abandoned in favour of the method adopted by Bernard of Pavia in his "Breviarium" and by St. Raymund of Pennafort in the official collection of the "Decretals" of Gregory IX, promulgated in 1234 (see CORPUS JURIS CANONICI). These collections, which did not include the texts utilized by Gratian, grouped the materials into five books, each divided into "titles", and under each title the decretals or fragments of decretals were grouped in chronological order. The five books, the subject matter of which is recalled by the well-known verse: "judex, judicium, clerus, connubia, crimen" (i.e. judge, judgment, clergy, marriages, crime), did not display a very logical plan; not to speak of certain titles that were more or less out of place. They treated successively of the depositaries of authority, procedure, the clergy and the things pertaining to them, marriage, crimes and penalties. In spite of its defects, the system had at least the merit of being official; not only was it adopted in the latter collections, but it served as the basis for almost all canonical works up to the sixteenth century, and even to our day, especially in the universities, each of which had a faculty of canon law.

However the method of studying and teaching gradually developed: if the early decretalists made use of the elementary plan of the gloss and literal commentary, their successors in composing their treatises were more independent of the text; they commented on the titles, not on the chapters or the words; often they followed the titles or chapters only nominally and artificially. In the sixteenth century they tried to apply, not to the official collections, but in their lectures on canon law the method and division of the "Institutes" of Justinian: persons, things, actions or procedure, crimes, and penalties (Institutes, I, ii, 12). This plan, popularized by the "Institutiones juris canonici" of Lancellotti (1563), has been followed since by most of the canonist authors of "Institutiones" or manuals, though there has been considerable divergency in the sub-divisions; most of the more extensive works, however, preserved the order of the "Decretals". This order will also be followed in the redaction of the forthcoming code. In recent times many text-books, especially in Germany, have adopted original plans. In the sixteenth century too, the study of canon law was developed and improved like that of other sciences, by the critical spirit of the age: doubtful texts were rejected and the *raison d'être* and tendency or intention of later laws traced back to the customs of former days. Canon law was more studied and better understood; writings multiplied, some of an historical nature, others practical, according to the inclination of the authors. In the universities and seminaries, it became a special study, though as might be expected, not always held in equal esteem. It may be noted too that the study of civil law is now frequently separated from that of canon law, a result of the changes that have come over society. On the other hand, in too many seminaries the teaching of ecclesiastical law is not sufficiently distinguished from that of moral theology. The publication of the new general code of canon law will certainly bring about a more normal state of affairs.

The first object of the science of canon law is to fix the laws that are in force. This is not difficult when one has exact and recent texts, drawn up as abstract laws, e. g. most of the texts since the Council of Trent, and as will be the case for all canon law when the new code is published. But it was not so in the Middle Ages; it was the canonists who, to a large extent, formulated the law by extracting it from the accumulated mass of texts or by generalizing from the individual decisions in the early collections of decretals. When the law in force is known it must be explained, and this second object of the science of canon law is still unchanged. It consists in showing the true sense, the reason, the extension and application of each law and each institution. This necessitates a careful and exact application of the triple method of exposition, historical, philosophical, and practical: the first explains the law in accordance with its source and the evolution of customs; the second explains its principles; the last shows how it is to be applied at present. This practical application is the object of jurisprudence, which collects, co-ordinates and utilizes, for more or less analogous cases, the decisions of the competent tribunal. From this we may learn the position of canon law in the hierarchy of sciences. It is a judicial science, differing from the science of Roman law and of civil law inasmuch as it treats of the laws of another society; but as this society is of the spiritual order and in a certain sense supernatural, canon law belongs also to the sacred sciences. In this category it comes after theology, which studies and explains in accordance with revelation, the truths to be believed; it is supported by theology, but in its turn it formulates the practical rules toward which theology tends, and so it has been called "theologia practica", "theologia rectrix". In as far as it is practical the science of canon law is closely related to moral theology; however, it differs from the latter which is not directly concerned with the acts prescribed or forbidden by the external law, but only with the rectitude of human acts in the light of the last end of man, whereas, canon law treats of the external laws relating to the good order of society rather than the workings of the individual conscience. Juridical, historical, and above all theological sciences are most useful for the comprehensive study of canon law.

III. SOURCES OF CANON LAW.—This expression has a twofold meaning; it may refer to the sources from which the laws come and which give the latter their judicial force (*fontes juris essendi*); or it may refer to the sources where canon law is to be found (*fontes juris cognoscendi*), i. e. the laws themselves such as they occur in the texts and various codes. These sources are also called the material and the formal sources of canon law. We shall consider first the sources under the former aspect.

The ultimate source of canon law is God, Whose will is manifested either by the very nature of things (natural Divine law), or by Revelation (positive Divine law). Both are contained in the Scriptures and in Tradition. Positive Divine law cannot contradict natural law; it rather confirms it and renders it more definite. The Church accepts and considers both as sovereign binding laws which it can interpret but cannot modify; however, it does not discover natural law by philosophic speculation; it receives it, with positive Divine law, from God through His inspired Books, though this does not imply a confusion of the two kinds of Divine law. Of the Old Law the Church has preserved in addition to the Decalogue some precepts closely allied to natural law, e. g. certain matrimonial impediments; as to the other laws given by God to His chosen people, it considers them to have been ritual and declares them abrogated by Jesus Christ. Or rather, Jesus Christ, the Lawgiver of the spiritual society founded by Him (Con. Trid., Sess. VI, "De justif.", can. xxi), has replaced them by the fundamental laws which He gave His Church. This Christian Divine law, if we may so call it, is found in the Gospels, in the Apostolic writings, in the living Tradition, which transmits laws as well as dogmas. On this positive Divine law depend the essential principles of the Church's constitution, the primacy, the episcopacy, the essential elements of Divine worship and the Sacraments, the indissolubility of marriage, etc.

Again, to attain its sublime end, the Church, endowed by its Founder with legislative power, makes laws in conformity with natural and Divine law. The sources or authors of this positive ecclesiastical law are essentially the episcopate and its head, the pope, the successors of the Apostolic College and its divinely appointed head, Saint Peter. They are, properly speaking, the active sources of canon law. Their activity is exercised in its most solemn form by the œcumenical councils, where the episcopate united with its head, and convoked and presided over by him, with him defines its teaching and makes the laws that bind the whole Church. The canons of the œcumenical councils, especially those of Trent (see COUNCILS) hold an exceptional place in ecclesiastical law. But, without infringing on the ordinary power of the bishops, the pope, as head of the episcopate, possesses in himself the same powers as the episcopate united with him. It is true that the disciplinary and legislative power of the popes has not always, in the course of centuries, been exercised in the same manner and to the same extent, but in proportion as the administration became centralized, their direct intervention in legislation became more and more marked; and so the sovereign pontiff is the most fruitful source of canon law; he can abrogate the laws made by his predecessors or by œcumenical councils; he can legislate for the whole church or for a part thereof, a country or a given body of individuals; if he is morally bound to take advice and to follow the dictates of prudence, he is not legally obliged to obtain the consent of any other person or persons, or to observe any particular form; his power is limited only by Divine law, natural and positive, dogmatic and moral. Furthermore, he is, so to say, the living law, for he is considered as having all law in the treasury of his heart ("in scrinio pectoris"; Boniface VIII, c. i, "De Constit.", in VI°). From the earliest ages the letters of the Roman pontiffs constitute, with the canons of the councils, the principal element of canon law, not only of the Roman Church and its immediate dependencies, but of all Christendom; they are everywhere relied upon and collected, and the ancient canonical compilations contain a large number of these precious "decretals" (*decreta, statuta, epistolæ decretales*, and *epistolæ synodicæ*). Later, the pontifical laws are promulgated more usually as constitutions, Apostolic Letters, the latter being classified as Bulls or Briefs, according to their external form, or even as spontaneous acts, "Motu proprio". (See BULLS and BRIEFS.) Moreover, the legislative and disciplinary power of the pope not being an incommunicable privilege, the laws and regulations made in his name and with his approbation possess his authority: in fact, though most of the regulations made by the Congregations of the cardinals and other organs of the Curia are incorporated in the Apostolic Letters, yet the custom exists and is becoming more general for legislation to be made by mere decrees of the Congregations, with the papal approval. These are the "Acts of the Holy See" (Acta Sanctæ Sedis), and their object or purpose permitting, are real laws (see ROMAN CURIA).

Next to the pope, the bishops united in local councils, and each of them individually, are sources of law for their common or particular territory; canons of national or provincial councils, and diocesan statutes, constitute local law. Numerous texts of such origin are found in the ancient canonical collections. At the present day and for a long time past, the law has laid down clearly the powers of local councils and of bishops; if their decrees should interfere with the common law they have no authority save in virtue of pontifical approbation. It is well known that diocesan statutes are not referred to the sovereign pontiff, whereas the decrees of provincial councils are submitted for examination and approval to the Holy See (Const. "Immensa" of Sixtus V, 22 Jan., 1587). We may liken to bishops in this matter various bodies that have the right of governing themselves and thus enjoy a certain autonomy; such are prelates with territorial jurisdiction, religious orders, some exempt chapters and universities, etc. The concessions granted to them are generally subject to a certain measure of control.

Other sources of law are rather impersonal in their nature, chief among them being custom or the unwritten law. In canon law custom has become almost like a legislator; not in the sense that the people are made their own lawgiver, but a practice followed by the greater part of the community, and which is reasonable and fulfils the legal requirements for prescription and is observed as obligatory, acquires the force of law by at least the tacit consent of the legislator. Under such circumstances custom can create or rescind a legal obligation, derogate from a law, interpret it, etc. But it must be remarked that in our days, owing to the fully developed body of written law, custom plays a much less important part than did the practices and habits of early Christian times, when there was but little written law and even that seldom of wide application. The civil law of different nations, and especially the Roman law, may be numbered among the accessory sources of canon law. But it is necessary to explain more exactly its rôle and importance. Evidently secular law cannot be, strictly speaking, a source of canon law, the State as such having no competence in spiritual matters; yet it may become so by the more or less formal acceptation of particular laws by the ecclesiastical authorities. We pass by in the first place the laws made by the mutual agreement of both parties, such as the legislation of the numerous assemblies in the Visigothic kingdom, and the Frankish kingdom and empire, where the bishops sat with the lords and nobles. Such also is the case of the concordats (q. v.) of later ages, real contracts between the two powers. In these cases we have an ecclesiastico-civil law, the legal force of which arose from the joint action of the two competent authorities. It is in a different sense that Roman law, Germanic law, and in a lesser degree modern law, have become a subsidiary source of canon law.

It must be remembered that the Church existed for a long time before having a complete and co-ordinated system of law; that many daily acts of its administration, while objectively canonical, were of the same nature as similar acts in civil matters, e. g. contracts, obligations, and in general the administration of property; it was quite natural for the Church to accommodate itself in these matters to the existing laws, without positively approving of them. Later when the canonists of the twelfth century began to systematize the ecclesiastical law, they found themselves in presence, on the one hand, of a fragmentary canon law, and on the other hand of the complete methodical Roman code; they had recourse to the latter to supply what was wanting in the former, whence the maxim adopted by the canonists and inserted in the "Corpus Juris", that the Church acts according to Roman law when canon law is silent (cap. 1. "De novi op. nunc.", X, i, V, tit. xxxii). Moreover, in the Teutonic kingdoms the clergy followed the Roman law as a personal statute. However, in proportion as the written canon law increased, Roman law became of less practical value in the Church (cap. 28, X, "De priv.", X, lib. V, tit. xxxiii). Canon law, it may be said, adopted from Roman law what relates to obligations, contracts, judiciary actions, and to a great extent civil procedure. Other Roman laws were the object of a more positive recognition than mere usage, i. e. they were formally approved, those, for instance, which though of secular origin, concerned ecclesiastical things, e. g. the Byzantine ecclesiastical laws, or again laws of civil origin and character but which were changed into canonical laws, e. g. the impediment of marriage arising

from adoption. The juridical influence of Teutonic law was much less important, if we abstract from the inevitable adaptation to the customs of barbarous races, yet some survivals of this law in ecclesiastical legislation are worthy of note: the somewhat feudal system of benefices; the computation of the degrees of kindred; the assimilating of the penitential practices to the system of penal compensation (*wehrgeld*); finally, but for a time only, justification from criminal charges on the oath of guarantors or co-jurors (De purgatione canonica, lib. V, tit. xxxiv).

Modern law has only a restricted and local influence on canon law, and that particularly on two points. On the one hand, the Church conforms to the civil laws on mixed matters, especially with regard to the administration of its property; on some occasions even it has finally adopted as its own measures passed by the civil powers acting independently; a notable case is the French decree of 1809 on the "Fabriques d'église". On the other hand, modern legislation is indebted to the canon law for certain beneficial measures: part of the procedure in criminal, civil, and matrimonial cases, and to some extent, the organization of courts and tribunals.

IV. Historical Development of Texts and Collections.—Considered under the second aspect, the sources of canon law are the legislative texts, and the collections of those texts whence we derive our knowledge of the Church's laws. In order to appreciate fully the reasons for and the utility of the great work of codification of the canon law, recently begun by order of Pius X, it is necessary to recall the general history of those texts and collections, ever increasing in number up to the present time. A detailed account of each of the canonical collections is here out of place; the more important ones are the subject of special articles, to which we refer the reader; it will suffice if we exhibit the different stages in the development of these texts and collections, and make clear the movement towards centralization and unification that has led up to the present situation. Even in the private collections of the early centuries, in which the series of conciliary canons were merely brought together in more or less chronological order, a constant tendency towards unification is noticeable. From the ninth century onwards the collections are systematically arranged; with the thirteenth century begins the first official collections, thenceforth the nucleus around which the new legislative texts centre, though it is not yet possible to reduce them to a harmonious and coordinated code. Before tracing the various steps of this evolution, some terms require to be explained.

The name "canonical collections" is given to all collections of ecclesiastical legislative texts, because the principal texts were the canons of the councils. At first the authors of these collections contented themselves with bringing together the canons of the different councils in chronological order; consequently these are called "chronological" collections; in the West, the last important chronological collection is that of Pseudo-Isidore. After his time the texts were arranged according to subject matter; these are the "systematic" collections, the only form in use since the time of Pseudo-Isidore. All the ancient collections are private, due to personal initiative, and have, therefore, as collections, no official authority: each text has only its own intrinsic value; even the "Decretum" of Gratian is of this nature. On the other hand, official or authentic collections are those that have been made or at least promulgated by the legislator. They begin with the "Compilatio tertia" of Innocent III; the later collections of the "Corpus Juris", except the "Extravagantes", are official. All the texts in an official collection have the force of law. There are also general collections and particular collections: the former treating of legislation in general, the latter treating of some special subject, for instance, marriage, procedure, etc., or even of the local law of a district. Finally, considered chronologically, the sources and collections are classified as previous to or later than the "Corpus Juris".

A. *Canonical Collections in the East.*—Until the Church began to enjoy peace, the written canon law was very meagre; after making full allowance for the documents that must have perished, we can discover only a fragmentary law, made as circumstances demanded, and devoid of all system. Unity of legislation, in as far as it can be expected at that period, is identical with a certain uniformity of practice, based on the prescriptions of Divine law relative to the constitution of the Church, the liturgy, the sacraments, etc. The clergy, organized everywhere in the same way, exercised almost everywhere the same functions. But at an early period we discover a greater local disciplinary uniformity between the Churches of the great sees (Rome, Carthage, Alexandria, Antioch, later Constantinople) and the Churches depending immediately on them. Further it is the disciplinary decisions of the bishops of the various regions that form the first nucleus of local canon law; these texts, spreading gradually from one country to another by means of the collections, obtain universal dissemination and in this way are the basis of general canon law.

There were, however, in the East, from the early days up to the end of the fifth century, certain writings, closely related to each other, and which were in reality brief canon law treatises on ecclesiastical administration, the duties of the clergy and the faithful, and especially on the liturgy. We refer to works attributed to the Apostles, very popular in the Oriental Churches, though devoid of official authority, and which may be called pseudo-epigraphic, rather than apocryphal. The principal writings of this kind are the "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles" or "Didache", the "Didascalia", based on the "Didache"; the "Apostolic Constitutions", an expansion of the two preceding works; then the "Apostolic Church Ordinance", the "Definitio canonica SS. Apostolorum", the "Testament of the Lord" and the "Octateuch of Clement"; lastly the "Apostolic Canons". Of all this literature, only the "Apostolic Canons" were included in the canonical collections of the Greek Church. The most important of these documents, the "Apostolic Constitutions", was removed by the Second Canon of the Council in Trullo (692), as having been interpolated by the heretics. As to the eighty-five Apostolic Canons, accepted by the same council, they rank yet first in the above-mentioned "Apostolic" collection; the first fifty, translated into Latin by Dionysius Exiguus (c. 500), were included in the Western collections and afterwards in the "Corpus Juris".

As the later law of the separated Eastern Churches did not influence the Western collections, we need not treat of it, but go on to consider only the Greek collection. It begins early in the fourth century: in the different provinces of Asia Minor, to the canons of local councils are added those of the œcumenical Council of Nicæa (325), everywhere held in esteem. The Province of Pontus furnished the penitentiary decisions of Ancyra and Neocæsarea (314); Antioch, the canons of the famous Council "in encæniis" (341), a genuine code of metropolitan organization; Paphlagonia, that of the Council of Gangra (343), a reaction against the first excesses of asceticism; Phrygia, the fifty-nine canons of Laodicea on different disciplinary and liturgical matters. This collection was so highly esteemed that at the Council of Chalcedon (451) the canons were read as one series. It was increased later by the addition of the canons of Constantinople (381), with other canons attributed to it, those of Ephesus (431), Chalcedon (451), and the Apostolic canons. In 692 the Council in Trullo passed 102 disciplinary canons, the second of which enumerates the elements of

the official collection: they are the texts we have just mentioned, together with the canons of Sardica, and of Carthage (419), according to Dionysius Exiguus, and numerous canonical letters of the great bishops, SS. Dionysius of Alexandria, Gregory Thaumaturgus, Basil, etc. If to these be added the canons of the two œcumenical councils of Nicæa (787) and Constantinople (869) we have all the elements of the definitive collection in its final shape. A few "systematic" collections may be mentioned as pertaining to this period: one containing fifty titles by an unknown author about 535; another with twenty-five titles of the ecclesiastical laws of Justinian; a collection of fifty titles drawn up about 550, by John the Scholastic, a priest of Antioch. The compilations known as the "Nomocanons" are more important, because they bring together the civil laws and the ecclesiastical laws on the same subjects; the two principal are the Nomocanon, wrongly attributed to John the Scholastic, but which dates from the end of the sixth century, with fifty titles; and another, drawn up in the seventh century, and afterwards augmented by the Patriarch Photius in 883.

B. *The Canonical Collections in the West to Pseudo-Isidore.*—In the West canonical collections developed as in the East, but about two centuries later. At first appear collections of national or local laws, and the tendency towards centralization is partially effected in the ninth century. Towards the end of the fourth century there is yet in the West no canonical collection, not even a local one, those of the fifth century are essentially local, but all of them borrow from the Greek councils. The latter were known in the West by two Latin versions, one called the "Hispana" or "Isidorian", because it was inserted in the Spanish canonical collection, attributed to St. Isidore of Seville, the other called the "Itala" or "ancient" (Prisca), because Dionysius Exiguus, in the first half of the sixth century, found it in use at Rome, and being dissatisfied with its imperfections improved it. Almost all the Western collections, therefore, are based on the same texts as the Greek collection, hence the marked influence of that collection on Western canon law.

(1) At the end of the fifth century the Roman Church was completely organized and the popes had promulgated many legislative texts; but no collection of them had yet been made. The only extra-Roman canons recognized were the canons of Nicæa and Sardica, the latter being joined to the former, and at times even cited as the canons of Nicæa. The Latin version of the ancient Greek councils was known, but was not adopted as ecclesiastical law. Towards the year 500 Dionysius Exiguus compiled at Rome a double collection, one of the councils, the other of decretals, i. e. papal letters. The former, executed at the request of Stephen, Bishop of Salona, is a translation of the Greek councils, including Chalcedon, and begins with the fifty Apostolic canons; Dionysius adds to it only the Latin text of the canons of Sardica and of Carthage (419), in which the more ancient African councils are partially reproduced. The second is a collection of thirty-nine papal decretals, from Siricius (384) to Anastasius II (496–98). (See CANONS, COLLECTIONS OF ANCIENT.) Thus joined together these two collections became the canonical code of the Roman Church, not by official approbation, but by authorized practice. But while in the work of Dionysius the collection of conciliary canons remained unchanged, that of the decretals was successively increased; it continued to incorporate letters of the different popes till about the middle of the eighth century when Adrian I gave (774) the collection of Dionysius to the future Emperor Charlemagne as the canonical book of the Roman Church. This collection, often called the "Dionysio-Hadriana", was soon officially received in all Frankish territory, where it was cited as the "Liber Canonum", and was adopted for the whole empire of Charlemagne at the Diet of Aachen in 802. This was an important step towards the centralization and unification of the ecclesiastical law, especially as the Latin Catholic world hardly extended beyond the limits of the empire, Africa and the south of Spain having been lost to the Church through the victories of Islam.

(2) The canon law of the African Church was strongly centralized at Carthage; the documents naturally took the form of a collection, as it was customary to read and insert in the Acts of each council the decisions of the preceding councils. At the time of the invasion of the Vandals, the canonical code of the African Church comprised, after the canons of Nicæa, those of the Council of Carthage under Bishop Gratus (about 348), under Genethlius (390), of twenty or twenty-two plenary councils under Aurelius (from 393 to 427), and the minor councils of Constantinople. Unfortunately these records have not come down to us in their entirety; we possess them in two forms: in the collection of Dionysius Exiguus, as the canons of a "Concilium Africanum"; in the Spanish collection, as those of eight councils (the fourth wrongly attributed, being a document from Arles, dating about the beginning of the sixth century). Through these two channels the African texts entered into Western canon law. It will suffice to mention the two "systematic" collections of Fulgentius Ferrandus and Cresconius (q. v.).

(3) The Church in Gaul had no local religious centre, the territory being divided into unstable kingdoms; it is not surprising therefore that we meet no centralized canon law or universally accepted collection. There are numerous councils, however, and an abundance of texts; but if we except the temporary authority of the See of Arles, no church of Gaul could point to a permanent group of dependent sees. The canonical collections were fairly numerous, but none was generally accepted. The most widespread was the "Quesnelliana", called after its editor (the Jansenist Paschase Quesnel), rich, but badly arranged, containing many Greek, Gallic, and other councils, also pontifical decretals. With the other collections it gave way to the "Hadriana", at the end of the eighth century. (4) In Spain, on the contrary, at least after the conversion of the Visigoths, the Church was strongly centralized in the See of Toledo, and in close union with the royal power. Previous to this, we must note the collection of St. Martin of Braga, a kind of adaptation of conciliary canons, often incorrectly cited in the Middle Ages as the "Capitula Martini papæ" (about 563). It was absorbed in the large and important collection of the Visigothic Church. The latter, begun as early as the council of 633 and increased by the canons of subsequent councils, is known as the "Hispana" or "Isidoriana", because in later times it was attributed (erroneously) to St. Isidore of Seville. It comprises two parts: the councils and the decretals; the councils are arranged in four sections: the East, Africa, Gaul, Spain, and chronological order is observed in each section; the decretals, 104 in number, range from Pope St. Damasus to St. Gregory (366–604). Its original elements consist of the Spanish councils from Elvira (about 300) to the Seventeenth Council of Toledo in 694. The influence of this collection, in the form it assumed about the middle of the ninth century, when the False Decretals were inserted into it, was very great.

(5) Of Great Britain and Ireland we need mention only the Irish collection of the beginning of the eighth century, from which several texts passed to the continent; it is remarkable for including among its canons citations from the Scriptures and the Fathers "Collectio Hibernensis", 2nd ed., Wasserschleben, Leipzig, 1885). (6) The collection of the False Decretals, or the Pseudo-Isidore (about 850), is the last and most complete of the "chronological" collections, and therefore the one most utilized by the authors of the sub-

sequent "systematic" collections; it is the "Hispana" or Spanish collection together with apocryphal decretals attributed to the popes of the first centuries up to the time of St. Damasus, when the authentic decretals begin. It exerted a very great influence (see FALSE DECRETALS). (7) To conclude the list of collections, where the later canonists were to garner their materials, we must mention the "Penitentials" (q. v.), the "Ordines" or ritual collections, the "Formularies", especially the "Liber Diurnus"; also compilations of laws, either purely secular, or semi-ecclesiastical, like the "Capitularies" (q. v.). The name "capitula" or "capitularia" is given also to the episcopal ordinances quite common in the ninth century. It may be noted that the author of the False Decretals forged also false "Capitularies", under the name of Benedict the Deacon, and false episcopal "Capitula", under the name of Angilramnus, Bishop of Metz.

C. *Canonical Collections to the Time of Gratian.*— The Latin Church was meanwhile moving towards closer unity; the local character of canonical discipline and laws gradually disappears, and the authors of canonical collections exhibit a more personal note, i. e. they pick out more or less advantageously the texts, which they borrow from the "chronological" compilations, though they display as yet no critical discernment, and include many apocryphal documents, while others continue to be attributed to the wrong sources. They advance, nevertheless, especially when to the bare texts they add their own opinions and ideas. From the end of the ninth century to the middle of the twelfth these collections are very numerous; many of them are still unpublished, and some deservedly so. We can only mention the principal ones.

(1) A collection in twelve books, compiled in Northern Italy, and dedicated to an Archbishop Anselm, doubtless Anselm II of Milan (833–97), still unedited; it seems to have been widely used. (2) The "Libri duo de synodalibus causis" of Regino, Abbot of Prüm (d. 915), a pastoral visitation manual of the bishop of the diocese, edited by Wasserschleben (1840). (3) The voluminous compilation, in twenty books, of Burchard, Bishop of Worms, compiled between 1012 and 1022, entitled the "Collectarium", also "Decretum", a manual for the use of ecclesiastics in their ministry; the nineteenth book, "Corrector" or "Medicus", treats of the administration of the Sacrament of Penance, and was often current as a distinct work. This widely circulated collection is in P. L., CXL. At the end of the eleventh century there appeared in Italy several collections favouring the reform of Gregory VII and supporting the Holy See in the investiture strife; some of the authors utilized for their works the Roman archives. (4) The collection of Anselm, Bishop of Lucca (d. 1086), in thirteen books, still unedited, an influential work. (5) The collection of Cardinal Deusdedit, dedicated to Pope Victor III (1087), it treats of the primacy of the pope, of the Roman clergy, ecclesiastical property, immunities, and was edited by Martinucci in 1869, more recently and better by Wolf von Glanvell (1905). (6) The "Breviarium" of Cardinal Atto; edited by Mai, "Script. vet. nova collect.", VI, app. 1832. (7) The collection of Bonizo, Bishop of Sutri, in ten books, written after 1089, still unedited. (8) The collection of Cardinal Gregory, called by him "Polycarpus", in eight books, written before 1120, yet unedited. (9) In France we must mention the small collection of Abbo, Abbot of Fleury (d. 1004), in fifty-two chapters, in P. L., CXXXIX; and especially (10) the collections of Ives, Bishop of Chartres (d. 1115 or 1117), i. e. the "Collectio trium partium", the "Decretum", especially the "Panormia", a short compilation in eight books, extracted from the preceding two works, and widely used. The "Decretum" and the "Panormia" are in P. L., CLXI. (11) The unedited Spanish collection of Saragossa (Cæsar-augustana) is based on these works of Ives of Chartres. (12) Finally, the "De misericordia et justitia", in three books, composed before 1121 by Algerus of Liège, a general treatise on ecclesiastical discipline, in which is foreshadowed the scholastic method of Gratian, reprinted in P. L., CLXXX.

D. *The "Decretum" of Gratian: the Decretists.*— The "Concordantia discordantium canonum", known later as "Decretum", which Gratian published at Bologna about 1148, is not, as we consider it to-day, a collection of canonical texts, but a general treatise, in which the texts cited are inserted to help in establishing the law. It is true that the work is very rich in texts and there is hardly a canon of any importance contained in the earlier collections (including the decisions of the Lateran Council of 1139 and recent papal decretals) that Gratian has not utilized. His object, however, was to build up a juridical system from all these documents. Despite its imperfections, it must be admitted that the work of Gratian was as near perfection as was then possible. For that reason it was adopted at Bologna, and soon elsewhere, as the text-book for the study of canon law. (For an account of this collection see CORPUS JURIS CANONICI; CANONS.) We may here recall again that the "Decretum" of Gratian is not a codification, but a privately compiled treatise; further, that the building up of a general system of canon law was the work of the canonists, and not of the legislative authorities as such.

Quite as the professors at Bologna commented on Justinian's "Corpus juris civilis", so they began at once to comment on Gratian's work, the personal element as well as his texts. The first commentators are called the "Decretists". In their lectures (Lat. *lecturæ*, readings) they treated of the conclusions to be drawn from each part and solved the problems (*quæstiones*) arising therefrom. They synopsized their teaching in "glosses" (q. v.), interlinear at first, then marginal, or they composed separate treatises known as "Apparatus", "Summæ", "Repetitiones", or else collected "casus", "quæstiones", "Margaritæ", "Breviaria", etc. The principal decretists are: Paucapalea, perhaps the first disciple of Gratian, whence, it is said, the name "palea" given to the additions to the "Decretum" (his "Summa" was edited by Schulte in 1890); Roland Bandinelli, later Alexander III (his "Summa" was edited by Thaner in 1874); Omnibonus, 1185 (see Schulte, "De Decreto ab Omnibono abbreviato", 1892), John of Faenza (d. bishop of that city in 1190); Rufinus ("Summa" edited by Singer, 1902); Stephen of Tournai (d. 1203; "Summa" edited by Schulte, 1891); the great canonist Huguccio (d. 1210; "Summa" is being edited by M. Gillmann); Sicard of Cremona (d. 1215); John the Teuton, really Semeca or Zemcke (d. 1245); Guido de Baysio, the "archdeacon" (of Bologna, d. 1313); and especially Bartholomew of Brescia (d. 1258), author of the "gloss" on the "Decretum" in its last form.

E. *Decretals and Decretalists.*—While lecturing on Gratian's work the canonists laboured to complete and elaborate the master's teaching; with that view they collected assiduously the decretals of the popes, and especially the canons of the œcumenical councils of the Lateran (1179, 1215); but these compilations were not intended to form a complete code, they merely centred round and supplemented Gratian's "Decretum"; for that reason these Decretals are known as the "Extravagantes", i. e. outside of, or extraneous to, the official collections. The five collections thus made between 1190 and 1226 (see DECRETALS), and which were to serve as the basis for the work of Gregory IX, mark a distinct step forward in the evolution of canon law: whereas Gratian had inserted the texts in his own treatise, and the canonists wrote their

works without including the texts, we have now compilations of supplementary texts for the purpose of teaching, but which nevertheless remain quite distinct; in addition, we at last find the legislators taking part officially in editing the collections. While the "Breviarium" of Bernard of Pavia, the first to exhibit the division into five books and into titles, which St. Raymund of Pennafort was later to adopt, is the work of a private individual, the "Compilatio tertia" of Innocent III in 1210, and the "Compilatio quinta" of Honorius III, in 1226, are official collections. Though the popes, doubtless, intended only to give the professors at Bologna correct and authentic texts, they nevertheless acted officially; these collections, however, are but supplements to Gratian.

This is also true of the great collection of "Decretals" of Gregory IX (see DECRETALS and CORPUS JURIS CANONICI). The pope wished to collect in a more uniform and convenient manner the decretals scattered through so many different compilations; he entrusted this synopsis to his chaplain Raymund of Pennafort, and in 1234 sent it officially to the universities of Bologna and Paris. He did not wish to suppress or supplant the "Decretum" of Gratian, but this eventually occurred. The "Decretals" of Gregory IX, though composed in great part of specific decisions, represented in fact a more advanced state of law; furthermore, the collection was sufficiently extensive to touch almost every matter, and could serve as a basis for a complete course of instruction. It soon gave rise to a series of commentaries, glosses, and works, as the "Decretum" of Gratian had done, only these were more important since they were based on more recent and actual legislation. The commentators of the Decretals were known as Decretalists. The author of the "gloss" was Bernard de Botone (d. 1263); the text was commented on by the most distinguished canonists; among the best known previous to the sixteenth century, we must mention, after Bernard of Pavia ("Summa" edited by Laspeyres, 1860), Tancred, archdeacon of Bologna, d. 1230 ("Summa de Matrimonio", ed. Wunderlich, 1841); Godfrey of Trani (1245); Sinibaldo Fieschi, later Innocent IV (1254), whose "Apparatus in quinque libros decretalium" has been frequently reprinted since 1477; Henry of Susa, later Cardinal-Bishop of Ostia (d. 1271), hence "Hostiensis"; his "Summa Hostiensis", or "Summa aurea" was one of the best known canonical works, and was printed as early as 1473; Ægilius de Fuscarariis (d. 1289); William Durandus (d. 1296, Bishop of Mende), surnamed "Speculator", on account of his important treatise on procedure, the "Speculum judiciale", printed in 1473; Guido de Baysio, the "archdeacon", already mentioned; Nicolas de Tudeschis (d. 1453), also known as "Abbas siculus" or simply "Panormitanus" (or also "Abbas junior seu modernus") to distinguish him from the "Abbas antiquus", whose name is unknown and who commented on the Decretals about 1275); Nicolas left a "Lectura" on the Decretals, the Liber Sextus, and the Clementines.

For some time longer, the same method of collecting was followed; not to speak of the private compilations, the popes continued to keep up to date the "Decretals" of Gregory IX; in 1245 Innocent IV sent a collection of forty-two decretals to the universities, ordering them to be inserted in their proper places; in 1253 he forwarded the "initia" or first words of the authentic decretals that were to be accepted. Later Gregory X and Nicholas III did likewise, but with little profit, and none of these brief supplementary collections survived. The work was again undertaken by Boniface VIII, who had prepared and published an official collection to complete the five existing books; this was known as the "Sextus" (Liber Sextus). Clement V also had prepared a collection which, in addition to his own decretals, contained the decisions of the Council of Vienne (1311–12); it was published in 1317 by his successor John XXII and was called the "Clementinæ". This was the last of the medieval official collections. Two later compilations included in the "Corpus Juris" are private works, the "Extravagantes of John XXII", arranged in 1325 by Zenzelin de Cassanis, who glossed them, and the "Extravagantes communes", a belated collection; it was only in the edition of the "Corpus Juris" by Jean Chappuis, in 1500, that these collections found a fixed form. The "Sextus" was glossed and commented by Joannes Andreæ, called the "fons et tuba juris" (d. 1348), and by Cardinal Jean Le Moine (Joannes Monachus, d. 1313), whose works were often printed.

When authors speak of the "closing" of the "Corpus Juris", they do not mean an act of the popes forbidding canonists to collect new documents, much less forbidding themselves to add to the ancient collections. But the canonical movement, so active after Gratian's time, has ceased forever. External circumstances, it is true, the Western Schism, the troubles of the fifteenth century, the Reformation, were unfavourable to the compiling of new canonical collections; but there were more direct causes. The special object of the first collections of the decretals was to help settle the law, which the canonists of Bologna were trying to systematize; that is why they contain so many specific decisions, from which the authors gathered general principles; when these had been ascertained the specific decisions were of no use except for jurisprudence; and in fact the "Sextus", the "Clementinæ", and the other collections contain texts only when they are the statement of a general law. Any changes deemed necessary could be made in teaching without the necessity of recasting and augmenting the already numerous and massive collections.

F. *From the Decretals to the Present Time.*—After the fourteenth century, except for its contact with the collections we have just treated of, canon law loses its unity. The actual law is found in the works of the canonists rather than in any specific collection; each one gathers his texts where he can; there is no one general collection sufficient for the purpose. It is not a case of confusion, but of isolation and dispersion. The sources of law later than the "Corpus Juris" are the decisions of councils, especially of the Council of Trent (1545–1563), which are so varied and important that by themselves they form a short code, though without much order; the constitutions of the popes, numerous but hitherto not officially collected, except the "Bullarium" of Benedict XIV (1747); the Rules of the Apostolic Chancery (q. v.); lastly the decrees, decisions, and various acts of the Roman Congregations, jurisprudence rather than law properly so called. For local law we have provincial councils and diocesan statutes. It is true there have been published collections of councils and Bullaria. Several Roman Congregations have also had their acts collected in official publications; but these are rather erudite compilations or repertories. We are to-day farther away than ever from a single accurate code of ecclesiastical law, owing to the mass and variety of documents, and also because no regulation is presumed abrogated unless it is abrogated expressly by a new law. From this one can appreciate the utility as well as the difficulty of the codification undertaken by Pius X.

V. CODIFICATION—The method followed, both by private individuals and the popes, in drawing up canonical collections is rather that of a co-ordinated compilation or juxtaposition of documents than codification in the modern sense of the word, i. e. a redaction of the laws (all the laws) into an orderly series of short precise texts. It is true that antiquity, even the Roman law, did not offer any model different from that of the various collections; that method, however, long since ceased to be useful or possible in canon law.

Since the "closing" of the "Corpus Juris" two attempts have been made; the first was of little use, not being official; the second, was official, but was not brought to a successful issue. In 1590 the jurisconsult Pierre Mathieu, of Lyons, published under the title "Liber septimus" a supplement to the "Corpus Juris", divided according to the order of the books and titles of the Decretals. It includes a selection of papal constitutions, from Sixtus IV to Sixtus V (1471–1590), but not the decrees of the Council of Trent. This compilation was of some service, and in a certain number of editions of the "Corpus Juris" was included as an appendix. As soon as the official edition of the "Corpus Juris" was published in 1582, Gregory XIII appointed a commission to bring up to date and complete the venerable collection. Sixtus V hastened the work and at length Cardinal Pinelli presented to Clement VIII what was meant to be a "Liber septimus". For the purpose of further studies the pope had it printed in 1598: the pontifical constitutions and the decrees of the Council of Trent were inserted in it in the order of the Decretals. For several reasons Clement VIII refused to approve this work and the project was definitively abandoned. (An abridged edition of this "Liber Septimus" of Clement VIII was published by M. Sentis, Freiburg, 1870.) Had this collection been approved it would have been as little used to-day as the others, the situation continuing to grow worse.

Many times during the nineteenth century, especially at the time of the Vatican Council (Collectio Lacensis, VII, 826), the bishops had urged the Holy See to draw up a complete collection of the laws in force, adapted to the needs of the day. It is true, their requests have been complied with in regard to certain matters; Pius X in his "Motu proprio" of 19 March, 1904, refers to the constitution "Apostolicæ Sedis" limiting and cataloguing the censures "latæ sententiæ", the Constitution "Officiorum", revising the laws of the Index; the Constitution "Conditæ" on the religious congregations with simple vows. These and several other recent documents were, moreover, drawn up in short precise articles, to a certain extent a novelty, and the beginning of a codification. Pius X has at length officially ordered a codification, in the modern sense of the word, for the whole canon law. In the first year of his pontificate he issued the Motu Proprio "Arduum", (De Ecclesiæ legibus in unum redigendis); it treats of the complete codification and reformation of canon law. For this purpose the pope has requested the entire episcopate, grouped in provinces, to make known to him the reforms they desire. At the same time he appointed a commission of consultors, on whom the initial work devolves, and a commission of cardinals, charged with the study and approval of the new texts, subject later to the sanction of the sovereign pontiff. The plans of the various titles have been confided to canonists in every country. The general idea of the future Code includes (after the preliminary section) four main divisions: persons, things (with subdivisions for the sacraments, sacred places and objects, etc.), trials, crimes and penalties. It is practically the plan of the "Institutiones", or manuals of canon law. The articles will be numbered consecutively. The first part of this great work is now almost finished. It is impossible to say what modifications and reforms will be made in the ancient law; we can, however, expect from this great work, to the immensity of which (*amplitudo et moles*) Pius X makes allusion, the best results for the study and practice of ecclesiastical law.

VI. Ecclesiastical Law.—The sources of canon law, and the canonical writers, give us, it is true, rules of action, each with its specific object. We have now to consider all these laws in their common abstract element, in other words Ecclesiastical Law, its characteristics and its practice. According to the excellent definition of St. Thomas (I, 2, q. 90, a. 1) a law is a reasonable ordinance for the common good, promulgated by the head of the community. Ecclesiastical law therefore has for its author the head of the Christian community over which he has jurisdiction strictly so called; its object is the common welfare of that community, although it may cause inconvenience to individuals; it is adapted to the obtaining of the common welfare, which implies that it is physically and morally possible for the majority of the community to observe it; the legislator must intend to bind his subjects and must make known that intention clearly; finally he must bring the law under the notice of the community. A law is thus distinguished from a counsel, which is optional not obligatory; from a precept, which is imposed not on the community but on individual members; and from a regulation or direction, which refers to accessory matters.

The object therefore of ecclesiastical law is all that is necessary or useful in order that the society may attain its end, whether there be question of its organization, its working, or the acts of its individual members; it extends also to temporal things, but only indirectly. With regard to acts, the law obliges the individual either to perform or to omit certain acts; hence the distinction into "affirmative or preceptive" laws and "negative or prohibitory" laws; at times it is forced to allow certain things to be done, and we have "permissive" laws, or laws of forbearance; finally, the law in addition to forbidding a given act may render it, if performed, null and void; these are "irritant" laws. Laws in general, and irritant laws in particular, are not retroactive, unless such is expressly declared by the legislator to be the case. The publication or promulgation of the law has a double aspect: law must be brought to the knowledge of the community in order that the latter may be able to observe it, and in this consists the publication. But there may be legal forms of publication, requisite and necessary, and in this consists the promulgation properly so called (see Promulgation). Whatever may be said about the forms used in the past, to-day the promulgation of general ecclesiastical laws is effected exclusively by the insertion of the law in the official publication of the Holy See, the "Acta Apostolicæ Sedis", in compliance with the Constitution "Promulgandi", of Pius X, dated 29 September, 1908, except in certain specifically mentioned cases. The law takes effect and is binding on all members of the community as soon as it is promulgated, allowing for the time morally necessary for it to become known, unless the legislator has fixed a special time at which it is to come into force.

No one is presumed to be ignorant of the law; only ignorance of fact, not ignorance of law, is excusable (Reg. 13 jur. in VI°). Everyone subject to the legislator is bound in conscience to observe the law. A violation of the law, either by omission of by act, is punishable with a penalty (q. v.). These penalties may be settled beforehand by the legislator, or they may be left to the discretion of the judge who imposes them. A violation of the moral law or what one's conscience judges to be the moral law is a sin; a violation of the exterior penal law, in addition to the sin, renders one liable to a punishment or penalty; if the will of the legislator is only to oblige the offender to submit to the penalty, the law is said to be "purely penal"; such are some of the laws adopted by civil legislatures, and it is generally admitted that some ecclesiastical laws are of this kind. As baptism is the gate of entrance to the ecclesiastical society, all those who are baptized, even non-Catholics, are in principle subject to the laws of the Church; in practice the question arises only when certain acts of heretics and schismatics come before Catholic tribunals; as a general rule an irritant law is enforced in such a case, unless the legislator has exempted them from its ob-

servance, for instance, for the form of marriage. General laws, therefore, bind all Catholics wherever they may be. In the case of particular laws, as one is subject to them in virtue of one's domicile, or even quasi-domicile, passing strangers are not subject to them, except in the case of acts performed within the territory.

The rôle of the legislator does not end with the promulgation of the law; it is his office to explain and interpret it (*declaratio, interpretatio legis*). The interpretation is "official" (*authentica*) or even "necessary", when it is given by the legislator or by some one authorized by him for that purpose; it is "customary", when it springs from usage or habit; it is "doctrinal", when it is based on the authority of the learned writers or the decisions of the tribunals. The official interpretation alone has the force of law. According to the result, the interpretation is said to be "comprehensive, extensive, restrictive, corrective," expressions easily understood. The legislator, and in the case of particular laws the superior, remains master of the law; he can suppress it either totally (abrogation), or partially (derogation), or he can combine it with a new law which suppresses in the first law all that is incompatible with the second (abrogation). Laws co-exist as far as they are reconcilable; the more recent modifies the more ancient, but a particular law is not suppressed by a general law, unless the fact is stated expressly. A law can also cease when its purpose and end cease, or even when it is too difficult to be observed by the generality of the subjects; it then falls into desuetude (see CUSTOM).

In every society, but especially in a society so vast and varied as the Church, it is impossible for every law to be applicable always and in all cases. Without suppressing the law, the legislator can permanently exempt from it certain persons or certain groups, or certain matters, or even extend the rights of certain subjects; all these concessions are known as privileges (q. v.). In the same manner the legislator can derogate from the law in special cases; this is called a dispensation (q. v.). Indults or the powers that the bishops of the Catholic world receive from the Holy See, to regulate the various cases that may arise in the administration of their dioceses, belong to the category of privileges; together with the dispensations granted directly by the Holy See, they eliminate any excessive rigidity of the law, and ensure to ecclesiastical legislation a marvellous facility of application. Without imperilling the rights and prerogatives of the legislator, but on the contrary strengthening them, indults impress more strongly on the law of the Church that humane, broad, merciful character, mindful of the welfare of souls, but also of human weakness, which likens it to the moral law and distinguishes it from civil legislation, which is much more external and inflexible.

VII. THE PRINCIPAL CANONISTS.—It is impossible to draw up a detailed and systematic catalogue of all the works of special value in the study of canon law; the most distinguished canonists are the subject of special articles in this ENCYCLOPEDIA. Those we have mentioned as commentators of the ancient canonical collections are now of interest only from an historical point of view; but the authors who have written since the Council of Trent are still read with profit; it is in their great works that we find our practical canon law. Among the authors who have written on special chapters of the "Corpus Juris", we must mention (the date refers to the first edition of the works): Prospero Fagnani, the distinguished secretary of the Sacred Congregation of the Council, "Jus canonicum seu commentaria absolutissima in quinque libros Decretalium" (Rome, 1661); Manuel González Téllez (d. 1649), "Commentaria perpetua in singulos textus juris canonici" (Lyons, 1673); the Jesuit Paul Laymann, better known as a moral theologian, "Jus canonicum seu commentaria in libros Decretalium" (Dillingen, 1666); Ubaldo Giraldi, Clerk Regular of the Pious Schools, "Expositio juris pontificii juxta recentiorem Ecclesiæ disciplinam" (Rome, 1769).

Among the canonists who have followed the order of the titles of the Decretals: the Benedictine Louis Engel, professor at Salzburg, "Universum jus canonicum secundum titulos libr. Decretalium" (Salzburg, 1671); the Jesuit Ehrenreich Pirhing, "Universum jus canonicum" etc. (Dillingen, 1645); the Franciscan Anaclet Reiffenstuel, "Jus canonicum universum" (Freising, 1700); the Jesuit James Wiestner, "Institutiones canonicæ" (Munich, 1705); the two brothers Francis and Benedict Schmier, both Benedictines and professors at Salzburg; Francis wrote "Jurisprudentia canonico-civilis" (Salzburg, 1716); Benedict: "Liber I Decretalium; Lib. II etc." (Salzburg, 1718); the Jesuit Francis Schmalzgrueber, "Jus ecclesiasticum universum" (Dillingen, 1717); Peter Leuren, also a Jesuit, "Forum ecclesiasticum" etc. (Mainz, 1717); Vitus Pichler, a Jesuit, the successor of Schmalzgrueber, "Summa jurisprudentiæ sacræ" (Augsburg, 1723); Eusebius Amort, a Canon Regular, "Elementa juris canonici veteris et moderni" (Ulm, 1757); Amort wrote also among other works of a very personal character, "De origine, progressu . . . indulgentiarum" (Augsburg, 1735); Carlo Sebastiano Berardi, "Commentaria in jus canonicum universum" (Turin, 1766); also his "Institutiones" and his great work "Gratiani canones genuini ab apocryphis discreti", (Turin, 1752); James Anthony Zallinger, a Jesuit, "Institutiones juris ecclesiastici maxime privati" (Augsburg, 1791), not so well known as his "Institutionum juris naturalis et ecclesiastici publici libri quinque" (Augsburg, 1784). This same method was followed again in the nineteenth century by Canon Filippo de Angelis, "Prælectiones juris canonici", (Rome, 1877); by his colleague Francesco Santi, "Prælectiones", (Ratisbon, 1884; revised by Martin Leitner, 1903); and E. Grandclaude, "Jus canonicum" (Paris, 1882).

The plan of the "Institutiones", in imitation of Lancelotti (Perugia, 1563), has been followed by very many canonists, among whom the principal are: the learned Antonio Agustin, Archbishop of Tarragona, "Epitome juris pontificii veteris" (Tarragona, 1587); his "De emendatione Gratiani dialogorum libri duo" (Tarragona, 1587), is worthy of mention; Claude Fleury, "Institution au droit ecclésiastique" (Paris, 1676); Zeger Bernard van Espen, "Jus ecclesiasticum universum" (Cologne, 1748); the Benedictine Dominic Schram, "Institutiones juris ecclesiastici" (Augsburg, 1774); Vincenzo Lupoli, "Juris ecclesiastici prælectiones" (Naples, 1777); Giovanni Devoti, titular Archbishop of Carthage, "Institutionum canonicarum libri quatuor" (Rome, 1785); his "Commentary on the Decretals" has only the first three books (Rome, 1803); Cardinal Soglia, "Institutiones juris privati et publici ecclesiastici" (Paris, 1859) and "Institutiones juris publici", (Loreto, 1843); D. Craisson, Vicar-General of Valence, "Manuale compendium totius juris canonici" (Poitiers, 1861). School manuals in one or two volumes are very numerous and it is impossible to mention all. We may cite in Italy those of G. C. Ferrari (1847); Vecchiotti (Turin, 1867); De Camillis, (Rome, 1869); Sebastiano Sanguinetti, S. J. (Rome, 1884); Carlo Lombardi (Rome, 1898); Guglielmo Sebastianelli (Rome, 1898), etc. For German-speaking countries, Ferdinand Walter (Bonn, 1822); F. M. Permaneder, 1846; Rosshirt, 1858; George Phillips (Ratisbon, 1859: in addition to his large work in eight volumes, 1845 sq.); J. Winckler, 1862 (specially for Switzerland); S. Aichner (Brixen, 1862) specially for Austria; J. F. Schulte (Geissen, 1863); F. H. Vering (Freiburg-im-B., 1874); Isidore Silbernagl (Ratisbon, 1879); H. Laemmer (Freiburg-im-B., 1886); Phil. Hergenroether (Freiburg-im-B., 1888); J. Hollweck (Freiburg-im-B., 1905); J. Laurentius

(Freiburg-im-B., 1903); D. M. Prummer, 1907; J. B. Sägmüller (Freiburg-im-B., 1904). For France: H. Icard, Superior of Saint-Sulpice (Paris, 1867); M. Bargilliat (Paris, 1893); F. Deshayes, "Memento juris ecclesiastici" (Paris, 1897). In Belgium: De Brabandère (Bruges, 1903). For English-speaking countries: Smith (New York, 1890); Gignac (Quebec, 1901); Taunton (London, 1906). For Spain: Marian Aguilar (Santo Domingo de la Calzada, 1904); Gonzales Ibarra (Valladolid, 1904).

There are also canonists who have written at considerable length either on the whole canon law, or on special parts of it, in their own particular manner; it is difficult to give a complete list, but we will mention: Agostino Barbosa (d. 1639), whose works fill at least 30 volumes; Cardinal J. B. Luca (d. 1683), whose immense "Theatrum veritatis" and "Relatio curiæ romanæ" are his most important works; Pignatelli, who has touched on all practical questions in his "Consultationes canonicæ", 11 folio volumes, Geneva, 1668; Prospero Lambertini (Pope Benedict XIV), perhaps the greatest canonist since the Council of Trent (q. v.); in the nineteenth century we must mention the different writings of Dominique Bouix, 15 volumes, Paris, 1852 sq.; the "Kirchenrecht" of J. F. Schulte, 1856 and of Rudolf v. Scherer, 1886; and above all the great work of Franz Xavier Wernz, General of the Society of Jesus, "Jus decretalium" (Rome, 1898 sq.). It is impossible to enumerate the special treatises. Among repertoires and dictionaries, it will suffice to cite the "Prompta Bibliotheca" of the Franciscan Ludovico Ferraris (Bologna, 1746); the "Dictionnaire de droit canonique" of Durand de Maillane (Avignon, 1761), continued later by Abbé André (Paris, 1847) etc.; finally the other encyclopedias of ecclesiastical sciences wherein canon law has been treated.

On ecclesiastical public law, the best-known handbooks are, with Soglia, T. M. Salzano, "Lezioni di diritto canonico pubblico et privato" (Naples, 1845); Cardinal Camillo Tarquini, "Juris ecclesiastici publici institutiones" (Rome, 1860); Cardinal Felice Cavagnis, "Institutiones juris publici ecclesiastici" (Rome, 1888); Mgr Adolfo Giobbio, "Lezioni di diplomazia ecclesiastica" (Rome, 1899); Emman. de la Pena y Fernández, "Jus publicum ecclesiasticum" (Seville, 1900). For an historical view, the chief work is that of Pierre de Marca, Archbishop of Toulouse, "De concordia sacerdotii et imperii" (Paris, 1641).

For the history of canon law considered in its sources and collections, we must mention the brothers Pietro and Antonio Ballerini of Verona, "De antiquis collectionibus et collectoribus canonum" (Venice, 1757); among the works of St. Leo I, in P. L., LIII; the matter has been recast and completed by Friedrich Maassen, "Geschichte der Quellen und der Literatur des kanonischen Rechts im Abendland", I, (Graz, 1870); for the history from the time of Gratian see J. F. Schulte, "Geschichte der Quellen und der Literatur des kanonischen Rechts von Gratian bis zum Gegenwart" (Stuttgart, 1875 sq.), and "Die Lehre von der Quellen des katholiscen Kirchenrechts" (Giessen, 1860); Philip Schneider, "Die Lehre von den Kirchenrechtsquellen" (Ratisbon, 1892), Adolphe Tardif, "Histoire des sources du droit canonique" (Paris, 1887); Franz Laurin, "Introductio in Corpus Juris canonici" (Freiburg, 1889). On the history of ecclesiastical discipline and institutions, the principal work is "Ancienne et nouvelle discipline de l'Eglise" by the Oratorian Louis Thomassin (Lyons, 1676), translated into Latin by the author, "Vetus et nova disciplina" (Paris, 1688). One may consult with profit A. J. Binterim, "Die vorzüglichsten Denkwürdigkeiten der christkatolischen Kirche" (Mainz, 1825); the "Dizionario di erudizione storico-ecclesiastica" by Moroni (Venice, 1840 sq.); also J. W. Bickell, "Geschichte des Kirchenrechts" (Giessen, 1843); E. Loening, "Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenrechts (Strasburg, 1878); R. Sohm, "Kirchenrecht, I: Die geschichtliche Grundlagen" (1892).

A. Boudinhon.

Law, Civil, Influence of the Church on.—Christianity is essentially an ethical religion; and, although its moral principles were meant directly for the elevation of the individual, still they could not fail to exercise a powerful influence on such a public institution as law, the crystallized rule of human conduct. The law of Rome escaped this influence to a large extent, because much of it was compiled before Christianity was recognized by the public authorities. But the *leges barbarorum* were more completely interpenetrated, as it were, by Christian influences; they received their definite form only after the several nations had submitted to the gentle yoke of Christ. This influence of the Church is particularly noticeable in the following matters:

(1) *Slavery.*—The condition of the slaves was most pitiable in the ages of antiquity. According to Roman law and usage a slave was considered, not as a human being, but as a chattel, over which the master had the most absolute control, up to the point of inflicting death. Gradually, the spirit of Christianity restricted these inhuman rights. From the time of the Emperor Antoninus Pius (138–61) a master was punished if he killed his slave without reason, or even practised on him excessive cruelty (Instit. Just., lib. I, tit. 8; Dig., lib. I, tit. 6, leges 1, 2). The emperor Constantine (306–37) made it homicide to kill a slave with malice aforethought, and described certain modes of barbarous punishment by which, if death followed, the guilt of homicide was incurred (Cod. Just., lib. IX, tit. 14). A further relief consisted in facilitating the manumission or liberation of slaves. According to several laws of Constantine the ordinary formalities could be dispensed with if the manumission took place in the church, before the people and the sacred ministers. The clergy were permitted to bestow freedom on their slaves in their last will, or even by simple word of mouth (Cod. Just., lib. I, tit. 13, leges 1, 2). The Emperor Justinian I (527–65) gave to freed persons the full rank and rights of Roman citizens, and abolished the penalty of condemnation to servitude (Cod. Just., lib. VII, tit. 6; Nov., XXII, cap. viii; Nov. LXXVIII, præf. capp. i, ii). Similar provisions were found in the Barbarian codes. According to the Burgundian and Visigothic laws the murder of a slave was punished; emancipation in the church and before the priest was permitted and encouraged. In one point they were ahead of the Roman law; they recognized the legality of the marriage between slaves, in the Lombardic law, on the authority of the Scriptural sentence: "Whom God hath joined together, let no man put asunder." The Church could not directly abolish slavery; she was satisfied with admitting the slaves within her pale on a footing of equality with others, with counselling patience and submission on the part of the slave, forbearance and moderation on that of the master. Otherwise she concurred in the civil legislation, or even went beyond it in some cases. Thus, the killing of a slave was severely punished (Counc. of Elvira, A. D. 300, Can. v; Counc. of Epaon, A. D. 517, Can. xxxiv); a fugitive slave who had taken refuge in the church was to be restored to his master only on the latter's promise of remitting the punishment (Counc. of Orléans, A. D. 511, Can. iii, c. vi, X, lib. III, tit. 49); marriage between slaves was recognized as valid (Counc. of Chalons, A. D. 813, Can. xxx; c. i, X, lib. IV, tit. 9); and even the marriage between a free person and a slave was ratified, provided it had been contracted with full knowledge (Counc. of Compiègne, A. D. 757, Can. viii).

(2) *Paternal Authority* (*Potestas Paterna*).—According to the Roman law the power of the father over his

children was as absolute as that of the master over his slaves: it extended to their freedom and life. The harsher features of this usage were gradually eliminated. Thus, according to the laws of different emperors, the killing of a child either by the father or by the mother was declared to be one of the greatest crimes (Cod. Theod., lib. IX, tit. 14, 15; Cod. Just., lib. IX, tit. 17; Dig., lib. XLVIII, tit. 9, lex 1). Cruel treatment of children was forbidden, such as the *jus liberos noxæ dandi*, i. e., the right of handing children over to the power of someone injured by them (Instit. Just., lib. IV, tit. 8); children could not be sold or given away to the power of others (Cod. Just., lib. IV, tit. 43, lex 1); children that were sold by their father on account of poverty were to be set free (Cod. Theod., lib. III, tit. 3, lex 1); finally, all children exposed by their parents and fallen into servitude were to become free without exception (Cod. Just., lib. VIII, tit. 52, lex 3). The son of a family was entitled to dispose in his last will of the possessions acquired either in military service (*peculium castrense*), or in the exercise of an office (*peculium quasi castrense*), or in any other way (Instit. Just., lib. II, tit. 11; c. iv, VI, lib. III, tit. 12). The children could not be disinherited at the simple wish of the father, but only for certain specified reasons based on ingratitude (Nov. CXV. cc. iii sqq.).

(3) *Marriage.*—In the ancient law of Rome the wife was, like the rest of the family, the property of the husband, who could dispose of her at will. Christianity rescued woman from this degrading condition by attributing to her equal rights, and by making her the companion of the husband. This equality was in part recognized by imperial laws, which gave to women the right of controlling their property, and to mothers the right of guardianship (Cod. Theod., lib. II, tit. 17, lex 1; lib. III, tit. 17, lex 4). The boundless liberty of divorce, which had obtained since the time of Augustus, was restricted to a certain number of cases. The legislation of the Emperors Constantine and Justinian on this subject did not come up to the standard of Christianity, but it approached it and imposed a salutary check on the free desire of husband or wife for separation (Cod. Theod., lib. III, tit. 16, lex 1; Cod. Just., lib. V, tit. 17, leg. 8, 10, 11). Woman was highly respected among the barbarian nations; and with some, like the Visigoths, divorce was forbidden except for adultery.

(4) *Wills and Testaments.*—The canon law introduced various modifications in the regulations of the civil law concerning last wills and testaments; among them there is one which enforced a particular fairness in favour of the necessary heirs, such as children. According to the Roman law, one who became heir or legatee with the condition of a *fideicommissum* (i. e., of transmitting his inheritance or legacy to another after his death) had the right of deducting the fourth part from the inheritance or legacy, which was not transmitted; this fourth part being known as the Trebellian quarter. Again, the necessary heirs, such as children, had a claim on a certain part of the inheritance. If it happened that the share of the necessary heir was burdened with a *fideicommissum*, then the necessary heir was entitled only to deduct the part coming to him as a necessary heir, but not the Trebellian quarter (Cod. Just., lib. VI, tit. 49, lex 6). The canon law modified this provision by enjoining that the necessary heir in such a case was entitled first to the deduction of his natural share and then also to the deduction of the Trebellian quarter from the rest of the inheritance (cc. 16, 18, X, lib. III, tit. 26).

(5) *Property Rights.*—According to a provision in the Roman law, a man who was forcibly ejected from his property could, in order to recover it, apply the process known as the *interdictum unde vi* against the one who ejected him directly or indirectly, i. e., against him who perpetrated the act of ejection or who counselled it. But he could take action against the heirs of those who ejected him only in so far as they were enriched by the spoliation, and none against a third owner, who meanwhile had obtained possession of his former property (Dig., lib. XLVIII, tit. 16, lex 1. tit. 17, lex 3). The canon law modified this unfair measure by decreeing that he who was despoiled of his property could insist first on being reinstated; if the matter were brought to the courts, he could allege the *exceptio spolii*, or the fact of spoliation; and, finally, he was permitted to have recourse to the law against a third owner who had acquired the property with the knowledge of its unjust origin (c. 18, X, lib. II, tit. 13; c. 1, VI, lib. II, tit. 5).

(6) *Contracts.*—The Roman law distinguished between pacts (*pacta nuda*) and contracts. The former could not be enforced by law or a civil action, while the latter, being clothed in special judicial solemnities, were binding before the law and the civil courts. Against this distinction the canon law insists on the obligation incurred by any agreement of whatever form, or in whatever manner it may have been contracted (c. 1, 3, X, lib. I, tit. 35).

(7) *Prescriptions.*—The Roman law admitted the right of prescription in favour of him who had been in good faith only at the beginning of his possession; and it abstracted altogether from the good or bad faith in either party to a civil action, if it were terminated by prescription. The canon law required the good faith in him who prescribed for all the time of his possession; and it refused to acknowledge prescription in the case of a civil action against a possessor of bad faith (cc. 5, 20, X, lib. II, tit. 26; c. 2, VI, lib. V, tit. 12, De Reg. Jur.). (See PRESCRIPTION.)

(8) *Legal Procedure.*—The spirit of Christianity made itself felt in the treatment of criminals and prisoners. Thus prisoners were not to be subjected to inhuman maltreatment before their trial (Cod. Theod., lib. IX, tit. 3, lex 1); criminals already sentenced were not to be branded on the forehead (Cod. Theod., lib. IX, tit. 40, lex 2); the bishops received the right of interceding for prisoners detained for lighter offences, and to obtain their freedom on the feast of Easter; they were likewise empowered to visit the prisons on Wednesdays or Fridays in order to see that the magistrates heaped no extra afflictions on the prisoners (Cod. Theod., lib. IX, tit. 38, leges 3, 4, 6–8; Cod. Just., lib. I, tit. 4, leges 3, 9, 22, 23). To all this may be added the recognition of the right of asylum in the churches, which prevented a hasty and vindictive administration of justice (Cod. Theod., lib. IX, tit. 15, lex 4). A great evil among the Germanic nations was the trial by ordeals, or judgments of God. The Church was unable for some time to suppress them, but at least she tried to control them, placed them under the direction of the priests, and gave to them a Christian appearance by prescribing special blessings and ceremonies for such occasions. The popes, however, were always opposed to the ordeals as implying a tempting of God; decrees to that effect were enacted by Nicholas I (858–67), Stephen V (885–91), Alexander II (1061–73), Celestine III (1191–98), Innocent III (1198–1216), and Honorius III (1216–27) (cc. 22, 20, 7, C. II, q. 5; cc. 1, 3, X, lib. V, tit. 35; c. 9, X, lib. III, tit. 50). Another evil consisted in the feuds or sanguinary conflicts between private persons in revenge for injuries or murders. The Church could not stop them altogether, owing to the conditions of anarchy and barbarism prevailing among the nations in the Middle Ages; but she succeeded at least in restricting them to certain periods of the year, and certain days of the week, by what is known as the *treuga Dei*, or "Truce of God". By this institution private feuds were forbidden from Advent to the Octave of Epiphany, from Septuagesima Sunday until the Octave of Pentecost, and from sunset of Wednesday until sunrise of Monday. Laws to that effect were enacted as early as the middle of the eleventh century in nearly

all countries of Western Europe—in France, Germany, Italy, Spain, England. The canon law insisted on certain principles of fairness: thus, it acknowledged that a civil action might extend sometimes over three years, against the ordinary rule (c. 20, X, lib. II, tit. 1); connected questions, such as disputes about possessions and the right of property, were to be submitted to the same court (c. 1, X, lib. II, tit. 12; c. 1, X, lib. II, tit. 17); a suspected judge could not be refused, unless the reasons were manifested and proved (c. 61, X, lib. II, tit. 28); of two contradictory sentences rendered by different judges the one favouring the accused was to prevail (c. 26, X, lib. II, tit. 27); the intention of appealing could be manifested outside of the court in the presence of good men, if anyone entertained fear of the judge (c. 73, X, lib. II, tit. 28).

(9) *Legislation, Government, and Administration of Justice.*—The Church was allowed to exercise a wide influence on civil law by the fact that her ministers, chiefly the bishops and abbots, had a large share in framing the *leges barbarorum*. Practically all the laws of the barbarian nations were written under Christian influences; and the unlettered barbarians willingly accepted the aid of the lettered clergy to reduce to writing the institutes of their forefathers. The co-operation of the clergy is not expressly mentioned in all the codes of this kind: in some only the learned in the law, or, again, the *proceres*, or nobles, are spoken of; but the ecclesiastics were, as a rule, the only learned men, and the higher clergy, bishops and abbots, belonged to the class of the nobles. Ecclesiastics—priests or bishops—were certainly employed in the composition of the "Lex Romana Visigothorum" or "Breviarium Alarici", the "Lex Visigothorum" of Spain, the "Lex Alamannorum", the "Lex Bajuwariorum", the Anglo-Saxon laws, and the capitularies of the Frankish kings (cf. Stobbe, "Gesch. der deut. Rechtsquellen", I). The bishops and abbots also had a great share in the government of states in the Middle Ages. They took a leading part in the great assemblies common to most of the Germanic nations; they had a voice in the election of the kings; they performed the coronation of the kings; they lived much at the Court, and were the chief advisers of the kings. The office of chancellor in England and in the medieval German Empire was the highest in the State (for the chancellor was the prime minister of the king or emperor, and responsible for all his public acts; it was the chancellor who annulled iniquitous decrees of the king or emperor, and righted all that was wrong); and this office was usually entrusted to an ecclesiastic, in Germany generally to a distinguished bishop (cf. Stubbs, "Constitutional History of England", I; Waitz, "Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte", VI). The bishops also had a great share in the administration of justice. As in the East so also in the West, they had a general superintendence over the courts of justice. They always had a seat in the highest tribunal; to them the injured parties could appeal in default of justice; and they had the power to punish subordinate judges for injustice in the absence of the king. In Spain they had a special charge to keep continual watch over the administration of justice, and were summoned on all great occasions to instruct the judges to act with piety and justice. What is more, they often acted directly as judges in temporal matters. By a law of the Emperor Constantine (321) the parties to a litigation could, by mutual consent, appeal to the bishop in any stage of their judicial controversy; and by a further enactment (331) either party could do so even without the consent of the other. This second part, however, was again abrogated by subsequent legislation.

In the Middle Ages the bishops acted likewise as judges, both in civil and in criminal matters. In civil matters the Church drew to its jurisdiction all things of a mixed character—the *causæ spirituali annexæ*, which were partly temporal and partly ecclesiastical. Criminal matters were brought before the bishop's court, which was held usually in connexion with the episcopal visitation throughout the diocese (cf. Sägmüller, "Lehrbuch des Kirchenrechts", III, 658 sqq.). The methods employed by the ecclesiastical or episcopal courts in a judicial process were such that they served as a model for secular courts. At the beginning the proceedings were very simple; the bishop decided the case presented to him with the advice of the body of presbyters, but without any definite formalities. After the twelfth century the Church elaborated her own method of procedure, with such comparative perfection that it was imitated to a large extent by modern courts. Several principles prevailed in this regard: first, all essential parts of a trial were to be recorded in writing—such as the presentation of the complaint, the citation of the defendant, the proofs, the deposition of witnesses, the defence, and the sentence; secondly, both parties were entitled to a full opportunity of presenting all material relating to the accusation or to the defence; thirdly, the parties in a litigation had the right of appealing to a higher court after the lapse of the ordinary term for a trial (which was two years); the party dissatisfied with the decision was permitted to appeal within ten days after the rendering of the sentence (cf. Sägmüller, "Lehrbuch des Kirchenrechts", III, 668 sqq.).

(10) *Sacred Scripture in Legislation.*—A last instance of the influence of Christianity on legislation is found in the appeal to the books of Sacred Scripture in support of civil laws. In the Roman law there is hardly any reference to Scripture. And that is not surprising, since the spirit of Roman legislation, even under the Christian emperors, was heathen, and the emperor—the *principis voluntas*—was conceived of as the supreme and ultimate source of legislation. On the contrary, the codes of the barbarian nations are replete with quotations from Scripture. In the prologue to several of them reference is made to the legislation given by Moses to the Jewish people (cf. Stobbe, "Gesch. der deut. Rechtsquellen", I, 57). Mention has been made above of a Lombardic law which recognizes the legality of marriages among slaves on the authority of the Scriptural text: "Whom God hath joined together, let no man put asunder" (Matt., xix, 6; Mark, x, 9). Many other examples may be found, e. g., in the "Leges Visigothorum" and in the capitularies of the Frankish kings, where almost every book of the Old and New Testament is resorted to for argument or illustration. It will suffice to open the pages in the editions of these codes by Zeumer, Boretius, and Krause, in the "Mon. Germ. Hist.: Leges", sect. I, 1, Sect. II, 1, 2, where the exact references to the Scriptural passages are marked in foot-notes.

Besides the works, already quoted, of Stubbs and Waitz, see Permaneder in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v. *Civilrecht und Civilprozess, Einfluss der Kirche auf dieselben;* Milman, *History of Latin Christianity*, I (New York, 1896); Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, III (5th ed., New York, 1893); Glasson, *Histoire du droit et des institutions de la France*, I (Paris, 1887); Digby, *Mores Catholici, or Ages of Faith* (3 vols., London, 1841–47); Gengler, *Einfluss d. Christenthums auf d. deutsche Rechtsleben* (Erlangen, 1884); Kober, *Einfluss d. Kirche u. ihrer Gesetzgebung auf Gesittung . . . im Mittelalter* in *Tüb. Theol. Quartalschrift* (1888), 443, 466; Troplong, *De l'influence du christianisme sur le droit romain* (reprint, Tours, 1903); Grupp, *Culturgesch. des Mittelalters* (Stuttgart, 1894–97); Allard, *Les Esclaves chrétiens* (Paris, 1900); Kurth, *Origines de la civilisation moderne* (Paris, 1898); Ratzinger, *Gesch. d. kirchl. Armenpflege* (Freiburg, 1884); Lallemant, *Hist. de la charité* (Paris, 1905–).

Francis J. Schaefer.

Law, Common (Lat. *communis*, general, of general application; *lex*, law). The term is of English origin and is used to describe the juridical principles and general rules regulating the possession, use and inheritance of property and the conduct of individuals, the origin of which is not definitely known, which have been observed since a remote period of antiquity, and

which are based upon immemorial usages and the decisions of the law courts as distinct from the *lex scripta;* the latter consisting of imperial or kingly edicts or express acts of legislation. That pre-eminent English lawyer and law-writer, Sir William Blackstone, states in his "Commentaries upon the Laws of England" that the common law consists of rules properly called *leges non scriptæ*, because their original institution and authority were not set down in writing as Acts of Parliament are, but they receive their binding power and the force of laws, by long immemorial usage, and by their universal reception throughout the kingdom; and, quoting from a famous Roman author, Aulus Gellius, he follows him in defining the common law as did Gellius the *Jus non scriptum* as that which is "tacito illiterato hominum consensu et moribus expressum" (expressed in the usage of the people, and accepted by the tacit unwritten consent of men).

When a community emerges from the tribal condition into that degree of social development which constitutes a *state* and, consequently, the powers of government become defined with more or less distinctness as legislative, executive, and judicial, and the arbitration of disputes leads to the establishment of courts, the community finds itself conscious of certain rules regarding the conduct of life, the maintenance of liberty, and the security of property which come into being at the very twilight of civilization and have been consistently observed from age to age. Such were the usages and customs, having the force of law which became the inheritance of the English people and were first compiled and recorded by Alfred the Great in his famous "Dome-book" or "Liber Judicialis", published by him for the general use of the whole kingdom. That famous depository of laws was referred to in a certain declaration of King Edward, the son of Alfred, with the injunction: "Omnibus qui reipublicæ præsunt etiam atque etiam mando ut omnibus æquos se præbeant judices, perinde ac in judiciali libro scriptum habetur: nec quicquam formident quin jus commune audacter libereque dicant" (To all who are charged with the administration of public affairs I give the express command that they show themselves in all things to be just judges precisely as in the Liber Judicialis it is written; nor shall any of them fear to declare the common law freely and courageously).

In modern times the existence of the "Liber Judicialis" was the subject of great doubt, and such doubt was expressed by many writers upon the constitutional history of England, including both Hallam and Turner. After their day the manuscript of the work was brought to light and was published both in Saxon and English by the Record Commissioners of England in the first volume of the books published by them under the title, "The Ancient Laws and Institutes of England". The profound religious spirit which governed King Alfred and his times clearly appears from the fact that the "Liber Judicialis" began with the Ten Commandments, followed by many of the Mosaic precepts, added to which is the express solemn sanction given to them by Christ in the Gospel: "Do not think that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets; I am not come to destroy but to fulfil." After quoting the canons of the Apostolic Council at Jerusalem, Alfred refers to the Divine commandment, "As ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them", and then declares, "From this one doom, a man may remember that he judge every one righteously, he need heed no other doom-book." The original code of the common law compiled by Alfred was modified by reason of the Danish invasion, and from other causes, so that when the eleventh century began the common law of England was not uniform but consisted of observances of different nature prevailing in various districts, viz: Mercen Lage, or Mercian laws, governing many of the midland counties of England and those bordering upon Wales, the country to which the ancient Britons had retreated at the time of the Anglo-Saxon invasion. These laws were, probably, influenced by and intermixed with the British or Druidical customs. Another distinct code was the West-Saxon Lage (Laws of the West-Saxons) governing counties in the southern part of England from Kent to Devonshire. This was, probably, identical for the most part with the code which was edited and published by Alfred. The wide extent of the Danish conquest is shown by the fact that the Dane Lage, or Danish law, was the code which prevailed in the rest of the midland counties and, also, on the eastern coast. These three systems of law were codified and digested by Edward the Confessor into one system, which was promulgated throughout the entire kingdom and was universally observed. Alfred is designated by early historians as *Legum Anglicanarum Conditor;* Edward the Confessor as *Legum Anglicanarum Restitutor.*

In the days of the Anglo-Saxon kings the courts of justice consisted principally of the county courts. These county courts were presided over by the bishop of the diocese and the ealdorman or sheriff, sitting *en banc* and exercising both ecclesiastical and civil jurisdiction. In these courts originated and developed the custom of trial by jury. Prior to the invasion led by William the Norman, the common law of England provided for the descent of lands to all the males without any right of primogeniture. Military service was required in proportion to the area of each free man's land, a system resembling the feudal system but not accompanied by all its hardships. Penalties for crime were moderate; few capital punishments being inflicted and persons convicted of their first offence being allowed to commute it for a fine or weregild; or in default of payment, by surrendering themselves to life-long bondage. The legal system which thus received form under the direction of the last Saxon King of England, was common to all the realm and was designated as "Jus commune" or Folk-right.

In contradistinction to English jurisprudence the Civil Law of Rome prevailed throughout the Continent. William the Conqueror brought with him into England jurists and clerics thoroughly imbued with the spirit of the civil law and distinctly adverse to the English system. However, the ancient laws and customs of England prevailing before the Conquest, withstood the shock and stress of opposition and remained without impairment to any material extent. The first great court of judicature in England after the Conquest was the Aula Regis or King's Court wherein the king either personally or constructively administered justice for the whole kingdom. The provision in Magna Charta to the effect that the King's Court of Justice should remain fixed and hold its sessions in one certain place, instead of being a peripatetic institution, constitutes historic evidence of the existence of such a court and, also, gives expression to the public discontent created by the fact that its sessions were held at various places and thus entailed great expense and trouble upon litigants. In later days, the Aula Regis became obsolete and its functions were divided between the three great common-law courts of the realm, viz; the Court of King's Bench, the Court of Common Pleas, and the Court of Exchequer. The Court of King's Bench was considered the highest of these three tribunals, although an appeal might be taken from the decisions thereof to the House of Lords. The Court of Common Pleas had jurisdiction over ordinary civil actions, while the Court of Exchequer was restricted in its jurisdiction to causes affecting the royal revenues. Besides these courts the canon law was administered by the Catholic clergy of England in certain ecclesiastical courts called "Curiæ Christianitatis" or Courts Christian. These courts were presided over by the archbishop and bishops and their derivative officers. The canon law at an early date laid down the rule that "Sacerdotes a regibus honorandi sunt, non

judicandi," i. e. the clergy are to be honoured by kings, but not to be judged by them, based on the tradition that when some petitions were brought to the Emperor Constantine, imploring the aid of his authority against certain of his bishops accused of oppression and injustice, he caused the petitions to be burned in their presence bidding them farewell in these words, "Ite et inter vos causas vestras discutite, quia dignum non est ut nos judicemus deos" (judge your own cases; it is not meet that we should judge sacred men).

The ecclesiastical courts of England were: (1) The Archdeacon's Court which was the lowest in point of jurisdiction in the whole ecclesiastical polity. It was held by the archdeacon or, in his absence, before a judge appointed by him and called his *official*. Its jurisdiction was sometimes in concurrence with and sometimes in exclusion of the Bishop's Court of the diocese, and the statute 24 Henr. VIII, c. XII, provided for an appeal to the court presided over by the bishop. (2) The Consistory Court of the diocesan bishop which held its sessions at the bishop's see for the trial of all ecclesiastical causes arising within the diocese. The bishop's chancellor, or his commissary, was the ordinary judge; and from his adjudication an appeal lay to the archbishop of the province. (3) The Court of Arches was a court of appeal belonging to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the judge of such court was called the Dean of the Arches because in ancient times he held court in the church of St. Mary le bow (Sancta Maria de arcubus), one of the churches of London. (4) The Court of Peculiars was a branch of and annexed to the Court of Arches. It had jurisdiction over all those parishes dispersed throughout the Province of Canterbury in the midst of other dioceses, which were exempt from the ordinary's jurisdiction and subject to the metropolitan only. All ecclesiastical causes arising within these peculiar or exempt jurisdictions were, originally, cognizable by this court. From its decisions an appeal lay, formerly, to the pope, but during the reign of Henry VIII this right of appeal was abolished by statute and therefor was substituted an appeal to the king in Chancery. (5) The Prerogative Court was established for the trial of testamentary causes where the deceased had left "bona notabilia" (i. e. chattels of the value of at least one hundred shillings) within two different dioceses. In that case, the probate of wills belonged to the archbishop of the province, by way of special prerogative, and all causes relating to the wills, administrations or legacies of such persons were, originally, cognizable therein before a judge appointed by the archbishop and called the Judge of the Prerogative Court. From this court an appeal lay (until 25 Henr. VIII, c. XIX) to the pope; and after that to the king in Chancery.

These were the ancient courts. After the religious revolution had been inaugurated in England by Henry VIII, a sixth ecclesiastical court was created by that monarch and designated the Court of Delegates (*judices delegati*), and such delegates were appointed by the king's commission under his great seal, issuing out of chancery, to represent his royal person and to hear ordinary ecclesiastical appeals brought before him by virtue of the statute which has been mentioned as enacted in the twenty-fifth year of his reign. This commission was frequently filled with lords, spiritual and temporal, and its personnel was always composed in part of judges of the courts at Westminster and of Doctors of the Civil Law. Supplementary to these courts were certain proceedings under a special tribunal called a Commission of Review, which was appointed in extraordinary cases to revise the sentences of the Court of Delegates; and, during the reign of Elizabeth, another court was created, called the Court of the King's High Commission in Cases Ecclesiastical. This court was created in order to supply the place of the pope's appellate jurisdiction in regard to causes appertaining to the reformation, ordering and correcting of the ecclesiastical state and of ecclesiastical persons "and all manner of errors, heresies, schisms, abuses, offences, contempts and enormities". This court was the agent by which most oppressive acts were committed and was justly abolished by statute, 16 Car. I, c. XI. An attempt was made to revive it during the reign of King James II.

The Church of England was the name given to that portion of the laity and clergy of the Catholic Church resident in England during the days of the Anglo-Saxon monarchy and during the history of England under William the Conqueror and his successors down to the time when Henry VIII assumed unto himself the position of spiritual and temporal head of the English Church. Prior to the time of Henry VIII, the Church of England was distinctly and avowedly a part of the Church universal. Its prerogatives and its constitution were wrought into the fibre of the common law. Its ecclesiastical courts were recognized by the common law—the *jus publicum* of the kingdom—and clear recognition was accorded to the right of appeal to the sovereign pontiff; thus practically making the pontiff the supreme judge for England as he was for the remainder of Christendom in all ecclesiastical causes. The civil courts rarely sought to trench upon the domain of ecclesiastical affairs and conflict arose only when the temporalities of the church were brought within the scope of litigation. The common law is chiefly, however, to be considered in reference to its protection of purely human interests. As such it proved to be powerful, efficient and imposing. The Court of King's Bench, Common Pleas and the Exchequer, together with the High Court of Chancery, were justly famous throughout Christendom. The original Anglo-Saxon juridical system offered none but simple remedies comprehended, for the most part, in the award of damages for any civil wrong and in the delivery to the proper owners of land or chattels wrongfully withheld. Titles of an equitable nature were not recognized and there was no adequate remedy for the breach of such titles. The prevention of wrong by writs of injunction was unknown.

The idea of a juridical restoration of conditions which had been disturbed by wrongful act as well as the idea of enforcing the specific performance of contracts had never matured into either legislation or judicial proceedings. Such deficiencies in the jurisprudence of the realm were gradually supplied, under the Norman kings, by the royal prerogative exercised through the agency of the lord chancellor by special adjudications based upon equitable principles. In the course of time, a great Court of Chancery came into being deriving its name from the fact that its presiding judge was the lord chancellor. In this court were administered all the great principles of equity jurisprudence. The lord chancellor possessed as one of his titles that of Keeper of the King's Conscience; and, hence, the High Court of Chancery was often called a Court of Conscience. Its procedure did not involve the presence of a jury and it differed from the courts of common law in its mode of proof, mode of trial, and mode of relief. The relief administered was so ample in scope as to be conformable in all cases with the absolute requirements of a conscientious regard for justice. Among the most eminent of the Chancellors of England was Sir Thomas More who laid down his life rather than surrender the Catholic Faith, and Lord Bacon who was the pioneer in broadening the scope of modern learning. After the time when courts became established and entered upon the exercise of their various functions, the common law developed gradually into a more finished system because of the fact that judicial decisions were considered to be an exposition of the common law and, consequently, were the chief repository of the law itself. For this reason the observance of precedents is a marked feature in English jurisprudence and prevails to a much greater ex-

tent than under other systems. As the law is deemed to be contained in the decisions of the courts, it necessarily follows that the rule to be observed in any particular proceeding must be found in some prior decision.

When the period of English colonization in America began, the aborigines were found to be wholly uncivilized and, consequently, without any system of jurisprudence, whatsoever. Upon the theory that the English colonists carried with them the entire system of the English law as it existed at the time of their migration from the fatherland, the colonial courts adopted and acted upon the theory that each colony, at the very moment of its inception, was governed by the legal system of England including the juridical principles administered by the common law courts and by the High Court of Chancery. Thus, law and equity came hand in hand to America and have since been the common law of the former English colonies.

When the thirteen American colonies achieved their independence, the English common law, as it existed with its legal and equitable features in the year 1607, was universally held by the courts to be the common law of each of the thirteen states which constituted the new confederated republic known as the United States of America. As the United States have increased in number, either by the admission of new states to the Union carved out of the original undivided territory, or by the extension of territorial area through purchase or conquest, the common law as it existed at the close of the War of the American Revolution has been held to be the common law of such new states with the exception that, in the State of Louisiana, the civil law of Rome, which ruled within the vast area originally called Louisiana, has been maintained, subject only to subsequent legislative modifications. The Dominion of Canada is subject to the common law with the exception of the Province of Quebec and the civil laws of that province are derived from the old customary laws of France, particularly the Custom of Paris, in like manner as the laws of the English-speaking provinces are based upon the common law of England. In process of time, the customary laws have been modified or replaced by enactments of the Imperial and Federal parliament and by those of the provincial parliament; they were finally codified in the year 1866 upon the model of the Code Napoléon. However, the criminal law of the Province of Quebec is founded upon that of England and was to a great extent codified by the federal statute of 1892. Practice and procedure in civil causes are governed by the Code of Civil Procedure of the year 1897.

The common law of England is not the basis of the jurisprudence of Scotland; that country having adhered to the civil law as it existed at the time of the union with England except so far as it has been modified by subsequent legislation. The English common law with the exceptions which have been noted prevails throughout the English-speaking world. Mexico, Central America, and South America, with the exception of an English Colony and a Dutch Colony, remain under the sway of the civil law. The common law of England has been the subject of unstinted eulogy and it is, undoubtedly, one of the most splendid embodiments of human genius. It is a source of profound satisfaction to Catholics that it came into being as a definite system and was nurtured, and to a great extent administered, during the first ten centuries of its existence by the clergy of the Catholic Church.

REEVES, *History of the English Law* (Philadelphia, 1880); BLACKSTONE, *Commentaries on the Laws of England*, SHARSWOOD edition (Philadelphia, 1875); POLLOCK AND MAITLAND, *The History of English Law* (Boston, 1875); KENT, *Commentaries upon American Law* (12th ed., Boston, 1873).

JOHN WILLEY WILLIS.

Law, DIVINE, MORAL ASPECT OF.—Divine Law is that which is enacted by God and made known to man through revelation. We distinguish between the Old Law, contained in the Pentateuch, and the New Law, which was revealed by Jesus Christ and is contained in the New Testament. The Divine Law of the Old Testament, or the Mosaic Law, is commonly divided into civil, ceremonial, and moral precepts. The civil legislation regulated the relations of the people of God among themselves and with their neighbours; the ceremonial regulated matters of religion and the worship of God; the moral was a Divine code of ethics. In this article we shall confine our attention exclusively to the moral precepts of the Divine Law. In the Old Testament it is contained for the most part and summed up in the Decalogue (Ex., xx, 2–17; Lev., xix, 3, 11–18; Deut., v, 1–33).

The Old and the New Testament, Christ and His Apostles, Jewish as well as Christian tradition, agree in asserting that Moses wrote down the Law at the direct inspiration of God. God Himself, then, is the lawgiver, Moses merely acted as the intermediary between God and His people; he merely promulgated the Law which he had been inspired to write down. This is not the same as to say that the whole of the Old Law was revealed to Moses. There is abundant evidence in Scripture itself that many portions of the Mosaic legislation existed and were put in practice long before the time of Moses. Circumcision is an instance of this. The religious observance of the seventh day is another, and this, indeed, seems to be implied in the very form in which the Third Commandment is worded: "*Remember* that thou keep holy the sabbath day." If we except the merely positive determinations of time and manner in which religious worship was to be paid to God according to this commandment, and the prohibition of making images to represent God contained in the first commandment, all the precepts of the Decalogue are also precepts of the natural law, which can be gathered by reason from nature herself, and in fact they were known long before Moses wrote them down at the express command of God. This is the teaching of St. Paul—"For when the Gentiles, who have not the law, do by nature those things that are of the law; these having not the law [of Moses], are a law to themselves: who shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience bearing witness to them" (Rom., ii, 14, 15). Although the substance of the Decalogue is thus both of natural and Divine law, yet its express promulgation by Moses at the command of God was not without its advantages. The great moral code, the basis of all true civilization, in this manner became the clear, certain, and publicly recognized standard of moral conduct for the Jewish people, and through them for Christendom.

Because the code of morality which we have in the Old Testament was inspired by God and imposed by Him on His people, it follows that there is nothing in it that is immoral or wrong. It was indeed imperfect, if it be compared with the higher morality of the Gospel, but, for all that, it contained nothing that is blameworthy. It was suited to the low stage of civilization to which the Israelites had at the time attained; the severe punishments which it prescribed for transgressors were necessary to bend the stiff necks of a rude people; the temporal rewards held out to those who observed the law were adapted to an unspiritual and carnal race. Still its imperfections must not be exaggerated. In its treatment of the poor, of strangers, of slaves, and of enemies, it was vastly superior to the civilly more advanced Code of Hammurabi and other celebrated codes of ancient law. It did not aim merely at regulating the external acts of the people of God, it curbed also licentious thoughts and covetous desires. The love of God and of one's neighbour was the great precept of the Law, its summary and abridgment, that on which the whole Law and the Prophets depended. In spite of the undeniable superiority in this respect of the Mosaic Law to the other codes of antiquity, it has not escaped the adverse criticism of heretics in all ages

and of Rationalists in our own day. To meet this adverse criticism it will be sufficient to indicate a few general principles that should not be lost sight of, and then to treat a few points in greater detail.

It has always been freely admitted by Christians that the Mosaic Law is an imperfect institution; still Christ came not to destroy it but to fulfil and perfect it. We must bear in mind that God, the Creator and Lord of all things, and the Supreme Judge of the world, can do and command things which man the creature is not authorized to do or command. On this principle we may account for and defend the command given by God to exterminate certain nations, and the permission given by Him to the Israelites to spoil the Egyptians. The tribes of Chanaan richly deserved the fate to which they were condemned by God; and if there were innocent people among the guilty, God is the absolute Lord of life and death, and He commits no injustice when He takes away what He has given. Besides, He can make up by gifts of a higher order in another life for sufferings which have been patiently endured in this life. A great want of historical perspective is shown by those critics who judge the Mosaic Law by the humanitarian and sentimental canons of the twentieth century. A recent writer (Keane, "The Moral Argument against the Inspiration of the Old Testament" in the Hibbert Journal, October, 1905, p. 155) professes to be very much shocked by what is prescribed in Exodus, xxi, 5-6. It is there laid down that if a Hebrew slave who has a wife and children prefers to remain with his master rather than go out free when the sabbatical year comes round, he is to be taken to the door-post and have his ear bored through with an awl, and then he is to remain a slave for life. It was a sign and mark by which he was known to be a lifelong slave. The practice was doubtless already familiar to the Israelites of the time, as it was to their neighbours. The slave himself probably thought no more of the operation than does a South African beauty, when her lip or ear is pierced for the lip-ring and the ear-ring, which in her estimation are to add to her charms. It is really too much when a staid professor makes such a prescription the ground for a grave charge of inhumanity against the law of Moses. Nor should the institution of slavery be made a ground of attack against the Mosaic legislation., It existed everywhere and although in practice it is apt to lead to many abuses, still, in the mild form in which it was allowed among the Jews, and with the safeguards prescribed by the Law, it cannot be said with truth to be contrary to sound morality.

Polygamy and divorce, though less insisted on by Rationalist critics, in reality constitute a more serious difficulty against the holiness of the Mosaic Law than any of those which have just been mentioned. The difficulty is one which has engaged the attention of the Fathers and theologians of the Church from the beginning. To answer it they take their stand on the teaching of the Master in the nineteenth chapter of St. Matthew and the parallel passages of Holy Scripture. What is there said of divorce is applicable to plurality of wives. The strict law of marriage was made known to our first parents in Paradise: "They shall be two in one flesh" (Gen., ii, 24). When the sacred text says *two* it excludes polygamy, when it says *one flesh* it excludes divorce. Amid the general laxity with regard to marriage which existed among the Semitic tribes, it would have been difficult to preserve the strict law. The importance of a rapid increase among the chosen people of God so as to enable them to defend themselves from their neighbours, and to fulfil their appointed destiny, seemed to favour relaxation. The example of some of the chief of the ancient Patriarchs was taken by their descendants as being a sufficient indication of the dispensation granted by God. With special safeguards annexed to it Moses adopted the Divine dispensation on account of the hardness of heart of the Jewish people. Neither polygamy nor divorce can be said to be contrary to the primary precepts of nature. The primary end of marriage is compatible with both. But at least they are against the secondary precepts of the natural law: contrary, that is, to what is required for the well-ordering of human life. In these secondary precepts, however, God can dispense for good reason if He sees fit to do so. In so doing He uses His sovereign authority to diminish the right of absolute equality which naturally exists between man and woman with reference to marriage. In this way, without suffering any stain on His holiness, God could permit and sanction polygamy and divorce in the Old Law.

Christ is the author of the New Law. He claimed and exercised supreme legislative authority in spiritual matters from the beginning of His public life until His Ascension into heaven. In Him the Old Law had its fulfilment and attained its chief purpose. The civil legislation of Moses had for its object to form and preserve a peculiar people for the worship of the one true God, and to prepare the way for the coming of the Messias who was to be born of the seed of Abraham. The new Kingdom of God which Christ founded was not confined to a single nation, it embraced all the nations of the earth, and when the new Israel was constituted, the old Israel with its separatist law became antiquated; it had fulfilled its mission. The ceremonial laws of Moses were types and figures of the purer, more spiritual, and more efficacious sacrifice and sacraments of the New Law, and when these were instituted the former lost their meaning and value. By the death of Christ on the Cross the New Covenant was sealed, and the Old was abrogated, but until the Gospel had been preached and duly promulgated, out of deference to Jewish prejudices, and out of respect for ordinances, which after all were Divine, those who wished to do so were at liberty to conform to the practices of the Mosaic Law. When the Gospel had been duly promulgated the civil and ceremonial precepts of the Law of Moses became not only useless, but false and superstitious, and thus forbidden.

It was otherwise with the moral precepts of the Mosaic Law. The Master expressly taught that the observance of these, inasmuch as they are prescribed by nature herself, is necessary for salvation—"If thou wouldst enter into life keep the commandments", —those well-known precepts of the Decalogue. Of these commandments those words of His are especially true—"I came not to destroy the law but to fulfil it." This Christ did by insisting anew on the great law of charity towards God and man, which He explained more fully and gave us new motives for practising. He corrected the false glosses with which the Scribes and Pharisees had obscured the law as revealed by God, and He brushed aside the heap of petty observances with which they had overloaded it, and made it an intolerable burden. He denounced in unmeasured terms the externalism of Pharisaic observance of the Law, and insisted on its spirit being observed as well as the letter. As was suited to a law of love which replaced the Mosaic Law of fear, Christ wished to attract men to obey His precepts out of motives of charity and filial obedience, rather than compel submission by threats of punishment. He promised spiritual blessings rather than temporal, and taught His followers to despise the goods of this world in order to fix their affections on the future joys of life eternal. He was not content with a bare observance of the law, He boldly proposed to His disciples the infinite goodness and holiness of God for their model, and urged them to be perfect as their heavenly Father is perfect. For such as were specially called, and who were not content to observe the commandments merely, He proposed counsels of consummate perfection. By observing these His specially chosen followers, not only conquered their vices, but destroyed

the roots of them, by constantly denying their natural propensities to honours, riches, and earthly pleasures. Still it is admitted by Catholic theologians that Christ added no new merely moral precepts to the natural law. There is of course a moral obligation to believe the truths which the Master revealed concerning God, man's destiny, and the Church. Moral obligations, too, arise from the institution of the sacraments, some of which are necessary to salvation. But even here nothing is added directly to the natural law; given the revelation of truth by God, the obligation to believe it follows naturally for all to whom the revelation is made known; and given the institution of necessary means of grace and salvation, the obligation to use them also follows necessarily.

As we saw above, the Master abrogated the dispensations which made polygamy and divorce lawful for the Jews owing to the special circumstances in which they were placed. In this respect the natural law was restored to its primitive integrity. Somewhat similarly with regard to the love of enemies, Christ clearly explained the natural law of charity on the point, and urged it against the perverse interpretation of the Pharisees. The Law of Moses had expressly enjoined the love of friends and fellow-citizens. But at the same time it forbade the Jews to make treaties with foreigners, to conclude peace with the Ammonites, Moabites, and other neighbouring tribes; the Jew was allowed to practise usury in dealing with foreigners; God promised that He would be an enemy to the enemies of His people. From these and similar provisions the Jewish doctors seem to have drawn the conclusion that it was lawful to hate one's enemies. Even St. Augustine, as well as some other Fathers and Doctors of the Church, thought that hatred of enemies, like polygamy and divorce, was permitted to the Jews on account of their hardness of heart. It is clear, however, that, since enemies share the same nature with us, and are children of the same common Father, they may not be excluded from the love which, by the law of nature, we owe to all men. This obligation Christ no less clearly than beautifully expounded, and taught us how to practise by His own noble example. The Catholic Church by virtue of the commission given to her by Christ is the Divinely constituted interpreter of the Divine Law of both the Old and the New Testament.

ST. THOMAS, *Summa theologica* (Parma, 1852); SUAREZ, *De Legibus* (Paris, 1856); PESCH, *Prælectiones dogmaticæ*, V (Freiburg, 1900); KNABENBAUER, *Commentarius in Evangelia* (Paris, 1892); GIGOT, *Biblical Lectures* (New York, 1901); PALMIERI, *De Matrimonio* (Rome, 1880); PELT, *Histoire de l'ancien Testament* (Paris, 1901); VON HUMMELAUER, *Commentarius in Exodum, Leviticum, Deuteronomium* (Paris, 1897, 1901); VIGOUROUX, *Dict. de la Bible* (Paris, 1908); HASTINGS, *Dict. of the Bible* (Edinburgh, 1904).

T. SLATER.

Law, INTERNATIONAL.—International law has been defined to be "the rules which determine the conduct of the general body of civilized states in their dealings with each other" (American and English Encycl. of Law). Different writers have given varying views of the foundation of the law of nations, some holding that it is founded merely upon consent and usage, and others that it is the same as the law of nature, applied to the conduct of nations in the character of moral persons susceptible of obligations and laws. Chancellor Kent holds that neither of these views is strictly true; that the law of nations is purely positive law founded on usage, consent, and agreement, but that it must not be separated entirely from natural jurisprudence, since it derives its force "from the same principles of right reason, the same views of the nature and constitution of man, and the same sanction of Divine revelation, as those from which the science of morality is deduced". It follows, then, that by the natural law every state is bound to conduct itself towards other states in accordance with the rules of justice, irrespective of the general rules that have arisen from long established custom and usage. International law is a part of the law of the land of which the courts take judicial notice, and municipal statutes are construed so as not to infringe on its doctrines. The rules of international law are to be found in writers of recognized authority, in treaties between civilized nations, in the decisions of international tribunals, in state papers and diplomatic correspondence, and its application is to be sought especially in the decisions of the courts of the different nations where the rules have been defined in litigated cases, arising especially in the admiralty where judgment has been sought in prize cases. The first great modern authority on the subject was Grotius. His works have been followed by those of Puffendorf, Burlamaqui, Bynkershoek, and Vattel. The works of these learned authors have been adapted and expanded by various writers, so that now there is a vast body of literature upon the subject representing great learning and ability.

The law of nations is essentially the product of modern times. Ancient nations looked upon strangers as enemies, and upon their property as lawful prize. Among the Greeks prisoners of war might lawfully be put to death or sold into slavery with their wives and children, and there was no duty owed by the nation to a foreign nation. Some beginnings of diplomatic intercourse may be traced in the relations of the Greek states towards one another, by agreements relating to the burying of the dead and the exchange of prisoners, while the Amphictyonic Council affords an instance of an attempt to institute a law of nations among the Grecian states themselves. The Romans show stronger evidence of appreciation of international law, or at least of the beginnings of it. They had a college of heralds charged with the Fetial Law relating to declarations of war and treaties of peace, and as their power and civilization grew, there came an appreciation of the moral duty owed by the state to nations with which it was at war. After the establishment of the empire, especially in its later periods, the law of nations became recognized as part of the natural reason of mankind. After the fall of the empire there was a relapse into the barbarism of earlier ages, but, when in the ninth century Charlemagne consolidated his empire under the influence of Christianity, the law of nations took on a new growth. As commerce developed, the necessity of an international law providing for the enforcement of contracts, the protection of shipwrecked sailors and property, and the maintaining of harbours, became more apparent. Various codes and regulations containing the laws of the sea gradually developed, the most famous of which are the "Judgments of Oléron", said to have been drawn up in the eleventh century and long recognized in the Atlantic ports of France and incorporated in part in the maritime ordinances of Louis XIV; the "Consolato del Mare", a collection of rules applicable to questions arising in commerce and navigation both in peace and war, probably drawn up in the twelfth century and founded upon the Roman maritime law and early maritime customs of the commercial cities of the Mediterranean; the "Guidon de la Mar", which dates from the close of the sixteenth century and deals with the law of maritime insurance, prize, and the regulations governing the issue of letters of marque and reprisal. In addition to these there were various bodies of sea laws, notably the maritime law of Wisby, the customs of Amsterdam, the laws of Antwerp, and the constitutions of the Hanseatic League. All of these codes contained provisions extracted from the earliest known maritime code, the Rhodian Laws, which were incorporated into the general body of Roman law, and were recognized and sanctioned by Tiberius and Hadrian.

During the long period between the fall of the Roman Empire and the definitive beginning of modern European states the greatest influence working for a

recognition of international law among all peoples was the Church. A common faith, imposing the same obligations upon the individual members of the Church among all nations, obviously tended to the establishment and recognition of rules of justice and morality as among the nations themselves; and, when the more general acceptance of the obligations of Christianity became the rule, it followed naturally that the Head of the Church, the pope holding the Divine commission, should become the universal arbiter in disputes among nations. For centuries the great offices of state, especially those having to do with foreign relations, were held by bishops learned in canon law, and, as canon law was based upon Roman law and especially adapted to the government of the Church whose jurisdiction was not bounded by state lines, it naturally suggested many of the rules that have found a place in international law. The pope became the natural arbitrator between nations, and the power to which appeals were made when the laws of justice and morality were flagrantly violated by sovereigns either in relation to their own subjects or to foreign nations.

As the empire founded by Charlemagne gained in power and extent, the controversies precipitated by the conflicting claims of civil and ecclesiastical jurisdiction developed still further the position of the pope as the highest representative of the moral power of Christendom. It has been justly said therefore that, "of all the effects of Christianity in altering the political face of Europe throughout all its people, and which may therefore very fairly be denominated a part of its Law of Nations, none are so prominent to observation during these centuries as those which sprang from the influence and form of government of the Church" (Ward, "Law of Nations", II, 31). At first without territory or temporal power, on account of his spiritual influence alone the pope was recognized as the ultimate tribunal of Christendom, and as such was known as the Father of Christendom. Under the Holy Roman Empire from the time of Otho I, as is pointed out by Janssen, there was a close alliance between the Church and the State, though they were at no time identical. "Church and State", he says, "granting certain presupposed conditions, are two necessary embodiments of one and the same human society, the State taking charge of the temporal requirements, and the Church of the spiritual and supernatural. These two powers would, however, be in a state of continual contention were it not for a Divine Law of equilibrium keeping each within its own limits." He points out further that the original cause of the separation between the spiritual and temporal powers, as "taught by Pope Gelasius at the end of the fifth century, lies in the law established by the Divine founder of the Church, Who, 'cognizant of human weakness, was careful that the two powers should be kept separate, and each limited to its own province. Christian princes were to respect the priesthood in those things which relate to the soul, and the priests in their turn to obey the laws made for the preservation of order in worldly matters; so that the soldiers of God shall not mix in temporal affairs, and the worldly authorities shall have naught to say in spiritual things. The province of each being so marked out, neither power shall encroach on the prerogatives of the other, but confine itself to its own limit.'"

"While it is recognized that the kingdoms of this world, as opposed to the one universal Church, may exist and prosper while remaining separate and independent, yet it was thought that the bond with the Church would be of a higher nature if the partition walls between people and people were broken down, all nations joined together in one, and the unity of the human race under one lord and ruler acknowledged. It was this idea which inspired the popes with the desire to found the Holy Roman Empire, whose Emperor would deem it his highest prerogative to protect the Christian Church. . . . The Gospel was to be the law of nations. The State would consolidate the nations, while the Church would sow the seeds of revealed truth" (Janssen, "History of the German People", II, 110 sq.). In this ideal we find the medieval conception of the State. Although the ideal was never completely realized, yet it met such general acceptance that the emperor became the chief protector of law and order and the arbiter between lesser princes. The growth of the power of the State gradually diminished that of the feudal barons, whose petty contentions and the violence of whose lives were a hindrance to the development of international justice. Until this phase of the beginnings of civilization changed there was little to ameliorate the brutality of conduct between warring peoples, except as the individual education of knights in chivalry affected their conduct.

Another influence of great importance in the formation of international law were the general councils of the Church, affecting as they did all Christian nations and laying down rules of faith and discipline binding alike upon individuals and governments. The history and development of rules of international law from these early beginnings have been traced to contemporary times, and, notwithstanding periods when the influence of a lofty and Christian ideal of the relations between nations seems almost to have been lost, it will appear that there has been a steady advance in the recognition of the existence of a moral law of nations whose sanction is the public opinion of the world. So far has this system progressed that its underlying principles are, in the main, well-defined, universally recognized, and constantly appealed to, both in times of war and in times of peace, by all civilized nations. Rules governing the acquisition of territorial property, jurisdiction over rivers and seas, protectorates over independent peoples; measures allowed to compel the rendering of justice, short of war; intervention in the affairs of foreign nations, have all been measurably settled; and so far as relates to the rights and duties of belligerents and of neutral states in declaring and carrying on war, the fixing of the character of property, the regulating of the effect of intercourse between individuals, many vexed points have also been carefully defined and to a large extent settled. Some of the most delicate questions, such as the right to visit and search the blockaded ports of the enemy, and the character of correspondence permitted between the subjects or citizens of neutral states and the belligerents, may be considered as well settled and recognized by decisions of the highest courts of all civilized nations as any of the rules of municipal law.

Earnest and intelligent efforts to bring about a permanent court of arbitration have resulted in the formation of an international tribunal at The Hague, which has already been accepted by the voluntary action of the various nations as a proper forum for the decision of many international questions specially referred to it. The principles of arbitration accepted by the United States and Great Britain in the settlement of the so-called Alabama Claims and the frequent agreements between the contending parties over questions of boundary, fisheries, and damages to private property of their respective citizens or subjects, have given emphasis to international law. Its rules have enforced respect for private property on the part of contending armies, and, under certain conditions, when such is carried by ships, have forbidden the use of certain destructive missiles, and in very many ways have alleviated the horrors of war. While there must always remain questions that no self-respecting nation would be willing to submit to arbitration, yet the field for the exercise of the latter is indefinitely great, and, as the demands of modern civilization, the means of communication between nations, and the development of trade relations increase, questions more frequently arise requiring appeal to some tribunal, ac-

ceptable to both parties, whose decision shall be final and absolute. Until the revolt against the Church in the first quarter of the sixteenth century, this power of arbitration, as has been stated, rested in the pope. With the decline of recognition of this moral power, religious sanctions in the relations between nations have gradually lessened. Instead of a decision of the pope, bearing with it the impress of the revealed truth of religion, the agreements of modern courts of arbitration or other referees for the settlement of international disputes have for their sanction the general sense of justice existing naturally among men, strengthened by such faith in revealed religion as may exist among them irrespective of the teaching of the Church. This is the great difference between the sanction of modern international law and that existing previous to the so-called Reformation. Previous to that event the power of the Church was exercised merely in a moral way by an appeal to the faith and consciences of all men and nations, enforcing the decrees of the arbiter of Christendom—the pope.

Controversy concerning this arbitration has been carried on, at first with great violence, but since with a calmer and fairer recognition of the exceeding advantage to nascent civilization of such power as that exercised by the popes during the Middle Ages. It has been insisted that the popes not alone wished to vindicate their supreme spiritual power, but cherished a desire to reduce all princes to a condition of vassalage to the Roman See. This is a grave error. The Church has never declared it to be an article of faith that temporal princes, as such, are in temporal matters subject to the pope. The confusion of thought has arisen from the fact that in the eyes of the Church the kingly power has never been looked upon as absolute and unlimited. The rights of the people were certainly not less important than those of the ruler, who owed them a duty, as they owed a duty to him. They did not exist for his benefit, and his power was to be employed, not for his own ends, but for the welfare of the nation. He was to be, above all, the servant of God, the defender of the Church, of the weak, and of the needy. In many states the monarch was elected only on the express condition of professing the Catholic Faith and defending it against attack. In Spain, from the seventh to the fourteenth century, the king had to take such an oath, and, even when it was no longer formally administered, he was still understood to be bound by the obligation. The laws of Edward the Confessor, published by William the Conqueror and his successors, expressly provide that a king who does not fulfil his duties towards the Church must forfeit his title of king. Kings were constantly reminded that their temporal power was given them for the defence of the Church, and that they should imitate King David in their submission to God.

With this intimate relation of Church and State, the clergy, by reason of their education and force of character and the respect paid to them because of their office, took an active part in the civic affairs of the various nations, and, until the controversies arose between them and the emperors who succeeded Charlemagne, the civil and religious powers existed harmoniously in the main. Owing to the limitations of human nature, and especially because the support of both Church and State necessarily came from voluntary or enforced contributions of the people, causes of friction would arise from time to time between the two powers. The decrees of the councils of the Church were confirmed as laws of the empire to secure their being put in force by the civil power, and the sentence was pronounced at Chalcedon (451) that imperial laws that were contrary to canon law should be null and void. Freedom and religion were mutually supported because the Church, in which religion was incorporated, was at the same time the guardian of freedom. The power of the pope as Head of the Church Universal gained somewhat, but not sufficiently to affect in a very marked degree his influence as the Head of Christendom from the fact of his becoming a temporal prince during the eighth century. Again and again the popes have declared it was part of their duty to make and preserve peace on all sides; to mediate between royal families; to hinder wars or bring them to a speedy close; to defend Christendom against the incursions of the Mohammedans; to incite Christian nations to carry on the crusades for the recovery of the Holy Places of Jerusalem. Whoever felt himself oppressed turned to the Roman See, and, if it did not give him help, the pope was thought to have neglected his duty. "In an age", says Lingard, "when warlike gains alone were prized, Europe would have sunk into endless wars had not the popes striven unceasingly for the maintenance and restoration of peace. They rebuked the passions of princes, and checked their unreasonable pretensions; their position of common father of Christendom gave an authority to their words which could be claimed by no other mediator; and their legates spared neither journeys nor labour in reconciling the conflicting interests of courts, and in interposing between the swords of contending factions the olive-branch of peace" (History of England, IV, 72; quoted by Hergenröther). The great Protestant writer Grotius says: "Quot dissidia sanata sint auctoritate Romanæ Sedis, quoties oppressa innocentia ibi præsidium reperit, non alium testem quam eundem Blondellum volo" (Hergenröther, "Church and State", pp. 286–7), i. e., how many quarrels were healed by the authority of the Roman See, how often oppressed innocence found support there, the same Blondel abundantly testifies.

Much misunderstanding as to the attitude of the popes has arisen from the Bull of Pope Alexander VI, when, acting at the solicitation of the sovereigns of Castile, he drew the limits of a line from the North to the South Pole, 100 Spanish leagues to the west of the most westerly island of the Azores; all that was east of the line belonged to Portugal, and all that was west of it to Spain. By this decision it has been said that the maxim "de externis non judicat ecclesia" has been violated, and also the further maxim that the conversion of subjects to the Catholic Faith takes nothing from the rights of infidel princes. The true explanation of this Bull will be found when it is remembered that the pope was acting as arbitrator between two nations of explorers, when it was most desirable that a line of demarcation should be drawn between the fields to be explored. It was intended only to prevent dissension and struggles likely to arise from rival pretensions, and, since by its terms it precluded any Christian prince from interfering within the boundaries assigned to each nation, it was a powerful preventive of wrong-doing. It being admitted that sovereignty over uncivilized peoples can be claimed under certain conditions by civilized nations, the pope sought only to regulate the rights of such nations so as to avoid war. It must be borne in mind, moreover, that the principal motive, as professed by the Spanish explorers, was not commerce or the acquisition of wealth alone, but the conversion of heathen nations to the Christian Faith.

It will appear from a review of the history of the centuries from the accession of Charlemagne to the crown of the Holy Roman Empire until modern times, the power of the pope as the supreme and common tribunal between nations has been exercised for the advantage of mankind in the extension of justice to all. In England, the excommunication of King John compelled the submission of a monarch, who, according to the Protestant writer Ward, had "by his violence and depravity drawn down upon himself the just detestation of mankind". In the example of Emperor Lothair of Lorraine in the ninth century, an instance may be found of an intervention of the pope

to prevent the repudiation by this monarch of his lawful wife in order that he might marry another. The pope intervened to secure the release of Richard I of England from the prison of the Duke of Austria and the emperor. By his interposition in 1193 he procured the liberty of the three daughters of King Tancred of Sicily, who had been unjustly carried off and retained captive by Emperor Henry VI. So in the case of the infant son of the King of Aragon. In 1214 Simon de Montfort was compelled to surrender his prisoner on the application of the prince's mother. Many other instances of equal importance show the reverence of peoples and sovereigns for the pope and for the fearless and impartial way in which his authority was exercised. The same author, from whom these instances have been quoted, speaks of the Councils of the Church. He says they were "composed of delegates from every nation of Christianity, and under this appearance Europe may fairly be said to deserve the appellation which has sometimes been bestowed upon it of a Republic of States." He points out that the two Councils of Lyons give an idea of "an almost perfect Court of Parliament of Christendom, in which the affairs of sovereigns were discussed, and sovereigns themselves proceeded against, under all the forms of a regular trial and sentence" (Ward, "Law of Nations", II, 55, 59).

The influence of the structure of the Roman State, with the emperor as the supreme ruler in temporal matters, educated the minds of the northern peoples, especially the Germans, who, on the fall of the Empire, gradually took possession of its former territory. After the acceptance of Christianity as the state religion in the reign of Constantine, it was not difficult for even the most ignorant of men to grasp an idea of the dual powers ruling human life—that of the sovereign with supreme jurisdiction in temporal matters, and that of the pope, the primate of all the bishops, the successor of St. Peter, the Head of the Church, the visible representative of the moral power of God on earth. While, in his human capacity, the pope in any given era may have been affected by the prevailing habit of thought of that era, and as a man has been subject to the limitations of our common nature, it may be safely said of the papacy that no institution has had so profound an effect upon the evolution of the laws of justice and right in the conduct of nations, and that without such a power of moral influence modern civilization would not have attained a higher plane than that of Imperial Rome. The sense of duty and obligation, which is a cardinal principle of Christianity, has been enforced among princes and peoples, so that even in our day the various nations, although to a great extent separated from the Catholic Faith, still recognize that the pope, as the head of the most venerable and most numerous body of professed Christians, embodies the moral power of Christianity and must be respected accordingly. As has been said by Hergenröther, "the perfection of international law depends upon two conditions: (1) the degree in which the notion of a common humanity is developed among nations; (2) the closeness of the connexion by which they feel themselves united. Christendom and the Church have had a powerful influence upon both these conditions. After the fall of the Roman Empire it created amongst new States common interests and an international law, which, founded upon the principles and laws of the Church, was administered by her and her Head as an international tribunal under the protection of the penalty of the Church's ban" (Church and State, 369).

In giving an address at the conference held under the auspices of the Civic Federation in Washington on 18 Jan., 1910, Elihu Root, former Secretary of State of the United States, said: "Since the Congress of Vienna in 1815, in which the powers of Europe for the first time undertook to deal with subjects of general interest to them, as distinct from specific situations which were the results of war, up to three years ago there had been over one hundred and twenty congresses or conferences of representatives of a considerable part, practically the whole of the civilized powers of the earth, and those conferences or congresses have accomplished a great variety of things. They have established an international postal union; they have agreed upon and put into force rules for the protection of industrial property, patents, copyrights, and trademarks; they have established rules for sanitation or control, and, to some degree, the prevention of disease, under which each country binds itself to so legislate and so enforce its laws as to prevent its being a nuisance to the other countries with whom it is in conference. They have united in measures for the abolition of the slave trade, for the abolition of privateering, for the establishment of agreement upon rules of the private international law, so that private rights depending upon the laws of different countries may be recognized and dealt with under uniform rules; they have in a series of conferences held at Geneva established rules for the enforcement of humane principles for the conduct of war, and by rules adopted at The Hague, for the enforcement of humane rules in the conduct of war by sea; they have established for the greater part of the world uniform weights and measures; they have agreed upon rules designed for the prevention of the white slave trade; they have, by a series of conferences, agreed in Europe upon a number, as yet a comparatively small number, of provisions for the protection of labour; they have agreed upon rules for telegraphic communication, rules for the protection of ocean cables, rules for the government of wireless telegraphy."

It will be seen from the foregoing sketch that all these beneficent results have followed from the development of the Christian idea of the brotherhood of mankind. International law, like all other systems, will be found to be but an endeavour to bring into the affairs of life the eternal principles of right at all times taught by the Christian Church. For the actual status of the Holy See concerning conflicts and wars between Christian nations, peace, peace conferences, and international arbitration, see PAPACY; PEACE; WAR.

HERGENRÖTHER, *Catholic Church and Christian State* (London, 1876); JAUGEY, *Dict. Apologétique de la foi catholique* (Paris, 1889), s.v. *Alexandre VI;* WARD, *Law of Nations* (London, 1795); KENT, *Commentaries* (1884); MANNING, *International Law* (London, 1875); DAVIS, *The Elements of International Law* (New York, 1908); WHEATON, *International Law*, ed. ATTAY (1904); LAWRENCE, *International Law* (1885); *American and English Encyclop. of Law* (1900); PERRIN, *L'ordre international* (Paris, 1888); PRADIER-FODÉRÉ, *Traité de droit international* (Paris, 1885); *The Peacemaker of the Nations* in *The Month* (May, 1869); Speech of LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY in the House of Lords (25 July, 1887); letter (1870) of URQUHART to Pius IX in *Acta Conc. Vaticani;* in *Coll. Lacensis*, VII; HALLS, *The Peace Conference at The Hague* (New York, 1900), and critique of same by SHAHAN in *Cath. Univ. Bulletin*, VII (1901), 1–22.

WALTER GEORGE SMITH.

Law, MORAL. See ETHICS; LAW, NATURAL.

Law, MOSAIC. See MOSAIC LEGISLATION.

Law, NATURAL.—I. ITS ESSENCE.—In English this term is frequently employed as equivalent to the laws of nature, meaning the order which governs the activities of the material universe. Among the Roman jurists natural law designated those instincts and emotions common to man and the lower animals, such as the instinct of self-preservation and love of offspring. In its strictly ethical application—the sense in which this article treats it—the natural law is the rule of conduct which is prescribed to us by the Creator in the constitution of the nature with which He has endowed us.

According to St. Thomas, the natural law is "nothing else than the rational creature's participation in the eternal law" (I–II, Q. xciv). The eternal law is God's wisdom, inasmuch as it is the directive norm

of all movement and action. When God willed to give existence to creatures, He willed to ordain and direct them to an end. In the case of inanimate things, this Divine direction is provided for in the nature which God has given to each; in them determinism reigns. Like all the rest of creation, man is destined by God to an end, and receives from Him a direction towards this end. This ordination is of a character in harmony with his free intelligent nature. In virtue of his intelligence and free will, man is master of his conduct. Unlike the things of the mere material world he can vary his action, act, or abstain from action, as he pleases. Yet he is not a lawless being in an ordered universe. In the very constitution of his nature, he too has a law laid down for him, reflecting that ordination and direction of all things, which is the eternal law. The rule, then, which God has prescribed for our conduct, is found in our nature itself. Those actions which conform with its tendencies, lead to our destined end, and are thereby constituted right and morally good; those at variance with our nature are wrong and immoral.

The norm, however, of conduct is not some particular element or aspect of our nature. The standard is our whole human nature with its manifold relationships, considered as a creature destined to a special end. Actions are wrong if, though subserving the satisfaction of some particular need or tendency, they are at the same time incompatible with that rational harmonious subordination of the lower to the higher which reason should maintain among our conflicting tendencies and desires (see GOOD). For example, to nourish our bodies is right; but to indulge our appetite for food to the detriment of our corporal or spiritual life is wrong. Self-preservation is right, but to refuse to expose our life when the well-being of society requires it, is wrong. It is wrong to drink to intoxication, for, besides being injurious to health, such indulgence deprives one of the use of reason, which is intended by God to be the guide and dictator of conduct. Theft is wrong, because it subverts the basis of social life; and man's nature requires for its proper development that he live in a state of society. There is, then, a double reason for calling this law of conduct natural: first, because it is set up concretely in our very nature itself, and second, because it is manifested to us by the purely natural medium of reason. In both respects it is distinguished from the Divine positive law, which contains precepts not arising from the nature of things as God has constituted them by the creative act, but from the arbitrary will of God. This law we learn, not through the unaided operation of reason, but through the light of supernatural revelation.

We may now analyse the natural law into three constitutents: the discriminating norm, the binding norm (*normā obligans*), and the manifesting norm. The discriminating norm is, as we have just seen, human nature itself, objectively considered. It is, so to speak, the book in which is written the text of the law, and the classification of human actions into good and bad. Strictly speaking, our nature is the *proximate* discriminating norm or standard. The remote and ultimate norm, of which it is the partial reflection and application, is the Divine nature itself, the ultimate groundwork of the created order. The binding or obligatory norm is the Divine authority, imposing upon the rational creature the obligation of living in conformity with his nature, and thus with the universal order established by the Creator. Contrary to the Kantian theory that we must not acknowledge any other lawgiver than conscience, the truth is that reason as conscience is only *immediate* moral authority which we are called upon to obey, and conscience itself owes its authority to the fact that it is the mouthpiece of the Divine will and *imperium*. The manifesting norm (*norma denuntians*), which determines the moral quality of actions tried by the discriminating norm, is reason. Through this faculty we perceive what is the moral constitution of our nature, what kind of action it calls for, and whether a particular action possesses this requisite character.

II. THE CONTENTS OF THE NATURAL LAW.—Radically, the natural law consists of one supreme and universal principle, from which are derived all our natural moral obligations or duties. We cannot discuss here the many erroneous opinions regarding the fundamental rule of life. Some of them are utterly false—for instance, that of Bentham, who made the pursuit of utility or temporal pleasure the foundation of the moral code, and that of Fichte, who taught that the supreme obligation is to love self above everything and all others on account of self. Others present the true idea in an imperfect or one-sided fashion. Epicurus, for example, held the supreme principle to be, "Follow nature"; the Stoics inculcated living according to reason. But these philosophers interpreted their principles in a manner less in conformity with our doctrine than the tenor of their words suggests. Catholic moralists, though agreeing upon the underlying conception of the Natural Law, have differed more or less in their expression of its fundamental formulæ. Among many others we find the following: "Love God as the end and everything on account of Him"; "Live conformably to human nature considered in all its essential respects"; "Observe the rational order established and sanctioned by God"; "Manifest in your life the image of God impressed on your rational nature." The exposition of St. Thomas is at once the most simple and philosophic. Starting from the premise that good is what primarily falls under the apprehension of the practical reason—that is of reason acting as the dictator of conduct—and that, consequently, the supreme principle of moral action must have the good as its central idea, he holds that the supreme principle, from which all the other principles and precepts are derived, is that good is to be done, and evil avoided (I–II, Q. xciv, a. 2).

Passing from the primary principle to the subordinate principles and conclusions, moralists divide these into two classes: (1) those dictates of reason which flow so directly from the primary principle that they hold in practical reason the same place as evident propositions in the speculative sphere, or are at least easily deducible from the primary principle. Such, for instance, are: "Adore God"; "Honour your parents"; "Do not steal"; (2) those other conclusions and precepts which are reached only through a more or less complex course of inference. It is this difficulty and uncertainty that requires the natural law to be supplemented by positive law, human and Divine. As regards the vigour and binding force of these precepts and conclusions, theologians divide them into two classes, primary and secondary. To the first class belong those which must, under all circumstances, be observed if the essential moral order is to be maintained. The secondary precepts are those whose observance contributes to the public and private good and is required for the perfection of moral development, but is not so absolutely necessary to the rationality of conduct that it may not be lawfully omitted under some special conditions. For example, under no circumstances is polyandry compatible with the moral order, while polygamy, though inconsistent with human relations in their proper moral and social development, is not absolutely incompatible with them under less civilized conditions.

III. THE QUALITIES OF THE NATURAL LAW.—(a) The natural law is *universal*, that is to say, it applies to the entire human race, and is in itself the same for all. Every man, because he is a man, is bound, if he will conform to the universal order willed by the Creator, to live conformably to his own rational nature, and to be guided by his reason. However, infants and in-

sane persons, who have not the actual use of their reason and cannot therefore know the law, are not responsible for their failure to comply with its demands. (b) The natural law is *immutable* in itself and also extrinsically. Since it is founded in the very nature of man and his destination to his end—two bases which rest upon the immutable ground of the eternal law—it follows that, assuming the continued existence of human nature, it cannot cease to exist. The natural law commands and forbids in the same tenor everywhere and always. We must, however, remember that this immutability pertains not to those abstract imperfect formulæ in which the law is commonly expressed, but to the moral standard as it applies to action in the concrete, surrounded with all its determinate conditions. We enunciate, for instance, one of the leading precepts in the words: "Thou shalt not kill"; yet the taking of human life is sometimes a lawful, and even an obligatory act. Herein exists no variation in the law; what the law forbids is not all taking of life, but all unjust taking of life.

With regard to the possibility of any change by abrogation or dispensation, there can be no question of such being introduced by any authority except that of God Himself. But reason forbids us to think that even He could exercise such power; because, given the hypothesis that He wills man to exist, He wills him necessarily to live conformably to the eternal law, by observing in his conduct the law of reason. The Almighty, then, cannot be conceived as willing this and simultaneously willing the contradictory, that man should be set free from the law entirely through its abrogation, or partially through dispensation from it. It is true that some of the older theologians, followed or copied by some later ones, hold that God can dispense, and, in fact in some instances, has dispensed from the secondary precepts of the natural law, while others maintain that the bearing of the natural law is changed by the operation of positive law. However, an examination of the arguments offered in support of these opinions shows that the alleged examples of dispensation are: (a) cases where a change of conditions modifies the application of the law, or (b) cases concerning obligations not imposed as absolutely essential to the moral order, though their fulfilment is necessary for the full perfection of conduct, or (c) instances of *addition* made to the law.

As examples of the first category are cited God's permission to the Hebrews to despoil the Egyptians, and His command to Abraham to sacrifice Isaac. But it is not necessary to see in these cases a dispensation from the precepts forbidding theft and murder. As the Sovereign Lord of all things, He could withdraw from Isaac his right to life, and from the Egyptians their right of ownership, with the result that neither would the killing of Isaac be an unjust destruction of life, nor the appropriation of the Egyptians' goods the unjust taking of another's property. The classic instance alleged as an example of (b) is the legalization of polygamy among the Hebrews. Polygamy, however, is not under all circumstances incompatible with the essential principles of a rationally ordered life, since the chief ends prescribed by nature for the marital union —the propagation of the race and the due care and education of offspring—may, in certain states of society, be attained in a polygamous union. The theory that God can dispense from any part of the law, even from the secondary precepts, is scarcely compatible with the doctrine, which is the common teaching of the School, that the natural law is founded on the eternal law, and, therefore, has for its ultimate ground the immutable essence of God himself. As regards (c), when positive law, human or Divine, imposes obligations which only modify the bearing of the natural law, it cannot correctly be said to change it. Positive law may not ordain anything contrary to the natural law, from which it draws its authority; but it may—and this is one of its functions—determine with more precision the bearing of the natural law, and for good reasons, supplement its conclusions. For example, in the eyes of the natural law mutual verbal agreement to a contract is sufficient; yet, in many kinds of contract, the civil law declares that no agreement shall be valid, unless it be expressed in writing and signed by the parties before witnesses. In establishing this rule the civil authority merely exercises the power which it derives from the natural law to add to the operation of the natural law such conditions as the common good may call for. Contrary to the almost universally received doctrine, a few theologians held erroneously that the natural law depends not on the essential necessary will of God, but upon His arbitrary positive will, and taught consistently with this view, that the natural law may be dispensed from or even abrogated by God. The conception, however, that the moral law is but an arbitrary enactment of the Creator, involves the denial of any absolute distinction between right and wrong—a denial which, of course, sweeps away the very foundation of the entire moral order.

III. Our Knowledge of the Law.—Founded in our nature and revealed to us by our reason, the moral law is known to us in the measure that reason brings a knowledge of it home to our understanding. The question arises: How far can man be ignorant of the natural law, which, as St. Paul says, is written in the human heart (Rom., ii, 14)? The general teaching of theologians is that the supreme and primary principles are necessarily known to every one having the actual use of reason. These principles are really reducible to the primary principle which is expressed by St. Thomas in the form: "Do good and avoid evil". Wherever we find man we find him with a moral code, which is founded on the first principle that good is to be done and evil avoided. When we pass from the universal to more particular conclusions, the case is different. Some follow immediately from the primary, and are so self-evident that they are reached without any complex course of reasoning. Such are, for example: "Do not commit adultery"; "Honour your parents". No person whose reason and moral nature is ever so little developed can remain in ignorance of such precepts except through his own fault. Another class of conclusions comprises those which are reached only by a more or less complex course of reasoning. These may remain unknown to, or be misinterpreted even by persons whose intellectual development is considerable. To reach these more remote precepts, many facts and minor conclusions must be correctly appreciated, and, in estimating their value, a person may easily err, and consequently, without moral fault, come to a false conclusion.

A few theologians of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, following some older ones, maintained that there cannot exist in anyone practical ignorance of the natural law. This opinion however has no weight (for the controversy see Bouquillon, "Theologia Fundamentalis", n. 74). Theoretically speaking, man is capable of acquiring a full knowledge of the moral law, which is, as we have seen, nothing but the dictates of reason properly exercised. Actually, taking into consideration the power of passion, prejudice, and other influences which cloud the understanding or pervert the will, one can safely say that man, unaided by supernatural revelation, would not acquire a full and correct knowledge of the contents of the natural law (cf. Vatican Council, Sess. III, cap. ii). In proof we need but recall that the noblest ethical teaching of pagans, such as the systems of Plato, Aristotle, and the Stoics, was disfigured by its approbation of shockingly immoral actions and practices.

As the fundamental and all-embracing obligation imposed upon man by the Creator, the natural law is the one to which all his other obligations are attached. The duties imposed on us in the supernatural law come

home to us, because the natural law and its exponent, conscience, tell us that, if God has vouchsafed to us a supernatural revelation with a series of precepts, we are bound to accept and obey it. The natural law is the foundation of all human law inasmuch as it ordains that man shall live in society, and society for its constitution requires the existence of an authority, which shall possess the moral power necessary to control the members and direct them to the common good. Human laws are valid and equitable only in so far as they correspond with, and enforce or supplement the natural law; they are null and void when they conflict with it. The United States system of equity courts, as distinguished from those engaged in the administration of the common law, are founded on the principle that, when the law of the legislator is not in harmony with the dictates of the natural law, equity (*æquitas, epikeia*) demands that it be set aside or corrected. St. Thomas explains the lawfulness of this procedure. Because human actions, which are the subject of laws, are individual and innumerable, it is not possible to establish any law that may not sometimes work out unjustly. Legislators, however, in passing laws, attend to what commonly happens, though to apply the common rule will sometimes work injustice and defeat the intention of the law itself. In such cases it is bad to follow the law; it is good to set aside its letter and follow the dictates of justice and the common good (II-II, Q. cxx, a. 1). Logically, chronologically, and ontologically antecedent to all human society for which it provides the indispensable basis, the natural or moral law is neither—as Hobbes, in anticipation of the modern positivistic school, taught—a product of social agreement or convention, nor a mere congeries of the actions, customs, and ways of men, as claimed by the ethicists who, refusing to acknowledge the First Cause as a Personality with whom one entertains personal relations, deprive the law of its obligatory basis. It is a true law, for through it the Divine Mind imposes on the subject minds of His rational creatures their obligations and prescribes their duties.

On this subject consult ETHICS; CONSCIENCE; GOOD; DUTY; *Summa Theol.*, I–II, QQ. xci, xciv; I, Q., lxxix, a. 12; SUAREZ, *De Legibus*, II, v–xvii; MEYER, *Institutiones Juris Naturalis*, II. The natural law is treated in all Catholic text-books of ethics. A good exposition in English will be found in RICKABY, *Moral Philosophy* (London, 1888); HILL, *Ethics or Moral Philosophy* (Baltimore, 1888). Consult also: ROBINSON, *Elements of American Jurisprudence* (Boston, 1900); LILLY, *Right and Wrong* (London, 1890); MING, *The Data of Modern Ethics Examined* (New York, 1897); BOUQUILLON, *Theologia Moralis Fundamentalis* (Ratisbon and New York, 1890); BLACKSTONE, *Commentaries*, I, introd., sec. i.

JAMES J. FOX.

Law, ROMAN.—In the following article this subject is briefly treated under the two heads of; I. Principles; II. History. Of these two divisions, I is subdivided into: A. Persons; B. Things; C. Actions. The subdivisions of II are: A. Development of the Roman Law (again divided into periods) and B. Subsequent Influence.

I. PRINCIPLES.—The characteristic of the earlier Roman law was its extreme formalism. From its first secret administration as the law of the privileged classes it expanded until it became the basis of all civilized legal systems. The Roman law in its maturity recognized a definite natural-law theory as the ultimate test of the reasonableness of positive law, and repudiated the concept that justice is the creature of positive law. Cicero (De leg., I, v) tells us "Nos ad justitiam esse natos, neque opinione sed natura constitutum esse jus" (i. e. Justice is natural, not the effect of opinion). Justice was conformity with perfect laws, and jurisprudence was the appreciation of things human and divine—the science of the just and the unjust, but always the science of law with its just application to practical cases. Law was natural or positive (man-made); it was natural strictly speaking (instinctive), or it was natural under the Roman concept of the *jus gentium* (law of nations)—natural in itself or so universally recognized by all men that a presumption arose by reason of universality. The Romans attributed slavery to the *jus gentium* because it was universally practised, and therefore implied the consent of all men, yet the definition of slavery expressly states that it is *contra naturam*, "against nature". The precepts of the law were these: to live honestly; not to injure another; to give unto each one his due. Positive law was the *jus civile*, or municipal law, of a particular state.

Gaius says that all law pertains to persons, to things, or to actions.

A. *Persons.*—*Man* and *person* were not equivalent terms. A slave was not a person, but a thing; a person was a human being endowed with civil status. In other than human beings personality might exist by a fiction. Status was natural or civil. Natural status existed by reason of natural incidents, such as posthumous or already born (*jam nati*), sane and insane, male and female, infancy and majority. Civil status had to do with liberty, citizenship, and family. If one had no civil status whatever, he had no personality and was a mere thing. Men were either free or slaves: if free they were either free born or freedmen. Slaves were born such or became slaves either by the law of nations or by civil law. By the law of nations they became slaves by reason of captivity; by civil law, by the status of their parents or in the occasional case where they permitted themselves to be sold in order to participate in the price, if they were over twenty years of age. An ungrateful freedman, again, might become a slave, as might one condemned to involuntary servitude in punishment for crime. Free-born, in the later law, were such as were born of a mother who was free at conception, at birth, or at any time between conception and birth. Freedmen were former slaves who had been emancipated under one of several forms. They owed *obsequium*—i. e., respect and reverence—to their former masters. The Lex Ælia Sentia placed restrictions on emancipation by minors and in fraud of creditors. The Lex Fusia Caninia restricted the right of manumission proportionately to the number of slaves owned.

Men were either citizens or foreigners (*peregrini*), perhaps more accurately "denizens". Assuming that one had civil status, he might be either *sui juris* (his own master) or *alieni juris* (subject to another). The power to which he was subject was termed a *potestas:* slaves were under the dominical power, and children were under the *patria potestas* exercised by a male ascendant; the marital power was termed *manus* (i. e., "the hand", signifying force).

Slaves were at first insecure in their lives, but later the master's power of life and death was taken away. They were in commerce and might be sold, donated, bequeathed by legacy, alienated by testament, or manumitted. They had nothing of their own, and whatever was acquired through them accrued to the masters. Only very rarely could they bring their masters into legal relations with third persons.

The paternal power over children (descendants) was a close patriarchal relationship, dating from remote antiquity and at first extending to life and death. Between *paterfamilias* and *filius familias* (father and son), no obligation was legally enforceable (see *Prejudicial action* below). During his lifetime the *paterfamilias* was the owner of accessions made by the *filius familias*. The later law, however, recognized a quasi-partnership of blood and conceded an inchoate ownership in the paternal goods, which was given expression in the system of successions. A child under power might have the administration of separate goods called his *peculium*. The *paterfamilias* did not part with the ownership. The military and quasi-military *peculium* became a distinct, separate property. Even the slave at his master's sufferance might enjoy a

peculium. The paternal power was stripped of the power of life and death, the right of punishment was moderated, and the sale of children was restricted to cases of extreme necessity. In the earlier law, it had been permitted to the father to give over his child (as he might give over a slave) to some person injured through the act of the child, and thus escape liability. With the growth of humane sentiment, the noxal action in the case of children was abolished. Between parents and children, only affirmative or negative actions on the question of filiation or the existence of the paternal power were permitted. The paternal power was held only by males, and extended indefinitely downward during the lifetime of the patriarch: i. e., father and son were under the *patria potestas* of the grandfather. The *potestas* was in no wise influenced by infancy or majority. In the case given, upon the death of the grandfather the paternal power would fall upon the father. The *patria potestas* was acquired over children born in lawful wedlock, by legitimation, and by adoption.

Marriage (*nuptiæ* or *connubium*) was the association or community of life between man and woman, for the procreation and rearing of offspring, validly entered into between Roman citizens. It was wont to be preceded by *sponsalia* (betrothal), defined as an agreement of future marriage. *Sponsalia* might be verbally entered into, and required no solemnities. The mutual consent of the spouses was requisite, and the object of marriage was kept in mind so that marriage with an impotent person (*castratus*) was invalid: the parties must have attained puberty, and there could be but one husband and one wife. It is true that more or less continuous extra-matrimonial relations between the same man and woman in the absence of any other marriage were considered as a kind of marriage, under the *jus gentium*, by the jurists of the second and third centuries. The *connubium*, or Roman marriage, was for Roman citizens: *matrimonium* existed among other free persons, and *contubernium* was the marital relation of slaves. The latter was a status of fact, not a juridical status. Marriage might be incestuous, indecorous, or noxal: incestuous, e. g., between blood relations or persons between whom affinity existed; indecorous, e. g., between a freeman and a lewd woman or actress; noxal, e. g., between Christian and Jew, tutor or curator and ward, etc.

Cognation or blood relationship is indicated by degrees and lines; the degree measures the distance between cognates, and the line shows the series, either direct (ascending or descending) or collateral; the collateral line is either equal or unequal in the descent from the common ancestor. In the direct line, in both civil and canon law, there are as many degrees as there are generations. In the collateral line there is a difference: by civil law, brother and sister are in the second degree, although each is only one degree removed from the common ancestor, the father; by canon law, they are in the first degree. The civil law counts each degree up to the common ancestor and then down to the other collateral. The canon law measures the cognation of collaterals by the distance in degrees of the collateral farthest removed from the common ancestor. Uncle and niece are three degrees distant by civil law; by canon law they are only two degrees removed. Affinity is the artificial relationship which exists between one spouse and the cognates of the other. Affinity has no degrees. By Roman law, marriage in the direct line was prohibited; in the collateral line it was prohibited in the second degree.

Marriage was usually accompanied by the dowry, created on behalf of the wife, and by donations *propter nuptias*, on behalf of the husband. The dowry (*dos*) was what the wife brought or what some other person on her behalf supplied towards the expenses of the married state. Property of the wife in excess of the dowry was called her *paraphernalia*. The dowry was profective, if it came from the father; adventitious, if from the wife or from any other source. The husband enjoyed its administration and control, and all of its fruits accrued to him. Upon the dissolution of the marriage the profective dowry might be reclaimed by the wife's father, and the adventitious by the wife or her heirs. Special actions existed for the enforcement of dotal agreements.

The offspring of incest or adultery could not be legitimated. Adoption, which imitates nature, was a means of acquiring the paternal power. Only such persons as in nature might have been parents could adopt, and hence a difference of eighteen years was necessary in the ages of the parties. Adoption was of a minor, and could not be for a time only. Similar to adoption was adrogation, whereby one *sui juris* subjected himself to the *patria potestas* of another.

The paternal power was dissolved by the death of the ancestor, in which case each descendant in the first degree became *sui juris;* those in remoter degrees fell under the paternal power of the next ascendant. Upon the death of the grandfather, his children became *sui juris*, and the grandchildren came under the power of their respective fathers. Loss of status (*capitis diminutio, media* or *maxima*), involving loss of liberty or citizenship, destroyed the paternal power. Emancipation and adoption had a similar effect.

One might be *sui juris* and yet subject to tutorship or curatorship. Pupillary tutorship was a personal public office consisting in the education and in the administration of the goods of a person *sui juris*, but who had not yet attained puberty. Tutorship was testamentary, statutory, or dative: testamentary when validly exercised in the will of the *paterfamilias* with respect to a child about to become *sui juris*, but under puberty. A testamentary tutor could not be appointed by the mother nor by a maternal ascendant. The agnates, who were an important class of kinsmen, in the early Roman law were cognates connected through males either by blood relationship or by the artificial tie of agnation. Statutory tutorship was that which the law immediately conferred, as the tutorship of agnates, of patrons, etc. The first statutory tutors were the agnates and gentiles called to tutorship by the Twelve Tables. Justinian abolished the distinction in this respect between agnates and cognates, and called them promiscuously to the statutory tutorship.

Similar to tutorship, although distinct in its incidents, was curatorship. In tutorship the office terminated with the puberty of the ward. The interposition of the tutor's *auctoritas* in every juridical act was required to be concurrent, both in time and place. He had no power of ratification, nor could he supply the *auctoritas* by letter or through an agent. Curators were given to persons *sui juris* after puberty and before they had reached the necessary maturity for the conduct of their own affairs. Curators were appointed also for the deaf and dumb, for the insane and for prodigals. The curator of a minor was given rather to the goods than to the person of his ward; the curator's consent was necessary to any valid disposition of the latter's goods. Tutors and curators were required to give security for the faithful performance of their duties and were liable on the quasi-contractual relationship existing between them and their wards. In certain cases the law excused persons from these duties, and provision was made for the removal of persons who had become "suspect".

In the law of persons, status depended upon liberty, citizenship, and family; and the corresponding losses of status were known respectively as *capitis diminutio maxima, media*, and *minima*. The *minima*, by a fiction at least, was involved even when one became *sui juris*, although this is disputed.

B. *Things.*—Things were *divini vel humani juris* (i. e., governed by divine or by human law). Things

sacræ were publicly consecrated to the gods; places of burial were things *religiosæ;* things *sanctæ* were so called because protected by a penal sanction—thus the city walls, gates, ditch, etc. were *sanctæ*. None of these could be part of an individual's patrimony, because they were considered as not in commerce.

Things *humani juris* were the things with which the private law concerned itself. Things are common when the ownership is in no one, and the enjoyment open to all. In an analogous way, things are public when the ownership is in the people, and the use in individuals. The air, flowing water, the sea, etc. were things common to all, and therefore the property of none. The seashore, rivers, gates, etc., were public. Private things were such as were capable of private ownership and could form part of the patrimony of individuals. Again, things were collective or singular. The once important distinction between *res mancipi* and *nec mancipi* was suppressed by Justinian. *Res mancipi* were those things which the Romans most highly prized: Italian soil, rural servitudes, slaves, etc. These required formal mancipation.

Things were either corporeal or incorporeal: corporeal were those *quæ tangi possunt* (which can be touched—tangible). Detention or naked possession of a thing was the mere physical faculty of disposing of it. Possession was the detention of a corporeal thing coupled with the *animus dominii*, or intent of ownership. It might be in good faith or in bad: if there was a just title, the possession was just: if not, unjust. A true possession was possible of a corporeal thing only; quasi-possession was the term employed in reference to an incorporeal thing, as a right. The *jus possessionis* was the entirety of rights which accrued to the possession as such. The advantages of possession as independent of ownership were as follows: the possessor had not the burden of producing and proving title; sometimes he enjoyed the fruits of the thing; he retained the thing until the claimant made proof; he stood in a better position in law than the claimant, and received the decision where the claim was not fully established; the possessor might retain the thing by virtue of the *jus retentionis*, until reimbursed for charges and outlays; the possessor in good faith was not liable for *culpa* (fault). One might not recover possession by violence or self-help.

A right *in re* was a real right, valid against all the world; a right *ad rem* was an obligation or personal right against a particular person or persons. Rights *in re* were ownership, inheritance, servitudes, pledge, etc. Ownership was quiritarian or bonitarian: quiritarian, when acquired by the *jus civile* only available to Roman citizens; bonitarian, when acquired by any natural, as distinguished from civil, means. This distinction was removed by Justinian. There could be co-ownership or sole ownership.

The modes of acquiring ownership were of two genera, arising from natural law and from civil law. One acquired, by natural law, in occupation, accession, perception of fruits, and by tradition (delivery). Occupation occurred in acquisition by hunting, fishing, capture in war, etc. The right of *post-liminium* was the recovery of rights lost through capture in war, and in proper cases applied to immoveables, moveables, and to the status of persons. Finding was also a means of occupation, since a thing completely lost or abandoned was *res nullius*, and therefore belonged to the first taker.

Accession was natural, industrial, or mixed. The birth of a child to a slave woman was an instance of natural accession; so also, was the formation of an island in a stream. This accrued to the riparian owners proportionately to their frontage along the side of the river towards which the island was formed. Alluvion was the slow increment added to one's riparian property by the current. Industrial accession required human intervention and occurred by *adjunctio*, *specificatio*, or *commixtio*, or by a species of the latter, *confusio*. Mixed accession took place by reason of the maxim: Whatever is planted on the soil, or connected with it, belongs to the soil.

In perception of fruits the severance or taking of revenue might be by the owner or by another, as by the usufructuary, the lessee (in *locatio-conductio*), by the creditor (in *antichresis*), and by the possessor in good faith.

Tradition was the transfer of possession and was a corporeal act, where the nature of the object permitted. Corporeal things were moveables or immoveables. In modern civil law, incorporeal things are moveables or immoveables, depending upon the nature of the property to which the rights or obligations attach. In Roman law obligations, rights, and actions were not embraced in the terms *moveables* and *immoveables*.

The vindicatory action (*rei vindicatio*) went to the direct question of ownership, and ownership was required to be conclusively proved. Complete proof of ownership was often extremely difficult, or impossible, and the Prætor Publicius devised the *actio publiciana* available to an acquirer by just title and in good faith, but who could not establish the ownership of his author. It was available to such an acquirer against a claimant who possessed *infirmiore jure*.

Ownership (*dominium*) is an absolute right *in re*. A servitude (sometimes called a dismemberment of ownership) was a constituted right in the property of another, whereby the owner was bound to suffer something, or abstain from doing something, with respect to his property, for the utility of some other person or thing. A servitude was not a service of a person, but of a thing, and to adjoining land or to a person. Servitudes due to land were real (predial), while servitudes due to a person as such were personal. There were servitudes which might be considered as either real or personal, and others, again, which could only be personal, such as usufruct, use, habitation, and the labour of slaves. A real servitude existed when land was servient to land. Such a servitude was either urban or rural, depending not so much on whether the servitude was exercised in the city or country as upon its relation to buildings. Servitudes consisted in something essentially passive, *in patiendo vel in non faciendo;* never *in faciendo*. Servitudes which consisted *in patiendo* were affirmative and those *in non faciendo* were negative. Servitudes could arise by agreement, last will, or prescription.

There were numerous urban predial servitudes: as *onus ferendi*, by which one's construction was bound to sustain the columns of another or the weight of his wall; *tigni immittendi*, the right to seat one's timbers in his neighbour's wall; *projiciendi*, the right to overhang one's timbers over the land of another, although in no way resting on the other's soil; *protegendi*, a similar right of projecting one's roof over another's soil. The servitudes *stillicidii* and *fluminis recipiendi* were similar: *stillicidium* was the right to drip; and *fluminis recipiendi*, the right to discharge rainwater collected in canals or gutters. The servitude *altius non tollendi* was a restriction on the height of a neighbour's construction while *altius tollendi* was an affirmative right to carry one's construction higher than otherwise permitted. Servitudes of light and prospect were of similar nature.

Rural predial servitudes were *iter*, *actus*, *via*, *aquæductus*, and the like. The servitude of *iter* (way) was an eight-foot roadway in the stretches, with accommodation at the turns. It included the right of driving vehicles and cattle, and the lesser right of foot-passage. *Actus* was a right of trail of four feet in which cattle or suitable narrow vehicles might be driven. *Iter* was a mere right of path. In these servitudes the lesser was included in the greater. The nature of the right of *aquæductus* is obvious, as well

as the various servitudes of drawing water, of driving cattle to water, of pasturage, of burning lime, of digging sand or gravel, and the like. Servitudes of this character could be extinguished by the consolidation of ownership of both servient and dominant estate in the same owner, and by remission or release; by non-user for the prescriptive period, and by the destruction of the dominant or servient estate.

Usufruct was the greatest of personal servitudes; yet, as its measure was not the strict personal needs of its subject, it exceeded a personal servitude. During the period of enjoyment it was almost ownership, and was described as a personal servitude consisting in the use and enjoyment of the corporeal things of another without change in their substance. *Ususfructus* was the right *utendi, fruendi, salva substantia*. In a strict sense it applied only to corporeal things which were neither consumed nor diminished by such use. After Tiberius, a quasi-usufruct (as of money) was recognized. Money, although not consumable *naturaliter*, was consumable *civiliter*. Usufruct could arise by operation of law, by judicial decision (as in partition), by convention, by last will, and even by prescription. The natural or civil death of the usufructuary extinguished the right, as did non-user and the complete loss of the thing.

Use and habitation were lesser rights of the same general nature. *Usus* was the right to use the things of another, but only to the extent of the usee's necessities, and always *salva substantia*. Habitation was the right of dwelling in another's building in those apartments which were intended for habitation, *salva substantia* (i. e., without substantial modification). The personal servitude *operæ servorum* embraced every utility from the labour of another's slave or slaves. The actions from servitudes were *confessoria* or *negatoria*, in assertion of the servitude or in denial of it.

Ownership might further be acquired by usucaption (*usucapio*) and prescription for a long period. Prescription (a slight modification of the older usucaption) is the dispensing with evidence of title, and is acquisitive when it is the means of acquiring ownership and extinctive (divestitive) when it bars a right of action. Acquisitive prescription required (1) a thing subject to prescription, (2) good faith, (3) continuous possession, and (4) the lapse of the prescribed time.

Again, ownership could be acquired by donation, the gratuitous transfer of a thing to another person. Donations were *mortis causa* or *inter vivos*, and the former was in reality a conditional testamentary disposition and very similar to a legacy, while the latter did not require the death of the donor for its perfection. A species of donation *inter vivos* was the *donatio propter nuptias* from the husband.

The juridical consequence of ownership is the power of alienation, and yet the law limited certain owners in this respect. The husband owned the dowry, but was subject to restrictions; the pupil under tutorship was owner, but without power to alienate, except probably in the single case of a sister's dowry. Even where one was owner without these specific limitations, if he had conceded rights *in re* to another, he could not alienate prejudicially to such other: thus, the pledge debtor could not prejudice the rights *in re* of the pledge creditor.

Acquisition could be made, not only personally, but through children and slaves; and, in the later law, through a mandatory or procurator. Acquisition could be made of possession, of ownership, and of the right of pledge.

Succession.—Succession to a deceased person was either testate or intestate: particular things were acquired by legacies or by trust-bequests (*fidei-commissa*). A universal succession was an inheritance. The Twelve Tables recognized the right of testation, and the civil law later conceived of a partnership of blood in both testate and intestate successions. The prætor's intervention was frequent in testamentary matters; and in equitable cases he softened the rigour of the law and gave the *possessio bonorum*. A testament was the legally declared last will in which an heir was instituted. Some departure from the strict formalities was permitted in the case of soldiers' wills. The right of testament was active and passive. Persons generally who were under no incapacity could make a will; those prohibited were such as had some defect of status, some vice or defect of mind, or even some sufficient defect of body, and those guilty of crime or improbity. The passive right of testament was the right to take under a will. Heirs were voluntary or necessary (forced). In the early freedom of the law, Romans might disinherit without cause; later, this liberty was restricted to disherison for just cause, and a *legitima*, or statutory provision, was prescribed. Disherison was the express exclusion from the whole inheritance of one who was entitled to the *legitima*. One was *præteritus* who was neither instituted an heir nor disinherited. Since disherison was required to be express, one conditionally instituted was only pretermitted. Further, disherison required exclusion from all heirs and from every degree. Under the early law, sons were required to be excluded by name; daughters and grandchildren could be excluded by class. The later law required that all children should be deprived by name. Justinian enumerated the "just" causes of disherison in Novel cxv; they are substantially the same in the modern civil codes.

The instituted heir, as successor to the universal rights of the decedent, was required to have passive testamentary capacity at the time of the will and at the time of the death; the intervening period was of no consequence. It was, however, requisite that he should retain capacity from the time of the death until the taking of the inheritance. In a conditional institution of the heir, capacity was necessary at the time of the will, at the time of the death, and at the time of the happening of the condition. Slaves as well as freemen could be instituted heirs, and, in the case of a slave the gift of liberty was implied. Uncertain and indeterminate persons might be instituted if they could be rendered certain; such were the poor, the municipalities, and licit corporations. Where co-heirs were instituted without definite shares, they took equally. The heir might be instituted absolutely or conditionally, but not merely for a time. A physically impossible condition, negatively added, left the institution absolute; in general, the conditions annexed were various and quite similar to the classes of conditions known to the modern civil law. Where one of several co-heirs failed to take, his portion accrued to the others as a matter of law, without their knowledge and even against their will: this was called the *jus accrescendi*.

As already intimated, the testator might institute one or several heirs; if all were instituted at the same time, they were direct heirs; but one might be direct and the other substituted by way of fidei-commissum. Again, the testator could substitute an heir, in case the first should not take. Direct substitution, therefore, was the institution of a second heir, in case the first failed to take: with respect to the person making the substitution, it was either military or non-military. The case in which the substitution was intended to take place classed it as vulgar, pupillary, or quasi-pupillary: vulgar was the ordinary substitution in which one was named to take, in case the first heir defaulted or died; pupillary, was where an heir was instituted to succeed a child under puberty (since such child could not make a will, the parent in a sense made two wills, one for himself to the child and one for the child in case the latter should die before puberty).

Testaments were vitiated in several ways: *nullum*, void from the begining, where there was a defect in the institution of the heir or incapacity in the testator;

injustum, not legally executed and hence void; *ruptum*, by revocation or by the agnation of a posthumous child, either natural or civil; *irruptum*, where the testator had lost the civil status necessary for testation; *destitutum*, where the heir defaulted because dead or unwilling, or upon failure of the condition; *recissum*, as the consequence of a legal attack upon an undutiful will.

It has been said that heirs were either necessary or voluntary: necessary heirs were either such as could not be pretermitted or such as were forced to accept. These were again *sui et necessarii* or *necessarii* only. The former were children under the *patria potestas*, and they were *sui* because one's own, and *necessarii*, because the civil law made them forced heirs, although the prætor gave to such the *beneficium abstinendi*. Voluntary heirs were strangers who had a perfect right of election to accept or reject the inheritance. The prætor conceded to the heir a period of time in which to balance the advantages and disadvantages of the inheritance, called the *jus deliberandi*. Justinian added to this the benefit of inventory.

Aside from the inheritance proper, a will could contain legacies whereby things were bequeathed by a single title and by express words; they could be imperative or precative. Legacies were by vindication, where the express words justified a direct legal claim by the legatee; by condemnation, where the language condemned or ordered the heir to transmit the legacy; by *præceptio*, where a legacy was left to one only of several co-heirs; and *sinendi modo*, by permissive words. As in the case of joint-heirs, the *jus accrescendi* existed also among joint-legatees.

By reason of the ambulatory character (as Heineccius terms it) of man's will, legacies and trust-bequests (*fidei-commissa*) were subject to ademption and transfer to another legatee. The Lex Falcidia, which created the statutory fourth portion, applied to legacies as well as to other testamentary provisions. *Fidei-commissa* were created by precative words addressed to the conscience of the heir, and were at first not legally enforceable. Trust-bequests were later given legal sanction; and they were universal or of single things. The modern civil law is hostile to trusts of any kind.

If a last will contained the institution of an heir, it was a testament; if it contained less, it was a codicil. Originally, codicils were only letters; later, they began to have testamentary force, containing, however, nothing which pertained to the direct institution of the heir. There could be several non-repugnant codicils. Not only could they contain no institution of an heir, but they could not provide for disherison or substitution. They were made either in connexion with a will or, in some cases, with a view to the intestate succession of the heir.

If there was an invalid will or no will at all, the succession was intestate: in the ancient law the basis of intestate succession was the peculiarly Roman artificial family made up of the agnates. Emancipated children and non-agnatic cognates did not succeed, since they were no part of the family. In the first rank, the heirs were the decedent's children (natural or adoptive) who took *per capita*, in the nearest degree and *per stirpes*, or by representation, in remoter degrees. Emancipated children had no claim until later, when they were aided by the prætor's edict, "Unde liberi". The Twelve Tables provided that, in the absence of children, the nearest agnate should be called: this was known as the statutory sucession of the agnates. Those only were called who were bound in agnation to the deceased through males; hence females beyond sisters were not called. The prætor, however, provided for the more remote in the edict, "Unde cognati". Agnates by adoption enjoyed the same rights as agnates by nature. The nearest agnate took, and there was no right of representation, although here again the prætor made innovations which were supplemented by the legislation of Justinian. The father did not succeed to the son, consistently with the idea that the son could have nothing of his own, and, where the father took, it was by right of resumption. The father succeeded to his emancipated child, not as an agnate, but as a manumissor. The mother was not an agnate, and did not succeed to her children, nor did they succeed to her. Here, again, changes were effected by the edict, "Unde cognati", and by the Senatus-consulta Tertullianum and Orphitianum. The former *senatus-consultum* provided that, if a free mother gave birth to three children, or a freedwoman to four, there should be a right of succession, and this legislation was modified by Justinian even more favourably to the mother. The Senatus-consultum Orphitianum was the complement of the other, and provided that the right of succession between mother and children should be reciprocal. These rights were extended by imperial constitution to grandchildren.

If agnates were wanting, the Twelve Tables called the *gentiles* in the next rank, and not the cognates: the prætor, however, in the edict "Unde cognati", called the cognates in this rank.

Servile cognation (that contracted in slavery) had been an impediment of marriage; but the slave woman, manumitted with her children, could not avail herself either of the Senatus-consultum Tertullianum or of the possession of goods derived from the edict "Unde cognati". Justinian created rights of succession to remedy this defect.

The former master or, by assignment of freedmen, his children, stood *in loco parentis* to the freedman, and succeeded to his patrimony. Even the predeceased patron, through his nearest children (representation being excluded) succeeded to the goods of his former slave. *Libertini*, freedmen, were restricted in their capacity to make a will. The prætor considered it no more than equitable that the *libertinus* should leave one-half his property to his former master. A higher equity arose where the freedman left children of his own, and in this case the patron might be excluded, the whole patrimony going to the freedman's children. In all other cases, and even *contra tabulas*, the patron took one half: later, in special circumstances depending upon the freedman's wealth, Justinian, developing the principles of the Lex Papia Poppæa, increased the patron's portion.

The prætor's intervention in succession matters did not directly overturn the provisions of the *jus civile*, but he devised the *possessio bonorum*, applicable to both testate and intestate successions. Justinian recognized and gave sanction to three kinds of *possessio:* first, *contra tabulas* (contrary to the will), where persons had been inequitably pretermitted; second, *secundum tabulas;* third, possession of an intestate's estate. The *bonorum possessor* was not an heir in accordance with *jus civile*, yet he enjoyed all of the privileges of an heir. Justinian placed the right of succession upon a basis of cognation, or blood relationship, and succession by right of blood occurred in four orders which may be indicated as follows: First order (a) the *sui heredes*, or natural heirs, who succeeded in virtue of the *con-dominium* in the inheritance; (b) those whose strict legal right had been barred (as by emancipation), but whom the prætor called to the inheritance; (c) emancipated sons to whom Justinian's constitution restored natural rights. Second order, (a) statutory heirs, agnates; (b) persons entitled under the Senatus-consultum Tertullianum; (c) those entitled under the Senatus-consultum Orphitianum. Third order, the cognates. (Heineccius gives tables of descent both before and after Justinian's legislation). None of these orders being entitled to take, the estate escheated to the *fiscus*, or public treasury. The adjective law (below, under

C. Actions) supplied various forms for the *hereditas petitio*. *Collatio*, or the return of advancements, was required in order that there might be a fair distribution. This is the collation of the modern civil codes.

Another means for the acquisition of ownership was adrogation, whereby a person *sui juris* was adopted into the paternal power of another. Originally the obligations of the *adrogatus* were strictly and logically extinguished, but the injustice to creditors was the subject of remedial legislation.

Again, one might acquire the goods of another by *sectio* or *venditio bonorum*, a sale at auction for the benefit of creditors.

The rights growing out of pledge were also a means for the acquisition of property. This institution was, in its inception, only a fiduciary pact without means of enforcement, and the title passed to the pledge creditor; later, it took the form of *pignus*, or pledge proper, whereby the creditor was placed in possession of a moveable with certain duties towards the debtor; a form of the same contract was extended to immoveables, and this was known as *antichresis*. In *antichresis* the creditor was placed in possession of the immoveables and obliged to pay, first, his interests and charges, and then to deduct from the principal debt whatever he received as revenue. *Hypotheca*, or mortgage, was a development and in scientific theory is the substructure of the modern law of mortgage. Privileges were akin to modern civil-law rights of the same name and to the liens of the common law; but possession was not of prime importance.

Pledge was extinguished by the extinction of the principal debt, by express release, by expiration of the time, by destruction of the thing pledged, etc. The actions growing out of it were the Servian and general hypothecary, or quasi-Servian action.

Real rights (*in re*) differ essentially from personal rights (*ad rem*), or obligations, which have persons as their immediate objects. Even these have things as their remote objects, since they tend to the attainment of a thing through a particular person and by reason of their being usually convertible into a money value. Obligations (dismissing at once those which were purely natural and hence unenforceable) were broader than either contract or tort, and included liability arising from both. They were civil or prætorian, and could arise from contract, quasi-contract, delict, and quasi-delict. In conventional obligations some things were essential, others accidental. Contractual obligations arose through delivery of a thing, through words, through writing, or merely through the consent of the parties; and were, accordingly, contracts *re, verbis, litteris*, or *consensu*.

Contracts *re* were the bailments, loan for use, loan for consumption, deposit, and pledge.

Contracts *verbis* were entered into by a formal stipulation consisting of a direct question and an adequately responsive answer. They could take immediate effect, could commence *in futuro*, or could be conditional. Stipulations were prætorian, judicial, common, and Aquilian: the prætorian and judicial were scarcely voluntary. The common stipulation was used in the ordinary affairs of men and by persons in fiduciary relationships (e. g., in this form the tutor gave security for the faithful discharge of his duties). The Aquilian stipulation, in connexion with *acceptilatio*, was a means of general release for the dissolution of any obligation. Stipulations required the same consensual elements that were necessary in other agreements, in addition to their own peculiar formalism. If a conditional response were made to a direct question, the stipulation was void; so also, if made by letter or messenger. The relation of suretyship could be created by stipulation: suretyship was an accessory contract, and the surety was known as the *fidei-jussor*. Sureties had the *beneficium divisionis*, which was conceded by Hadrian. They enjoyed also the *beneficium ordinis*, invented by Justinian, and the *beneficium cedendarum actionum*, or subrogation to the right of action of the creditor against the principal debtor, or *pro rata* against the co-sureties.

Contracts *litteris* took their juridical efficacy from writings, which evidenced the fact that an obligation subsisted or that it had been extinguished. The latter were called *apochæ*. Writings evidencing a subsisting obligation were syngraphic or chirographic respectively, as they expressed a mutual or a unilateral obligation. A writing in the book of the debtor which supported the creditor's entry was conclusive, and even the creditor's entry created a strong presumption.

Contracts *consensu* were not peculiar in that they required consent, which was requisite in all contracts. Their peculiarity was in the fact that consent alone sufficed. They were five in number: buying and selling (*emptio-venditio*); letting and hiring (*locatio-conductio*); the emphyteuticary contract; partnership (*societas*); and mandate (gratuitous agency). In sale, there was necessary the consent of the parties, an object and an agreed price. Letting and hiring might be considered a temporary sale, and the essential incidents of a valid contract were the same as in sale. Emphyteusis strictly was neither a sale nor a letting; it was rather a quit-rent lease dependent in its duration upon the payment of the agreed *canon*. Its special incidents were a quasi-ownership in the tenant and a right of pre-emption in the *dominus*. Similar to emphyteusis was the right of superficies; but as it applied only to the surface—that is, to buildings—it was less permanent. Partnership was general or universal; particular or special; and, finally, singular. As consent was of its essence, withdrawal of consent worked its dissolution. Partnership was an entity distinct from the individual partners; it gave rise to the *actio pro socio*. The leonine partnership (*societas leonina*) was illegal. Mandate was a consensual contract whereby one undertook gratuitously to attend to an affair for another; it was commissioned agency and was an actual contract; it was distinguishable from *negotiorum gestio* (uncommissioned agency) in that the latter belonged to quasi-contract. It gave rise to the *actio mandati, directa*, or *contraria*.

The contracts which had a definite name and form of action for their enforcement were nominate contracts. There were others termed innominate because they had no special names: these were summed up in the four formulæ: *Do, ut des; Do, ut facias; Facio, ut des;* and *Facio, ut facias*. They were enforced by the general action *in factum* or by the action *præscriptis verbis*.

All of the foregoing contracts, nominate and innominate, were contracts in the true sense of the word, but there was another class of relations in which the law imposed duties and obligations as if the parties had actually contracted. These were the so-called quasi-contracts, and the forms were *negotiorum gestio*, tutorship, inheritance, administration in common, *hereditatis aditio, indebiti solutio* (payment under mistake of fact), and a few others of similar nature.

Obligations could be acquired through the paternal and dominical powers and through mandataries. A civil obligation once constituted could be extinguished by an exception (plea in bar) or by its own terms. Pleas in bar were divers and could arise from a will, a contract or pact, a judicial decision, etc.

The means of extinction common to all obligations were: *solutio* (payment); *compensatio* (set-off); *confusio* (merging of the character of debtor and creditor) *oblatio et consignatio* (tender); *rei interitus* (loss of the thing); *novatio* (substitution of obligations as to person or thing); *præscriptio* (lapse of time); and further, in proper cases, by *acceptilatio* (release) and by *mutuus dissensus* (mutual change of intention).

The prætorian *restitutio in integrum* was an equitable restoration of the parties to their former situation, and could be invoked for *metus* (duress), *dolus* (fraud), minority, and generally by all who had suffered hardship through no fault of their own.

Obligations and rights of action arose also out of *delictum*, which was the voluntary penal violation of human law. Delicts were either actual or quasi-delicts—the former deliberate, the latter negligent. When public, they were crimes; when private, torts. Instances were: *furtum* (theft), either manifest or concealed; *rapina* (robbery with violence); *damnum injuria datum* (injury to property); and *injuria* (a kind of outrage, or defamatory wrong by word or action). In *furtum*, the thief could be prosecuted either civilly or criminally, and in the civil action the thing or the penalty could be recovered. The Roman criminal law imposed a fine to the *fiscus* and corporal or capital punishment. Justinian abolished mutilation and capital punishment for theft and substituted fines and exile. *Rapina*, like *furtum*, required a criminal intent. Where the putative owner, in the belief of ownership, sought to recover his property by violence, this was not robbery, but the offence against public order was punished by the loss of the property without, however, any fine to the fiscus. Damage to the property of another *injuria datum* was the subject matter of the Aquilian Law, and the damage must have been inflicted by a freedman; if by a slave, it was a noxal tort; if by a quadruped, the tort and liability were designated *pauperies*. The measure of damages in *injuria* depended upon the atrocity of the wrong and the status of the parties; the right of action accrued to the father for *injuria* to the son; to the husband, for the wife; to the master, for the slave, etc. Quasi-delictual obligations were torts or wrongs based on *culpa* (fault or negligence), and not upon *dolus* (evil intent). An instance was where anything was negligently or carelessly thrown from a house (*dejecta vel effusa*). Quasi-delictual, also, were the obligations of persons employed in a public calling, such as shipmasters and innkeepers, for the wrongful acts of their servants.

C. *Actions.*—Adjective Law.—An action was the legal means for the enforcement of a right, and the Roman law included in the term *actio* both the right of action and the action itself. Actions were petitory, when they sought to recover the very thing in controversy, or possessory, where the right of possession only was in issue. Specific nominate actions were provided in most of the relations between men, and where the relations were innominate there were *actiones in factum, præscriptis verbis*, and *condictiones ex lege*.

According to their origin, actions were civil or honorary, the latter emanating either from the prætor or from the ædiles. Civil actions were either *directæ* or *utiles: directæ*, if brought in the express words of the law or by the logical parties; *utiles*, if brought upon equitable facts not within the strict letter, and possibly, in the case of a ceded action, by the nominal plaintiff for the use of the real plaintiff. Actions aiming to establish personal status were called prejudicial. Real actions were *vindicationes;* personal were *condictiones*.

Rei vindicatio and the Publician action went to the question of ownership. Succession gave rise to the *hereditas petitio* and to the *querela inofficiosi*. Servitudes were affirmed or denied by an *actio confessoria* or *negatoria*. In pledge, there was the Servian or quasi-Servian action. The prætor or the ædile granted equitable actions, such as the *actio ad exhibendum* for the production of moveables; the *actio in factum de edendo*, an action of account against bankers; and the *redhibitoria* and *quanti minoris*, actions for redhibition and abatement of the price. The actions based on duress, fraud, and minority were purely equitable, and there was a *condictio sine causa* in cases of failure of consideration. This may be considered as equitable or as growing out of quasi-contract. Indeed, all of the quasi-contractual relations had their appropriate actions. Private wrongs, too, were redressed in suitable forms of action. In delicts the recovery might be simply the value, as in the persecutory actions; or double the value, as in the *actio furti nec manifesti* and in the action for corrupting a slave. In some instances, a triple, or even quadruple, recovery might be had.

Actions founded on the consensual contracts of sale, hire, emphyteusis, partnership, and mandate, and on the real contracts of *commodatum, depositum*, and *pignus* were actions *bonæ fidei:* so also, the *actio præscriptis verbis* for innominate contracts and the quasi-contractual actions *negotiorum gestorum, funeraria, tutelæ*, etc., as well as the personal action *hereditas petitio*.

The *actio ex stipulatu* and the *condictio ex chirographo* were actions of strict law (*stricti juris*).

An arbitrary action was one in which a non-compliant party was forced to comply or be held liable in a larger discretionary sum.

Certain exemptions to judgment debtors were favoured by the Roman law; among these was the *beneficium competentiæ*.

Ordinarily the foundation of liability was personal, yet one might incur liability through the act of another—as a son, a slave, or even a stranger. The *actio quod jussu* was properly brought against father or master for an act done by his order. The master of a ship, whether freeman or slave, by a sort of necessary agency could incur liability for the ship-owner and the right of action was enforced by the *actio exercitoria*. Similar in theory was the *actio institoria* which was the proper form in which to bring an action against one who had placed another in charge of a shop for the buying and selling of wares. The age and condition of the institor were immaterial. The prætor gave an *actio de peculio* to persons who contracted with son or slave in respect to the *peculium*, and this action was effective against the father or master to the extent of the *peculium*.

Aside from the specific remedies sought in particular cases, actions were perpetual or temporary, depending upon the lapse of time. Perpetual actions were ordinarily such as were barred by thirty years' prescription, while temporary actions were barred by shorter periods.

Exceptions or pleas to actions, like actions themselves, were civil or prætorian; and in general were *perpetuæ* and *peremptoriæ* (complete pleas in bar); or *temporariæ* (only dilatory).

The developed written altercations, or pleadings, of the parties were as follows: the *actor* (plaintiff) brought his *actio*, which the *reus* (defendant) met with his *exceptio* (plea). To this the plaintiff could reply with a *replicatio*, which in turn might be met with a *duplicatio*, and in exceptional cases the pleadings might advance to a *triplicatio* and a *quadruplicatio*.

The interdicts were formulæ, or conceptions of words, whereby the prætor, in an urgent cause or in one affecting the public interest, ordered or forbade something to be done. They were, in effect, prohibitory or mandatory injunctions; they were *prohibitoria*, as against violence to possession, obstructing a public place, etc.; they were *restitutoria*, to restore possession, etc.; and, finally, *exhibitoria*, as for the production of a free man or for the production of a will. The object to be attained by a possessory interdict was to receive, to retain, or to recover possession. The interdicts *quorum bonorum* and *quod legatorum* had to do with successions. The Salvian and quasi-Salvian interdicts were used for foreclosure in pledge obligations.

(The subject of Roman criminal law is beyond the

scope of this article; its most concise arrangement is to be found in Pothier's "Pandectæ: de pœnis.")

II. History and Sources.—A. *Its Development.*—The classic period of development of Roman Law was in the second and third centuries of our era, and this is known to us for the greater part through the compilations of Justinian, in the sixth century. In the form given it by Justinian, the Roman Law, through the revival of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, spread over Europe and became the foundation of modern European law.

The history of Roman law has been variously divided into periods. One division is into the Regal Period, from the foundation of the city, the Republican, until the time of Augustus, and, finally, the Imperial, closing with the legislation of Justinian in the year 1280 (A. D. 526) from the foundation of the city (Howe). Again, the lapse of almost 1000 years, from the Twelve Tables to the reign of Justinian, has been divided into three periods: the first, A. U. C. 303–648; the second A. U. C. 648–988, the splendid age from the birth of Cicero to the reign of Alexander Severus; the third, from Alexander to Justinian, in which "the oracles of Jurisprudence were almost mute" (Gibbon). A better division, and one which more accurately corresponds with the growth of Roman political institutions, gives four periods: the first, from the foundation of the city down to the laws of the Twelve Tables; the second, to the battle of Actium (beginning of the empire); the third, from the battle of Actium to the accession of Diocletian; the fourth, from Diocletian to the death of Justinian (565). The first of these four periods is that of infancy; the second, of adolescence; the third, of mature age; the fourth, of senility and decay (Ortolan; Staedtler).

(1) From the Foundation of Rome to the Twelve Tables.—Our knowledge of this period is largely conjectural, from data furnished by the subsequent period. Roman history begins with pure myth and fable, then passes through a stage of blended fable and fact, and finally becomes history properly so called. The history of Roman Law has no vital interest with the petty communities and subordinate nationalities that were finally absorbed in the three ethnological elements, Latin, Sabine, and Etruscan, with which the dawn of Rome's legal history begins. Of these three elements the Etruscan was more advanced in civilization, with definite religious and political institutions (Ortolan). The only Etruscan text we have is that of the nymph Vegoia (*lasa Veku*), which recognizes the right of property and protects it with the wrath of the gods (Casati). It is customary to speak of certain *leges* in the earliest historical period as *leges regiæ:* whether these were real statutes enacted during the regal period or the mere formulation of customary law is disputed (Bruns, introd. note to "Leges Regiæ" in "Fontes Jur. Rom. Antiqui"). There were some well established, though crude and radical, rules of private law, such as the harsh paternal power and the equally drastic right of the creditor over his unfortunate debtor. It may safely be affirmed that during this primitive period customary law was the only law.

Pomponius says: "At the beginning of our city, the people began their first activities without any fixed law and without any fixed rights: all things were ruled despotically by kings" (2, §1. D. 1. 2). In the next paragraph he speaks of the so-called *leges regiæ* as collected and still extant in the book of Sextus Papirius. Again, after the expulsion of the kings the people resorted to customary law. The great mass of historical facts prove that there was no private law other than custom down until this period closed with the enactment of the Twelve Tables (Stædtler). The lack of a precise definition of their rights was the principal grievance of the plebeians, and in A. U. C. 292 their tribune, Terentilius Arsa, proposed the nomination of magistrates to formulate written laws. In 303 decemvirs were appointed, and they agreed upon ten tables during the first year of their magistracy, and two additional tables the second year. The political object sought by the plebeians, namely, the fusing of both classes into one, was not attained: private rights, however, were given definite form. These laws of the Twelve Tables contained the elements from which, in process of time, the vast edifice of private law was developed.

(2) From the Twelve Tables to Actium.—The law expanded rapidly and commensurately with the expansion of Rome in territory and civilization. The jurists, however, had not yet the *imperium*, or power of developing the law through judicial legislation. The growth of law was simply the result of interpretation of the Twelve Tables. The jurists of this period were skilled lawyers who penetrated the spirit of the law, but were not free to depart from it. The few *leges* passed by the people in assembly had practically little to do with private law. The Senate, which was really an administrative body, began to assume legislative powers, but this source of law was as yet unimportant. The activity of the jurisconsults in interpreting the Twelve Tables was the most conspicuous factor in the growth of private law, and their labours were designated by the same term which designated the Twelve Tables, i. e., *jus civile.* The Roman magistrate, however, did possess the *imperium*, and, while at first he used it sparingly, he at length began to develop an equitable jurisdiction, giving remedies in a limited number of cases where the *jus civile* gave none. He proceeded cautiously and upon a rational theory, and, since he could not introduce chaos into the law by varying it in the particular case, he anticipated its defects in hypothetical cases and announced the relief which he would give. The prætor made an announcement in an edict upon assuming magistracy: he was bound by his edict, yet he did not discard the edicts of his predecessors, and in this sense the prætor's edict became an *edictum perpetuum*, i. e., permanent. When experience showed the value of an innovation, the prætor made it, and thus the honorary law became a developing system, modified and improved from year to year. In the course of time it became voluminous. Most of the changes wrought by the prætor were inroads (after the manner of the English chancellors), upon the harsh rigour of the Twelve Tables. The Twelve Tables were deferentially treated by the prætor, whose functions were constructive, and not destructive, yet, by reason of his *imperium*, he was not bound by the *jus civile* in the drafting of his edict. Hence the prætor had the power to engraft upon Roman law new ideas and new principles derived from the *jus gentium.* There were many non-citizens at Rome, and non-Roman relations were administered by a special magistrate, called the *prætor peregrinus*, under a body of principles which were conceived to be common to all men. There was a naturalness and an equity in these principles in which all men were presumed to concur. This was in striking contrast with the *jus civile*, and the contact of legal ideas began to broaden and liberalize Roman law. This influence, however, had not yet overpowered the *jus civile* at the close of this second period.

(3) From Actium (31 B. C.) to Diocletian (d. A. D. 313).—In this, the classic period, the science of law reached a high degree of perfection. *Leges* were very rare, and were usually measures of public policy to which some slight elements of private law were incidental; such were the legislative measures rewarding marriage and dealing with the emancipation of slaves (Stædtler). *Senatus-consulta*, on the contrary, became of increasing importance, and, whereas at first their constitutionality, so to speak, had been doubted, they were fully recognized as law. Other sources were the *constitutiones principum*, or imperial constitutions;

these took the form of edicts, mandates, decrees, and rescripts. The edictal legislation of the magistrates (the honorary law) had become so voluminous that it was incapable of further growth; it was, moreover, out of harmony with changed positive legislation and with changed conditions. Salvius Julianus was commissioned by Hadrian to revise and edit it, and on this revision many of the jurisconsults made their commentaries *ad edictum*. In the literary splendour of the Augustan age the jurisconsults took high rank; their work was not only scientific, but literary, and it has been said that, had all its other monuments perished, classical Latin would have survived in the fragments of the jurisconsults of this period. Augustus granted to the most eminent in law the startling *jus respondendi*, i. e., the right of officially giving, in the name of the prince, opinions which were legally binding upon the judge. These *responsa* were in writing and were sealed before delivery to the judge. Among the celebrated jurisconsults were Capito and Labeo, founders of rival schools (2, § 47, D. 1. 2). Others were Salvius Julianus and Sextus Pomponius, both represented by copious fragments in the Pandects. In the second century came Gaius, of whose "Institutes" those of Justinian are only a recension. In 1816 a palimpsest was discovered by Niebuhr in the library of the cathedral chapter of Verona. On it were some compositions of St. Jerome, in places superimposed on an earlier writing, which proved to be a copy of the lost "Institutes" of Gaius. Gaius himself was a contemporary of the Emperor Hadrian, but scientific research has fixed the date of this copy of his great work as a little earlier than the time of Justinian, in the sixth century.

In the third century lived Papinian, "the Prince of the Jurisconsults". Ulpian and Paulus also were among the greatest lawyers of the period: approximately one-sixth of the Digest is made up of fragments from Ulpian, while Paulus is represented by upwards of two thousand fragments (Staedtler). Modestinus was the last of the great series. We have in manuscript part of an elementary work by Ulpian and the Institutes of Gaius. In Justinian's Digest a very large part of the writings of the classical jurists is to be found. Most of the original treatises have perished; two thousand of these, containing three million unpunctuated and unspaced lines, were abridged to one hundred and fifty thousand lines or sentences. The originals became useless in practice, and were for the greater part soon lost. A number of classic jurists are represented in a collection of 341 fragments, discovered in the Vatican Library in the early part of the nineteenth century by Cardinal Mai, and edited by him at Rome in 1823. Another edition was published in Germany in 1828, under the title "Fragmenta Vaticana". Fragments of the classic jurists are also contained in the "Collatio Mosaicarum et Romanarum Legum", known also as the "Lex Dei", compiled in the fourth and fifth centuries. They are found also in the "Breviary of Alaric" or "Lex Romana Wisigothorum", which contains the Sentences of Paulus and the excerpts from Papinian's "Responsa". Fragments from the jurisconsults are found in the "Edictum Theodorici" or "Lex Romana Ostrogothorum" and in the "Lex Romana Burgundionum" (see below).

(4) From Diocletian (d. 313) to Justinian (d. 565).—The seat of an absolute monarchy was now shifted from Rome to Constantinople, and the Empire was divided into East and West. Constructive jurisprudence was a thing of the past, and the sources of law were merged in the will of the prince. The edicts of the prætorian prefect were given the same effect as the imperial constitutions, which were concerned principally with public law. Private law was vast and diversified, but it had long since ceased to have any stimulating growth. The *jus civile*, expanded by the ancient jurists in the interpretation of the Twelve Tables, the honorary law of the magistrates, the public legislative acts of the early empire, the mass of imperial constitutions, and the writings of the classic jurisconsults, composed a heterogeneous jumble of legal materials from which a systematic jurisprudence was destined to arise. An attempt was made in the early fifth century to effect a workable system, and the law of citations was adopted by which the relative authority of the classic jurists was posthumously fixed by statute. Numerical weight of authority was done away with, and the great galaxy were the recognized authorities, although other jurists might be cited if approved by any of the five. Collections of imperial constitutions were made at an interval of fifty years, and published under the names of the Gregorian and Theodosian Codes respectively; the latter was republished in the "Breviary of Alaric". Something at least, had been done for the simplification of a difficult legal situation. The Eastern and Western emperors thenceforward agreed to mutually communicate their legislative designs for simultaneous publication in both empires, and these future projects were to be known as *novellæ constitutiones*.

Upon Justinian's accession there were in force two principal sources of law: the imperial constitutions and the classical jurisprudence operating under the law of citations (Staedtler). To Justinian's practical mind, the state of the law was still chaotic; the empire was poor, and it was a hardship for lawyers to possess themselves of the necessary MSS. The very bulk of the law produced a situation analogous to that which exists in common-law jurisdictions to-day, and which always ushers in more or less abortive efforts towards codification. Justinian undertook to make these immense materials more accessible and more responsive to the practical needs of his empire. That, in the opinion of some, he wronged posterity by destroying the original sources, is entirely beside the mark. He has been lauded as a great lawgiver when measured by the needs of his time and situation; and, on the other hand, he has been as heartily abused and reviled for an unscientific iconoclast. The first task of the commission appointed by Justinian was to edit the imperial constitutions as a code, published under the title, "Codex Justiniani". After this the emperor directed the compilation of a complete repository of the law made up of fragments of the classical writings strung together without any too scientific arrangement. This work is the great treasury of juridical lore, and was the most valuable part of Justinian's compilation. It was called the "Digest" or "Pandects". Occasionally Tribonian, who, with two other jurists, was intrusted with the task, complacently or ignorantly modified the text. The emperor forbade commentaries and abbreviations.

Upon the completion of the Pandects, Justinian, always intelligently interested in legal education, ordered an abridgment of the Digest for the purposes of instruction; these are the Institutes of Justinian. The Institutes of Gaius (see above, under 3) furnished a ready model; indeed, the Institutes of Gaius and those of Justinian are even to-day the most essential first books of the law. The first draft of the Code was not in complete harmony with the Digest and the Institutes, and a revision of it became necessary; this was promulgated as the "Codex Repetitæ Prælectionis". The second edition of the code was intended to be final, and upon its publication Justinian announced that any new imperial legislation would take the form of detached constitutions to be known as "novels" (*novellæ*, i. e. "new"); of these he issued a large number, but two only (the 118th and 127th) have great importance for modern law.

The Justinian compilation is sometimes elegantly termed the Imperial Code; it is, however, more accurate to refer to it as the "Corpus Juris Civilis". It is the whole body of the civil law comprising the four

books of the Institutes, the fifty books of the Digest, the twelve books of the Code, and the Novels. Early editions divide the Pandects into three parts, the Digestum vetus, the Infortiatum, and the Digestum novum. The labours of Justinian have come down to us in the form of texts of the so-called glossators during the Middle Ages. The glossators worked from earlier manuscripts and harmonized conflicting texts into a generally accepted *lectio vulgata* ("vulgate", or "common reading"). We have one text known as the "Florentine Pandects" which dates from the seventh century, one hundred years after Justinian. It is, however, in all probability, only one of the texts from which the glossators worked, and, when the errors of copyists are considered, its antiquity should not entitle it to overrule the vulgate. This Florentine text is the subject of legend, and the revival of the study of Roman law has been attributed to its discovery. Savigny and others have demonstrated that the revival was well under way before the discovery of this codex. The publication of a photographic reproduction of the Florentine Pandects was begun at Rome in 1902, and seven of the ten parts are already at hand.

In what had been the Western Empire, Justinian no longer held sway at the date of the promulgation of his laws; the subject race were, however, permitted by their barbarian conquerors to retain the pre-Justinian law as their personal law. The conquerors themselves caused to be made the several compilations known as the "Roman Barbarian Codes" (see LEX). Justinian did, however, effect the reconquest of Italy, and held it long enough to promulgate his laws. When the Ostrogoths again became masters they left the legislation of Justinian undisturbed, and it flourished in a less corrupted form than in the Eastern Empire, which was its logical field. The Roman law of Justinian superseded the barbarian codes and, with the revival, was taught in the medieval schools and thus spread all over Europe.

B. *Subsequent Influence.*—In the Eastern Empire subsequent changes are of interest to the historian rather than to the jurist. There was a lull of nearly three centuries after the death of Justinian, until Leo the Philosopher revised the legislation and published what is known as the "Basilica". While Byzantine materials throw many side lights upon the Roman legal system, they are relatively unimportant, though they were of service to the Humanists. The Eastern law schools only (Constantinople and Berytus) were subject to Justinian at the time of his constitution on legal education, yet he speaks of Rome as a royal city and prohibits the teaching of law elsewhere than in these three cities (Ortolan). Professors of law had been active in all of his reforms: Tribonian was a professor of law and an able, but venal, jurist, whose career had much resemblance with that of Bacon. Theophilus was also a professor of law who, like Tribonian, had taken part in the work of Justinian, and he composed a paraphrase of the Institutes in Greek. A number of commentaries in Greek were produced and an abridgment of the Novels. The greater part of the Byzantine writings were from secondary sources and are abridgments, condensations, manuals, etc. Among others were the "Enchiridium" of Isaurian law, the "Prochiron" of Basil, and the revision entitled "Epanagoge"; and the revised Basilica from A. D. 906 to A. D. 911. In the composition of these collections it is highly probable that the sources were secondary and that the originals of Justinian were not directly consulted. The Basilica through its scholia or annotations grew so bulky that a synopsis of it was made, and this continued in high repute until the fall of the empire, in 1453, when the Greek legal authorities were supplanted by the Mohammedan Koran. Enough of personal law was suffered to the vanquished by the conqueror to constitute the historic element and principal basis of Greek civil law (Ortolan, Morey). Greek fugitives also carried over with them into Italy and elsewhere the relics of their law, and many manuscripts are still extant: of these the Humanist Cujas possessed a valuable library. Thus, the Greek texts, while of little value to the glossators, were yet a potent factor in the second renaissance of Roman law in the sixteenth century. This was of service to the historical and philological school, the inspirations and traditions of which are still active in modern scholarship, particularly that of Germany, where, as Montreuil wrote fifty years ago, the French school is refound in the labours of Reitz, Ruhneken, Biener, Witte, Heimbach, and Zacharia.

The most flourishing school of law following the first revival of Roman law was that of Bologna, towards the end of the eleventh century. Its founder was Irnerius, and he was the first of the glossators. Placentinus and Vacarius were others of the glossators. Vacarius was a Lombard, and he it was who carried the texts of Justinian to England and founded a law school at Oxford, about the middle of the twelfth century. The glossators known as the four doctors all belonged to Bologna; and that school acquired a reputation in civil law equal to that of Paris in theology and canon law. So attractive was the Roman law that the clergy had to be restrained from its study, and the study of canon law stimulated by a decretal in 1220 (Morey). The early Church had been governed by councils, synods, etc. Collections had been made in the fifth and sixth centuries, but it was only in the ninth century that a real collection of ecclesiastical legal documents was made. There began to be collections of decrees of the popes, and the revival of Roman law at Bologna in the twelfth century gave impetus to a systematic canon law. About 1130 Gratian, a Benedictine monk, made the compilation which developed into the "Corpus Juris Canonici". The external similarity of this compilation to the "Corpus Juris Civilis" is thus given by Duck: "The Roman pontiffs effected that in the Church which Justinian effected in the Roman Empire. They caused Gratian's Decree to be published in imitation of the Pandects; the Decretals in imitation of the Code; the Clementine Constitutions and the Extravagantes in imitation of the Novels; and to complete the work Paul IV ordered Launcellot to prepare Institutes which were published at Rome under Gregory XIII, and added to the Corpus Juris Canonici." (In qualification of this, see CORPUS JURIS CANONICI.)

To return to the Roman law, the school of the glossators (of whom Accursius in the middle of the thirteenth century was the last) was succeeded by the school of which Bartolus of Sasso Ferrato and Alciat were representatives. From 1340 the Bartolists flourished for two hundred and fifty years, to be succeeded in turn by the Humanist school, of which Cujas was the chief ornament. Until the sixteenth century Roman law was most cultivated in Italy; its glory then passed to France, and, in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, though there were conspicuous Dutch jurists of great ability in the application of the law, it may fairly be said to belong to Germany during that period. France, Italy, Belgium, and even England, however, are awakening in the dawn of the twentieth century.

The survival of Roman-law principles was in great measure due to the principle of personality. The Roman-Greek law had not been entirely supplanted by the Koran in the Moslem states, such as Egypt and Syria (Amos). In modern Egypt there has been a reaffirmation of many Roman principles in the Civil Code proposed by the international commission which "harmonized the rules of Arabic jurisprudence which were not repugnant to European legislation, with the chief provisions of the Code Napoleon". An interesting Syrian text has been edited by Bruns (Syrisch-Römisches Rechtsbuch aus dem 15. Jahrhundert).

This principle of personality permitted by the kings of the Visigoths, Ostrogoths, and Burgundians sufficed to keep alive the Roman law in the West. Except as to the municipalities, the Roman political system had been destroyed. The concession of personal law to Roman subjects and the influence of the clergy, who always preferred to claim the civil law, was a barrier "between Roman civilization and barbarism" (Morey). In the military tenures of feudalism, it has been attempted to trace the idea of two distinct ownerships, the *dominium eminens* and the *dominium vulgare*, to the Roman contract of emphyteusis. A collection of feudal law known as the "Consuetudines Feudorum" is contained as a kind of appendix in most editions of the "Corpus". In the Amsterdam edition of 1681, is the note after the second book: "Hic est finis Feudorum in editione vulgata" (End of the feudal constitutions in the vulgate edition). The third book is missing; fragments of the fourth are given, as well as parts of a fifth book, reconstructed by Cujas. In feudalism the institutions of Roman law and Germanic customs became merged; the impress of the former upon the latter was not simply one of terminology; with the terminology was much of interpretation and illuminating principle. It would be rash to assert that feudalism owed more to Roman public law than to theories and analogies drawn from the private law of Rome. Charlemagne favoured the civil-law ideas which savoured of imperialism, and adopted Roman methods of administration. The German emperors also found in Roman legal institutions a plausible support for their claim to the imperial power. The predominant influence in the survival of Roman private law in all the countries of central and southern Europe was that of the clergy. In all national codes there is present a large quantity of customary law; yet, in concept and in classification, all of the civil codes are Roman through and through, and this is as true of the German civil code (and, in part, of the Japanese code) as of those other national codes which trace their immediate parentage to the Code Napoléon and their remote ancestry to the Twelve Tables.

England, from a purely external point of view, is less indebted to the Roman system, but the jurist trained in both systems is at no pains to discover analogies and runs upon evidence of the common law's indebtedness at every step. Anglo-Saxon legal institutions have been jealously and persistently represented as in no wise beholden to Rome. This is to be accounted for in part by a peculiarity in the manner of administration of the common law. With its narrow tradition and its abject rule of *stare decisis*, it has offered until recently, at least, an unattractive field for historical jurisprudence. The courts and lawyers of the common law have always been intensely practical and have accepted their system, not only as purely indigenous, but also, in the words of the Blackstonian tradition, as "the perfection of reason". For four centuries after Cæsar's conquest Roman law held sway in Britain; her soil was trodden by the great Papinian himself, and possibly by others of the immortal five (Morey). There must indeed have remained in Britain a substantial deposit of Roman law, and it is not to be affirmed that this was completely destroyed by subsequent invasions or by the conquest. The earliest English treatises are for the most part transcriptions of Roman law: such was the book of Bracton (Güterboch). The Roman law was historically in the early English law of persons, of property, of contracts, and of procedure, although not always with equal obviousness. While it had little in common with the law of real property, we are fairly justified in maintaining that Roman law has always continued a substantial ingredient in English law, from the Roman occupation down to the time when we can cite specific decisions in which Roman law principles were engrafted in the chancery law of England. In respect to admiralty, chancery, and ecclesiastical law there has never been, nor could there well be, any disposition to withhold acknowledgment to Rome. The practice is quite common of referring to the chancellor as the prætor. This indebtedness, so begrudgingly acknowledged by many early English jurists in a mistaken sense of national pride, is now frankly admitted by all who lay claim to a knowledge of both Civil and Common law.

A complete bibliography of Roman Law is precluded by the space allotted to this article. A list (by no means exhaustive) of the more modern authoritative civilians, whose works are found on the shelves of a good American collection gives some idea of the wealth of this literature:—

AMOS; ARNDTS; ACCARIAS; BARON; BERNARD; BONFANTE; BÖCKING; BRINI; BRINZ; BRUNS; CLARK; COLQUHOUN; CONRAT (COHN); CORNIL; COSTA; COULANGES; CUQ: DE MANGEAT; DERNBERG; DEURER; DU CAURROY; DIRKSEN; ESMARCH; ESMEIN; FADDA; FERRINI; FLACK; FITTING; FRESQUET; GIRARD; GLUCK; GÜTERBOCH; HÄNEL; HALLIFAX; HAUBOLD; HEIMBACH; HERZOG; HUNTER; HUSCHKE; IHNE; IHRING; JACQUELIN; JOBBÉ-DUVAL; JORS; LENEL; MACKELDEY; MACKENZIE; MAREZOLL; MARQUART; MOLITOR; MOMMSEN; MÜHLENBRUCK; MONTREUIL; ORTOLAN; PHILLIMORE; POSTE; PUCHTA; ROBY; SANDARS; SAVIGNY; SCHEURL; SCHMIDT; SCHULTING; STAEDTLER; VOIGT; WACHTER; WALKER; WALTER; WARNKÖNIG; WINDSCHIED; VANGEROW; VERING; ZACHARIA.

The writer of this article acknowledges special indebtedness in its preparation to STAEDTLER, *Cours de Droit Romain* (Louvain and Paris, 1902); and to *MS. notes on lectures* by PROF. STAEDTLER.

HEINECCIUS, *Elementa Juris Civilis* (Göttingen, 1787); MÜHLENBRUCH, *Doctrina Pandectarum* (Halle, 1839); SOHM, *Inst. of Rom. Law*, tr. LEDLIE (Oxford, 1901); MOREY, *Outlines of Rom. Law* (New York, 1893); CHAMIER, *Manual of Rom. Law* (London, 1893); HOWE, *Studies in the Civil Law* (Boston, 1896); MOYLE, *Inst. of Just.* (Oxford, 1883); VON SAVIGNY, *Geschichte des römischen Rechts im Mittelalter* (Heidelberg, 1822); ORTOLAN, *Hist. of Rom. Law*, tr. CUTLER (London 1896); AMOS, *Hist. and Principles of Rom. Law* (London, 1883).

Important fac-simile reproductions of original texts are the photographic copies of the MS. of the *Florentine Pandects* (Rome, 1902) and of the MS. of GAIUS, *Institutes* (Leipzig, 1909). Among the approved texts are the following: (a) Pre-Justinian; GAIUS, tr. by MEARS (London, 1883), by POSTE (Oxford, 1875), and by TOMPKINS AND LEMON (London, 1869); *Jus Civile Antejustinianeum* (Berlin, 1815); *Flores Juris Romani Antejustinianei* (Paris, 1839); *Corpus Juris Antejustinianei* (Bonn, 1841); *Fontes Juris Romani Antiqui* (Leipzig, 1893). (b) The Justinian texts: The *Institutes* in English by MOYLE, SANDARS, COOPER, etc., *The Digest*, of which two vols. in English, by PROF. MONRO, of Cambridge, have appeared (his untimely death leaves the completion to another); *The Digest* has been tr. into German, French, and Spanish; *Corpus Juris Civilis*, of which the standard Latin text is the German ed. (Berlin, 1904–08) (*Institutes* by KRUEGER, *Digest* by MOMMSEN, *Code* by KRUEGER, and *Novels* by SCHOELL but completed after the latter's death, by KROLL). Recently Italian scholars, under the leadership of BONFANTE, have produced a similar critical text the first part of which appeared in 1908. (c) Roman Barbarian texts: *Edictum Theorodici*, or *Lex Romana Ostrogothorum* and *Lex Romana Burgundionum* are given in BLUHME, *Monumenta* (Hanover, 1875); *Lex Romana Wisigothorum*, or *Breviary of Alaric* has been edited by HÄNEL (Leipzig, 1849) and more recently in Spain. (d) Byzantine texts: *Paraphrasis Theophili* (Amsterdam, 1860); BASILICA, ed. HEIMBACH (Leipzig, 1833–1870); HAUBOLD, *Manuale Basilicorum* (Leipzig, 1819).

JOSEPH I. KELLY.

Lawrence, SAINT, martyr; d. 10 August, 258. St. Lawrence, one of the deacons of the Roman Church, was one of the victims of the persecution of Valerian in 258, like Pope Sixtus II and many other members of the Roman clergy. At the beginning of the month of August, 258, the emperor issued an edict, commanding that all bishops, priests, and deacons should immediately be put to death ("episcopi et presbyteri et diacones incontinenti animadvertantur"—Cyprian, Epist. lxxx, 1; ed. Hartel, II, 839). This imperial command was immediately carried out in Rome. On 6 August Pope Sixtus II was apprehended in one of the catacombs, and executed forthwith ("Xistum in cimiterio animadversum sciatis VIII id. Augusti et cum eo diacones quattuor." Cyprian, ep. lxxx, 1; ed. cit., 840). Two other deacons, Felicissimus and Agapitus, were put to death the same day. In the Roman Calendar of feasts of the fourth century their feast day is on the same date (cf. also "Liber Pontificalis", Xystus II, ed. Duchesne, I, 155). Four days later, on the 10th of August of that same year, Lawrence,

the last of the seven deacons, also suffered a martyr's death. The anniversary of this holy martyr falls on that day, according to the Almanac of Philocalus for the year 354, the inventory of which contains the principal feasts of the Roman martyrs of the middle of the fourth century; it also mentions the street where his grave is to be found, the Via Tiburtina ("IIII id. Aug. Laurentii in Tiburtina"; Ruinart, "Acta sincera", Ratisbon, 1859, 632). The itineraries of the graves of the Roman martyrs, as given in the seventh century, mention the burial-place of this celebrated martyr in the Catacomb of Cyriaca *in agro Verano* (De Rossi, "Roma Sott.", I, 178).

Since the fourth century St. Lawrence has been one of the most honoured martyrs of the Roman Church. Constantine the Great was the first to erect a little oratory over his burial-place, which was enlarged and beautified by Pope Pelagius II (579–90). Pope Sixtus III (432–40) built a large basilica with three naves, the apse leaning against the older church, on the summit of the hill where he was buried. In the thirteenth century Honorius III made the two buildings into one, and so the basilica of San Lorenzo remains to this day. Pope St. Damasus (366–84) wrote a panegyric in verse, which was engraved in marble and placed over his tomb (Ihm, "Damasi epigrammata", Leipzig, 1895, 37, num. 32). Two contemporaries of the last-named pope, St. Ambrose of Milan and the poet Prudentius, give particular details about St. Lawrence's death. Ambrose relates (De officiis min., xxviii) that when St. Lawrence was asked for the treasures of the Church he brought forward the poor, among whom he had divided the treasure, in place of alms; also that when Pope Sixtus II was led away to his death he comforted Lawrence, who wished to share his martyrdom, by saying that he would follow him in three days. The saintly Bishop of Milan also states that St. Lawrence was burned to death on a gridiron (De offic., xli). In like manner, but with more poetical detail, Prudentius describes the martyrdom of the Roman deacon in his hymn on St. Lawrence ("Peristephanon", Hymnus II).

St. Lawrence the Deacon
From a manuscript of the Apocalypse illuminated during the thirteenth century; now in the library at Lambeth Palace, England

The meeting between St. Lawrence and Pope Sixtus II, when the latter was being led to execution, related by St. Ambrose, is not compatible with the contemporaneous reports about the persecution of Valerian. The manner of his execution—burning on a red-hot gridiron—also gives rise to grave doubts. The narrations of Ambrose and Prudentius are founded rather on oral tradition than on written accounts. It is quite possible that between the year 258 and the end of the fourth century popular legends may have grown up about this highly venerated Roman deacon, and some of these legends have been preserved by these two authors. We have, in any case, no means of verifying from earlier sources the details derived from St. Ambrose and Prudentius, or of ascertaining to what extent such details are supported by earlier historical tradition. Fuller accounts of the martyrdom of St. Lawrence were composed, probably, early in the sixth century, and in these narratives a number of the martyrs of the Via Tiburtina and of the two Catacombs of St. Cyriaca *in agro Verano* and St. Hippolytus were connected in a romantic and wholly legendary fashion. The details given in these Acts concerning the martyrdom of St. Lawrence and his activity before his death cannot claim any credibility. However, in spite of this criticism of the later accounts of the martyrdom, there can be no question that St. Lawrence was a real historical personage, nor any doubt as to the martyrdom of that venerated Roman deacon, the place of its occurrence, and the date of his burial. Pope Damasus built a basilica in Rome which he dedicated to St. Lawrence; this is the church now known as that of San Lorenzo in Damaso. The church of San Lorenzo in Lucina, also dedicated to this saint, still exists. The feast day of St. Lawrence is kept on 10 August. He is pictured in art with the gridiron on which he is supposed to have been roasted to death.

Mombritius, *Sanctuarium*, II, 50–52; *Acta SS. Bolland.* August, II, 485–532; *Bibliotheca hagiographica latina*, II, 708–12; Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers* (2nd ed.), Part I: *St. Clement of Rome*, II (London, 1890), 455 sqq.; Dufourcq, *Etude sur les Gesta martyrum romains*, I (Paris, 1900), 199 sqq., 307 sqq.; Aubé, *L'Eglise et l'état dans la seconde moitié du III^e siècle* (Paris, 1855), 369 sqq.; Allard, *Histoire des persécutions*, III (Paris, 1887), 88 sqq.; Franchi de Cavalieri, *S. Lorenzo e il supplizio della graticola* in *Röm. Quartalschrift* (1900), 159 sqq.; Marucchi, *Basiliques et églises de Rome* (Rome, 1902), 405 sqq., 419 sqq., 476 sqq.

J. P. Kirsch.

Lawrence, Saint, second Archbishop of Canterbury, d. 2 Feb., 619. For the particulars of his life and pontificate we rely exclusively on Venerable Bede's "History", details added by medieval writers being unsupported by historical evidence, though they may possibly embody ancient traditions. According to St. Bede, he was one of the original missionaries who left Rome with St. Augustine in 595 and finally landed in Thanet in 597. After St. Augustine had been consecrated he sent St. Lawrence back to Rome, to carry to the pope the news of the conversion of King Ethelbert and his people, to announce his consecration, and to ask for direction on certain questions. In this passage of the historian St. Lawrence is referred to as *presbyter*, in distinction to Peter who is called *monachus*. From this it has been conjectured that he was a secular priest and not a monk; but this conclusion has been questioned by Benedictine writers such as Elmham in the Middle Ages and Mabillon in later times. When St. Gregory had decided the questions asked, St. Lawrence returned to Britain bearing the replies, and he remained with St. Augustine sharing his work. That saint, shortly before his death which probably took place in 604, consecrated St. Lawrence as bishop, lest the infant Church should be left for a time without a pastor. Of the new archbishop's episcopate Bede writes: "Lawrence, having attained the dignity of archbishop, strove most vigorously to add to the foundations of the Church which he had seen so nobly laid and to forward the work by frequent words of holy exhortation and by the constant example of his devoted labour." The only extant genuine document relating to him is the fragment

ST. LAWRENCE BEING ORDAINED DEACON BY SIXTUS II

FRA ANGELICO—VATICAN

preserved by Bede of the letter he addressed to the Celtic bishops exhorting them to peace and unity with Rome. The death of King Ethelbert in 616 was followed by a heathen reaction under his son Eadbald, and under the sons of Sebert who became kings of the East Saxons. Saints Mellitus and Justus, bishops of the newly-founded Sees of London and Rochester, took refuge with St. Lawrence at Canterbury and urged him to fly to Gaul with them. They departed, and he, discouraged by the undoing of St. Augustine's work, was preparing to follow them, when St. Peter appeared to him in a vision, blaming him for thinking of leaving his flock and inflicting stripes upon him. In the morning he hastened to the king, exhibiting his wounded body and relating his vision. This led to the conversion of the king, to the recall of Saints Mellitus and Justus, and to their perseverance in their work of evangelizing Kent and the neighbouring provinces. These events occurred about 617 or 618, and shortly afterwards St. Lawrence died and was buried near St. Augustine in the north porch of St. Peter's Abbey church, afterwards known as St. Augustine's. His festival is observed in England on 3 February.

BEDE, *Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum*, I, XXVII; II, IV–VII; ELMHAM, *Historia Monasterii S. Augustini* in *Rolls Series* (London, 1858); *Acta SS. Bolland.*, February, I; HARDY, *Descriptive Catalogue* (London, 1862–71), giving a list of MS. lives; HADDAN AND STUBBS, *Ecclesiastical Documents*, I (London, 1869), ii; STUBBS in *Dict. Christ. Biog.*, s. v. *Laurentius* (25); HUNT in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, s. v. *Lawrence*.

EDWIN BURTON.

ST. LAWRENCE JUSTINIAN WITH OTHER SAINTS
Pordenone, Academy of Fine Arts, Venice

Lawrence Justinian, SAINT, Bishop and first Patriarch of Venice, b. in 1381, and d. 8 January, 1456. He was a descendant of the Giustiniani, a Venetian patrician family which numbered several saints among its members. Lawrence's pious mother sowed the seeds of a devout religious life in the boy's youth. In 1400 when he was about nineteen years old, he entered the monastery of the Canons Regular of St. Augustine on the Island of Alga near Venice. In spite of his youth he excited admiration by his poverty, mortifications, and fervour in prayer. At that time the convent was changed into a congregation of secular canons living in community. After his ordination in 1406 Lawrence was chosen prior of the community, and shortly after that general of the congregation. He gave them their constitution, and was so zealous in spreading the same that he was looked upon as the founder. His reputation for saintliness as well as his zeal for souls attracted the notice of Eugene IV and on 12 May, 1433, he was raised to the Bishopric of Castello. The new prelate restored churches, established new parishes in Venice, aided the foundation of convents, and reformed the life of the canons. But above all he was noted for his Christian charity and his unbounded liberality. All the money he could raise he bestowed upon the poor, while he himself led a life of simplicity and poverty. He was greatly respected both in Italy and elsewhere by the dignitaries of both Church and State. He tried to foster the religious life by his sermons as well as by his writings. The Diocese of Castello belonged to the Patriarchate of Grado. On 8 October, 1451, Nicholas V united the See of Castello with the Patriarchate of Grado, and the see of the patriarch was transferred to Venice, and Lawrence was named the first Patriarch of Venice, and exercised his office till his death somewhat more than four years later. His beatification was ratified by Clement VII in 1524, and he was canonized in 1690 by Alexander VIII. Innocent XII appointed 5 September for the celebration of his feast. The saint's ascetical writings have often been published, first in Brescia in 1506, later in Paris in 1524, and in Basle in 1560, etc. We are indebted to his nephew, Bernardo Giustiniani, for his biography.

BERNARDUS JUSTINIANUS, *Opusculum de vita beati Laurentii Justiniani* (Venice, 1574); SURIUS, *De vitis sanctorum*, ed. 1618, I, 126–35; *Acta SS.*, January, I, 551–63; *Bibliotheca hagiographica latina*, ed. BOLLANDISTS, II, 1708; *Bullarium Romanum*, ed. TAURIN., V, 107 sqq.; EUBEL, *Hierarchia catholica medii ævi*, II, 134–290; ROSA, *Summorum Pontificum, illustrium virorum . . . de b. Laurentii Justiniani vita, sanctitate ac miraculis testimoniorum centuria* (Venice, 1614); BUTLER, *Lives of the Saints*, III (Baltimore, 1844), 416–422; REGAZZI, *Note storiche edite ed inedite di S. Lorenzo Giustiniani* (Venice, 1856); CUCITO, *S. Lorenzo Giustiniani, primo patriarca di Venezia* (Venice, 1895).

J. P. KIRSCH.

Lawrence of Brindisi. See LORENZO DA BRINDISI, SAINT.

Lawrence O'Toole (LORCAN UA TUATHAIL), SAINT, confessor, b. about 1128, in the present Co. Kildare; d. 14 Nov., 1180, at Eu in Normandy; canonized in 1225 by Honorius III. His father was chief of Hy Murray, and his mother one of the Clan O'Byrne. At the age of ten he was taken as a hostage by Dermot McMurrogh, King of Leinster. In 1140 the boy obtained permission to enter the monastic school of Glendalough; in that valley-sanctuary he studied for thirteen years, conspicuous for his piety and learning. So great was his reputation in the eyes of the community that on the death of Abbot Dunlaing, early in 1154, he was unanimously called to preside over the Abbey of St. Kevin. Dermot, King of Leinster, married Mor, sister of St. Lawrence, and, though his character has been painted in dark colours by the native annalists, he was a great friend to the Church. He founded an Austin nunnery, of the reform of Aroaise, in Dublin, with two dependent cells at Kilculliheen (Co. Kilkenny) and at Aghade (Co. Carlow), in 1151. He also founded an abbey for Cistercian monks at Baltinglass, and an abbey for Austin canons at Ferns.

St. Lawrence, through humility, declined the See of Glendalough in 1160, but on the death of Gregory, Archbishop of Dublin (8 Oct., 1161), he was chosen to the vacant see, and was consecrated in Christ Church

cathedral by Gilla Isu (Gelasius), Primate of Armagh, early in the following year. This appointment of a native-born Irishman and his consecration by the successor of St. Patrick marks the passing of Scandinavian supremacy in the Irish capital, and the emancipation from canonical obedience to Canterbury which had obtained under the Danish bishops of Dublin. St. Lawrence soon set himself to effect numerous reforms, commencing by converting the secular canons of Christ Church cathedral into Aroasian canons (1163). Three years later he subscribed to the foundation charter of All Hallows priory, Dublin (founded by King Dermot), for the same order of Austin canons. Not content with the strictest observance of rules, he wore a hair shirt underneath his episcopal dress, and practised the greatest austerity, retiring for an annual retreat of forty days to St. Kevin's cave, near Glendalough. At the second siege of Dublin (1170) St. Lawrence was active in ministration, and he showed his political foresight by paying due deference to Henry II of England, during that monarch's stay in Dublin. In April, 1178, he entertained the papal legate, Cardinal Vivian, who presided at the Synod of Dublin. He successfully negotiated the Treaty of Windsor, and secured good terms for Roderic, King of Connacht. He attended the Lateran Council in 1179, and returned as legate for Ireland. The holy prelate was not long in Dublin till he deemed it necessary again to visit King Henry II (impelled by a burning charity in the cause of King Roderic), and he crossed to England in September of that year. After three weeks of detention at Abingdon Abbey, St. Lawrence followed the English King to Normandy. Taken ill at the Augustinian Abbey of Eu, he was tended by Abbot Osbert and the canons of St. Victor; before he breathed his last he had the consolation of learning that King Henry had acceded to his request.

MESSINGHAM, *Florilegium* (Paris, 1624); O'HANLON, *Life of St. Lawrence O'Toole* (Dublin, 1857); HEALY, *Ireland's Ancient Schools and Scholars* (4th ed., Dublin, 1902).

W. H. GRATTAN-FLOOD.

Laxism. See THEOLOGY, MORAL.

Lay Abbot (*abbatocomes, abbas laicus, abbas miles*), a name used to designate a layman on whom a king or someone in authority bestowed an abbey as a reward for services rendered; he had charge of the estate belonging to it, and was entitled to part of the income. This baneful custom had a bad effect upon the life of the cloister. It existed principally in the Frankish Empire from the eighth century till the ecclesiastical reforms of the eleventh. Charles Martel (q. v.) was the first to bestow extensive ecclesiastical property upon laymen, political friends, and warriors who had helped him in his campaigns. At an earlier period the French Merovingians had bestowed church lands on laymen, or at least allowed them their possession and use, though not ownership. Numerous synods held in France in the sixth and seventh centuries passed decrees against this abuse of church property. The French kings were also in the habit of appointing abbots to monasteries which they had founded; moreover, many monasteries, though not founded by the king, placed themselves under royal patronage in order to share his protection, and so became possessions of the Crown. This custom of the Merovingian rulers of disposing of church property in individual cases, as also that of appointing abbots to monasteries founded by or belonging to themselves, was taken as a precedent by the French kings for rewarding laymen with abbeys, or giving them to bishops *in commendam*. Under Charles Martel the Church was greatly injured by this abuse, not only in her possessions, but also in her religious life. St. Boniface and later Hincmar of Reims picture most dismally the consequent downfall of church discipline, and though St. Boniface tried zealously and even successfully to reform the Frankish Church, the bestowal of abbeys on secular abbots was not entirely abolished. Under Pepin the monks were permitted, in case their abbey should fall into secular hands, to go over to another community.

Charlemagne also frequently gave church property, and sometimes abbeys, in feudal tenure. It is true that Louis the Pious aided St. Benedict of Aniane in his endeavours to reform the monastic life. In order to accomplish this it was necessary to restore the free election of abbots, and the appointment as well of blameless monks as heads of the monastic houses. Although Emperor Louis shared these principles, he continued to bestow abbeys on laymen, and his sons imitated him. The important Abbey of St. Riquier (Centula) in Picardy had secular abbots from the time of Charlemagne, who had given it to his friend Angilbert, the poet and the lover of his daughter Bertha, and father of her two sons (see ANGILBERT, SAINT). After Angilbert's death in 814, the abbey was given to other laymen. Under such influences the Church was bound to suffer; frequently the abbeys were scenes of worldliness and revelry. Various synods of the ninth century passed decrees against this custom; the Synod of Diedenhofen (October, 844) decreed in its third canon, that abbeys should no longer remain in the power of laymen, but that monks should be their abbots (Hefele, "Konziliengeschichte", 2nd ed., IV, 110). In like manner the Synods of Meaux and Paris (845–846) complained that the monasteries held by laymen had fallen into decay, and emphasized the king's duty in this respect (op. cit., IV, 115). But abbeys continued to be bestowed upon laymen especially in France and Lorraine, e. g. St. Evre near Toul, in the reign of Lothaire I. Lothaire II, however, restored it to ecclesiastical control in 858, but the same king gave Bonmoutier to a layman; and the Abbeys of St. Germain and St. Martin, in the Diocese of Toul, were also given to secular abbots. In the Diocese of Metz, the Abbey of Gorze was long in the hands of laymen, and under them fell into decay. Stavelot and Malmédy, in the Diocese of Liège, were in the eleventh century bestowed on a certain Count Raginarius, as also St. Maximin near Trier on a Count Adalhard, etc. (Hauck, "Kirchengeschichte Deutschland", II, 598). In 888 a Synod of Mainz decreed (can. xxv) that the secular abbots should place able provosts and provisors over their monasteries.

Councils, however, were unable to put an end to the evil; in a synod held at Trosly, in the Diocese of Soissons, in 909, sharp complaints were made (ch. iii) about the lives of monks; many convents, it was said, were governed by laymen, whose wives and children, soldiers and dogs, were housed in the precincts of the religious. To better these conditions it was necessary, the synod declared, to restore the regular abbots and abbesses; at the same time ecclesiastical canons and royal capitularies declared laymen quite devoid of authority in church affairs (Hefele, op. cit., IV, 572–73). Lay abbots existed in the tenth century, also in the eleventh. Gosfred, Duke of Aquitaine, was Abbot of the monastery of St. Hilary at Poitiers, and as such he published the decrees issued (1078) at the Synod of Poitiers (Hefele, op. cit., V, 116). It was only through the so-called investitures conflict that the Church was freed from secular domination; the reform of religious and ecclesiastical life brought about by the papacy, put an end to the bestowal of abbeys upon laymen.

THOMASSINUS, *Vetus et nova ecclesiæ disciplina circa beneficia*, part II, lib. II, c. 12 sqq. (Lyons, 1705, 586–622); HEFELE, *History of the Councils;* DIGBY, *Ages of Faith;* FOSTER, *British Monasticism;* LINGARD, *History of England* (Dublin, 1878); *D'Alton, History of Ireland;* STUART AND COLEMAN, *History of the Diocese of Armagh.*

J. P. KIRSCH.

Lay Baptism. See BAPTISM, sub-title XIII.

Lay Benefice. See COMMENDATORY ABBOT.

Lay Brothers.—Religious occupied solely with manual labour and with the secular affairs of a monastery or friary. They have been known, in various places and at various times, as *fratres conversi*, *laici barbati*, *illiterati*, or *idiotæ*, and, though members of their respective orders, are entirely distinct from the choir monks or brothers, who are devoted mainly to the *opus Dei* and to study. There is some dispute as to the origin of lay brothers. They are first heard of in the eleventh century, and are stated by Mabillon to have been first instituted by St. John Gualbert at Vallombrosa, about 1038. But, though the name *conversi* is first applied to religious of this kind in the life of St. John Gualbert, written by the Bl. Andrea Strumensis about the end of the eleventh century, it seems certain they were instituted before the founding of Vallombrosa. St. Peter Damian indicates that servants who were also religious were set apart to perform the manual labour at Fonte Avellana, which was founded about the year 1000, while, at the monastery of Fonte Buono, at Camaldoli, founded about 1012, there were certainly brethren who were distinct from the choir monks, and were devoted entirely to the secular needs of the house.

In early Western monasticism no such distinction existed. The majority of St. Benedict's monks were not clerics, and all performed manual labour, the word *conversi* being used only to designate those who had received the habit late in life, to distinguish them from the *oblati* and *nutriti*. But by the beginning of the eleventh century the time devoted to study had greatly increased, a larger proportion of the monks were in Holy orders, while great numbers of illiterate persons embraced the religious life. At the same time it was found necessary to regulate the position of the *famuli*, the hired servants of the monastery, and to include some of these in the monastic family. So in Italy the lay brothers were instituted, and we find similar attempts at organization at the abbey of St. Benignus, at Dijon, under William of Dijon (d. 1031) and Richard of Verdun (d. 1046), while at Hirschau the Abbot William (d. 1091) gave a special rule to the *fratres barbati* and *exteriores*. At Cluny the manual work was relegated mostly to paid servants, but the Carthusians, the Cistercians, the Order of Grandmont, and most subsequent religious orders possessed lay brothers, to whom they committed their secular cares. At Grandmont, indeed, the complete control of the order's property by the lay brothers led to serious disturbances, and finally to the ruin of the order; but the wiser regulations of the Cistercians provided against this danger and have formed the model for the later orders. The English Black Monks have made but slight use of lay brothers, finding the service of paid attendants more convenient; but Father Taunton was mistaken in his assertion that "in those days in English Benedictine monasteries there were no lay brothers", for they are mentioned in the customaries of St. Augustine's at Canterbury and St. Peter's at Westminster.

Lay brothers are now to be found in most of the religious orders. They are mostly pious and laborious persons, usually drawn from the working classes of the community, who, while unable to attain to the degree of learning requisite for Holy orders, are yet drawn to the religious life and able to contribute by their toil to the prosperity of the house or order of their vocation. Not seldom they are skilled in artistic handicrafts, sometimes they are efficient administrators of temporal possessions, always they are able to perform domestic services or to follow agricultural pursuits. The Cistercians, especially their lay brethren, are famous for their skill in agriculture, and many a now fertile spot owes its productiveness to their unremitting labour in modern as well as in medieval times.

Lay brothers are usually distinguished from the choir brethren by some difference in their habit: for instance, the Cistercian lay brother wears a brown habit, instead of white, with a black scapular; in choir they wear a large cloak instead of a cowl; the Vallombrosan lay brothers wore a cap instead of a hood, and their habit was shorter; the English Benedictine lay brothers wear a hood of a different shape from that of the choir monks, and no cowl; a Dominican lay brother wears a black, instead of a white, scapular. In some orders they are required to recite daily the Little Office of Our Lady, but usually their office consists of a certain number of Paters, Aves, and Glorias. Wherever they are found in considerable numbers they possess their own quarters in the monastery; the *domus conversorum* is still noticeable in many of the ruins of English monasteries.

Lay sisters are to be found in most of the orders of women, and their origin, like that of the lay brothers, is to be found in the necessity at once of providing the choir nuns with more time for the Office and study, and of enabling the unlearned to embrace the religious life. They, too, are distinguished by their different habit from the choir sisters, and their Office consists of the Little Office of Our Lady or a certain number of Paters, etc. They seem to have been instituted earlier than the lay brothers, being first mentioned in a life of St. Denis written in the ninth century. In the early medieval period we even hear of lay brothers attached to convents of women and of lay sisters attached to monasteries. In each case, of course, the two sexes occupied distinct buildings. This curious arrangement has long been abolished.

Besse, *Le Moine Bénédictin* (Ligugé, 1898), 190–1; Grützmacher in Herzog u. Hauck, *Realencyklopädie* (Leipzig, 1903), s. v. *Mönchtum;* Heimbucher, *Die Orden u. Kongregationen der katholischen Kirche*, I (Paderborn, 1907), 268–271; Hélyot, *Dictionnaire des Ordres Religieux* (Paris, 1863), s. v. *Hirsauge;* Hergott, *Vetus Disciplina Monastica* (Paris, 1726); Hoffman, *Das Konversen-Institut des Cistercienserordens in seinem Ursprung und seiner Organisation* (Freiburg, 1905); Mabillon, *Acta Sanctorum O.S.B.* (Venice, 1732–40), saec. III (I), v-ix; saec. VI (II), xl-xli, 281, 733; Mabillon, *Annales O.S.B.*, IV (Lucca, 1739), 411; Martène, *De antiquis Monachorum ritibus* (Lyons, 1690); Martène and Durand, *Thesaurus Novus Anecdotorum* (Paris, 1617), IV, 1547–1652; Mittarelli and Costadoni, *Annales Camaldulenses O.S.B.*, I (Venice, 1755; App., 336-457; Thompson, *Customary of the Benedictine Monasteries of St. Augustine, Canterbury, and St. Peter, Westminster*, ed. Henry Bradshaw Society (London, 1902–4); Zöckler, *Askese und Mönchtum*, 403, 405, 407.

Leslie A. St. L. Toke.

Lay Communion.—The primitive discipline of the Church established a different punishment for certain crimes according as they were committed by laymen or clerics. The former entailed a shorter and ordinarily lighter penance than the latter, which were punished with a special penalty. The layman was excluded from the community of the faithful, the cleric was excluded from the hierarchy and reduced to the lay communion, that is to say, he was forbidden to exercise his functions. The nature of the latter punishment is not quite certain. According to one opinion, it consisted in excommunication, together with a prohibition to receive the Blessed Eucharist; according to another, the penitent was allowed to receive Holy Communion, but only with the laity. Canon xv of the so-called Apostolical Canons (see Canons, Apostolic) forbids any priest, residing outside his diocese without authorization, to celebrate the Holy Sacrifice, but grants him permission to receive the Eucharist along with the faithful. The canon lxii ordained that clerics who apostatized during the persecutions were to be received among the laity. In 251, a letter of Pope Cornelius to Fabius, Bishop of Antioch, informs us that the pope, in presence of all the people, received into his communion, but as a layman, one of the bishops guilty of having conferred sacerdotal ordination on the heretic Novatian. A letter of St. Cyprian of Carthage mentions a certain Trophimus, who was admitted to communion among the laity. It would be easy to mention similar cases, in which we find it stated that

the penitent was admitted to receive communion among the laity. The Council of Elvira (c. 300) which reveals to us in many ways the religious life of an entire ecclesiastical province, in canon lxxvi, àpropos of a deacon, mentions the same discipline. This is the most ancient canonical text that speaks of the custom of lay communion. We do not cite the Council of Cologne (346) since its authenticity may yet be questioned. But from that time forward we find, in a series of councils, declarations which show conclusively that, when lay communion is mentioned, there is question of the reception of the Blessed Eucharist. Besides the Council of Sardica, those of Hippo (393), canon xli; Toledo (400), canon iv; Rome (487) canon ii, are too explicit to admit of any doubt that we have here an established discipline. We may also cite the Councils of Agde (506), canon l; Lerida (524), canon v; Orléans (538), canon ii; etc.

Speaking generally, the expression "lay communion" does not necessarily imply the idea of the Eucharist, but only the condition of a layman in communion with the Church. But as the Eucharist was granted only to those in communion with the Church, to say that a cleric was admitted to the lay communion is equivalent to saying that he received the Holy Eucharist. The person who passed from the condition of a penitent to the lay communion, had necessarily to be received by the bishop into the bosom of the Church, before being admitted to communion. There are no grounds for supposing that this transition implied an intermediate stage in which he who was admitted to the communion was deprived of the Blessed Eucharist. This discipline applied not only to those who were guilty of a secret sin, but also to those who had for some time belonged to an heretical sect. But there was no absolute rule, since the Council of Nicæa (325) received back the Novatian clergy without imposing this penalty on them, while we see it enforced in the case of the Donatists. In modern times "lay communion" is sometimes imposed, but only in exceptional cases, which need not be treated of here.

SCUDAMORE in *Dict. Christ. Antiq.*, s. v.

H. LECLERCQ.

Lay Confession.—This article does not deal with confession by laymen but with that made to laymen, for the purpose of obtaining the remission of sins by God. It has no practical importance, and is treated merely from an historical point of view. It is found under two forms: first, confession without relation to the sacrament, second, confession intended to supply for the sacrament in case of necessity. In the first instance, it consists of confession of venial sins or daily faults which need not necessarily be submitted to the power of the keys; in the second, it has to do with the confession of even grievous sins which should be declared to a priest, but which are confessed to a layman because there is no priest at hand and the case is urgent. In both cases the end sought is the merit of humiliation which is inseparable from freely performed confession; but in the first no administration of the sacrament, in any degree, is sought; in the second, on the contrary, sacramental confession is made to a layman for want of a priest. Theologians and canonists in dealing with this subject usually have two historical texts as a basis. The optional and meritorious confession of slight faults to any Christian is set forth in Venerable Bede's 'Commentary on the Epistle of St. James": "Confess your sins one to another" (Confitemini alterutrum peccata vestra). "It should be done", says the holy Doctor, "with discernment; we should confess our daily and slight faults mutually to our equals, and believe that we are saved by their daily prayer. As for more grievous leprosy (mortal sin), we should, according to the law, discover its impurity to the priest, and according to his judgment carefully purify ourselves in the manner and time he shall fix" (In Ep. Jacob, c. v; P. L., XCIII, 39). Clearly Bede did not consider such mutual avowal a sacramental confession; he had in mind the monastic confession of faults. In the eleventh century Lanfranc sets forth the same theory, but distinguishes between public sins and hidden faults; the first he reserves "to priests, by whom the Church binds and looses", and authorizes the avowal of the second to all members of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, and in their absence to an upright man (vir mundus), and in the absence of an upright man, to God alone ("De celanda confess.", P. L., CL. 629). So also Raoul l'Ardent, after having declared that the confession of grievous faults (criminalium) should be made to a priest, declares that "the confession of venial sins may be made to any person, even to an inferior" (cuilibet, etiam minori), but he adds this explanation: "We make this confession, not that the layman may absolve us; but because, by reason of our own humiliation and accusation of our sins and the prayer of our brethren, we may be purified of our sins" (Hom. lxiv, P. L., CLV, 1900). Confession to laymen made in this way has, therefore, no claim to a sacramental character and provokes no theological objection. The passage from Bede is frequently quoted by the Scholastics.

The other text on which is based the second form of confession to laymen, is taken from a work widely read in the Middle Ages, the "De vera et falsa pœnitentia", until the sixteenth century unanimously attributed to St. Augustine and quoted as such (P. L., XL, 1122). To-day it is universally regarded as apocryphal, though it would be difficult to determine its author. After saying that "he who wishes to confess his sins should seek a priest who can bind and loose", he adds these words often repeated as an axiom: "So great is the power of confession that if a priest be wanting, one may confess to his neighbour" (tanta vis est confessionis ut, si deest sacerdos, confiteatur proximo). He goes on to explain clearly the value of this confession made to a layman in case of necessity: "Although the confession be made to one who has no power to loose, nevertheless he who confesses his crime to his companion becomes worthy of pardon through his desire for a priest." Briefly, to obtain pardon, the sinner performs his duty to the best of his ability, i. e. he is contrite and confesses with the desire of addressing himself to a priest; he hopes that the mercy of God will supply what in this point is lacking. The confession is not sacramental, if we may so speak, except on the part of the penitent; a layman cannot be the minister of absolution and he is not regarded as such. Thus understood confession to laymen is imposed as obligatory, later only counselled or simply permitted, by the greater number of theologians from Gratian and Peter Lombard to the sixteenth century and the Reformation. Though Gratian is not so explicit (can. 78, Dist. I, De Poenit.; can. 36, Dist. IV, De Cons.), the Master of the Sentences (IV, dist. xvii) makes a real obligation of confession to a layman in case of necessity. After having demonstrated that the avowal of sins (*confessio oris*) is necessary in order to obtain pardon, he declares that this avowal should be made first to God, then to a priest, and in the absence of a priest, to one's neighbour (*socio*). This doctrine of Peter Lombard is found, with some differences, in many of his commentators, among them, Raymond of Peñafort, who authorizes this confession without making it an obligation (Summa, III, xxxiv, 84); Albertus Magnus (in IV, dist. xvii, aa. 58, 59), who, arguing from baptism conferred by a layman in case of necessity, ascribes a certain sacramental value to absolution by a layman. St. Thomas (in IV, dist. xvii, q. 3, art. 3, sol. 2) obliges the penitent to do what he can, and sees something sacramental (*quodammodo sacramentalis*) in his confession; he adds, and

in this many followed him, that if the penitent survives he should seek real absolution from a priest (cf. Bonav. in IV, sent., d. 17, p. 3, a. 1, q. 1, and Alex. of Hales, in IV, q. 19, m. 1, a. 1). Scotus, on the other hand (in dist. xiv, q. 4; dist. xvii, q. 1), not only does not make this confession obligatory, but discovers therein certain dangers; after him John of Freiburg, Durandus of Saint-Pourçain, and Astesanus declare this practice merely licit. Besides the practical manuals for the use of the priests may be mentioned the "Manipulus curatorum" of Guy de Montrocher (1333), the synodal statutes of William, Bishop of Cahors, about 1325, which oblige sinners to confess to a layman in case of necessity; all, however, agree in saying that there is no real absolution and that recourse should be had to a priest if possible.

Practice corresponds to theory; in the medieval *chansons de gestes* and in annals and chronicles, examples of such confessions occur (see Laurain, "De l'intervention des laïques, des diacres, et des abbesses dans l'administration de la Pénitence", Paris, 1897). Thus, Joinville relates (Hist. de S. Louis, §70), that the army of the Christians having been put to flight by the Saracens, each one confessed to any priest he could find, and at need to his neighbour; he himself thus received the confession of Guy d'Ybelin, and gave him a kind of absolution saying: "Je vous asol de tel pooir que Diex m'a donnei" (I absolve you with such power as God may have given me). In 1524 Bayard, wounded to death, prayed before his cross-shaped sword-hilt and made his confession to his "maistre d'ostel" (Hist. de Bayard par le loyal serviteur, ch. lxiv–v). Neither theory nor practice, it will readily be seen, was erroneous from a theological point of view. But when Luther (Prop. damn., 13) attacked and denied the power of the priest to administer absolution, and maintained that laymen had a similar power, a reaction set in. The heresy of Luther was condemned by Leo X and the Council of Trent; this Council (sess. xiv, cap. 6, and can. 10), without directly occupying itself with confession to a layman in case of necessity, defined that only bishops and priests are the ministers of absolution. Sixteenth-century authors, while not condemning the practice, declared it dangerous, e. g. the celebrated Martin Aspilcueta (Navarrus) (Enchirid., xxi, n. 41), who with Dominicus Soto says that it had fallen into desuetude. Both theory and practice disappeared by degrees; at the end of the seventeenth century there remained scarcely a memory of them.

MORIN, *Comment. histor. de discipl. in administr. sacram. Pœnit.*, VIII (Paris, 1651), c. xxiii–iv; CHARDON, *Histoire des Sacrements; la Pénitence*, sect. II, c. vii (in MIGNE, *Pat. Lat.*, XX); LAURAIN, *op. cit.*; MARTÈNE, *De antiq. eccl. ritibus* (Rouen, 1700), I, a, 6, n. 7; and II, 37; and VACANT, *Dict. de Théologie cath.*, I, 182; KÖNIGER, *Die Beicht nach Cäsarius von Heisterbach* (1906). From a Protestant point of view, to be corrected by the foregoing, LEA, *History of Auricular Confession*, I (Philadelphia, 1896), 218.

A. BOUDINHON.

Lay Investiture. See INVESTITURE.

Laymann, PAUL, a famous Jesuit moralist, b. in 1574 at Arzl, near Innsbruck; d. of the plague on 13 November, 1635, at Constance. After studying jurisprudence at Ingolstadt, he entered the Jesuit Order there in 1594, was ordained priest in 1603, taught philosophy at the University of Ingolstadt from 1603–9, moral theology at the Jesuit house in Munich from 1609–25, and canon law at the University of Dillingen from 1625–32. He was one of the greatest moralists and canonists of his time, and a copious writer on philosophical, moral, and juridical subjects. The most important of his thirty-three literary productions is a compendium of moral theology "Theologia Moralis in quinque libros partita" (Munich, 1625), of which a second and enlarged edition in six volumes appeared in 1626 at the same place. Until the second quarter of the eighteenth century it was edited repeatedly (latest edition, Mainz, 1723), and was extensively used as a textbook in seminaries. Especially in the third edition of his "Theologia Moralis", Laymann stands up resolutely for a milder treatment of those who had been accused of witchcraft. The reason why Laymann is often represented as an advocate of the horrible cruelties practised at trials for witchcraft lies in the false assumption that he is the author of a book entitled "Processus juridicus contra sagas et veneficos" (Cologne, 1629). Quite in contrast with Laymann's "Theologia Moralis", this book is a defence of the extreme severity at trials for witchcraft. Father Duhr, S.J., has now proved beyond doubt that Laymann is not the author of this work. See "Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie", XXIII (Innsbruck, 1899), 733–43; XXIV (1900), 585–92; XXV (1901), 166–8; XXIX (1905), 190–2. At the instance of Bishop Heinrich von Knöringen of Augsburg, Laymann wrote "Pacis compositio inter Principes et Ordines Imperii Romani Catholicos atque Augustanæ Confessionis adhærentes" (Dillingen, 1629), an elaborate work of 658 pages, explaining the value and extent of the Religious Peace of Augsburg, effected by King Ferdinand I in 1555. Another important work of Laymann is entitled "Justa defensio S. Rom. Pontificis, augustissimi Cæsaris, S. R. E. Cardinalium, episcoporum, principum et aliorum, demum minimæ Societatis Jesu, in causa monasteriorum extinctorum et bonorum ecclesiasticorum vacantium . . . " (Dillingen, 1631). It treats of the Edict of Restitution, issued by Ferdinand II in 1629, and sustains the point that in case of the ancient orders the property of suppressed monasteries need not be restored to the order to which these monasteries belonged, because each monastery was a corporation of its own. Such property, therefore, may be applied to Catholic schools and other ecclesiastical foundations. In the case of the Jesuit Order, however, he holds that all confiscated property must be restored to the order as such, because the whole Jesuit Order forms only one corporation. His work on canon law, "Jus Canonicum seu Commentaria in libros decretales" (3 vols., Dillingen, 1666–98), was published after his death.

SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus* (Brussels and Paris, 1890–1909), IV, 1582–94; SCHWICKERATH, *Attitude of the Jesuits in the trials for witchcraft* in *American Cath. Quarterly Review*, XXVII (Philadelphia, 1902), 493–8; SPECHT, *Geschichte der Universität Dillingen* (Freiburg im Br., 1902), 325, etc.

MICHAEL OTT.

Lay Tithes.—Under this heading must be distinguished (1) secular tithes, which subjects on crown-estates were obliged to pay to princes, or tenants, or vassals on leased lands or lands held in fief to their landlords (*decimæ origine laicales*), and (2) ecclesiastical tithes, which in the course of time became alienated from the Church to lay proprietors (*decimæ ex post laicales s. sæcularizatæ*). There is question here only of the latter. In the secularizations initiated under the Merovingians the transference of ecclesiastical property and their tithes or of the tithes alone to laymen was effected. In subsequent times church lands with their tithes, or the tithes alone, were bestowed even by bishops and abbots on laymen to secure servants, vassals, protectors against violence and defenders of their civil rights. Other church property with tithes, or the tithes alone, were forcibly seized by laymen. Finally, the development of churches, once the property of private individuals, into parish churches subject to the bishop gave rise to the landlord appropriating the tithes due to the parish church. The church soon took measures to repress this spoliation, beginning as early as the ninth century at the Synod of Diedenhofen (844; cap. iii, 5) and that of Beauvais (845; cap. iii, 6). Gregory VII revived in a stricter form these old canons at the Autumn Synod of 1078, demanding that the laity should return all tithes to the Church, even though they had been given

them by bishops, kings, or other persons, and declared all who refused obedience to be *sacrilegi* (C. 1, C. XVI, q. 7). Succeeding popes and synods repeated this order, declaring that Church tithes to be *iuris divini* (C. 14, X, de decim., III, 30); that, as the inalienable source of income of the parish church, they could not be transferred to another church or monastery (C. 30, X, de decim., III, 30); that they could not be acquired by a layman through prescription or inheritance, or otherwise alienated.

But it was quite impossible for the Church to recover the tithes possessed for centuries by laymen, to whom in fact they had been in many cases transferred by the Church itself. Laymen gave them in preference to the monastery instead of the parish church, but this became thenceforth subject to the approval of the bishop (C. 3, X, de privil., III, 33). The decision of the Lateran Council (1179), forbidding the alienation of the church tithes possessed by the laity, and demanding their return to the Church (C. 19, X, de decim., III, 30), was interpreted to mean that those ecclesiastical tithes, which up to the time of this council were in possession of laymen, might be retained by them, but no further transference should take place (C. 25, X, de decim., III, 30, c. 2, 3 in VI^{to}, h. t., III, 13). But even this could not be carried out. There thus existed side by side with church tithes a quantity of lay tithes; the latter were dealt with by secular courts as being purely secular rights, while ecclesiastical law was applied to ecclesiastical tithes. However, certain of the obligations imposed by the (once) ecclesiastical tithes continued to bind the proprietor, even though he were a layman. Thus, in the case of church buildings, the Council of Trent declared that patrons and all "qui fructus aliquos ex dictis ecclesiis provenientes percipiunt" were bound secondarily to defray the cost of repair (Sess. XXI, De ref., c. vii; see Fabrica Ecclesiæ). When there is a doubt as to whether the tithes in question are ecclesiastical or lay, the reasonable presumption is that they are ecclesiastical.

Ferraris, *Bibl. canonica* (Rome, 1885–99), s. v. *Decimæ*; Perels, *Die kirchl. Zehnten im karoling. Reich* (Berlin, 1904); Pöschl, *Bischofsgut u. mensa episcopalis*, I (Berlin, 1908), 114 sqq.; Stutz, *Das karoling. Zehntgebot* (Weimar, 1908).

Johannes Baptist Sägmüller.

Lazarists. See Mission, Congregation of the.

Lazarus (Gk. Λάζαρος, a contraction of Ελεάζαρος—see II Mach., vi, 18—meaning in Hebrew "God hath helped"), the name of two persons in the N. T.; a character in one of Christ's parables, and the brother of Martha and Mary of Bethania.

Lazarus of the Parable.—(1) *The Story.*—The dramatic story of the rich man and the beggar (only in Luke, xvi, 19–31) is set forth by Christ in two striking scenes: (a) Their Condition Here.—The rich man was clothed in purple and byssus (D. V. fine linen), and spent each day in gay carousing. The beggar had been cast helpless at the rich man's gate, and lay there all covered with sores; he yearned for the crumbs that fell from the rich man's table, but received none, and was left to the dogs. (b) Their Condition Hereafter. —The earthly banquet is over; the heavenly banquet is begun. Lazarus partakes of the banquet in a place of honour (cf. John, xiii, 23). He reclines his head on Abraham's bosom. The rich man is now the outcast. He yearns for a drop of water. Lazarus is not allowed to leave the heavenly banquet and tend to the outcast.

(2) *The Meaning.*—Catholic exegetes now commonly accept the story as a parable. It is also legendary that the sores of Lazarus were leprous. The purpose of the parable is to teach us the evil result of the unwise neglect of one's opportunities. Lazarus was rewarded, not because he was poor, but for his virtuous acceptance of poverty; the rich man was punished, not because he was rich, but for vicious neglect of the opportunities given him by his wealth.

II. Lazarus of the Miracle.—This personage was the brother of Martha and Mary of Bethania; all three were beloved friends of Jesus (John, xi, 5). At the request of the two sisters Jesus raised Lazarus from

Resurrection of Lazarus
Second-century fresco in the Catacomb of St. Callistus

the dead (John, xi, 41–44). Soon thereafter, the Saturday before Palm Sunday, Lazarus took part in the banquet which Simon the Leper gave to Jesus in Bethania (Matt., xxvi, 6–16; Mark, xiv, 3–11; John, xii, 1–11). Many of the Jews believed in Jesus because of Lazarus, whom the chief priests now sought to put to death. The Gospels tell us no more of Lazarus (see Lazarus of Bethany, Saint).

Walter Drum.

Lazarus, Saint, Order of, of Jerusalem.—The military order of St. Lazarus of Jerusalem originated in a leper hospital founded in the twelfth century by the crusaders of the Latin Kingdom. Without doubt there had been before this date leper hospitals in the East, of which the Knights of St. Lazarus claimed to be the continuation, in order to have the appearance of remote antiquity and to pass as the oldest of all orders. But this pretension is apocryphal. These Eastern leper hospitals followed the Rule of St. Basil, while that of Jerusalem adopted the hospital Rule of St. Augustine in use in the West. The Order of St. Lazarus was indeed purely an order of hospitallers from the beginning, as was that of St. John, but without encroaching on the field of the latter. Because of its special aim, it had quite a different organization. The inmates of St. John were merely visitors, and changed constantly; the lepers of St. Lazarus on the contrary were condemned to perpetual seclusion. In return they were regarded as brothers or sisters of the house which sheltered them, and they obeyed the common rule which united them with their religious guardians. In some leper hospitals of the Middle Ages even the master had to be chosen from among the lepers. It is not proved, though it has been asserted, that this was the case at Jerusalem.

The Middle Ages surrounded with a touching pity these the greatest of all unfortunates, these *miselli*, as they were called. From the time of the crusades, with the spread of leprosy, leper hospitals became very numerous throughout Europe, so that at the death of St. Louis there were eight hundred in France alone.

However, these houses did not form a congregation; each house was autonomous, and supported to a great extent by the lepers themselves, who were obliged when entering to bring with them their implements, and who at their death willed their goods to the institution if they had no children. Many of these houses bore the name of St. Lazarus, from which, however, no dependence whatever on St. Lazarus of Jerusalem is to be inferred. The most famous, St. Lazarus of Paris, depended solely and directly on the bishop of that city, and was a mere priory when it was given by the archbishop to the missionaries of St. Vincent de Paul, who have retained the name of Lazarists (1632).

The question remains, how and at what time the Order of St. Lazarus of Jerusalem became a military order. This is not known exactly; and, moreover, the historians of the order have done much to obscure the question by entangling it with gratuitous pretensions and suspicious documents.

The house at Jerusalem owed to the general interest devoted to the holy places in the Middle Ages a rapid and substantial growth in goods and privileges of every kind. It was endowed not only by the sovereigns of the Latin realm, but by all the states of Europe. Louis VII, on his return from the Second Crusade, gave it the Château of Broigny, near Orléans (1154). This example was followed by Henry II of England, and by Emperor Frederick II. This was the origin of the military commanderies whose contributions, called *responsions*, flowed into Jerusalem, swollen by the collections which the hospital was authorized to make in Europe.

The popes for their part were not sparing of their favours. Alexander IV recognized its existence under the Rule of St. Augustine (1255). Urban IV assured it the same immunities as were granted to the monastic orders (1262). Clement IV obliged the secular clergy to confine all lepers whatsoever, men or women, clerics or laymen, religious or secular, in the houses of this order (1265).

At the time these favours were granted, Jerusalem had fallen again into the hands of the Mussulmans. St. Lazarus, although still called "of Jerusalem", had been transferred to Acre, where it had been ceded territory by the Templars (1240), and where it received the confirmation of its privileges by Urban IV (1264).

It was at this time also that the Order of St. Lazarus of Jerusalem, following the example of the Order of St. John, armed combatants for the defence of the remaining possessions of the Christians in Asia. Their presence is mentioned without further detail at the Battle of Gaza against the Khwarizmians in 1244, and at the final siege of Acre in 1291.

As a result of this catastrophe the leper hospital of St. Lazarus of Jerusalem disappeared; however, its commanderies in Europe, together with their revenues, continued to exist, but hospitality was no longer practised. The order ceased to be an order of hospitallers and became purely military. The knights who resided in these commanderies had no tasks, and were veritable parasites on the Christian charitable foundations.

Things remained in this condition until the pontificate of Innocent VIII, who suppressed this useless order and transferred its possessions to the Knights of St. John (1490), which transfer was renewed by Pope Julius II (1505). But the Order of St. John never came into possession of this property except in Germany.

In France, Francis I, to whom the Concordat of Leo X (1519) had resigned the nomination to the greater number of ecclesiastical benefices, evaded the Bull of suppression by conferring the commanderies of St. Lazarus on Knights of the Order of St. John. The last named vainly claimed the possession of these goods. Their claim was rejected by the Parliament of Paris (1547).

Leo X himself disregarded the value of this Bull by re-establishing in favour of Charles V the priory of Capua, to which were attached the leper hospitallers of Sicily (1517).

Pius IV went further; he annulled the Bulls of his predecessors and restored its possessions to the order that he might give the mastership to a favourite, Giovanni de Castiglione (1565). But the latter did not succeed in securing the devolution of the commanderies of France. Pius V codified the statutes and privileges of the order, but reserved to himself the right to confirm the appointment of the grand master as well as of the beneficiaries (1567). He made an attempt to restore to the order its hospitaller character, by incorporating with it all the leper hospitals and other houses founded under the patronage of St. Lazarus of the Lepers. But this tardy reform was rendered useless by the subsequent gradual disappearance of leprosy in Europe.

Finally, the grand mastership of the order having been rendered vacant in 1572 by the death of Castiglione, Pope Gregory XIII united it in perpetuity with the Crown of Savoy. The reigning duke, Philibert III, hastened to fuse it with the recently founded Savoyan Order of St. Maurice, and thenceforth the title of Grand Master of the Order of Sts. Maurice and Lazarus was hereditary in that house. The pope gave him authority over the vacant commanderies everywhere, except in the states of the King of Spain, which included the greater part of Italy. In England and Germany these commanderies had been suppressed by Protestantism. France remained, but it was refractory to the claims of the Duke of Savoy. Some years later King Henry IV, having founded with the approbation of Paul V (1609) the Order of Notre-Dame du Mont-Carmel, hastened in turn to unite to it the vacant possessions of St. Lazarus in France, and such is the origin of the title of "Knight of the Royal, Military, and Hospitaller Order of Our Lady of Mount Carmel and St. Lazarus of Jerusalem", which carried with it the enjoyment of a benefice, and which was conferred by the king for services rendered.

To return to the dukes of Savoy: Clement VIII granted them the right to exact from ecclesiastical benefices pensions to the sum of four hundred crowns for the benefit of knights of the order, dispensing them from celibacy on condition that they should observe the statutes of the order and consecrate their arms to the defence of the Faith. Besides their commanderies the order had two houses where the knights might live in common, one of which, at Turin, was to contribute to combats on land, while the other, at Nice, had to provide galleys to fight the Turks at sea. But when thus reduced to the states of the Duke of Savoy, the order merely vegetated until the French Revolution, which suppressed it. In 1816 the King of Sardinia, Victor Emmanuel I, re-established the titles of Knight and Commander of Sts. Maurice and Lazarus, as simple decorations, accessible without conditions of birth to both civilians and military men.

DE SIBERT, *Histoire des Ordres royaux de Notre Dame de Mont-Carmel et de St-Lazare de Jérusalem* (Paris, 1772); FERRAND, *Précis historique des Ordres de St-Lazare et de St-Maurice* (Lyons, 1860). Documents: *Charter of St. Lazarus of Jerusalem* in *Archives de l'Orient latin*, II; *Privilegia Ordinis S. Lazari* (Rome, 1566); *Provedimenti relativi all' Ordine dei SS. Maurizio e Lazaro* (Turin, 1855).

CH. MOELLER.

Lazarus of Bethany, SAINT, reputed first Bishop of Marseilles, d. in the second half of the first century. According to a tradition, or rather a series of traditions combined at different epochs, the members of the family at Bethany, the friends of Christ, together with some holy women and others of His disciples, were put out to sea by the Jews hostile to Christianity in a vessel without sails, oars, or helm, and after a miraculous voyage landed in Provence at a place

called to-day the Saintes-Maries. It is related that they separated there to go and preach the Gospel in different parts of the south-east of Gaul. Lazarus of whom alone we have to treat here, went to Marseilles, and, having converted a number of its inhabitants to Christianity, became their first pastor. During the first persecution under Nero he hid himself in a crypt, over which the celebrated Abbey of St-Victor was constructed in the fifth century. In this same crypt he was interred, when he shed his blood for the Faith. During the new persecution of Domitian he was cast into prison and beheaded in a spot which is believed to be identical with a cave beneath the prison Saint-Lazare. His body was later translated to Autun, and buried in the cathedral of that town. But the inhabitants of Marseilles claim to be in possession of his head which they still venerate. Like the other legends concerning the saints of the Palestinian group, this tradition, which was believed for several centuries and which still finds some advocates, has no solid foundation. It is in a writing, contained in an eleventh century manuscript (Paris, 1767, Fonds Notre-Dame, 101), with some other documents relating to St. Magdalen of Vézelay, that we first read of Lazarus in connexion with the voyage that brought Magdalen to Gaul. Before the middle of the eleventh century there does not seem to be the slightest trace of the tradition according to which the Palestinian saints came to Provence. At the beginning of the twelfth century, perhaps through a confusion of names, it was believed at Autun that the tomb of St. Lazarus was to be found in the cathedral dedicated to St. Nazarius. A search was made and remains were discovered, which were solemnly translated and were considered to be those of him whom Christ raised from the dead, but it was not thought necessary to inquire why they should be found in France.

The question, however, deserved to be examined with care, seeing that, according to a tradition of the Greek Church, the body of St. Lazarus had been brought to Constantinople, just as all the other saints of the Palestinian group were said to have died in the Orient, and to have been buried, translated, and honoured there. It is only in the thirteenth century that the belief that Lazarus had come to Gaul with his two sisters and had been Bishop of Marseilles spread in Provence. It is true that a letter is cited (its origin is uncertain), written in 1040 by Pope Benedict IX on the occasion of the consecration of the new church of St-Victor in which Lazarus is mentioned. But in this text the pope speaks only of relics of St. Lazarus, merely calling him the saint who was raised again to life. He does not speak of him as having lived in Provence, or as having been Bishop of Marseilles. The most ancient Provençal text alluding to the episcopacy of St. Lazarus is a passage in the "Otia imperialia" of Gervase of Tilbury (1212). Thus the belief in his Provençal apostolate is of very late date, and its supporters must produce more ancient and reliable documentary evidence. In the crypt of St-Victor at Marseilles an epitaph of the fifth century has been discovered, which informs us that a bishop named Lazarus was buried there. In the opinion of the most competent archæologists, however, this personage is Lazarus, Bishop of Aix, who was consecrated at Marseilles about 407, and who, having had to abandon his see in 411, passed some time in Palestine, whence he returned to end his days in Marseilles. It is more than likely that it is the name of this bishop and his return from Palestine, that gave rise to the legend of the coming of the Biblical Lazarus to Provence, and his apostolate in the city of Marseilles.

CHEVALIER, *Gallia christ. noviss.*, II (Paris, 1899), 1–6; *Analect. Bolland.*, VI (Brussels, 1887), 88–92; BOUCHE, *Vindiciæ fidei et pietatis Provinciæ pro cœlitibus illius tutelaribus restituendis* (Aix, 1644); DE CHANTELOUP, *L'apôtre de la Provence ou la vie du glorieux S. Lazare, premier évêque de Marseille* (Marseilles, 1684); FAILLON, *Mon. inéd. sur l'apostolat de Ste. Marie Madeleine en Provence et sur les autres apôtres de cette contrée* (Paris, 1848); DE LAUNOY, *De commentitio Lazari et Maximini Magdalenæ et Marthæ in Provinciam appulsu dissertatio* (Paris, 1641); DE MAZENOD, *Preuves de la mission de S. Lazare à Marseille* in *Annales de philos. chrét.*, XIII (Paris, 1846), 338–50; TILLEMONT, *Mem. pour servir à l'hist. eccl.s.*, II (Paris, 1694), 32–4; L. DUCHESNE, *Fastes épisc. de l'anc. Gaule*, I (Paris, 1894), 324–5, 341–4; MORIN, *S. Lazare et S. Maximin, données nouvelles sur plusieurs personnages de la tradition de Provence* in *Mém. de la Soc. des ant. de France*, F, VI (Paris, 1897) 27–51.

LÉON CLUGNET.

Lead, DIOCESE OF (LEADENSIS), which was established on 6 August, 1902, comprises all that part of the State of South Dakota (U. S. A.) west of the Missouri River—an area of 41,759 square miles. The residence of the bishop is at Hot Springs. The territory taken to form the diocese had previously belonged to the Vicariate Apostolic of Nebraska, and had in 1902 a Catholic population of about 6000, including the Catholic Indians of the Sioux Reservations. As first bishop, the Very Rev. John N. Stariha, Vicar-General of the Archdiocese of St. Paul, was chosen and consecrated in St. Paul, 28 October, 1902. He was born in the Province of Krain (Carniola), Austria, 12 May, 1845. Migrating to the United States he became affiliated to the Diocese of St. Paul, where for many years he was pastor of the Church of St. Francis de Sales. The opening of the Rosebud Reservation to settlers and the extension of railways across the state attracted many emigrants to South Dakota, and a number of new parishes were established, churches erected in these new towns, and missions and schools located among the Indians. In 1909, Bishop Stariha's ill-health and age determined him to resign the see, and he returned to his old home in Austria on 1 May of that year. On 11 April, 1910, Pius X ratified the appointment of the Rev. Joseph F. Busch, of Excelsior, Minnesota, as bishop. The religious communities in the diocese include the Jesuit and Benedictine Fathers and the Benedictine Sisters and the Sisters of St. Francis. Statistics (1909): priests, 25 (regulars, 9); churches with resident priests, 18; missions with churches, 35; schools, 5; pupils, 1030; 1 orphan asylum, 24 inmates; Catholic population, 11,000 whites and 6500 Indians.

Catholic News (New York), files; *Catholic Directory* (Milwaukee, 1909).

THOMAS F. MEEHAN.

League, THE.—I. THE LEAGUE OF 1576.—The discontent produced by the Peace of Beaulieu (6 May, 1576), which restored the government of Picardy to the Protestant Prince de Condé and gave him Péronne to hold as a security, induced d'Humières, a Catholic who commanded the city of Péronne, to form a league of gentry, soldiers, and peasants of Picardy to keep Condé from taking possession of the city. D'Humières also appealed to all the princes, nobles, and prelates of the kingdom, and to the allies of the nations neighbouring to France. This League of Péronne thus aspired to become international. From a religious point of view it aimed at supporting Catholicism in France, politically at restoring the "ancient franchises and liberties" against the royal power. Its programme was spread throughout France by the efforts of Henri de Guise (see GUISE), and Henry III, then on good terms with the Guises, declared himself its chief. Gregory XIII was apprised of the formation of the League by Jean David, an advocate of the Parliament of Paris, acting for the Guises, and he communicated the fact to Philip II. But when the Peace of Bergerac (17 September, 1577) between Henry III and the Protestants, curtailed the liberties accorded them by the Edict of Beaulieu, the king hastened to dissolve the League of Péronne and the other Catholic leagues formed after its example. This dissolution was the cause of great rejoicing to a certain number of royalists, who held that "all leagues and associations in a

monarchical state are matters of grave consequence, and that it is impossible for subjects to band themselves together without prejudicing the royal superiority". The nobility had lacked unanimity, and the cities had been too lukewarm to maintain this first league.

II. The League of 1585.—The death of the Duke of Anjou (10 June, 1584) having made Henry of Bourbon, the Protestant King of Navarre, heir presumptive to Henry III, a new league was formed among the aristocracy and the people. On the one hand, the Dukes of Guise, Mayenne, and Nevers and Baron de Senecey met at Nancy to renew the League, with the object of securing the recognition, as heir to the throne, of the Cardinal de Bourbon, who would extirpate heresy and receive the Council of Trent in France. Philip II, by the Treaty of Joinville (31 December, 1584), promised his concurrence, in the shape of a monthly subsidy of 50,000 crowns. At Paris, on the other hand, Charles Hotteman, Sieur de Rocheblond, "moved by the Spirit of God", Prévost, curé of Saint Séverin, Boucher, curé of Saint Benoît, and Launoy, a canon of Soissons, appealed to the middle classes of the cities to save Catholicism. A secret society was formed. Rocheblond and five other leaguers carried on a propaganda, gradually organizing a little army at Paris, and establishing relations with the Guises. The combination of these two movements—the aristocratic and the popular—resulted in the manifesto of 30 March, 1585, launched from Péronne by Guise and the princes amounting to a sort of declaration of war against Henry III. The whole story of the League has been told in the article Guise. We shall here dwell upon only the following two points.

A. *Relations between the Popes and the League.*—Gregory XIII approved of the League after 1584, but abstained from committing himself to any writing in its favour. Sixtus V wished the struggle against heresy in France to be led by the king himself; the religious zeal of the Leaguers pleased him, but he did not like the movement of political independence in relation to Henry III. Events, however, drove Sixtus V to take sides with the Leaguers. The Bull of 9 September, 1585, by which he declared Henry of Bourbon and the Prince of Condé as Protestants, to have forfeited the succession, provoked so much opposition from the Parliament, and so spirited a reply from Henry, that the League, in its turn, recognized the necessity of a counterstroke. Louis d'Orléans, an advocate and a leaguer, undertook the defence of the Bull in the "Avertissement des Catholiques Anglais aux Français Catholiques", an extremely violent manifesto against Henry of Bourbon. Madame de Montpensier, a sister of the Guises, boasted that she ruled the famous preachers of the League, the "Satire Ménippée" presently turned them to ridicule, while in their turn the Leaguers from the pulpits of Paris, attacked not only Henry of Bourbon, but the acts, the morals, and the orthodoxy of Henry III. Such preachers were Rose, Bishop of Senlis, Boucher and Prévost, the aforesaid curés,—the latter of whom caused an immense picture to be displayed, representing the horrible sufferings inflicted upon Catholics by the English co-religionists of Henry of Bourbon. Other preachers were de Launay, a canon of Soissons, the learned Benedictine Génébrard, the controversialist Feuardent, the ascetic writer Pierre Crespet, and Guincestre, curé of Saint-Gervais, who, preaching at Saint-Barthélemy on New Year's Day, 1589, made all who heard him take an oath to spend the last penny they had and shed their last drop of blood to avenge the assassination of Guise. By these excesses of the Leaguers against the monarchical principle, and by the murder of Henry III by Jacques Clément (1 August, 1589), Sixtus V was compelled to assume an attitude of extreme reserve towards the League. The nuncio Matteuzzi having thought it his duty to leave Venice because immediately after the assassination of Henry III the Senate had decided to send an ambassador to Henry of Bourbon, the pope sent him back to his post, expressing a hope that the Venetians might be able to persuade Henry of Bourbon to be reconciled with the Holy See. On 14 May, 1590, the papal legate Caetani blessed, saluting them as Machabees, the 1300 monks who, led by Rose, Bishop of Senlis, and Pelletier, Curé of Saint-Jacques, organized for the defence of Paris against Henry of Bourbon; but, on the other hand, the pope manifested great displeasure because the Sorbonne had declared, on 7 May, that, even "absolved of his crimes", Henry of Bourbon could not become King of France. The Leaguers in their enthusiasm had denied to the papal authority the right of eventually admitting Henry of Bourbon to the throne of France. They found new cause for indignation in the fact that Sixtus V had received the Duke of Luxembourg-Piney, the envoy of Henry's party; and Philip II, while in Paris, caused a sermon to be preached against the pope.

But when, after the brief pontificate of Urban VII, Gregory XIV became pope (5 December, 1590) the League and Spain recovered their influence at Rome. Several Briefs dated in March, 1591, and two "monitoria" to the nuncio Landriano once more proclaimed the downfall of Henry of Bourbon. The prelates who sided with Henry, assembled at Chartres, in September, 1591, protested against the "monitoria" and appealed from them to the pope's maturer information. The gradual development of a third party weakened the League and hastened the approach of an understanding between Rome and Henry of Bourbon (see Henry IV). Briefly, the Holy See felt a natural sympathy for the Catholic convictions in which the League originated; but, to the honour of Sixtus V, he would not, in the most tragic moments of his pontificate, compromise himself too far with a movement which flouted the authority of Henry III, the legitimate king; neither would he admit the maxim: "Culpam non pœnam aufert absolutio peccati" (Absolution blots out the sin, but not its penalty), in virtue of which certain theologians of the League claimed that Henry IV, even if absolved by the pope, would still be incapable of succeeding to the French throne. By this wise policy, Sixtus prepared the way far in advance for the reconciliation which he hoped for, and which was to be realized in the absolution of Henry IV by Clement VIII.

B. *Political Doctrines of the League.*—Charles Labitte has found it possible to write a book on "La Démocratie sous la Ligue". The religious rising of the people soon took shelter behind certain political theories which tended to the revival of medieval political liberties and the limitation of royal absolutism. In 1586 the advocate Le Breton, in a pamphlet for which he was hanged, called Henry III "one of the greatest hypocrites who ever lived", demanded an assembly of the States General from which the royal officers should be excluded, and proposed to restore all their franchises to the cities. Ideas of political autonomy were beginning to take definite shape. The League wished the clergy to recover those liberties which it possessed before the Concordat of Francis I, the nobility to regain the independence it enjoyed in the Middle Ages, and the cities to be restored to a certain degree of autonomy. After the assassination of Guise, a crime instigated by Henry III, sixty-six doctors of the Sorbonne declared that the king's subjects were freed from their oath of allegiance and might lawfully take arms, collect money, and defend the Roman religion against the king; the name of Henry III was erased from the Canon of the Mass and replaced by the "Catholic princes". Boucher, curé of Saint-Benoît, popularized this opinion of the Sorbonne in his book "De justa Henrici Tertii abdicatione", in which he maintained that Henry III, "as a

perjurer, assassin, murderer, a sacrilegious person, patron of heresy, simoniac, magician, impious and damnable", could be deposed by the Church; that, as "a perfidious waster of the public treasure, a tyrant and enemy of his country", he could be deposed by the people. Boucher declared that a tyrant was a ferocious beast which men were justified in killing. It was under the influence of these theories that upon the assassination of Henry III by Jacques Clément (1 August, 1589), the mother of the Guises harangued the throng from the altar of the church of the Cordeliers, and glorified the deed of Clément. These exaggerated ideas served only to justify tyranny, and did not long influence the minds of men. Moreover, the "Declaration" of Henry IV against seditious preachers (September, 1595) and the steps taken at Rome by Cardinal d'Ossat, in 1601, put a stop to the political preachings which the League had brought into fashion. The memory of the excesses committed under the League was afterwards exploited by the legists of the French Crown to combat Roman doctrines and to defend royal absolutism and Gallicanism. But, considering the bases of the League doctrines, it is impossible not to accord them the highest importance in the history of political ideas. Power, they said, was derived from God through the people, and they opposed the false, absolutist, and Gallican doctrine of the Divine right and irresponsibility of kings, such as Louis XIV professed and practised; and they also bore witness to the perfect compatibility of the most rigorous Roman ideas with democratic and popular aspirations.

It has been possible to trace certain analogies between the doctrines of the League and Protestant brochures like Hotman's "Franco-Gallia" and the "Vindiciæ contra tyrannos" of Junius Brutus (Duplessis Mornay), published immediately after the Massacre of St. Bartholomew. Indeed, both Huguenots and Leaguers were then seeking to limit the royal power; but in the Huguenot projects of reform the tendency was to favour the aristocracy, the *optimates*; they would not allow the mob—the *mediastinus quilibet* of whom the "Vindiciæ" speak so contemptuously—any right of resistance against the king; the Leaguers, on the contrary, appealed to the democracy. The Huguenots permitted no uprising of the mere private individual save with "God's special calling"; the Leaguers held that every man was called by God to the defence of the Church, and that all men were equal when there was question of repelling the heretic or the infidel. Hence, in his work, "Des progrès de la révolution et de la guerre contre l'Eglise" Lamennais felt free to write (1829): "How deeply Catholicism has impressed souls with the sentiment of liberty, was never more evident than in the days of the League."

See the bibliography of GUISE; also LABITTE, *De la démocratie chez les prédicateurs de la Ligue* (Paris, 1841); WEILL, *Les théories sur le pouvoir royal en France pendant les guerres de religion* (Paris, 1891); TREUMANN, *Die Monarchomachen; eine Darstellung der revolutionären Staatslehren des XVI. Jahrhunderts, 1573–1599* (Leipzig, 1885).

GEORGES GOYAU.

League, GERMAN (CATHOLIC).—Only three years before the League was established, Duke Maximilian of Bavaria (d. 1651), who was afterwards its leading spirit, declared against the formation of a confederacy of the Catholic states of the empire in Germany, proposed by the spiritual electors. Soon after, however, in 1607, he emphasized the need of such a confederacy, "in order that each may know how far he may rely on the others". There is indeed nothing more natural than the drawing together in times of discord of those who think alike. Besides, the Protestant "Union" was inaugurated in May, 1608.

Early in 1608 Duke Maximilian started negotiations with the spiritual electors and some of the Catholic states of the empire, with a view to the formation of a union of the Catholic states. On 5 May, 1608, there was a conference on this question in the Imperial Diet at Ratisbon, which amounted, however, only to an exchange of ideas. Two months later (5 July), we find the spiritual electors assembled at Andernach at the invitation of the Archbishop of Mainz. This assembly was really held to consider the question of the imperial succession, but the proposed League was also discussed, and a tendency was manifested in favour of the confederacy suggested by Maximilian. Opinions were even expressed as to the size of the confederate military forces to be raised. Maximilian, who took the most active part at the Andernach conference, afterwards sought among the neighbouring princes members for the proposed League. Salzburg showed disapproval; Würzburg's bishop was not much more encouraging, but the Bishops of Augsburg, Passau, and Ratisbon concurred. Until the end of January, 1609, however, the negotiations flagged. About this time Maximilian won over the Catholic states of Swabia to his project, and on 5 July the representatives of Augsburg, Constance, Passau, Ratisbon, and Würzburg assembled at Munich. Salzburg was not invited this time, and Eichstädt still hesitated. Here on 10 July, 1609, the participating states concluded an alliance "for the defence of the Catholic religion and peace within the Empire". The confederates might not make war on each other; their disputes must be decided either by arbitration within the confederacy, or by the laws of the Empire; should one member be attacked, the League must resort to arms, or, if prevented from doing this, must take legal steps. Duke Maximilian was to be the president of the confederacy, and the Bishops of Augsburg, Passau, and Würzburg his councillors. The League was to continue for nine years.

The foundation of the confederacy was at last laid, but a substantial structure was certainly not erected at Munich. This was not the fault of Maximilian, but of the states, which, always cautious and dilatory, could not be spurred to take decisive action. On 18 June, 1609, even before the Munich Diet, the Electors of Mainz, Cologne, and Trier had exchanged opinions through their envoys as to the personnel of the League and the size of the confederate army, for which they proposed 20,000 men. They had also considered the making of Maximilian president of the alliance, and on 30 August they announced their adhesion to the Munich agreement, provided that Maximilian accepted the Elector of Mainz as co-president. As the arch-chancellor of the Empire, the latter enjoyed great prestige, and was in a position to exercise great influence; consequently, his support could scarcely be termed anything less than essential to the League. Indeed, in conformity with his wishes, the emperor was informed of the foundation and aims of the confederacy. As to its precise object, the members themselves were not quite clear. Maximilian, therefore, urged the convocation of a general meeting of the confederates to remove all misunderstandings. The first was held on 10 Feb., 1610, at Würzburg. Except Austria and Salzburg, all the important Catholic states and a great number of the smaller ones sent representatives. The organization of the coalition, the raising of a confederate army, the apportionment of the contributions to the alliance, and the enlistment of foreign mercenaries, were the questions under discussion. The confederacy received the official name, *Defensiv- oder Schirmvereinigung*. Only after this can one really speak of a Catholic League. The foreign help, on which they principally counted, seemed already assured. The pope and the King of Spain, who had been informed by Maximilian of his plan through the medium of Zuniga, the Spanish ambassador at Prague, were both favourably disposed towards the undertaking.

But the success of the League depended primarily on the effective co-operation of the members themselves. This broke down when it came to the collection of contributions. In the case of very many of the members, their contribution was, in the words of Maximilian, nothing but a "poor prayer". Up to April, 1610, not a single member had paid his quota, although at that very moment, the dispute concerning the Jülich succession, and the threatening of the Rhenish principalities by the troops of the Union, urgently required a League ready for war. Disgusted with the indifference of the members, which narrowness of means on the part of a few could not excuse, Maximilian threatened to resign the presidentship. His threat at once achieved this, that Spain, which had made the giving of a subsidy dependent on Austria's enrolment in the League, waived this condition, and the pope promised a further contribution in 1611. The conduct of the Union in the Jülich dispute and the warlike operations of the Union army in Alsace, seemed to make a battle between League and Union inevitable. But the internal affairs of the League were to become still more critical. In the year 1613 the exertions of Cardinal Klesl at an assembly of the confederates in Ratisbon (where the Imperial Diet was also sitting), against the wishes of Duke Maximilian but very much in accordance with the wishes of the Elector of Mainz, succeeded in bringing about the enrolment of Austria in the League. The assembly now appointed no less than three war-directors: Duke Maximilian, and Archdukes Albert and Maximilian of Austria. The object of the League was now declared "eine christlich rechtmässige Defension". The division of leadership did not conduce to increasing the League's power, while, by Austria's accession, it became entangled in her difficulties, already very threatening in her hereditary domains.

Duke Maximilian, who attached great importance to the League's fitness for war, showed his disapproval of the Ratisbon resolutions by refusing to accept them, and later resigned his post as president, when Archduke Maximilian, of Austria, the third director, protested against the inclusion of the Bishop of Augsburg, and the Provost of Ellwangen in the Bavarian Directory, and was supported in his protest by Mainz and Trier. On 27 May, 1617, he formed a separate league for nine years with Bamberg, Eichstädt, Würzburg, and the Provost of Ellwangen. But the position in Bohemia, as in Lower and Upper Austria, gradually became so critical, that King Matthias at the end of 1618 strove hard with Mainz for the restoration of the League. A meeting of several of the ecclesiastical states met the emperor's wishes in that, at Oberwesel (Jan., 1619), they decided to reconstruct the League, but on its original basis. It was in future to have only two groups: the Rhenish under the presidency of Mainz, and the Oberland under Bavaria, the treasury and the military command were to be considered as separate. Maximilian might only lead the whole of the troops, when he had to appear in the Rhenish district. After Maximilian had made sure that Austria would not again claim the privilege of appointing a third director, he summoned the Oberland states to Munich, where on 31 May the Oberland group came again into life. The Rhenish group was already re-established at Oberwesel. The two groups bound themselves to render mutual help for six years.

The Kingdom of Bohemia, in a state of insurrection from 1618, deprived Ferdinand II of the Bohemian crown, and gave it to Elector Palatine Frederick V (26–27 Aug., 1619). Ferdinand's sole hope of recovering his lands now lay in drastic action. On the way to Frankfort on the day of the imperial election he had already consulted personally with Maximilian of Bavaria on the projected warlike preparations. After the election Ferdinand conferred with the spiritual electors still at Frankfort concerning the support of the League. With the formation of a confederate army the serious activity of the League began. The critical time, which Maximilian's clear vision had foreseen, and for which, with characteristic energy, he had been long making provision, made him the undisputed leader of Catholic Germany. On 8 Oct., 1619, Ferdinand and Maximilian came to an agreement at Munich over the support of the League, and the separate support of Bavaria. The latter supplied 7000 men to the confederate army, whose strength was fixed at an assembly at Würzburg in Dec., 1619, as 21,000 infantry and 4000 cavalry.

In July, 1620, the League army totalled about 30,000 men, to which the Protestant Union could only oppose about 10,000. This superiority at once helped the League to a diplomatic victory over the Union, with which an agreement was come to, whereby, during the war in Austria and Bohemia, hostilities between the parties of both alliances in Germany should cease. Bavaria and the League had thus their whole military forces free to support the emperor. On 3 July the arrangement had been made with the Union; on 24 July Tilly had already begun his march into Upper Austria. That there was no decisive battle till 8 November was due to the over-cautious and procrastinating imperial field-marshal, Buquoy. Even before Prague he was still averse to a battle. That one was fought was due to Maximilian and Tilly. With the victory of the combined confederate and imperial armies over the Bohemians at Prague the first stage of the League's activity during the Thirty Years War ended. Its subsequent history is closely involved in that of the Thirty Years War (q. v.). The strength of the League principally lay in Maximilian's personality, and in the resources of his excellently administered country. But for Maximilian (q. v.) the League at the beginning of the Thirty Years War would probably have been just as disorganized a body as its opponent, the Union.

Briefe u. Akten zur Gesch. des dreissigjähr. Krieges zur Zeit des vorwaltenden Einflusses der Wittelsbacher: vol. VII: *Von der Abreise Erzh. Leopolds nach Jülich bis zu den Werbungen Herzog Maxim. von B. im März 1610*, ed. Stieve and revised by Mayr (Munich, 1905); vol. VIII: *Von den Rüstungen Herzog Maxim. von B. bis zum Aufbruch der Passauer*, ed. Stieve and revised by Mayr (Munich, 1908); vol. IX: *Vom Einfall des Passauer Kriegsvolks bis zum Nürnberger Kurfürstentag*, ed. Chroust (Munich, 1903); vol. X: *Der Ausgang der Regierung Rudolfs II. u. die Anfänge des Kaisers Matthias*, ed. Chroust (Munich, 1906); vol. XI: *Der Reichstag von 1613*, ed. Chroust (Munich, 1909); Bürger, *Ligapolitik des Mainzer Kurfürsten Joh. Schweickhard v. Cronberg 1604–1613* in *Würzburger Studien etc.*, I; Cornelius, *Zur. Gesch. der Gründung der deutschen Liga* (Munich, 1863); Götz, *Die Kriegskosten Bayerns u. der Ligastände im dreissigjähr. Kriege* in *Forschungen zur Gesch. Bayerns*, XII; Gothein, *Deutschland vor dem dreissigjähr. Kriege* (Leipzig, 1908); Janssen-Pastor, *Gesch. des deutschen Volkes seit dem Ausgange des Mittelalters*, vol. V: *Die kirchlich-pol. Revolution u. ihre Bekämpfung seit der Verkündigung der Konkordienformel 1530 bis zum Beginn der dreissigjähr. Krieges* (15th and 16th improved ed., Freiburg, 1902); Ritter, *Deutsche Gesch. im Zeitalter der Gegenref. u. des dreissigjähr. Krieges (1555–1648)*, II (*1586–1618*) (Stuttgart, 1895), III (Stuttgart and Berlin, 1908); Stieve, *Kurfürst Maxim. I. von B.* in *Abhandlungen, Vorträge u. Reden* (Leipzig, 1900); Idem, *Das "Contobuch" der Deutschen Liga* in *Deutsche Zeitschr. für Geschichtswissenschaft*, X (1893); Wolf, *Gesch. Maximilians I. u. seiner Zeit*, II (Munich, 1807).

J. Kraft.

League of the Cross, The, a Catholic total abstinence confraternity founded in London in 1873 by Cardinal Manning to unite Catholics, both clergy and laity, in the warfare against intemperance, and thus improve religious, social, and domestic conditions, especially among the working classes. The original and chief centres of the league are London and Liverpool, and branches have been organized in the various cities of Great Britain and Ireland and in Australia. The fundamental rules of the league are: (1) that the pledge shall be of total abstinence, and taken without limit as to time; (2) that only Catholics can be members; (3) that all members shall live as good, practical Catholics; (4) that no one who is not a prac-

tical Catholic shall, as long as he fails to practise his religion, hold any office in the league. The pope has granted several indulgences to the league for its members. A conference of the league is held in August.

The Tablet (London) files; *Catholic Directory* (London, 1910).

THOMAS F. MEEHAN.

Leander of Seville, SAINT, bishop of that city, b. at Carthage about 534, of a Roman family established in that city; d. at Seville, 13 March, 600 or 601. Some historians claim that his father Severian was duke or governor of Carthage, but St. Isidore simply states that he was a citizen of that city. The family emigrated from Carthage about 554 and went to Seville. The eminent worth of the children of Severian would seem to indicate that they were reared in distinguished surroundings. Severian had three sons, Leander, Isidore, and Fulgentius, and one daughter, Florentina. St. Leander and St. Isidore both became bishops of Seville; St. Fulgentius, Bishop of Carthagena, and St. Florentina, a nun, who directed forty convents and one thousand nuns. It has been also believed, but wrongly, that Theodosia, another daughter of Severian, became the wife of the Visigothic king, Leovigild. Leander became at first a Benedictine monk, and then in 579 Bishop of Seville. In the meantime he founded a celebrated school, which soon became a centre of learning and orthodoxy. He assisted the Princess Ingunthis to convert her husband Hermenegild, the eldest son of Leovigild, and defended the convert against his father's cruel reprisals. In endeavouring to save his country from Arianism, Leander showed himself an orthodox Christian and a far-sighted patriot. Exiled by Leovigild, he withdrew to Byzantium from 579 to 582. It is possible, but not proved, that he sought to rouse the Emperor Tiberius to take up arms against the Arian king: in any case the attempt was without result. He profited, however, by his stay at Byzantium to compose important works against Arianism, and there became acquainted with the future Gregory the Great, then legate of Pelagius II at the Byzantine court. A close friendship thenceforth united the two men, and the correspondence of St. Gregory with St. Leander remains one of the latter's great titles to honour. It is not known exactly when Leander returned from exile. Leovigild put to death his son Hermenegild in 585, and himself died in 589.

In this decisive hour for the future of Spain, Leander did most to ensure the religious unity, the fervent faith, and the broad culture on which was based its later greatness. He had a share in the conversion of Reccared, and never ceased to exercise over him a deep and beneficial influence. At the Third Council of Toledo, where Visigothic Spain abjured Arianism, Leander delivered the closing sermon. On his return from this council, Leander convened an important synod in his metropolitan city of Seville (Conc. Hisp., I), and never afterwards ceased his efforts to consolidate the work, in which his brother and successor St. Isidore was to follow him. Leander received the pallium in August, 599. There remain unfortunately of this writer, superior to his brother Isidore, only two works: "De institutione virginum et contemptu mundi", a monastic rule composed for his sister, and "Homilia de triumpho ecclesiæ ob conversionem Gothorum" (P. L., LXXII). St. Isidore wrote of his brother: "This man of suave eloquence and eminent talent shone as brightly by his virtues as by his doctrine. By his faith and zeal the Gothic people have been converted from Arianism to the Catholic faith" (De script. eccles., XXVIII).

Acta SS., 13 March: MABILLON, *Acta SS. O. S. B.*, sæc. I; AGUIRRE, *Collectio max. conc. hisp.*, III; FLORES, *España Sagrada*, IX; BOURRET, *L'école chrétienne de Séville sous la monarchie des Visigoths* (Paris, 1855); MONTALEMBERT, *Les Moines d'Occident*, II; GAMS, *Die Kirchengesch. von Spanien*, II (2nd ed., 1874); GÖRRES, *Leander, Bischof von Sevilla u. Metropolit der Kirchenprov. Bätica* in *Zeitsch. für wissenschaftl. Theol.*, III (1885).

PIERRE SUAU.

Leap Year. See CALENDAR, REFORM OF THE.

Leavenworth, DIOCESE OF (LEAVENWORTHENSIS), suffragan to St. Louis. When established, 22 May, 1877, it comprised the State of Kansas, U. S. A., with the Right Rev. Louis Mary Fink, O.S.B. as its first bishop. At his request, ten years later the Holy See divided the diocese into three: Wichita, Concordia, and Leavenworth. Leavenworth was then restricted to the 43 counties lying east of Republic, Cloud, Ottawa, Saline, McPherson, Harvey, Sedgwick, and Sumner Counties. The diocese had an area of 28,687 sq. m., with a total population in 1890, of 901,536. Authorized by the Holy See, Bishop Fink on 29 May, 1891, took up his residence in Kansas City, Kans., and the diocese was named after this city for some years. Apostolic letters dated 1 July, 1897, further diminished the territory of the diocese in favour of Concordia and Wichita. It now includes only the Counties of Anderson, Osage, Pottawatomie, Shawnee, Wabaunsee, Wyandotte, Jackson, Jefferson, Linn, Lyon, Marshall, Miami, Nemaha, Atchison, Brown, Coffey, Doniphan, Douglas, Franklin, Johnson, and Leavenworth; an area of 12,594 sq. miles.

The first missionary to the wild Indians of the plains, within the present borders of Kansas, was Father Juan de Padilla. He obtained the martyr's crown just fifty years after Columbus discovered the New World. The first permanent Indian missions in these parts were established by the Jesuit Fathers among the Pottawatomies and Osages. The latter originally dwelt on both sides of the Missouri. They knew of Father Marquette and had implored Father Gravier to preach to them. Two Franciscan friars had been among them in 1745. Bishop Dubourg promised them missionaries in 1820. The Pottawatomies came from Michigan and Indiana. Some hundreds of them had been baptized by the Rev. S. T. Badin of Kentucky, the first priest ordained in the United States. In Indiana, Father Deseilles was succeeded among the Pottawatomies by Father Petit, who accompanied them to the confines of their new reservation in the Indian Territory, which then included Kansas. The Indian converts were confirmed by Bishop P. Kenrick in 1843, and by Bishop Barron in 1845. An Indian priest of the Oklahoma Diocese is descended from the Pottawatomies and was born in Kansas. In 1845 by the zealous efforts of the Jesuit missionaries, Catholic prayer-books in the Pottawatomie dialect were given to the Indians. Manual training schools for girls and boys had been established some years previously. The latter were conducted by the Jesuits. Bishop Rosati wrote from Europe that Gregory XVI would be delighted to have a Sacred Heart school among the Indians. In the year 1841 the Religious of the Sacred Heart opened a school among the Pottawatomies under the leadership of Mother Philippine-Rose Duchesne. Manual training schools were established among the Osages in 1847. Here also the boys' school was under the conduct of the Jesuits; but the girls' school was in charge of the Sisters of Loretto.

Kansas was under the jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical superiors of Louisiana until St. Louis was made an episcopal see. The Vicariate Apostolic of the Indian Territory east of the Rocky Mountains included the present states of Kansas, Nebraska, Oklahoma, that part of North and South Dakota west of the Missouri River, Wyoming, Montana, and a part of Colorado. It was placed under Rt. Rev. John B. Miège, S.J., who was appointed vicar Apostolic, and consecrated Bishop of Messenia, in St. Louis, 25 March, 1851. Accompanied by Father Paul Ponziglione, S.J., who was to devote himself for forty years to the Indians and the early white settlers of the new vicariate, Bishop Miège arrived among the Pottawatomies on the Kansas River, where now stands St. Mary's College, in May of that year. The founder of the Pottawatomie mission of the Immaculate Conception, Father Christian Hoecken, S.J., while ascending the Missouri River

with Father P. J. de Smedt, died of cholera, at the age of forty-three years (19 June, 1851), fifteen of which were passed among the Indians in the Missouri Valley.

Bishop Miège was born 18 September, 1815, at La Forêt, Upper Savoy, Italy. He studied classics and philosophy at the diocesan seminary of Moutiers where his elder brother Urban was a teacher for over forty years. He entered the Society of Jesus at Milan 23 Oct., 1836; was ordained priest 7 Sept., 1847, at Rome, where he was professor of philosophy in the Roman College. Driven from Italy by the political troubles of the following year, he was sent at his own request to the Indian Missions in the United States. In 1849 he was assistant pastor of St. Charles's church at St. Charles, Missouri. In 1850 he was *socius* of the master of novices at Florissant. He also taught moral theology there. The vicariate subjected to his jurisdiction in 1851 consisted mostly of Indian missions. There were five churches, ten Indian Nations, and eight priests, with a Catholic population of almost 5000, of whom 3000 were Indians. He was an indefatigable missionary, traversing on horseback and by wagon for years the wild remote regions over which his people were scattered, visiting the Indian villages, forts, trading posts, and growing towns. In August, 1855, there were seven Catholic families in Leavenworth, and he moved his residence from the Pottawatomie mission, to this city for a permanent location to minister to the fast increasing tide of immigration that had turned to Kansas. In 1856 the Benedictines began a foundation at Doniphan, near Atchison, but a short time afterwards they established a priory and a college in the latter city. They were followed by the Carmelites in 1864. Father Theodore Heimann, a German, who later joined the Carmelite Fathers; Father J. H. Defouri, from Savoy; and Father Ambrose T. Butler, from Ireland were among the first secular priests to come to the assistance of Bishop Miège, who was represented at the second Plenary Council of Baltimore, and went to Rome in 1853. He assisted at provincial councils in St. Louis in 1855 and 1858. The bishop soon had a parochial school wherever there was a resident priest. He built a noble cathedral at Leavenworth. Before leaving for the Œcumenical Council of the Vatican, he appointed the Very Rev. L. M. Fink, Prior of St. Benedict's, vicar-general *in spiritualibus*, and Father Michael J. Corbett, administrator *in temporalibus*. Nebraska was formed into a separate vicariate in 1857; but the jurisdiction of Bishop Miège over the new vicariate (which included the present states of Nebraska, part of the Dakotas, Wyoming, and Montana) continued until May, 1859. The increase in the Kansas Territory, which extended west to the Rocky Mountains, was steady. Desiring to return to the ranks of the Society of Jesus, Bishop Miège petitioned to be allowed to resign his episcopal jurisdiction, and in 1871 a coadjutor was given him in the Very Rev. Louis M. Fink, prior of the Benedictine monastery at Atchison, and who had as a priest worked on the missions in Pennsylvania, Kentucky, New Jersey, and Illinois. He was consecrated at Chicago 11 June, 1871, titular Bishop of Eucarpia.

Bishop Miège then went on a begging tour in aid of the vicariate and spent three years collecting in South America. His petition to be allowed to resign was granted in December, 1874, when he returned to his order, being assigned to the house of studies at Woodstock, Maryland. In 1877 he was sent to Detroit where he founded a college and remained until 1880, when he was appointed spiritual director at Woodstock for three years. Here he died 21 July, 1884.

In 1874 Bishop Fink took charge of the vicariate on the resignation of Bishop Miège; and 22 May, 1877, it was established as the Diocese of Leavenworth, and his title was transferred to this see. He was born 12 July, 1834, at Triftersberg, Bavaria, and emigrated in boyhood to the United States. He entered the Benedictine Order in September, 1852, and was ordained priest at St. Vincent's Abbey, Beatty, Pennsylvania, 27 May, 1857. When he assumed jurisdiction in 1874, there were within the boundaries of Kansas 65 priests, 88 churches, 3 colleges, 4 academies, 1 hospital, 1 orphan asylum, 13 parish schools with 1700 pupils; and communities of Benedictine, Jesuit, and Carmelite priests; of Religious of the Sacred Heart, of Sisters of St. Benedict, of Sisters of Charity, and of Sisters of Loretto; with a Catholic population of nearly 25,000. In 1887 there were in Kansas 137 priests, and 216 churches. The decrees of the second diocesan synod are admirable. The two new dioceses of Wichita and Concordia took from the diocese over 69,000 sq. miles. The parochial schools were placed under the supervision of a diocesan board that selects textbooks, and examines teachers and pupils. He fostered the Association of the Holy Childhood, the sodalities of the Blessed Virgin, and the Holy Angels; established the Confraternity of the Holy Family throughout the diocese, and acted as diocesan director of the League of the Sacred Heart. Bishop Fink took part in the Third Council of Baltimore, and sedulously endeavoured to enforce its decrees. He continued to promote the progress of the Church until his death, 17 March, 1904.

There were then 110 priests, 100 churches, 13 stations and chapels, 37 parochial schools, 4000 pupils, 35,000 Catholics. On his demise the Very Rev. Thomas Moore, who had been vicar-general since 1899, was made Apostolic administrator.

The successor of Bishop Fink was the Very Rev. Thomas F. Lillis, Vicar-General of the Diocese of Kansas City, who was born at Lexington, Missouri, in 1862, and ordained priest in 1885. He was consecrated Bishop of Leavenworth, in Kansas City, 27 December, 1904. His episcopal administration of the Leavenworth Diocese was eminently successful. The growth of the Church under his jurisdiction was marked by the foundation of new congregations, and the building of churches and parochial schools. Catholic societies were strengthened and the diocesan statutes revised to enforce the decrees of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore under present conditions. He adopted practical means of enforcing the papal "Motu Proprio", on Church music. In March, 1910, he was appointed coadjutor to the Bishop of Kansas City, Missouri, *cum jure successionis*.

Statistics.—Orders of men: Benedictines, Carmelites, Franciscans, Jesuits. Women: Sisters of St. Benedict, Sisters of Charity, Sisters of St. Frances, Sisters of the Poor of St. Francis, Sisters of St. Joseph, Oblate Sisters of Providence (coloured), Ursuline Sisters, Felician Sisters, Franciscan Sisters, Sisters of the Precious Blood. Priests, 143 (regulars, 71); churches with resident priests 76, missions with churches 46, stations 7, chapels 8, brothers 71, sisters 160; diocesan seminary 1, seminary for religious 1; colleges and academies for boys 2, students 750; academies for young ladies 3, pupils 325, parochial schools 39, pupils 5700; high schools 2; orphan asylums 2, inmates 130; young people under Catholic care, 6900; hospitals, 4; Catholic population 56,000. The Ursuline academy at Paola with 30 sisters was founded from Louisville in 1895. Mt. St. Scholastica's convent, established in 1863 subject to a prioress, has one hundred and seventy-five professed sisters with schools in the Dioceses of Concordia, Davenport, Kansas City, Sioux City, and Leavenworth with 3680 pupils. They conduct an academy at Atchison. The Sisters of Charity have a mother-house at St. Mary's Academy at Leavenworth since 1858. There are over 500 Sisters conducting establishments in the Archdiocese of Santa Fé, and in the Dioceses of Denver, Great Falls, Helena, and Leavenworth, with 8000 patients yearly in hospitals, 525 orphans, and 6000 pupils. St. Margaret's Hos-

pital, Kansas City, Kansas, in charge of Sisters of the Poor of St. Francis, has 3000 patients annually.

St. Benedict's Abbey, Atchison, founded over fifty years ago, has 1 abbot, 51 monks, 11 clerics, 13 brothers. The Benedictine Fathers conduct St. Benedict's College, a boarding school with 300 pupils. St. Mary's College, a boarding school with 450 pupils, conducted by the Jesuit Fathers, is the development of the Mission School which the Jesuits established among the Pottawatomie Indians in 1841. There are churches for the Croatians, Slovaks, Slovenians, Poles, Bohemians, and Germans, as well as for the English-speaking congregations. The majority of the Catholics in the diocese are Irish and Germans who came to America over fifty years ago, and their descendants. A goodly proportion of the clergy ordained during the past twenty-five years are natives of the state. Several of the clergy are still active, after more than a quarter of a century of pastoral duties. The Rt. Rev. Mgr Ant. Kuhls, ordained in 1863, retired to St. Margaret's Hospital after forty-five years of zealous work.

(See DUCHESNE, PHILIPPINE-ROSE; KANSAS.)

DEFOURI, *Original Diaries and Letters of Jesuit Missionaries; Catholic Directory, 1851–1910;* CLARKE, *Lives of the Deceased Bishops of the Catholic Church in the United States,* III (New York, 1888), 611 sqq.; REUSS, *Biol. Cycl. of the Catholic Hierarchy in U. S.* (Milwaukee, 1898); *Western Watchman* (St. Louis, Missouri), files.

J. A. SHORTER.

Lebanon (Assyr. *Labnânu;* Heb. *Lebanôn;* Egypt. possibly, *Ramanu;* Gr. Λίβανος), modern *Jebel Libnân,* or "White Mountain" (Semitic root *laban*), so called from the snow which covers the highest peaks during almost the entire year, or from the limestone which glistens white in the distance. The centre of the great mountain range of Central Syria, which stretches from N.N.E. to S.S.W. almost parallel with the sea for about 95 miles from 33° 20′ to 34° 40′, is separated in the south by the Qâsimiye from the Galilean hill-country; in the north, by the Nahr el-Kebîr from Jebel el-Ansarieh. It consists of two parallel mountain chains of the same formation: the western, or Lebanon proper, called Jebel el-gharbi; the eastern, known as Jebel el-sharqi (the Antilibanus of the Greeks). The primeval mass was cleft asunder towards the end of the Tertiary formation (Pliocene), forming the northern part of the Jordan fissure, which extends southward to the Red Sea.

Geologically there are four strata, which are easily distinguishable in the deeply rent ravines. The first stratum, consisting of a layer of limestone (Araya limestone), about 980 feet in thickness, is sparingly strewn with fossils (*cidaris glandaria,* corals and sponges), and belongs to the Cenoman, earliest of the Upper Jura. Above it lies a richly fossilized composite (Cephalopoda) of sandstone, from 650 to 1630 feet in thickness, and clay marl, divided by layers of chalky deposit (Trigonia or Nubian sandstone) from the Cenoman. Basaltic masses of lava appear in the sandstone. Peat, iron ore, and traces of copper are also found, and fossilized resin in the coal schists. The third layer of Lebanon limestone (about 3580 feet thick) is characterized at the base by abundant oyster beds or by hippurite limestone (Cenoman-Turon). One peculiarity is the slate of Hakel, containing fossil fishes, found also in the marly limestone of Sâhil 'Alma. In Antilibanus (the Beqâ'a), and on the outer edges of Lebanon, a fourth stratum of Senonian (not over 330 feet in thickness) appears in flinty chalk and limestone.

The highest peaks of these mountains are in the Western chain. They rise in the *Arz Libnân* to a height of more than 9800 feet, as Dahr el-Qodîb; Jebel Makmal; Dahr el-Dubab (Qarn Sauda), about 10,000 feet. Exact measurements are wanting. Towards the south the elevation is not so great: Jebel-el Muneitira, 9130; Jebel Sannin, 8500 feet. In Antilibanus the Tala' at Mûsa is 8710 feet in height; Hermon, 9300. Deposits due to glacier formations may be observed at the top, but no one has as yet reached the actual snow line. Between Lebanon and Antilibanus extends the table-land of Beqâ'a, 5 to 9 miles broad, about 70 miles long, never rising to any height, considered by many the true Cœlesyria. The plain of Lebanon (D. V. Libanus) mentioned in Jos., xi, 17, and xii, 7, is probably Merj 'Aiyun. The southern and central parts are very fertile to-day. Near Ba'albek is the watershed (about 3800 feet) between south and north, between the Nahr el-'Âṣi (Orontes) and the Nahr el-Liṭâni (not the Leontes), which latter as

THE CASTLE OF TRIPOLI
A stronghold of the Crusaders

Nahr el-Qâsimiye empties into the sea a little to the north of Tyre. The western slope of Lebanon has many springs and rivers which pierce the limestone after a partly subterranean course, e. g. the Nahr el-Kelb. From south to north we come in succession to the Nahr el-Zaherâni; Nahr el-'Awali; Nahr Dâmûr (Tamyras); Nahr Beirut (Magoras); Nahr el-Kelb (Lykus), at the mouth of which Egyptian, Assyrian, Greek, and Latin inscriptions are found; Nahr Ibrâhîm (Adonis), at whose source was Afga (Apheka), the celebrated temple of Venus with its lewd and bloody cult, destroyed by Constantine; finally the Nahr el-Joz, and Nahr Qadîsha. The eastern slope and the Antilibanus are less favoured. In the north and east of Antilibanus there is great scarcity of water. Towards the south there are a few tributaries of the Liṭâni, chiefly the celebrated Baradâ, the river of Damascus (with 'Ain Fîje), the Abana of Holy Writ (IV Kings, v, 12). Hermon feeds the three sources of the Jordan.

The vicinity of the sea causes proportionate dampness and warmth on the western side. The mountains are frequented as summer resorts on account of their agreeable climate. In the Beqâ'a the winter is apt to be sharp. During severe winters the snow descends to the most outlying spurs of the Lebanon. Along the coast, frost is unusual. In October the rainy season ushers itself in with sudden and violent showers. From December until February there are, on an average, twelve rainy days. In May rain is infrequent. The effects of the rainstorms, which are frequently of tropical violence and accompanied by thunder and lightning, are seen in the excessive erosion of the valleys. The natural bridges are also the result of erosion, for instance those of 'Âqûra and Jisr el-Ḥajar (with a span of about 130 feet; more than 65 over the Neba' el-Leben).

In the western region, where water is plentiful, the flora is abundant and of great variety. In prehistoric times the entire range as far as the coast was covered with forests. According to the Old Testament and profane literature, the Lebanon was renowned for its abundance of wood. Cedar, pine, maple, linden, and oak made the possession of the mountains lucrative. Solomon and Hiram, Egyptian and Assyrian, profited by these resources. To-day, through senseless plunder and the progress of cultivation, Lebanon has been largely robbed of its ancient splendour. Cedar is found in but few places, although all the climatic conditions for a successful growth are at hand. Large tracts are now used for cultivating plants; and olive, fig, and mulberry trees constitute the wealth of to-day. Pomegranate, peach, apricot (in Damascus and vicinity), almond trees, walnuts, quinces, and other varieties of fruit flourish. The grape ripens at an altitude of nearly 5000 feet. The cultivation of the vine has developed advantageously. Grain flourishes at an altitude of 6200 feet, but is little cultivated. A number of sweet-scented shrubs deserve mention: myrtle, oleander, sage, lavender, etc., to which fragrant plants the Old Testament attributes part of the fame of Lebanon. On the west, in general, the flora of the Mediterranean is found, and, on the heights, Alpine flora. On the eastern slope, in northern Beqâ'a and in Antilibanus, with their dry, severe climate, the flora is that of the steppes.

The prehistoric fauna was very different from that of to-day; stag, deer, bison, the wild horse, wild boar, lynx, lion, bear, and wild goat inhabited the forests. As remotely as Assyrian and Babylonian times, Lebanon was celebrated as a royal hunting-ground. To-day the number of deer is greatly diminished; bears, wolves, and panthers are rare. Hyenas, jackals, and wild boars are more frequent. The birds are not as well represented. Songsters are rare. Wild doves, rock ptarmigan, eagles, and hawks are more often found. Reptiles are fairly numerous. Serpents, often venomous, abound, and also lizards (chameleon, gecko).

Traces of human occupation are found, dating from prehistoric times. Not only from the mouth of the Qâsimiye to Tripolis, but also in the mountains and in Beqâ'a, genuine neolithic and palæolithic remains have been discovered. Broken human bones suggest the cannibalism of the aborigines. In historic times the Amorrhites appeared, whilst in the period of the Israelite kings the Phœnicians exercised dominion over the Lebanon, and Solomon had buildings erected there (III Kings, v, 6 sqq.; ix, 19). Later the Ituræans occupied Lebanon, and in Christian times the Maronites. The bloody persecutions of 1860 resulted in some improvement in the condition of part of the country, chiefly through the interference of France. The independent province of Lebanon has a Christian governor named by the sultan and approved by the Powers. Beteddîn, near Der el-Qamar, is the seat of government. The inhabitants in 1900 numbered about 400,000; the greater part are Catholic Maronites; about 8 per cent, Greek Uniats; 13 per cent, Orthodox Greeks; 12 per cent, Druzes; 4 per cent, Shiite Metawiles; 3 per cent, Sunnites. The spirit of travel has seized the Maronites, who seek profit in Egypt, the United States, or in Latin America, returning later to their mountains.

Ecclesiastically, the Maronites are subject to a patriarch who lives in the monastery of Qannobin. Numerous convents, some of them wealthy, are scattered over the hills; they maintain schools and have set up printing-presses. Higher instruction is given chiefly by European priests, but those of native birth take an active part. The American Protestant missions have long since entered into competition. For the education of the girls, native teaching sisters (Mariamettes) are employed jointly with Europeans.

In times of peace the Christian administration has obtained good results. Safety and order have been established, and a great deal has been done for commerce. The high road from Beirut to Damascus (about 70 miles) was built in 1862, and other roads later, e. g. that following the coast, that from Beirut to Jezzîn, from Jezzîn to Saida, etc. In 1895 the first railroad was opened from Beirut to Damascus (90 miles), which in Lebanon reaches an elevation of 4850 feet, and in Antilibanus 4570 feet. The branch line from Rayâq to Ḥaleb was opened in 1906. Further plans are being considered, principally for a better connexion with Beqâ'a.

THOMSON, *The Land and the Book* (London, 1886), sections on Lebanon and Damascus; BURTON AND DRAKE, *Unexplored Syria*, 2 vols. (London, 1872); PORTER, *Five Years in Damascus*, 2 vols. (London, 1855); BAEDEKER, *Palestine and Syria* (4th ed., Leipzig, 1906); POST, *Flora of Syria, Palestine, and Sinai* (Beirut, 1896); RITTER, *Erdkunde von Asien*, VIII (Berlin, 1855); FRAAS, *Drei Monate im Libanon* (Stuttgart, 1876); IDEM, *Aus dem Orient* (2nd ed., Stuttgart, 1878); DIENER, *Libanon* (Vienna, 1886); ZUMOFFEN, *La Phénicie avant les Phéniciens* (Beirut, 1900); CUINET, *Syrie, Liban et Palestine* (Paris, 1896–1902); ZUMOFFEN, *L'âge de la pierre en Phénicie* in *Anthropos*, III (1908), 431–55; BLANCKENHORN, *Abriss der Geologie Syriens, Altneuland* (Berlin, 1905); IDEM, *Ueber die Steinzeit und die Feuersteinpetrefakten in Syrien-Palastina* in *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, XXXVII (1905), 447–68.

A. MERK.

Lebbæus. See JUDE, SAINT.

Lebedus, titular see of Asia Minor, suffragan of Ephesus. It was on the coast, ninety stadia to the east of Cape Myonnesus, and 120 west of Colophon. According to Pausanius, the town was inhabited by Carians when the Ionians immigrated there under the guidance of Andræmon, a son of Codrus. Strabo, however, states it was colonized by Andropompus, and that it previously bore the name of Artis. It became a flourishing city by its commerce, and was famous for its mineral springs, but was nearly destroyed by Lysimachus, who transported the population to Ephesus. Under the Romans, however, it flourished anew, became the meeting place of the actors of all Ionia, and festivals were celebrated in honour of Dionysus. Its remains, of little interest, are seen near Hypsili Hissar, in the caza of Sivri Hissar, vilayet of Smyrna. Lebedus appears in "Notitiæ episcopatum" as an episcopal see, suffragan of Ephesus until the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Three bishops only are known: Cyriacus, who witnessed the Robber Council of Ephesus, 449; Julian, represented by his metropolitan at Chalcedon in 451; Theophanes or Thomas, who attended the Council of Nicæa, 787.

LEQUIEN, *Oriens Christianus*, I, 725; CHANDLER, *Asia Minor*, 125; SMITH, *Dict. Greek and Roman Geog.*, s. v.

S. PÉTRIDÈS.

Le Blant, EDMOND-FREDERIC, French archæologist and historian, b. 12 August, 1818; d. 5 July, 1897 at Paris. He studied law and having qualified to practice, he obtained in 1843 a situation in the customs under the Finance Board. This position assured his future and he was free to follow his scientific inclinations. During a voyage through Italy (1847) he visited the Kircher Museum, and his intercourse with G. B. de Rossi determined him to undertake in France the scientific work which the founder of Christian archæology had undertaken in Rome. As early as 1848 Le Blant was commissioned to collect the inscriptions of the earliest days of Christianity in Gaul, and like de Rossi, he made an investigation of manuscripts, printed books, museums, churches, and the Gallo-Roman cemeteries. In 1856 appeared the first volume of his "Recueil des inscriptions chrétiennes des Gaules antérieures au VIII^e siècle". The second volume of the work (Paris, 1865) obtained for its author his election as a member of the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres. A third volume appeared in 1892 under the title of "Nouveau Recueil". In the course of his researches Le Blant did not over-

look any questions raised by his documents. He wrote learned articles on the method of Christian epigraphy, on Christian art, on the origin, progress, popular beliefs, and moral influence of Christianity in ancient Gaul. When he resigned his post as sub-commissioner of the customs (1872) he continued to devote himself to his favourite studies.

He tried to gather into one "Corpus" the Christian sarcophagi of which so many have been preserved in the south of France. In 1878 he published in Paris his "Etudes sur les sarcophages chrétiens de la ville d'Arles", which was followed by a second work "Etudes sur les sarcophages chrétiens de la Gaule" (Paris, 1886). In the introduction he treats of the form, ornamentation, and iconography of these monuments; he dwells upon the relationship between the sarcophagi of Arles and those of Rome, and the difference between them and those of the south-west of France, in which he finds more distinct signs of local influence. His studies and his personal tastes led him to take an interest also in the history of the persecutions and the martyrs. In numerous writings he treats in particular of the judicial bases of the persecutions and the critical value of the Acts of the Martyrs. These studies were crowned by his fine work "Persécuteurs et Martyrs" (Paris, 1893), in which he displays his scientific knowledge of history and his deep Christian convictions. In 1883, Le Blant became director of the Ecole Française at Rome. As such, his name figures honourably between that of Geffroy and of Mgr Duchesne. In addition to his works mentioned above we may mention his collaboration with Jacquemart in "Histoire artistique, industrielle et commerciale de la porcelaine" (Paris, 1862); "Manuel d'épigraphie chrétienne" (Paris, 1869); "Les Actes des martyrs, Supplément aux 'Acta sincera' de Dom Ruinart" (Paris, 1882).

WALLON, *Notice sur la vie et les travaux de E. Fr. Le Blant* in *Compte rendu Acad. Inscr. et Belles-Lettres*, I (Paris, 1900), 609–44; HAUVETTE, *Notice nécrologique sur Edmond Le Blant* in *Bull. Soc. Antiquaires de France* (1899), 59–77; PROU, *Bibliographie des œuvres d'Edmond Le Blant, ibid.*, 79–123.

R. MAERE.

Lebrun, CHARLES, French historical painter, b. in Paris, 1619; d. at the Gobelin tapestry works, 1690. This great designer, whose fertility was so wonderful, received his first instruction in art from his father, and at the age of eleven was placed in the studio of Vouet. There he attracted the notice of Poussin, and in 1642 accompanied him to Italy, remaining there four years. On his return, he was for a while at Lyons, and then settled down in Paris. His skill soon brought him before the notice of the eminent personages of his day, and he received an important commission from Fouquet, and painted a large picture for Queen Anne of Austria, who in return gave him her portrait set in diamonds. Cardinal Mazarin introduced him to Louis XIV, and he speedily became a very popular person at court, and held almost unlimited sway over all artistic matters after the death of Le Sueur. He was intimately concerned in 1648 in the foundation of the Academy, and when the king, under the advice of Colbert, founded the Gobelin tapestry works in 1662, Lebrun was appointed director, and was styled "a person skilful and intelligent in the art of painting, to make designs for tapestry, sculpture, and other works, to see that they were correctly rendered, and to direct and overlook all the workmen employed". Lebrun was responsible for designing almost all the important cartoons for the early work of the Gobelin factory, but beyond that, he was responsible for decoration and for statues at Versailles, for a long series of allegorical paintings, and for decoration work at Sceaux, Versailles, and Marly. When Colbert died in 1683, Lebrun lost his great patron, and during the last few years of his life, he withdrew from court, and fell into a condition of melancholy which continued until the time of his death. He was a great scenic artist, inspired by grand ideas, a man of unceasing energy, with a fine colour sense, and good knowledge of decoration, but his work was somewhat heavy, and the influence he exercised over French art was not wholly to its advantage. In designing tapestry, his art was well employed, and he will be remembered more for his splendid designs for the Gobelin work than for his own paintings.

LACORDAIRE, *Notice historique sur les Manufactures impériales de Tapisseries des Gobelins et de Tapis de la Savonnerie* (Paris, 1853, 1873); COLE, *Tapestry and Embroidery* (London, 1888); THOMSON, *History of Tapestry* (London, 1906); BONNAFFE, *Fouquet* (Paris, 1882); MONTAULT, *Tapestries preserved by Rome* (Arras, 1879); DUBOS, *Beauvais Tapestry* (Beauvais, 1834).

GEORGE CHARLES WILLIAMSON.

Lebwin (LEBUINUS or LIAFWIN), SAINT, Apostle of the Frisians and patron of Deventer, b. in England of Anglo-Saxon parents at an unknown date; d. at Deventer, Holland, about 770. Educated in a monastery and fired by the example of St. Boniface, St. Willibrord, and other great English missionaries, Lebwin resolved to devote his life to the conversion of the Germans. After his ordination he proceeded to Utrecht, and was gladly welcomed by Gregory, third bishop of that place, who entrusted him with the mission of Overyssel on the borders of Westphalia, and gave him as a companion Marchelm (Marcellinus), a disciple of St. Willibrord. Hospitably received by a widow named Abachilda (Avaerhilt), he fearlessly preached the Gospel among the wild tribes of the district, and erected a little chapel at Wulpe (Wilpa) on the west bank of the Yssel. As the venerable personality and deep learning of the missionary quickly won numbers, even of the nobles, to the Faith, it soon became necessary to build at Deventer on the east bank of the river a larger church, after which a residence for Lebwin was also erected. This state of undisturbed development of his little fold was not, however, to continue. Lebwin's wonderful success excited great hostility among the pagans; ascribing his conversions to witchcraft, they formed an alliance with the predatory and anti-Christian Saxons, burned the church at Deventer, and dispersed the flock. Having with difficulty managed to escape, Lebwin determined to voice the claims of Christianity at the national assembly of the Saxons. To this the three estates of each *gau* sent twelve men as representatives, and with it the decision of all important matters rested. Setting out for Marclo near the Weser in Saxony, where the assembly was held, Lebwin was hospitably entertained by a noble named Folchert (Folkbert), apparently a Christian, who vainly strove to dissuade him from his purpose. Clad in priestly vestments and bearing the crucifix in one hand and the Gospels in the other, Lebwin appeared in the midst of the assembled Saxons, while they were engaged with their sacrifices to their false deities. Having boldly proclaimed the One True God, the Creator of all, he warned them that, if they obstinately adhered to their idolatry, "a bold, skilful, and mighty king would advance upon them like a raging torrent, destroy everything with fire and sword, bring want and banishment into their territories, send their wives and children into slavery, and make the remainder submit to the yoke of his domination." Enraged at these words, the Saxons demanded that this enemy of their religion and land should expiate his reckless offence by death, and they prepared to slay him with stakes torn from the thickets and sharpened, but he made his escape. An old nobleman, Buto, reminded the assembly that, while ambassadors from the Normans, Slavs, and Frisians had been always honourably received and dismissed in peace, they were now insulting and threatening with death the ambassador of the Highest God, of whose mightiness the present wonderful deliverance of His

servant from instant death was sufficient evidence. Convinced by this speech, the Saxons promised henceforth to respect the rights of Christianity. On his return to Friesland, Lebwin rebuilt the church at Deventer, and found there his last resting-place. That he died before 776 is certain, since in that year the Saxons made a fresh inroad into the district and burnt the church, but, in spite of the most careful search for three days, were unable to discover the saint's body. St. Ludger (q. v.) rebuilt the church a few years later, and found the saint's remains. Lebwin is commemorated by the Church on 12 November.

The principal sources for Lebwin's biography are: HUCBALD (918–76), *Vita s. Lebuini* in SURIUS, *Vitæ SS.*, VI, 277–86, and in abbreviated form in *Mon. Germ. SS.*, II, 360–4; tr. in CRESSY, *Church History of Brittany*, XXIV, vii; RADBOD, *Ecloga et Sermo* (on Lebwin) in SURIUS, VI, 839; ALTFRID, *Vita Liutgeri* in *Mon. Germ. SS.*, II, 360 sqq. For further bibliography see GAMMACK in *Dict. Christ. Biog.*, s. v. *Lebuinus*.

THOMAS KENNEDY.

Le Camus, EMILE-PAUL-CONSTANT-ANGE, preacher, theologian, scripturist, Bishop of La Rochelle and Saintes, b. at Paraza, France, 24 August, 1839; d. at Malvisade, near Castelnaudary, France, 28 September, 1906. He made his preparatory studies at Carcassonne, and then entered the theological seminary of St-Sulpice at Paris. In 1861 he went to Rome, where he received his doctorate in theology, and in the following year, 20 December, 1862, he was ordained priest at Carcassonne, France. He at once revealed remarkable oratorical powers, and in 1867 he was invited to preach the Lenten sermons at Avignon, for which he was made honorary canon. This same honour was again conferred upon him somewhat later by Mgr Las Cazes, Bishop of Constantine (Algeria), who also chose Le Camus as his theologian at the Vatican Council. In 1875 Le Camus was appointed assistant director of the Dominican school at Sorez, France, but soon after he became head of the new school of St. Francis de Sales, which he established at Castelnaudary. Here he laboured until 1887, when he resigned his position as director in order to devote himself exclusively to the study of the New Testament. To equip himself properly for this study, and especially to study the topography of the Holy Land, he made his first journey to the East in the following year (1888). This was followed by several other visits, and the results of his travels and studies were published at various times. While pursuing his Scriptural studies, Le Camus also found time to preach several ecclesiastical retreats at Lyons, Montpellier, Paris, and Rome. In 1897 he was elected theological canon of Carcassonne, and on 6 April, 1901, he received his appointment as Bishop of La Rochelle and Saintes. He was consecrated at Carcassonne, 2 July, 1901, by Cardinal Lecot. Even as bishop, Le Camus continued his work on the New Testament, and also published several letters and pamphlets on ecclesiastical topics.

His more important works are: "La Vie de Notre-Seigneur Jésus-Christ", 3 vols., 6th ed., 1901 (translated into English, German, and Italian); "Voyages aux Sept Eglises de l'Apocalypse"; "Notre Voyage aux Pays Bibliques", 3 vols., 1889–90; "L'Œuvre des Apôtres", 3 vols., 1905; "Les Enfants de Nazareth"; "Vraie et Fausse Exégèse"; "Lettre sur la Formation Ecclésiastique des Séminaristes"; "Lettre réglant la réorganization des études ecclésiastiques"; "Mémoire addressé à MM. les députés membres de la Commission des Congrégations".

Bulletin Trimestriel des Anciens Elèves de St-Sulpice, n. xliii (15 Nov., 1906), 450–54; *New York Review*, II, n. iii, 496; II, vi, 773–80.

F. X. E. ALBERT.

Le Camus, ETIENNE, French cardinal, b. at Paris, 1632; d. at Grenoble, 1707. Through the influence of his father, Nicolas le Camus, a state councillor, he was when still very young attached to the court as almoner of the king, and enjoyed the friendship of Bossuet. The Sorbonne made him doctor of theology at the age of eighteen. The fact of his consorting with such men as Benserade, Vivonne, and Bussy drew upon him the severity of Mazarin, and he was for a while exiled to Meaux. Recalled through the influence of Colbert, he retired in 1665 to La Trappe with de Rancé, and passed from his former levity to an asceticism that led him to Port-Royal. The publication of his letters by Ingold shows that Jansenism was with Le Camus more a matter of personal sympathy and spiritual discipline than of doctrinal tenets. Made against his will Bishop of Grenoble in 1671, he proved himself zealous almost to excess in reforming abuses in his diocese. In the affair of the "régale" he acted as intermediary between Rome and Versailles, and showed creditable courage before the omnipotent Louis XIV. Innocent XI, having made him cardinal instead of Harlay, presented by the king, he was not allowed till 1689 to go to Rome to receive the insignia of his dignity. Le Camus founded in the Diocese of Grenoble two seminaries and several charitable institutions. Besides a "Recueil d'ordonnances synodales" we have from him the "Défense de la Virginité perpétuelle de la Mère de Dieu" (Paris, 1680), and numerous letters published by Ingold.

BELLET, *Histoire du Cardinal Le Camus* (Paris, 1886); SAINTE-BEUVE, *Port-Royal*, IV (Paris, 1901), 528; ST-SIMON, *Mémoires* (ed. HACHETTE), IV, 59, to be corrected by LALOUETTE, *Abrégé de la vie de M. le Cardinal Le Camus* (Paris, 1720); INGOLD, *Lettres du Card. Le Camus* in *Bulletin de l'Académie Delphinoise*, 2nd series, I.

J. F. SOLLIER.

Le Caron, JOSEPH, one of the four pioneer missionaries of Canada and first missionary to the Hurons (q. v.), b. near Paris in 1586; d. in France, 29 March, 1632. He embraced the ecclesiastical state and was chaplain to the Duke of Orléans. When that prince died, Le Caron joined the Recollects and made his profession in 1611. On 24 April, 1615, he sailed from Honfleur, reached Canada on 25 May, and immediately went to Sault St. Louis. After a short time he travelled to Quebec, provided himself with a portable altar service, returned to the Sault, and went into the land of the Hurons, being the first to visit their settlements and preach the Gospel. He stayed with them about a year, and was again among them in 1623. In 1616 he returned to France to look after the spiritual and material interests of the colony. The following spring saw him in Canada again, as provincial commissary. During the winters of 1618 and 1622 he evangelized the Montagnais of Tadousac. In 1625 he was once more in France, returned to Canada a year later, was elected superior of his order at Quebec, and filled this office until the capture of Quebec by the English in 1629, when he and his colleagues were sent back to France by the conquerors.

Le Caron was a saintly man, given to the practice of austerities, but gentle towards others. He died of the plague in the convent of Ste-Marguerite in France. We owe to him the first dictionary of the Huron language. The "Bibliotheca Universa Franciscana" of Jean de S. Antoine, II (Madrid, 1732), 243, says on the evidence of Arturus in his "Martyrologium Franciscanum" under date of 31 August, that Le Caron wrote also "Quærimonia Novæ Franciæ" (Complaint of New France).

Histoire chronol. de la province de St-Denis (Bibl. Nat., Paris); *Mortuologe des Récollets de la province de St-Denis* (late seventeenth-century MS., in the archives of Quebec seminary); CHAMPLAIN, *Œuvres*, ed. LAVERDIÈRE (6 vols., Quebec, 1870); SAGARD, *Histoire du Canada*, ed. TROSS (4 vols., Paris, 1866); LECLERCQ, *Premier Etablissement de la Foi dans la Nouvelle France* (2 vols., Paris, 1691).

ODORIC-M. JOUVE.

Lecce, DIOCESE OF (LICIENSIS), suffragan of Otranto. Lecce, the capital of a province in Terra d'Otranto in Apulia, seven and a half miles from the sea, is an industrial and commercial city (tobacco, grain, wine, oil, woven goods). Marble quarries are

in the vicinity. Extensive ruins of megalithic structures in its territory prove that it was inhabited at a very remote period. It was known to the ancients as Lupiæ, and then had a port, enlarged by Hadrian and Marcus Aurelius. Near Lecce is the village of Rugge, the ancient Rudiæ, birthplace of Ennius. In the time of the Normans, Lecce became the seat of a countship, some of its counts being famous, notably Tancred (d. 1194), who contested with Henry VI the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies, and Gautier de Brienne, cousin of Tancred. Under Charles V, to whom a triumphal arch was erected in the city, Lecce received new life, and the features of that epoch are retained to this day. For this reason Lecce is one of those cities that have preserved a characteristic and uniform style of architecture. Of the more ancient buildings there remains only the church of SS. Nicola and Cataldo, outside the city, in Romanesque style (1180). The cathedral of S. Oronzio (first built in 1114 by Goffredo d'Altavilla), in its present form, and the church of S. Domenico are of the seventeenth century, S. Croce of the sixteenth—all in baroque style. The cathedral tower is about 240 feet high, and serves yet as a lighthouse for ships plying between Otranto and Brindisi. Until the beginning of the nineteenth century there was a signal on its summit to give warning of pirate ships. The Palazzo della Intendenza, once the abbey of the Celestines, is noteworthy. Mention must also be made of the manufacture of tobacco in the ancient Dominican convent. The historian Scipione Ammirati and the painter Matteo da Lecce (sixteenth century) were natives of Lecce. The Christian religion, it is said, was first introduced by St. Orontius, a Pythagorean philosopher converted by St. Paul. St. Leucius is also venerated as bishop and martyr. But a bishop of Lecce is first mentioned in 1057, in the person of Teodoro Bonsecolo. Other bishops of note were Roberto Vultorico (1214), who restored the cathedral; Tommaso Ammirati (1429); Ugolino Martelli (1511), a linguist; Giambattista Castromediani (1544), who founded the hospital and other institutions for children and the poor; Luigi Pappacoda (1639), who rebuilt the cathedral, which contains his statue in marble; Antonio Pignatelli (1672), later Innocent XII, who founded the seminary of Lecce.

The diocese has 32 parishes with 100,000 souls, 8 religious houses of men and 16 of women, 10 schools for boys, and 6 for girls.

De Simone, *Lecce e i suoi dintorni* (Lecce, 1874); Cappelletti, *Le Chiese d'Italia*, XXI.

U. Benigni.

Leclerc du Tremblay, François, a Capuchin, better known as Père Joseph, b. in Paris, 4 Nov., 1577; d. at Rueil, 18 Dec., 1638. Owing to the influence of his kinsman the Constable de Montmorency, he appeared at court at the age of eighteen with the title of Baron de Maffliers, and served in the armies of Henry IV against Spain. On 2 Feb., 1599 he became a Capuchin novice. He was provincial of the Capuchins of Touraine in Sept., 1613, and took part in 1616 in the negotiations of Loudun between Marie de Medicis and the malcontents led by the Prince de Condé. To the future Cardinal de Richelieu he furnished the opportunity of a conference with Condé, the first service rendered by Richelieu to Marie de Medicis and to the State. In this way Père Joseph appears at the opening of Richelieu's political career. The rôle of Père Joseph has recently been studied anew by Abbé Dedouvres and M. Fagniez. Their researches prove that Père Joseph remained true to the medieval idea of Christendom. He had visions of a crusade that would combine all Europe, and the purpose of his visit to Rome in 1616 was to discuss with Paul V the schemes of the Duke of Nevers, who was planning to unite against the Turks the Maniots of Morea and the Slav populations of the Balkans, and with this enterprise in view, founded (1617) the Order of the Christian Militia. Père Joseph even wrote an epic poem on this subject, "La Turciade." But the conflict between the Habsburgs and the Bourbons, as well as the new prospects of the Mantuan succession open to Charles de Nevers caused the crusade scheme to fail. Père Joseph then became Richelieu's confidential political agent, hoping that, with the Bourbons victorious, and peace established in Europe, it would finally be possible to march against the Turks. His scheme was to weaken both the Protestants and the House of Austria, both of whom he considered enemies of the peace of Europe. He wished France to use the Protestants to weaken the House of Austria, and the House of Austria to weaken the Protestants.

Richelieu sent him to Rome in 1625, to negotiate regarding the rival claims of the Grisons and Spain in Valtellina. In 1630 he was sent to the Diet of Ratisbon to give quiet support to the opposition of the German princes to the claims of Emperor Ferdinand, and to strengthen the bonds of alliance between France and the Elector Maximilian of Bavaria, head of the Catholic League. On the morrow of the Diet of Ratisbon, Germany was divided between a powerless emperor and two parties, one Catholic, the other Protestant, both equally hostile to the empire. Père Joseph laboured to obtain the neutrality of the Duke of Bavaria and of the Catholic League in view of the invasion of Gustavus Adolphus, protector of the Protestants; he even had hopes of forming an alliance between Maximilian and Gustavus Adolphus. After the death of Gustavus Adolphus war became inevitable between France and the Habsburgs, and it broke out in 1635. Henceforth instead of pressing on Richelieu his own broad political views, Père Joseph was content to support the makeshift policy imposed by circumstances on the cardinal. The desire for territorial expansion, which at that time governed French policy, was Richelieu's rather than Père Joseph's. The latter however, eagerly followed the progress of the French troops and, in the cardinal's name, kept up an active correspondence with the generals and ministers. Tradition represents the cardinal as bending over his dying friend and saying to him: "Père Joseph, Brisach is ours". As a matter of fact the taking of Brisach, which occurred on 17 Dec., 1638, could not have been known in Paris on the next morning, the date of the death of Père Joseph; but the tradition such as it is, symbolizes the close bond which patriotism created between these two men.

While the religious idea of a crusade inspired the secular policy of Père Joseph, intense sacerdotal and Apostolic zeal characterized him amid all his political preoccupations. At his suggestion d'Orléans-Longueville reformed the Benedictine Order at Fontevrault and founded the congregation of Our Lady of Calvary, for whose nuns he wrote many books of piety. He opposed, even more openly than Richelieu, Richer's Gallican doctrines. Père Joseph also founded Capuchin missions for the conversion of Protestants, in Poitou, Dauphiné, the Cevennes, Languedoc, Provence, and later in the East. The sending of Père Pacifique to Constantinople in 1624, with the title of "Prefect of Eastern Missions" was the beginning of vast spiritual conquests by the Capuchins in the Archipelago, the Greek peninsula, and Asia Minor. From Paris Père Joseph directed this work, and in 1633 there were ten Eastern missions. It was he also who, in 1633, sent Père Agathange of Vendôme to found a mission in Egypt; this same father in 1637 attempted but in vain to establish a mission in Abyssinia; finally Père Joseph tried, but unsuccessfully, to establish a mission of French Capuchins in Morocco.

Fagniez, *Le P. Joseph et Richelieu* (2 vols., Paris, 1894); Dedouvres, *Le P. Joseph polémiste, ses premiers écrits, 1623–1626* (Paris, 1895); Dedouvres, *Un précurseur de la B. Marguerite Marie. Le Père Joseph et le Sacré Cœur* (Angers, 1899).

Georges Goyau.

Leclercq, CHRESTIEN, a Franciscan Récollet and one of the most zealous missionaries to the Micmac of Canada, also a distinguished historiographer of Nouvelle France. A Fleming by birth, he joined the province of the Récollets of St. Antoine, in Artois, and went to Canada in 1675; on 11 October of that year he was put in charge of the Micmac mission by Mgr de Laval. He learned the language of that tribe and devoted himself to its evangelization. His superiors sent him to France in 1680 on business connected with the Franciscan missions in Canada; he returned in the following spring with letters authorizing the foundation of a convent in Montreal, whither he went during the summer of 1681 to carry out this work. In the month of November he went back to the Micmac mission, where he passed in all twelve years of his life. In autumn, 1686 he returned finally to France, where he filled various positions of authority in the Artois province of his order. The date of his death, like that of his birth, is unknown, but he was still living in 1698. After his return to France, he completed two works which he published at Paris in 1691. They are: (1) "Premier établissement de la foy dans la Nouvelle-France", 2 vols. in 12mo. The first volume contains fourteen unnumbered leaves and 559 pages; the second 458 pages. This work is now very rare and commands a high price. It may be divided into three parts. The first contains the early history of Nouvelle-France, the introduction of Catholicism into that country, and describes the labours of the first missionaries in Canada, the Récollets. This part ends at the year 1629 on the taking of Quebec by the English. The second part, from 1632 till 1670 inclusive, continues the history of the colony, relates the spreading of the Faith among the native tribes through the devoted labours of the Jesuit Fathers, and tells of the return of the Récollets to Canada and their new foundation of the convent of Notre-Dame des Anges at Quebec. The third part gives one of the best accounts, and in certain matters the only account of the travels and discoveries of de La Salle, and ends with the victory of the French over the English at the siege of Quebec in 1690. The work has been criticized, Charlevoix complaining that Leclercq treats only of the religious affairs in which the Récollets took part, and even ascribing to Frontenac a share in the authorship of the work; but the authenticity of the documents on which the author relied for his information has never been impugned; and it remains an important source for the history of Canada and of the Catholic Church in North America. An English translation by John Gilmary Shea, was published at New York in 1881, containing an account of the author, portraits, map, views, and facsimile.

(2) "Nouvelle relation de la Gaspésie", 1 vol. in 12mo, also published at Paris, in 1691, by Auroy, contains four unnumbered leaves and 572 pages. This book describes the scenes of the Apostolic labours of the zealous author from 1675 till 1686. It relates the missionary efforts of Leclercq and some other Récollets around the Gulf of St. Lawrence, the Baie des Chaleurs, and in New Brunswick. But the author describes in particular the life, customs, and beliefs of the savages (called by him by the general name of Gaspesians) who then inhabited these regions. It is an important work, though of mere local interest. From it we learn that Leclercq invented a system of writing by which he taught the Micmac Indians to read their own language. Very probably these hieroglyphics have been preserved, and are to be found in the Micmac writings which still exist. It has been translated into English by W. F. Ganong, with an account of the author and illustrations (1 vol., Edinburgh, 1910).

Archives of the Archbishopric of Quebec; LECLERCQ, *Premier établissement de la foy dans la Nouvelle-France* (Paris, 1691); IDEM, *Nouvelle relation de la Gaspésie* (Paris, 1691); HENNEPIN, *Nouveau voyage, etc.* (Utrecht, 1698); REVEILLAUD, *Histoire chronologique de la Nouvelle-France* (Paris, 1888).

ODORIC-M. JOUVE.

Lecoy de La Marche (RICHARD-ALBERT), French historian; b. at Nemours, 1839; d. at Paris, 1897. He left the Ecole des Chartes in 1861, and was appointed archivist of the Department of Haute Savoie. In 1864 he went to Paris as archivist in the historical section of the Archives Nationales; he was also, for many years, professor of French history at the Catholic Institute in Paris. Lecoy de La Marche was gifted with rare qualities as a writer and scholar, and what is still more remarkable, he never separated the research for and the diffusion of historical truth from the defence and propagation of religious truth. His masterpiece is his "Chaire française au moyen âge" (Paris, 1868), which was awarded a prize by the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres. It has served as a model for many books on this subject, but has remained to this day the standard work of its kind. It consists of three parts: "Les prédicateurs; les sermons; la société d'après les sermons". Part I begins with a summary of the history of preaching in the primitive Church, and in France previous to the eleventh century, and then gives an exhaustive history of the French preachers in the following centuries, especially the thirteenth. Part II deals with the audiences, the time and the place of preaching, and the various kinds of sermons. Part III, which is perhaps the most remarkable section of the book, is a study of French society in the Middle Ages as it appears in the light of the sermons. Kings, lords, bishops, priests, monks, burgesses, peasants, men and women, pass before our eyes, with their characteristic traits and weaknesses. Lecoy de La Marche also published: "L'académie de France à Rome" (1874); "Le roi René, sa vie, son administration" (1875); "Anecdotes historiques, etc." (1876); "La Société au XIII^{e} siècle" (1880); "Saint Martin" (1881); "Les manuscrits et la miniature" (1884); "Relations politiques de la France et du royaume de Majorque" (1892), etc.

Revue des questions historiques (Paris, 1897).

PIERRE MARIQUE.

Le Coz, CLAUDE, French bishop, b. at Plouévez-Parzay (Finistère), 1740; d. at Villevieux (Jura), 1815. Pupil, then professor, and finally principal of the Collège de Quimper, he took the constitutional oath in 1791, was elected schismatic Bishop of Ille-et-Vilaine, and wrote in defence of his election—declared null and void by the pope—"Accord des vrais principes de la morale et de la raison sur la Constitution civile du clergé". Elected to the Legislative Assembly he showed courage and ability in defending against the majority Catholic colleges, the ecclesiastical costume, and even Christian marriage. His moderation drew upon him the severity of the Convention, and he spent fourteen months in the prison of Mont-Saint-Michel. Later, under the Directory, the vigour with which he opposed the substitution of the *decadi* for the Christian Sunday came near causing his deportation. Under the Concordat, Le Coz was one of the Constitutional bishops whom the force of circumstances compelled the Holy See to recognize, and he became Archbishop of Besançon. There is a doubt as to the nature of his retractation: Bernier, the ecclesiastical diplomat who negotiated the rehabilitation of the jurors, thought it best, in order to avoid delay, not to make a clear mention of the manner of retractation required by Pius VII; as a consequence, Le Coz denied ever having retracted, and the awkwardness of the situation was ended only by a personal interview between Le Coz and Pius VII, in which both were seen weeping but of which neither ever spoke. As schismatic Bishop of Ille-et-Vilaine, Le Coz failed in his endeavour to organize the new province of which he was the metropolitan; otherwise he proved a zealous administrator and even a charitable pastor. As Archbishop of Besançon he displayed some good qualities, but his sad antecedents, the doubt hanging over his conversion, and the presence

in his archiepiscopal palace of too many ex-juror priests, detracted considerably from the effectiveness of his ministry. The strange mixture of truth and error, of good and evil in Le Coz's life, is partly explained by his intensely Gallican education, which caused him to adopt with apparent sincerity and to maintain with unconquerable obstinacy the most schismatic views. His Gallicanism, which made him so haughty toward the pope, found him almost cringing before the various political regimes which succeeded one another during his episcopate. In an age full of confusion, we should give some credit to Le Coz for sometimes having, even against the all-powerful Abbé Grégoire, defended the cause of religion in the "Annales de la Religion", in which he was an assiduous collaborator, and in his "Correspondance", part of which has been published by his biographer.

ROUSSEL, *Le Coz, évêque d'Ille-et-Vilaine* (Paris, s. d.); IDEM, *Correspondance de Le Coz* (Paris, 1900); PISANI, *Le Coz* in *Répertoire biographique de l'Episcopat Constitutionnel* (Paris, 1907).

J. F. SOLLIER.

Lectern (LECTURN, LETTURN, LETTERN, from *legere*, to read), support for a book, reading-desk, or bookstand, a solid and permanent structure upon which the Sacred Books, which were generally large and heavy, were placed when used by the ministers of the altar in liturgical functions. In early days only one such structure was employed; later, two were erected, one at the northern wall of the choir, and another on the opposite side. From the former the sermon was delivered by the priest, and also by the bishop, unless he spoke from his *cathedra;* here decrees of synods were promulgated, censures and excommunications pronounced, the diptychs read, the Gospel chanted by the deacon, and all those parts of the liturgy were sung which belonged to the deacon's office. The other, somewhat longer but not so high, was divided into two compartments or stories—the higher, facing the altar, was used by the subdeacon when reading the Epistle; in the other, facing the nave, the other lessons were read. A third lectern was used in some churches for the sermon. Some of these were built of marble, others of wood, highly adorned with silver and gold, enamelled, and set with precious stones, covered with bronze plates and carvings in ivory. Besides those mentioned under AMBO, we find among the treasures of the Abbey of Saint-Riquier "lectoria tria ex marmore, argento et auro fabricata" (P. L., CLXXIV, 1257). One in the court of the church of St. Pantalæmon in Thessalonica is held to be the oldest. On its lower part is found in relief the Madonna and Child, seated on a throne and surrounded by shepherds and the three Magi, and on the superstructure are symbolic representations. The upper part of the lectern in S. Apollinare Nuovo at Ravenna is old and fairly complete. Another, well preserved and richly decorated, a donation of Henry II, is at Aachen. Movable lecterns were also made of wood, bronze, or polished brass. A bronze lectern inlaid with ivory, made about the middle of the twelfth century by Suger, Abbot of St. Denis, was in the shape of an eagle whose outspread wings held the book. Eagle-shaped lecterns were also numerous in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries in England. Samples, but not going back later than the fifteenth century, are found at Aachen, Düsseldorf, St. Severin's at Cologne, etc. A lectern of neatly wrought iron, in the shape of an X, which can be folded, is in the Musée Cluny at Paris. The Carthusians of Dijon had a lectern which was a large column of copper, in renaissance style, supporting a phœnix surrounded by the four animals of the Prophet Ezechiel. In some the figure of a deacon holds the book.

The Synods of Münster (1279), Liège (1287), and Cambrai (1300) prescribed that the Missal, enveloped in a linen cloth, should be laid on the altar. Towards the end of the thirteenth century a cushion came into use. The oldest notice of a stand for the Missal is found in an inventory of the cathedral of Angers of the year 1297 (Zeitschrift für christliche Kunst, X, 175). All such lecterns were covered on festivals with rich cloths of silver and gold. At the present day lecterns are in use as Missal-stands and for the reading of the prophecies on Holy Saturday and Pentecost Saturday, for the chanting of the Passion, the singing of the "Exultet", and the reading of the lessons in choirs.

DUCHESNE, *Christian Worship* (London, 1904), 114, 169, 353; ROCK, *Church of our Fathers*, I (London, 1903), 106; KRAUS, *Geschichte der christlichen Kunst*, II (Freiburg im Br., 1897), 482; BINTERIM, *Denkwürdigkeiten*, IV, i, 70

FRANCIS MERSHMAN.

Lectionary (*Lectionarium* or *Legenda*), is a term of somewhat vague significance, used with a good deal of latitude by liturgical writers. It must be remembered that in the early Middle Ages neither the Liturgy of the Mass, nor the Divine Office recited by monks and other ecclesiastics in choir, were to be found, as in the Missal and the Breviary of the present day, complete in one volume. Both for the Mass and for the Office a variety of books were used, for it was obviously a matter of convenience when books were both bulky and costly to produce, that the prayers, e. g. which the priest had to say at the altar, should be contained in a different volume from the antiphons to be sung by the choir. The word *lectionary*, then, in its wider sense, is a term which may be correctly applied to any liturgical volume containing passages to be read aloud in the services of the Church. In this larger signification it would include all Scriptural books written continuously, in which readings were marked, such as the "Evangeliaria" (also often known as "Textus"), as well as books, known also as "Plenaria", containing both Epistles and Gospels combined, such as are commonly employed in a high Mass at the present day, and also those collections, either of extracts from the Fathers or of historical narrations about the martyrs and other saints, which were read aloud as lessons in the Divine Office. This wider signification is, however, perhaps the less usual, and in practice the term lectionary is more commonly used to denote one of two things: (1) the book containing the collection of Scriptural readings which are chanted by the deacon, subdeacon, or a lector during Mass; (2) any book from which the readings were taken which are read aloud in the Office of Matins, after each nocturn or group of psalms. With regard to these last the practice seems to have varied greatly. Sometimes collections were made containing just the extracts to be used in choir, such as we find them in a modern Breviary. Sometimes a large volume of patristic homilies (known also as *sermonarium*) or historical matter was employed, in which certain passages were marked to be used as lessons. This last custom seems more particularly to have obtained with regard to the short biographical accounts of martyrs and other saints, which in our modern Breviary form the lessons of the second nocturn. In this connexion the word *legenda* in particular is of common occurrence. The Bollandist Poncelet is, consequently, inclined to draw a distinction between the "Legenda" and the 'Lectionarium" (see Analecta Bollandiana, XXIX, 13). The "Legenda", also called "Passionarium", is a collection of narratives of variable length, in which are recounted the life, martyrdom, translation, or miracles of the saints. This usually forms a large volume, and the order of the pieces in the collection is commonly, though not necessarily, that of the calendar. A few such "Legendæ" come down from quite the early Middle Ages, but the vast majority of those now preserved in our libraries belong to the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries. The earliest is the "Codex Velseri", MS. Lat. 3514, of the Royal Library at Munich, written probably before the year 700. When these books

were used in choir during Office the reader either read certain definitely marked passages, indicated by markings of which our existing manuscripts constantly show traces, or, in the earlier periods especially, he read on until the abbot or priest who presided gave him the signal to stop. After the thirteenth century however, this type of book was much more rarely transcribed. It was replaced by what may conveniently be called for distinction's sake the "Lectionarium" *par excellence*, a book which consisted not of entire narratives, but only of extracts arranged according to feasts, and made expressly to be read in the Office. It may be added that about the same period the still more comprehensive liturgical book, known to us so familiarly as the Breviary (q. v.) also began to make its appearance. In the early centuries the Scriptural passages to be read at Mass, whether taken from the Gospels, the Epistles, or the Old Testament, were very commonly included in one book, often called a "Comes" or "Liber Comicus". But no constant or uniform practice was followed, for sometimes the Epistles and Lessons were read from a continuous text equipped with rubrics indicating the different days for which the passages were intended—this is the case with the famous "Epistolarium" of St. Victor of Capua in the sixth century; sometimes Lessons, Epistles, and Gospels were all transcribed in their proper order into one volume, as in the case of the "Liber Comicus" of the Church of Toledo lately edited by Dom Morin, or of the Lectionnaire de Luxeuil, published by Mabillon in his "Liturgia Gallicana".

BAUDOT, *Les Lectionnaires* in *Science et Religion* (Paris, 1907), nos. 463, 464; SAUER in BUCHBERGER, *Kirchliches Handlex.*, s. v. *Lektionar;* MORIN, *Liber Comicus*, introduction (Maredsous, 1893); and many articles of the same writer in *Revue Bénédictine;* PONCELET in *Analecta Bollandiana*, XXIX (Brussels, 1910), 1–48; BEISSEL, *Entstehung der Perikopen des röm. Messbuches* (Freiburg im Br., 1907); RANKE, *Das kirch. Perikopen-System* (Berlin, 1847); WORDSWORTH AND LITTLEHALES, *Old Service Books of the English Church* (London, 1904).

HERBERT THURSTON.

Lector.—A *lector* (reader) in the West is a clerk having the second of the four minor orders. In all Eastern Churches also, readers are ordained to a minor order preparatory to the diaconate. The primary reason for a special class of readers was the need of some persons sufficiently educated to be able to read the books in church, for the Christians continued the Jewish practice of reading the Sacred Books publicly. The first mention of a Christian liturgical reader is by Justin Martyr (d. about 165) in I Apol., lxvii, 3, 4. The homily known as "II Clem. ad Corinthios" also contains a reference to a lector, ἀναγινώσκων (xix, 1). The position of reader was honourable and dignified. It involved a higher standard of education than that of most offices. Although Justin says that the bishop preached the sermon, it appears that the reader himself often went on to expound what he had read. As the idea obtained that a special blessing and dedication should be given to everyone who performs an office for the Church, the reader too was instituted by prayers and some ceremony. Readers were blessed and set apart, as were the *fossores* who dug graves, the *notarii* who kept registers, and widows. All the group of rituals that depend on the "Apostolic Constitutions" contain the rite of ordaining readers. "Apost. Const.", viii, xxii, tells the bishop to ordain a reader by laying on his hand and saying a prayer, which is given. The derived documents however forbid an imposition of hands. ("Epitome Const. Ap.", xiii; Funk, "Didascalia", Paderborn, 1905, II, p. 82; see also the "Egyptian Church Order", V, ib., p. 105).

During the first centuries all the lessons in the liturgy, including the Epistle and Gospel, were read by the lector. Cornelius I (251–53) in a letter to Fabius of Antioch mentions that the Church of Rome has forty-two acolytes and fifty-two exorcists, readers and doorkeepers. (Denzinger, "Enchiridion", n. 45). In the fourth century in Africa the Church of Cirta had four priests, three deacons, four subdeacons, and seven readers. The account of the persecution ("Gesta apud Zenophilum" printed in the appendix to Optatus of Mileve in the Vienna edition of "Corp. Script. eccl. lat.", XXVI, 185–97) describes how the readers kept the sacred books which the magistrate demanded to be given up (p. 187). An old set of Western canons, ascribed (wrongly) to a supposed Council of Carthage in 398, but really of the sixth century, gives forms for all ordinations. Canon 8 is about our subject: "When a reader is ordained let the bishop speak about him (*faciat de illo verbum*) to the people, pointing out his faith and life and skill. After this, while the people look on, let him give him the book from which he is to read, saying to him: Receive this and be the spokesman (*relator*) of the word of God and you shall have, if you do your work faithfully and usefully, a part with those who have administered the word of God" (Denzinger, op. cit., n. 156). But gradually the lectorate lost all importance. The deacon obtained the office of reading the Gospel; in the West the Epistle became the privilege of the subdeacon. In the Eastern Churches this and other lessons are still supposed to be read by a lector, but everywhere his office (as all minor orders) may be supplied by a layman. The lector is still mentioned twice in the Roman Missal. In the rubrics at the beginning it is said that if Mass be sung without deacon and subdeacon a lector wearing a surplice may sing the Epistle in the usual place; but at the end he does not kiss the celebrant's hand ("Ritus celebr. Missam", vi, 8). On Good Friday the morning service begins with a prophecy read by a lector at the place where the Epistle is usually read (first rubric on Good Friday).

Everywhere the order of reader has become merely a stepping-stone to major orders, and a memory of early days. In the Roman Rite it is the second minor order (*Ostiarius, Lector, Exorcista, Acolythus*). The minor orders are conferred during Mass after the first Lesson; but they may be given apart from Mass, on Sundays or doubles, in the morning. The lectorate involves no obligation of celibacy or of any other kind. The Byzantine Office will be found in the "Euchologion" (Εὐχολόγιον τὸ μέγα, Venetian 8th edition, 1898, pp. 186–87). The Armenians (Gregorian and Uniate) have adopted the Roman system of four minor orders exactly. Their rite of ordaining a reader also consists essentially in handing to him the book of the Epistles.

WIELAND, *Die Genetische Entwickelung der sog. Ordines minores in den 3 ersten Jahrhunderten* in *Römische Quartalschrift*, Suppl. no. 7 (Rome, 1892); HARNACK, *Über den Ursprung des Lectorats u. der anderen niederen Weihen* in *Texte u. Untersuchungen*, II, 5.

ADRIAN FORTESCUE.

Ledochowski, MIECISLAS HALKA, count, cardinal, Archbishop of Gnesen-Posen, b. at Gorki near Sandomir in Russian Poland, 29 October, 1822; d. at Rome, 22 July, 1902. After studying at Radom and Warsaw, he entered the *Accademia dei Nobili Ecclesiastici* in Rome in 1842, and was ordained priest 13 July, 1845. He became domestic prelate of Pius IX in 1846, auditor of the papal nunciature at Lisbon in 1847, Apostolic delegate to Colombia and Chile in 1856, nuncio at Brussels and titular Archbishop of Thebes in 1861, and finally Archbishop of Gnesen-Posen in December, 1865. He was preconized on 8 January, 1866, and enthroned on 22 April of the same year. Being on friendly terms with the King of Prussia, he was sent to Versailles by Pius IX in November, 1870, to ask the services of Prussia for the re-establishment of the Pontifical States, and to offer the services of the pope as mediator between France and Germany, but his mission proved fruitless.

Shortly after the outbreak of the German *Kulturkampf*, the Prussian Government, without the knowledge or co-operation of Ledochowski, passed an ordinance that, after Easter, 1873, all religious instruction in Posen should be imparted in the German language only. It was but natural that the Polish people should object to such an unjust ordinance, especially since most of the children were either entirely ignorant of the German language or understood it only with difficulty. When the Government ignored the urgent request of the archbishop to revoke the ordinance, he issued a circular on 23 February, 1873, to the teachers of religion at the higher educational institutions, ordering them to use the vernacular in their religious instructions in the lower classes, but permitting the use of the German language in the higher classes, beginning with the *secunda*. Pius IX approved this act of the archbishop in a Brief dated 24 March, 1873. All the teachers of religion were obedient to their archbishop and, in consequence, the Government deprived them of their positions. Religion being thus no longer taught at many institutions, the archbishop erected private religious schools, but in an ordinance of 17 September, 1873, the Government forbade all pupils of the higher institutions to obtain religious instruction at these private schools. As all protests of the archbishop proved useless, he disregarded the unjust ordinances of the Government, and, after being fined repeatedly, he was finally ordered on 24 November, 1873, to present his resignation. The archbishop's answer was that no temporal court had the right to deprive him of an office which God had imposed upon him through His visible representative on earth. Before he was formally deposed, he was arrested between 3 and 4 o'clock in the morning of 3 February, 1874, and carried off to the dungeon of Ostrowo, because he refused to pay the repeated fines imposed upon him. While in prison, he was created cardinal by Pius IX on 13 March, 1874. The Prussian Government declared him deposed on 15 April, 1874. On 3 February, 1876, he was released from prison, but was ordered to leave Prussia. He continued to rule his diocese from Rome, and was sentenced to imprisonment for "arrogating episcopal rights" on three occasions, viz., 9 Feb. and 26 May, 1877, and 7 Nov., 1878. After being appointed secretary of papal Briefs in 1885 he voluntarily resigned his archdiocese in the interests of peace. In 1892 he became Prefect of the Propaganda, an office which he held until his death. An official reconciliation between the cardinal and the Prussian Government took place when Emperor William II visited Rome in 1893.

Brück, *Geschichte der katholischen Kirche in Deutschland im 19. Jahrhundert*, IV (Mainz, 1901), 147–50 et alibi; Hogan in *The Irish Ecclesiastical Review*, fourth series, XII (Dublin, 1902), 289–301.

Michael Ott.

Leeds (Loidis), Diocese of (Loidensis), embraces the West Riding of Yorkshire, and that part of the city of York to the south of the River Ouse. Though one of the fourteen dioceses now comprised in the Province of Westminster, it was not erected at the time of the restoration of the English hierarchy by Pius IX in 1850. For in that year the Holy See, whilst anticipating and providing for its ultimate division, created for Yorkshire the See of Beverley, with jurisdiction over the entire county then known to the ecclesiastical authorities as the Yorkshire District. As that of Lancashire, this vicariate had been made in 1840 by Gregory XVI out of a portion of the original Northern District, first established by Innocent XI, in 1688.

Dr. John Briggs, President of St. Cuthbert's College, Durham (1832–36), and last vicar Apostolic of this extensive territory, which included seven counties of the North of England, and the Isle of Man, was, in 1833, consecrated as Bishop of Trachis *in partibus*, and coadjutor of the Northern District, to which he succeeded in 1836. In 1839 he returned the number of Catholics within his vicariate as about 180,000, of whom only 13,000 were in Yorkshire. Having in 1840 been appointed to the Yorkshire District, Dr. Briggs, by a decree of Propaganda approved by Pius IX, 23 Sept., 1850, was translated from Trachis to Beverley, which see he resigned, 7 Nov., 1860. He died at York, 4 Jan., 1861. Eventually senior bishop of the restored hierarchy, his episcopate was one long, heroic struggle to provide schools and churches for an ever-growing destitute Catholic population—the outcome of many years of Irish immigration. So early as 1838, Bishop Briggs deplored that great numbers of his people were without pastors, without chapels, and without schools for their children; of whom, in 1845, he stated that, in Yorkshire alone, no less than 3000 were receiving no Catholic education whatsoever—a class, ten years later, known to have numbered, throughout England and Wales, 120,000.

Dr. Briggs was succeeded in the See of Beverley by Dr. Robert Cornthwaite, canon of Hexham and Newcastle, and formerly rector of the English College, Rome (1851–57). He was consecrated by Cardinal Wiseman, 10 Nov., 1861. Subsequently, Dr. Cornthwaite obtained from Rome a Brief, dated 20 Dec., 1878, though not published until 6 Feb., 1879, dividing the Diocese of Beverley into those of Leeds and Middlesbrough—that of Leeds lying, for the most part, to the south of a line running east and west through the County of Yorkshire, marked by the courses of the Humber, the Ouse, and the Ure, but embracing also a small portion of the county north of the Ouse included within the parliamentary division of the West Riding. Of the 152 clergy of Beverley (who in 1850 had numbered 69) 98 were transferred to Leeds; of its 123 churches and chapels (which twenty-nine years before were 61) Beverley surrendered to Leeds 85; whilst of its 141 schools (in 1850 in all 31) 105 were transferred to the larger of the two new dioceses, carrying with them more than four-fifths of the 15,677 children formerly in attendance within the Diocese of Beverley.

Dr. Cornthwaite having petitioned the Holy See for assistance, he received as coadjutor Dr. William Gordon, a member of the Leeds Chapter, and afterwards his vicar-general, and rector of the diocesan seminary. The last priest ordained by Dr. Briggs in 1859, he was consecrated as Bishop of Arcadiopolis *in partibus*, and coadjutor of Leeds *cum jure successionis*, 24 Feb., 1890, to which see he succeeded upon the death of his predecessor, 16 June, 1890. His coadjutor, Dr. Joseph Robert Cowgill, was appointed fifteen years later *cum jure successionis*. At that time financial agent of the diocese, and canon of the Chapter, he was consecrated as Bishop of Olenus *in partibus*, 30 Nov., 1905.

With an estimated Catholic population of about 106,000, mostly operatives, the Diocese of Leeds now contains 138 churches and chapels, served by 163 clergy, of whom 36 are members of religious orders and congregations. Of its 150 elementary and other schools, 70 are taught by religious. Among other memorials of Dr. Cornthwaite's episcopate, besides 39 churches and chapels, and its diocesan seminary at Leeds, the diocese possesses houses of the Little Sisters of the Poor, for the aged and infirm, at Sheffield and Leeds; industrial schools for boys and girls at Shibden and Sheffield; St. Mary's Orphanage for Girls and St. Vincent's Working Boys' Home, at Leeds; and, at Boston Spa, St. John's Institution for the Deaf and Dumb—one of the largest of its kind, and in efficiency second to none in the kingdom. During Dr. Gordon's government of the diocese, much-needed secondary schools for boys have been established at Leeds and Bradford; of these, St. Michael's College, Leeds, being erected

1908–09, at a cost of upwards of £18,000. Provision has also been made, during this period, for the higher education of girls at Sheffield, Leeds, and Bradford—the Leeds Centre and Teachers' Training College, under the care of the Sisters of Notre Dame (Namur), representing an outlay of about £15,000.

Among the 35 religious houses for women, within the Diocese of Leeds, special interest attaches to the seventeenth-century Bar Convent, of the Institute of Mary, in York, rich in Catholic associations and in relics of the English martyrs. Of the numerous churches more recently built, particular mention should be made of the cathedral, dedicated to St. Anne, and erected at Leeds, in 1902–04, from the designs of J. H. Eastwood, A. R. I. B. A., a small but unique example of "developed Gothic"; and, among the churches of earlier date architecturally remarkable, St. Mary's, Sheffield (1850) and St. Mary's, Leeds (1857), are both fine examples of the Gothic revival of the last century. And with these may be associated St. Edward's, Clifford (1850), a small church in the Norman style, worthy of the ages of Faith, erected principally through the piety of descendants of the Venerable Ralph Grimston, martyred under Elizabeth at York, in 1598.

Diocesan Archives of Beverley and Leeds; BRADY, *English Catholic Hierarchy* (London, 1883); WAUGH, *The Leeds Missions* (London, 1904); LANE-FOX, *Chronicles of a Wharfedale Parish* (Fort Augustus, 1909).

N. WAUGH.

Lefebvre, CAMILLE, Apostle of the Acadians, b. at St. Philippe, P. Q., 1831; d. at St. Joseph, N. B., 1895. The son of sturdy French-Canadian peasants, he attended the village school and academy until he was seventeen, became a primary teacher for several half-yearly terms, prosecuted his study of Latin at St. Cyprien, and in 1852 entered the Congregation of the Holy Cross, at St. Laurent, near Montreal. Ordained priest in 1855, he served successively as curate at St. Eustache and St. Rose, professor at St. Laurent College, and missionary in the Diocese of St. Hyacinth, this last office coming to him as the natural result of his quite exceptional ability as a pulpit orator. His real life-work, however, began only in 1864, when, in accordance with an agreement between his religious superiors and Bishop Sweeney of St. John, he took charge of the principal Acadian parish, Memramcook, N. B., and forthwith began the foundation of St. Joseph's College. Half a century ago, the French Acadians of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and Prince Edward Island were admittedly an unimportant factor in the social life and polity of those provinces. From the time of the great expulsion in 1755, they had been constructively deprived of all means of instruction, in public, professional, or even commercial life; in consequence, an Acadian name rarely if ever became prominent. Unquestionably looked down upon by their English and non-Catholic neighbours as a race naturally inferior to Anglo-Saxons and Celts, they apparently acquiesced in the fate that doomed them to be mere hewers of wood and drawers of water. With the advent among them of Father Lefebvre and the establishment of St. Joseph's College, there dawned a new era, and in the brief space of three decades there was wrought a veritable transformation.

Thanks mainly to his initiative, his personal service, and the enthusiasm with which he imbued his fellow-workers in the college and the leaders of the people themselves, Father Lefebvre lived to see the practical servitude and inferiority in which he found the Acadians replaced by genuine equality and freedom. In ever-increasing numbers his students took prominent places in the business, educational, or professional world, gave themselves to the altar or pleaded at the bar, entered the provincial legislative assemblies and the federal parliament, and graced the bench of the Supreme Court. From 1864 to 1875 the "Apostle of the Acadians" encountered trials, reverses, and difficulties which nothing but indomitable energy, coupled with unwavering confidence in God, could have enabled him to survive. During these years, in addition to his duties as college president and pastor of Memramcook, he preached missions throughout Acadia, served several terms as Provincial of his Congregation, founded the Little Sisters of the Holy Family, and was honoured with the degree of Doctor of Divinity by Laval University and the title of Apostolic Missionary by Pius IX. His death occurred in January, 1895; and within two years St. Joseph's Alumni erected at Memramcook in his honour a handsome stone edifice, the Lefebvre Memorial Hall. "After God", says his Acadian biographer, "he loved especially the Congregation of the Holy Cross and the Acadian people. He is perhaps the purest glory of the former; he is certainly the greatest benefactor of the latter."

POIRIER, *Le Père Lefebvre et l'Acadie* (Montreal, 1898); SORIN, *Circular Letters* (Notre Dame, Ind., 1880); *Album Souvenir* (Montreal, 1894).

ARTHUR BARRY O'NEILL.

Lefèvre, FAMILY OF.—There were various members of the Lefèvre family engaged in tapestry weaving in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. We hear of one Lancelot Lefèbvre as one of the masters of tapestry weaving in Brussels and in Antwerp in 1655; and in Italy, in 1630, we read of a certain Pierre le Fèvre, a master tapestry worker, who was a native of Paris. It is not known whether these two men were connected one with the other, and of their personal history we know very little. Pierre died in 1669, leaving a son Philip, who was working in Florence in 1677. In 1647, Pierre was attracted by some offers made him on the part of Henry IV of France, and left Florence for Paris. There he received considerable emoluments, was styled *Tapissier* to the King, and provided with a workshop in the Garden of the Tuileries. He is known to have gone back to Florence in 1650, but to have returned to Paris five years later; he probably lived in Florence for about ten years, returning there for the last short period of his life. His son Jean, who came with him, does not appear to have ever quitted France, and he had the signal honour, on the establishment of the Gobelin factory, of directing with Jean Jans the high warp looms. Jans was a Flemish weaver, but had come to Paris to work in the royal buildings in 1654, and he had charge of the largest workshop of the new factory, giving employment to sixty-seven weavers, exclusive of apprentices. The second workshop, which was erected in the Garden of the Tuileries, was the one conducted by Jean Lefèvre, and he appears to have had full charge of it until 1770, and to have earned for the Government a very large sum of money. The fine tapestry entitled "The Toilet of a Princess", which was in the Spitzer collection, was the work of Jean Lefèvre, and three other pieces, representing Bacchanalia, bear his name on their selvedge. One of his most wonderful works was entitled "The Toilet of Flora", a sheet of tapestry now preserved at the Garde-meuble. Cardinal Mazarin possessed one of his hangings entitled "The History of St. Paul", and he was probably largely responsible for the two series entitled "The History of Louis XIV", and "The History of Alexander".

MUNTZ, *History of Tapestry* (London, 1885); THOMSON, *History of Tapestry* (London, 1906); LACORDAIRE, *Notice historique sur les Manufactures impériales de Tapisseries des Gobelins* (Paris, 1853, 1873), various articles in *La Gazette des Beaux Arts.*

GEORGE CHARLES WILLIAMSON.

Lefèvre, HONORÉ. See FABRI.

Le Fèvre, JACQUES, a French theologian and controversialist, b. at Lisieux towards the middle of the seventeenth century; d. 1 July, 1716, at Paris. He became archdeacon of his native city and vicar-general of the Archbishopric of Bourges, and in 1674 received

the doctorate in theology from the Sorbonne. His works are the following: "Entretiens d'Eudoxe et d' Eucharist sur les histoires de l'arianisme et des iconoclastes du P. Maimbourg" (Paris, 1674). The first of these dialogues was condemned and burned. "Motifs invincibles pour convaincre ceux de la religion prétendue réformée" (Paris, 1682), in which Le Fèvre endeavours to show that there is fundamental agreement between Catholic and Protestant teachings, the differences being of slight importance and mostly verbal. These conciliatory views were attacked by Arnauld, and, in answer, Le Fèvre wrote "Réplique a M. Arnauld pour la défense du livre des motifs invincibles" (1685). Amongst Le Fèvre's other works are: "Conférence avec un ministre touchant les causes de la séparation des protestants" (Paris, 1685); "Instructions pour confirmer les nouveaux convertis dans la foi de l'église" (Paris, 1686); "Recueil de tout ce qui s'est fait pour et contre les protestants en France" (Paris, 1686); "Lettres d'un docteur sur ce qui se passe dans les assemblées de la faculté de théologie de Paris" (Cologne, 1700). These letters were published anonymously when the work of the Jesuit Father Lecomte, "Mémoires sur la Chine", was referred to the faculty of theology. To Father Lallemant, who had defended his confrère in the "Journal historique des assemblées tenues en Sorbonne", Le Fèvre replied in his "Anti-journal historique . . . "; and he also produced "Animadversions sur l'histoire ecclésiastique du P. Noël Alexandre", the first volume of which was printed at Rouen without date about 1680; it was seized and destroyed, and the other volumes were not published.

HURTER, *Nomenclator; Nouvelle biographie générale*, XXX (Paris, 1858), 344.

C. A. DUBRAY.

Lefèvre de la Boderie, GUY, French Orientalist and poet; b. near Falaise in Normandy, 9 August, 1541; d. in 1598 in the house in which he was born. At an early age he devoted himself to the study of Oriental languages, particularly Hebrew and Syriac. After much travelling in different provinces of France he settled down to uninterrupted study under the guidance of the Orientalist Guillaume Postel, who was a professor in the Collège de France. Guy was an earnest student and his scientific ardour was intensified by the religious enthusiasm of his character. He was convinced that deep study and full knowledge were the surest natural mainstays of faith. He felt, too, that if this was true generally, it was true in a very special way in regard to Biblical work. He became an Orientalist therefore, like many others, because he was an apologist. He selected Syriac and Aramaic generally as his special department that he might come nearer to the mind of Christ by the study of Christ's vernacular. His first published work of importance was a Latin version of the Syriac New Testament published in 1560. This work attracted much attention, and in 1568 Guy was invited by Arias Montanus to assist in the production of the Antwerp Polyglot. Guy accepted the invitation and proceeded to Antwerp with his brother Nicolas who was also an Orientalist.

The work assigned to Guy by Arias Montanus was the editing of the Syriac New Testament. He examined for this purpose a new Syriac MS. of the New Testament which Guillaume Postel had brought from the East. In 1572 appeared in the fifth volume of the Antwerp Polyglot Bible the result of Lefèvre's work, entitled "Novum Testamentum syriace, cum versione latinâ". This work included the collated Syriac text and Lefèvre's previously published (and now amended) Latin version. This work was republished by Le Jay in 1645 in the Paris Polyglot. In 1572 Lefèvre published at Antwerp a short Syriac text which he had found accidentally thrown together with the Eastern Biblical MS. above mentioned. This text, furnished with a Latin translation, appeared under the title "D. Severi, Alexandrini, quondam patriarchæ, de Ritibus baptismi et sacræ synaxis apud Syros Christianos receptis liber". Lefèvre tells us (Epistola dedicatoria, p. 4 f.) that he published this text to illustrate the agreement of the ancient Eastern Church with the Western in the important matter of sacramental ritual. To make the little text useful for beginners in Syriac Lefèvre vocalized the text and added at the foot of the page a vocalized transliteration in Hebrew characters. In the sixth volume of the Antwerp Polyglot appeared a further work by Lefèvre, "Grammatica chaldaica et Dictionarium Syro-Chaldaicum". In the same year 1572, Lefèvre published, also at Antwerp, a short introduction to Syriac, "Syriacæ linguæ prima elementa". This work has no scientific value: it is little more than an account of the names of the consonants and vowel signs with a few easy texts. On completing his work in Antwerp in 1572 Lefèvre returned to France where he soon obtained the post of secretary and interpreter to the Duke of Alençon. In this position he was brought into close contact with the somewhat radical thought of the period. His associates were men like Baïf, Dorat, Ronsard, Vauquelin de La Fresnaye etc. But Lefèvre remained, in spite of all, a strong Catholic and a steady enemy of Protestantism. In 1584 he published a transliteration in Hebrew characters of the Syriac New Testament, "Novum J. Chr. Testamentum, syriace litteris hebraicis, cum versione latinâ interlineari". In this work the Vulgate and Greek texts were printed at the foot of the page.

But Lefèvre was not merely a philologist; he was also a poet. His poetic flights, however, were not high, and in his poetry, as in his Orientalia, the apologetic trend of his thought is clear. He was, as his friend Vauquelin de La Fresnaye said of him, *poète tout chrestien*. Among his more important poetic performances are: "L'Encyclie des secrets de l'Eternité" (Antwerp, 1571), an apology of Christianity; "La Galliade, ou de la révolution des arts et sciences" (Paris, 1578; 2nd ed. 1582), which celebrates the return to France of the banished sciences; "Hymnes ecclésiastiques" and "Cantiques spirituels et autres mélanges poétiques" (Paris, 1578–1582), many of which are translations from the Italian; "L'Harmonie du Monde" (Paris, 1582), a translation of a Latin work. Lefèvre published in his last years an immense number of translations from Latin, Italian, Spanish etc., in verse and prose. Most of these translations are apologetic, and few of them are of any value. Lefèvre shows by the choice of his life-work that his thoughts were ahead of his time. Of his life, apart from his writings, we know next to nothing. It has been conjectured from some words of his in a poem addressed to Marguerite de France that he was an ecclesiastic; and it has been said that Pope Clement VIII wished to make him a cardinal. But Lefèvre would not allow himself to be led away in his last days from his books to the Roman Court. He died in the peaceful family mansion of La Boderie in 1598. An epitaph which he wrote for himself sums up his life work simply and well:

Tandisque j'ai vescu, j'ai toujours souhaité
Non d'amasser trésors, mais chercher Verité.

DE LA FERRIÈRE-PERCY, *Les La Boderie* (Paris, 1857); NÈVE, *Guy Le Fèvre de La Boderie* (Brussels, 1862); NICERON, *Mémoires*, Vol. XXXVIII, 303–314; GOUJET, *Bibliothèque Française*, VI, XIII.

P. BOYLAN.

Lefèvre d'Etaples, JACQUES, frequently called Faber Stapulensis, a French philosopher, biblical and patristic scholar, b. at Etaples in Picardy, about 1455; d. at Nérac, 1536. He pursued his classical studies at the University of Paris, graduating as master of arts. In 1492 he made a journey to Italy. His protracted visits to Florence, Rome, and Venice were devoted

chiefly to the study of the works of Aristotle. On his return to Paris he displayed considerable activity as professor in the college of Cardinal Lemoine. Among his disciples were the Protestant reformer Farel and the later bishops Briçonnet, Roussel, D'Arande, Poncher. In 1507 he was invited to the monastery of St. Germain-des-Prés near Paris, by the abbot Briçonnet. Here he resided till 1520, assiduously studying the Bible. The first-fruit of his labours was his "Psalterium Quintuplex, gallicum, romanum, hebraicum, vetus, conciliatum" (Paris, 1509). In 1517 and 1519 he published at Paris two critical essays on Mary Magdalen, "De Maria Magdalena" and "De tribus et unica Magdalena disceptatio secunda". In these writings he endeavoured to prove that Mary, sister of Lazarus, Mary Magdalen, and the penitent woman who anointed Christ's feet (Luke, vii, 37) were three distinct persons. This opinion, new at the time, gave rise to a violent controversy; refutations by Noël Bédier, syndic of the University of Paris, and John Fisher, the martyr-Bishop of Rochester, appeared; they were followed by the condemnation by the Sorbonne in 1521. The preceding year, Lefèvre had left Paris for Meaux, where his friend, Briçonnet, now bishop of this city, was to appoint him his vicar-general in 1523. He continued his bibilical studies, publishing the "Commentarii initiatorii in quatuor Evangelia" (Paris, 1522); a French translation of the New Testament (Paris, 1523), and of the Psalms (Paris, 1525); an explanation of the Sunday Epistles and Gospels (Meaux, 1525). As these works contained some erroneous views and revealed the author's sympathies for the doctrines of the so-called reformers, they again brought him into conflict with the Sorbonne. His commentary on the Gospels was condemned in 1523, and only the timely interposition of the king shielded him temporarily from further molestation. But during the captivity of Francis I, which followed the battle of Pavia (February, 1525), further proceedings were instituted against Lefèvre for his novel doctrines and he sought safety in flight. After the king's release, he was recalled from exile and appointed librarian in the royal castle of Blois (1526). Here he worked at his translation of the Old Testament, which appeared at Antwerp in 1528. In 1531, he accompanied Marguerite, Queen of Navarre, to Nérac, where he spent the last years of his life. Lefèvre was a strong advocate of ecclesiatical reforms but did not deem a separation from the Catholic Church, of which he always remained a member, necessary for the attainment of this end. Among his non-biblical writings the following may be mentioned: "Theologia vivificans, Dionysii cœlestis hierarchia, Ignatii XV epistolæ, Polycarpi epistolæ" (Paris, 1498); "Opera complura St. Hilarii episcopi" (Paris, 1510); "Liber trium virorum Hermæ, Uguetini et Roberti triumque spiritualium virginum Hildegardis, Elizabethæ et Mechtildis" (Paris, 1513).

GRAF, *Jacobus Faber Stapulensis* in *Zeitsch. für Hist. Theol.* (1852), 3–86, 165–237; BARNAUD, *J. Lefèvre d'Etaples* (Cahors, 1900); PROOSDIJ, *J. Lefèvre d'Etaples, voorganger van Calvijn*, (Leyden, 1906); BAIRD, *The Rise of the Huguenots*, I (New York, 1907), 67–98.

N. A. WEBER.

Legacies (Lat. *Legata*).—I. DEFINITION.—In its most restricted sense, by a pious legacy or bequest (*legatum pium*) is understood, the assigning, by a last will, of a particular thing forming part of an estate, to a church or an ecclesiastical institution. It differs from a testament in favour of pious works (*testamentum ad pias causas*) in this, that in a testament the favoured institution is made the true heir of the testator, continuing as it were his person. Moreover, a testament deals with the whole property, the patrimony of the testator. It results from this that a pious legacy or bequest need not necessarily be made in the body of a will; it can be inserted in a codicil. A pious bequest differs likewise from a "donatio mortis causa", which is a contract, whereas the bequest is made by a unilateral act. It is distinguished, finally, from a foundation, which can be made during life as well as by provision in a will, and which always imposes on the favoured establishment obligations, either perpetual or of fairly long duration. A legacy may be but is not necessarily a foundation.

II. RIGHT OF THE CHURCH TO RECEIVE LEGACIES.—Natural law, no less than Divine, ordains that the will of the faithful, bequeathing part of their wealth to the Church should be respected (Instruction of Propaganda, 1807, in "Collectanea S.C. de P. F.", I, Rome, 1907, n. 689). The Church was established by God as a necessary and perfect society, since its object is to lead men to their last end, consequently, it can uphold its right to acquire all the means necessary to realize the object for which God instituted it. Being an external and visible society, it must be able to dispose of temporal goods for the needs of Divine service, the support of its ministers, the propagation of the Faith, the care of the poor, etc. Therefore, it may acquire these goods by all legitimate means, and among these means are included pious bequests or legacies. Natural right demands that the goods of parents dying intestate should pass to their children, and in many cases it is a duty for parents to leave part of their patrimony to their children; canon law recognizes and approves of this duty. But there is no serious reason for depriving parents of the right to dispose by will, for a pious purpose, of those goods that are at their free disposal as long as they are alive. While profitable to the Church, pious bequests are not less so to the donors "for the salvation of their souls", in the words of the usual testamentary formula of the Middle Ages (Fournier, "Les officialités au moyen âge", Paris, 1880, p. 87). The Council of Trent (Sess. XXVI, Decr. de Purgatorio) declares that pious foundations are a means of relieving the sufferings of purgatory. The First Provincial Council of Halifax applies to pious bequests those words of the Gospel: "Make unto you friends of the Mammon of iniquity; that when you shall fail, they may receive you into everlasting dwellings" (Luke xvi, 9; "Collectio Lacensis", III, Freiburg, 1875, 746). Pious bequests are a means by which generous souls can continue, after their decease, their good works, and provide for the future of the institutions that they have founded or enriched. Those who have omitted during life to fulfill the precept of charity can find therein a way of repairing their negligence ("First Provincial Council of Westminster", 1852, XXV, II; "Collectio Lacensis", III, 942). Those, finally, who, owing to daily cares and anxieties, found it impossible to be bountiful during life, may yet, if only at the hour of death, cooperate in the relief of the unfortunate, and assure their neighbour the spiritual advantages of Divine service.

III. HISTORY.—The charity of the first Christians led them to despoil themselves while alive of their superfluous goods; consequently, mention is rarely made of pious legacies before the time of Constantine. After that emperor's conversion they became more prominent, especially after the law of the year 321 allowed churches to receive all kinds of legacies, and granted them the "factio testamenti passiva", i. e. the right of being made heirs (Theodosian Code, XVI, II, lit. iv). Authors are not agreed on the import of a law of Theodosius dated June, 390, forbidding deaconesses, who were widows and had children, to dispose of their goods in favour of churches or the poor (ibid. xxvii). Many authors consider it an important restriction of the right recognized by Constantine as belonging to the churches (Fourneret, "Les biens d'Eglise après les édits de pacification; Ressources dont l'Eglise disposa pour reconstruire son patrimoine", Paris, 1902, p. 84). Others see in it only a means of

protecting, against the abuse of maternal power, the rights of the children to the succession of their parents (Knecht, "System des Justinianischen Kirchenvermögensrechtes", Stuttgart, 1905, 75–76). In any case, Emperor Marcian restored the right to the churches in 485 (Justinian Code, I, II, xiii). Among the Teutonic peoples, testamentary liberalities properly so-called seem to have been unknown, but they had an arrangement resembling the "donatio mortis causa" of the Romans, i. e., the "cessiones post obitum", donations which the donor bound himself not to retract, but which took effect only on his death.

In virtue of the Teutonic principle of the personality of law, the inhabitants whom the Teutons found settled in the old provinces of the empire they conquered could continue to follow the Roman law. In this way the power to bequeath to pious establishments was introduced among the Visigoths, Burgundians, and Bavarians, while in Gaul pious bequests were tolerated in fact before being authorized by law (Loening, "Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenrechts", II, Strasburg, 1878, 655). Several synods of the Frankish period even declare the validity of testaments, especially those of ecclesiastics, in which the formalities prescribed by the civil law had not been observed (Bondroit, "De capacitate possidendi Ecclesiæ ætate merovingica", Louvain, 1900, 87 and 105). (See DONATIONS.)

The bishops retained in the Middle Ages the right of supervising the execution of pious bequests, which had been recognized by the Justinian Code (I, III, xlv). This right was even extended, and in several regions the ecclesiastical tribunal judged of the validity of wills and supervised their execution (Fournier, op. cit., 87; Friedberg, "De finium inter Ecclesiam et Civitatem regundorum judicio quid medii ævi doctores statuerint", Leipzig, 1861, 124). It was in virtue of this right that Alexander III determined the conditions for the validity of wills in non-ecclesiastical matters (c. x., "De testamentis et ultimis voluntatibus", X, III, xxvi. See Wernz, "Jus Decretalium", III, Rome, 1901, 309). This same pope ordained, following the example of St. Gregory, that the ecclesiastical judge was to decide the validity of pious bequests not in accordance with the provisions of the Roman law but with the decrees of canon law (cc. iv, xi, "De testamentis et ultimis voluntatibus", X, III, xxvi).

The practice of pious bequests was so common in the Middle Ages that it seemed improbable that any person would have dispensed himself from it. This was the origin of the right of bishops in certain places, particularly in France and Southern Italy, to dispose, in favour of pious objects, of part of the goods of an intestate deceased person (Fournier, op. cit., 89). The generosity of the faithful built and endowed those wonders of art, the monasteries and churches, as well as the many charitable institutions that were the glory of the medieval Church, and that the official charity of the State has succeeded neither in rivalling nor in replacing. It was not until the close of the medieval period that the civil power began to restrict the acquisition of property by religious mortmain. In modern times, even in Catholic countries, wills were withdrawn from the judicial authority of the Church, and the civil power finally deprived the latter of the right to adjudicate even on testamentary questions relating to pious bequests.

IV. ACTUAL CANONICAL LEGISLATION.—The Church reserves to itself, even now, an exclusive authority in the matter of pious wills and legacies; it has its own legislation, the Roman law modified on several points by canon law, and its ecclesiastical tribunals to examine the questions connected therewith. (1) Besides persons who by natural law or in virtue of the enactments of Roman law are incapable of making a will, the Church refuses to accept the pious bequests of usurers (c. ii, De usuris, in VI°, V, 5), of heretics and their accomplices (c. xiii, De hæreticis, X, V, 7), and of those who are guilty of attacks on the cardinals (c. v, De pœnis, in VI°, V, 9). In practice, the Church refuses at the present time, to accept the bequests of sinners who die impenitent, and especially of usurers, in order not to be enriched by their ill-gotten goods (Santi, "Prælectiones juris canonici", III, Rome, 1898, 224–25). Religious who make solemn vows of profession are permitted to make wills only during the two months preceding their solemn profession; other religious must conform to the rules of their congregation. The rules (*normæ*) drawn up by the Congregation of Bishops and Regulars for the approbation of institutes bound by simple vows (Rome, 1901) forbid the making of wills after religious profession without the permission of the Holy See or, in case of urgency, without the authorization of the bishop or the superiors (Art. 120 and 122. See Vermeersch, "De religiosis", I, Bruges, 1902, 148).

(2) It is not alone bequests made to churches that enjoy the prerogatives established by canon law, but also those made to monasteries, religious houses, and all institutions, whether purely religious or of a charitable character subject to the direction of religious authorities. However, certain religious orders, either because they practise poverty in a stricter manner, or in virtue of their constitution, have only a restricted right to acquire property by legacy or will (Santi, op. cit., III, 238–9; Wernz, op. cit., III, 322).

(3) The heirs of the testator are obliged to execute pious bequests, even if they have not been made in accordance with the formalities prescribed under penalty of nullity by the civil law, provided canon law considers them to have been made validly. The State has an incontestable right to prescribe the formalities requisite for the validity of wills in all matters falling within its jurisdiction, but pious legacies and bequests for pious purposes are under the exclusive control of the Church. This principle was clearly enunciated by Alexander III in the decretal "Relatum" (c. xi, De testamentis et ultimis voluntatibus, X, III, xxvi). It is true this decretal was addressed to the judges of Velletri, a town in the Papal States, but its force cannot be restricted solely to the territory under the temporal power of the pope, and the insertion of the decretal in the "Corpus Juris", or general law of the Church, deprives the objection of all force. It has been urged that a contrary custom had abrogated this canonical enactment, and that, moreover, only natural equity and the favour shown by the Church to pious bequests have caused pious legacies made with a neglect of solemn formalities to be considered valid. The constant practice of the Holy See proves that this argument is not conclusive. On 10 January, 1901, the Sacred Penitentiaria declared that, as a general rule, it considers valid and binding in conscience pious bequests which the civil law declares void on account of the omission of extrinsic formalities prescribed by the civil law. Nevertheless, in such a case the ecclesiastical authorities are generally disposed to come to terms with the heirs ("Acta Sanctæ Sedis", XXXIV, Rome, 1902, 384). (See, in the same sense, the decrees of the S. C. C. "in caus. Arimin.", 13 September, 1854; "in caus. Hortana", 29 February, 1855; and reply of the Penitentiaria, 23 June, 1844.)

According to the common opinion of theologians, for a pious bequest to be obligatory in conscience it suffices that the wish of the testator be well established, e. g. by a holograph or a writing merely signed by the testator, by a verbal declaration made to the heir himself or before two witnesses (a single testimony other than that of the heir would be insufficient). If it be urged that the testator has revoked his bequest, the fact must be proved. The Congregation of the Council decided, 16 March, 1900, that a writing containing erasures, which is only a draft of a

will, is not a sufficient proof that the testator wished to revoke a previous will ("Acta Sanctæ Sedis", XXXII, Rome, 1900–01, 202). The contrary opinion is now held only by a few authorities (Carrière, "De contractibus", n. 586, Louvain, 1846; D'Annibale, "Summula theologiæ moralis", II, n 339, Rome, 1892; Boudinhon in "Le Canoniste contemporain", XXIV, Paris, 1901, 734). By Roman law, if a testator knowingly bequeathes a thing not in his possession, it was equivalent to ordering the heir to purchase the thing for the legatee or, if that were impossible, to give him its value. A decree of Gregory I seems to overrule this decision (c. v. De testamentis et ultimis voluntatibus, X, III, xxvi). But it may be replied that this decree, while admitting the principle of the Roman law, intended only to declare that natural equity will often dispense the heir from carrying out the wish of the testator in the matter (Santi, op. cit., III, 242–245). This provision of Roman law being not generally known in our day, it is lawful to presume that the testator made a mistake, and that the bequest is therefore void.

(4) The Church approved the provision of the Roman law prohibiting the testator from disposing of the "pars legitima" which the laws ordered to be preserved to the heirs, this being conformable to natural law. Although in our modern codes the "pars legitima" is greater than it was in the Roman law, it may be presumed that the Church recognizes the ruling of our codes in the matter. All bequests exceeding the amount which the civil law allows to be disposed of freely by the testator may therefore be reduced. The provisions of the Corpus Juris (cc. xiv, xv, xx, De testamentis et ultimis voluntatibus, X, III, xxvi) granting the bishop the "portio canonica"—i. e. the quarter of all pious bequests not affected by the testator to a definite purpose—are no longer in force.

(5) The bishop can compel the heirs or the executors to fulfil the last wishes of the deceased in the matter of pious bequests (c. ii, v, xix, "De testamentis et ultimis voluntatibus", X, III, xxvi; Council of Trent, Sess. xxii, "De reformatione", c. viii). He is also the judge of the first instance in testamentary cases submitted to ecclesiastical tribunals. In virtue of this he has the right to interpret the terms of the will, but any change properly so called of the wishes of the deceased is reserved, we think, to the Holy See, which can make such change only for grave reasons (c. ii, "De religiosis domibus", III, 11, in "Clem."). The Council of Trent (Sess. XXII, De reformatione, c. vi) recognizes in bishops only the right of executing a change in the will made by the pope; this, however, does not prevent a bishop from applying to another object, a legacy left for a definite purpose which can no longer be executed in accordance with the wish of the testator. Propaganda grants vicars Apostolic the right of making changes in the will of a testator, in countries where communication with Rome is very difficult, and in cases where it is impossible to carry out the testator's wish; but it obliges them in each case to obtain a subsequent approval of their act by the Holy See (Instruction of 1807, in "Collectanea", I, n. 689). The Constitution "Romanos pontifices" of 8 May, 1881, lays down certain rules concerning the interpretation of the terms of a last will ("Acta et decreta concilii plenarii Baltimorensis III", Baltimore, 1886, 46, 225–227).

V. Wills of Ecclesiastics.—While canon law has never forbidden ecclesiastics to dispose freely of their own private property, it has always maintained the principle that the superfluous revenues derived from church property ought to be devoted to religious or charitable purposes. If they have not been so disposed of during his lifetime by the person who was in receipt of them, after his death they should be distributed either as canonical legislation enacts or as a pious bequest. During the first centuries of the Church, when bishops alone had the administration of ecclesiastical property, measures were taken by the ecclesiastical authorities to prevent its dissipation by the heirs of the bishops. Justinian forbade bishops to dispose of the goods acquired by them after their promotion to the episcopacy, excepting, of course, their own patrimonial estate (Novellæ, CXXXI, c. xiii). The Third Council of Carthage (397) had already legislated in a similar sense with regard to ecclesiastics (Bruns, "Canones apostolorum et conciliorum veterum selecti", I, Berlin, 1839, 134). Moreover, the Theodosian Code assigned to the Church the goods of clerics dying intestate, and not leaving children or relatives (V, III, lib. i). These regulations were confirmed by the popes and the councils (see Decretum Gratiani, II, c. xii, q. 5, "An liceat clericis testamenta conficere"). But, as early as the sixth century, we learn from the decrees of councils that abuses had already crept in: ecclesiastics and even bishops were attempting to seize ecclesiastical property on the death of their confrères (Decret. Gratian, loc. cit., q. 2); later, it was the turn of the laity; emperors, princes, lawyers, and patrons claimed a right to the spoils (*Jus spolii* or *exuviarum*).

To remedy this state of affairs, the reforming popes of the eleventh and twelfth centuries forced the emperors to renounce explicitly their right to the spoils, and the Third Council of Lateran (1179) as well as Alexander III made certain enactments regarding the estates of ecclesiastics; the latter were free to dispose of their own patrimony, the "peculium patrimoniale", as canonists call it, i. e., all goods which ecclesiastics acquired by inheritance, will, or any kind of contract soever, but independently of the ecclesiastical character. They might dispose likewise of the "peculium industriale" or "quasi patrimoniale", i. e. the property acquired by their own personal activity. To this was likened the "peculium parsimoniale", or that portion of the revenues coming from ecclesiastical benefices, which the beneficiary might reasonably have spent on himself, but which he economized (Santi, op. cit., III, 210). But he was forbidden to dispose of the "peculium beneficiale", the superfluous revenue of the benefices he held, and which he did not distribute in good works during his life. In principle this was to pass to the church in which the ecclesiastic held the benefice. However, Alexander III does not blame the custom, where it exists, of bequeathing some part of this "peculium" to the poor, or to ecclesiastical institutions, or even, as a reward for services rendered, to persons, whether relatives or not, who have been in the service of the deceased cleric (cc. vii, viii, ix, xii, De testamentis et ultimis voluntatibus, X, III, xxvi).

It does not follow, of course, that the law was observed; the "spolium" remained customary among ecclesiastics, especially abbots of monasteries, chapters, and bishops (c. xl, "De electione" in VI°, I, 6; c. ix, "De officio ordinarii" in VI°, I, 16; c. i, "De excessibus prælatorum", in Clem. V, vi). The popes themselves saw in it a means of increasing their revenues. As early as the fourteenth century, they reserved to the Holy See that portion of the property of ecclesiastics which the latter could not dispose of freely, with certain exceptions. These fiscal measures reached their highest limits during the Western Schism. They met with vigorous opposition in France, where the kings refused to admit the right of the pope, and also in the councils of the fifteenth century. Nevertheless the popes maintained their claims for a long time (see the Constitution of Pius IV "Grave nobis", 26 May, 1560 in "Bullarum amplissima collectio", ed. Cocquelines, IV, ii, 18; that of Pius V "Romani pontificis providentia", 30 August, 1587, Ibidem, 394; and of Gregory XIII, "Officii", 21 January, 1577, Ibidem, IV, iii, 330). On 19 June, 1817, Pius VIII declared that Propaganda was entitled

to all revenue of the "spolium" (Collectanea, I, n. 724). On the other hand, even when the legislation of Alexander III was introduced, it was not always enforced in the same way; in some places the ecclesiastics could dispose of their "peculium beneficiale" in favour of pious purposes; in others they were granted full testamentary liberty, provided they made a legacy in favour of pious objects, or else paid a certain sum to the bishop who allowed them to make the will. These practices, together with the difficulty of distinguishing, in the inheritance of an ecclesiastic, the amount of the "patrimonium beneficiale", eventually left ecclesiastics testamentary freedom.

However, the canonical legislation is yet substantially unchanged; ecclesiastics are even now obliged to bequeath for pious purposes the superfluous part of the revenues from their benefices which they have not distributed during their life. This principle, recalled by the Council of Trent (Sess. XXV, De reformatione, c. i), is reasserted in most provincial councils of the nineteenth century. It is commonly admitted that it imposes no obligation of justice, but merely one based on ecclesiastical precept (Santi, op. cit., III, 211; Wernz, op. cit., III, 210–11). This obligation does not exist in countries where there are no benefices, or where benefices strictly so called are notoriously insufficient for the support of the clergy who enjoy them. Under these circumstances, pious bequests are earnestly recommended to ecclesiastics, but they are never obligatory in conscience. For the special rules regulating the wills of cardinals, see Santi, op. cit., III, 227–34. The obligations imposed on ecclesiastics, needless to say, are binding on their heirs in case they die intestate. Sometimes this matter is decided by local custom. The Provincial Councils of Vienna (1858) and of Prague (1860) decree that the estate of an ecclesiastic deceased intestate is to be divided into three parts: one for the Church, one for the poor, and the third for the relatives of the deceased. If the deceased was not possessed of any ecclesiastical benefices, only one-third of the estate is subject to the above rule, and that is to be distributed among the needy, but should the heirs of the deceased belong to that class, said portion may be given to them.

See the commentaries of the canonists on the Third Book of the Decretals, titles XXV, XXVI, and XXVII; SCHMALZGRUEBER, *Jus canonicum universum*, III, ii (Rome, 1844), 462–607; REIFFENSTUEL, *Jus canonicum universum*, IV (Paris, 1867), 362–567; SANTI, *Prælectiones juris canonici*, III (Rome, 1897), 209–247; WERNZ, *Jus decretalium*, III (Rome, 1901), 199–218, 306–327; SÄGMÜLLER, *Lehrbuch des katholischen Kirchenrechts* (Freiburg, 1904), 764, 787–92; THOMASSINUS, *Vetus et nova ecclesiæ disciplina*, pt. III, bk. II (Paris, 1691), cc. XXXVIII–LVII; WAGNER, *Dissertatio de testamento ad pias causas* (Leipzig, 1735); THOMAS, *Das kanonische Testament* (Leipzig, 1897); WOLFF VON GLANVELL, *Die letzwillige Verfügungen nach gemeinem Kirchlichen Rechte* (Paderborn, 1900); FÉNELON, *Les fondations et les établissements ecclésiastiques* (Paris, 1902); SCHMIDT, *Thesaurus juris ecclesiastici*, IV (Heidelberg, 1727), 382–440; SENTIS, *De jure testamentorum a clericis secularibus ordinandorum* (Bonn, 1862); EISENBERG, *Das Spolienrecht am Nachlass der Geistlichen* (Marburg, 1886); HOLLWECK, *Das Testament der Geistlichen nach kirchlichen und burgerlichen Recht* (Mainz, 1901); SAMARAN, *La jurisprudence pontificale en matière de droit de dépouille (jus spolii) dans la seconde moitié du XIVe siècle* in *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire (École française de Rome)* XXII, (Paris, 1902), 141 sq.

A. VAN HOVE.

Legal, EMILE JOSEPH. See ST. ALBERT, DIOCESE OF.

Legate (Lat. *legare*, to send) in its broad signification means that person who is sent by another for some representative office. In the ecclesiastical sense it means one whom the pope sends to sovereigns or governments or only to the members of the episcopate and faithful of a country, as his representative, to treat of church matters or even on a mission of honour. Hence the legate differs from the delegate, taking this term in a strictly juridical sense, since the delegate is one to whom the pope entrusts an affair or many affairs to be treated through delegated jurisdiction and often in questions of litigation, whereas the legate goes with ordinary jurisdiction over a whole country or nation. The canon law treats of delegates of the Holy See, *delegati Sedis Apostolicæ* (Decret., lib. I, tit. xxix), and in this sense even bishops, in certain cases determined by the Council of Trent (Sess. V, cap. i, De Ref., etc.), may act as delegates of the Holy See. Nevertheless, as will be seen later, according to the present discipline of the Church, a delegate, inasmuch as he is sent to represent the Holy See in some particular country, really fills the office of a legate. Since the jurisdiction of a legate is ordinary, he does not cease to be legate even at the death of the pope who appointed him, and even if he arrived at his post after the death of that pope.

The pope, by virtue of his primacy of jurisdiction, has the right to send legates to provide for the unity of Faith and for ecclesiastical discipline, and to choose them at will. Though self-evident, this authority of the pope has been contested from a very early period. Gregory VII (1073–85) reproved the claims of those who wished to have only Romans as legates and not representatives from other countries. Paschal II (1099–1118), in a letter to Henry II of England, grievously deplores the vexations inflicted on the pontifical legate, and maintains the right of the pope to send such representatives. John XXII (1316–34) declares unreasonable and contrary to the authority of the pope the refusal to admit a papal legate without the approval of the sovereign. And there are not wanting writers who denied, some wholly, others in part, such a right on the part of the pope, e. g. Marc' Antonio de Dominis, Richer, Febronius, Eybel, and others. This erroneous claim was upheld in the eighteenth century by four archbishops of Germany, those of Mainz, Trier, Cologne, and Salzburg, to whom Pius VI made the famous reply of 14 November, 1789, in which we read that one of the rights of primacy of St. Peter is that "By virtue of his Apostolic prerogative, while providing for the care of all the lambs and the sheep confided to him, the Roman Pontiff discharges his Apostolic duty also by delegating ecclesiastics for a time or permanently as may seem best, to go into distant places where he cannot go and to take his place and exercise such jurisdiction as he himself, if present, would exercise". Worthy of attention also are the diplomatical note of Cardinal Consalvi to the Spanish Government (9 January, 1802), which treats of the character of the Apostolic nuncio, and the letter of Cardinal Jacobini (15 April, 1885) to the same Government. The Vatican Council, in stating the true doctrine concerning the primacy of the pope (Sess. IV, cap. iii), condemned implicitly the said errors. The Constitution "Apostolicæ Sedis", moreover, contains (no. 5) an excommunication reserved *speciali modo* to the pope against those who harm, expel, or unlawfully detain legates or nuncios.

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT AND DIVISION.—The popes have made use of this right from the earliest ages of the Church. The first example was the sending by Sylvester I of legates to the Council of Nicæa (325); afterwards those sent to the Council of Sardica (345); and those sent by Zosimus I to Africa (418), to settle certain ecclesiastical matters. In the fourth century we find the first example of a papal representative sent in an official character, i. e. the *apocrisiarius* (q. v.), or *responsalis*. According to Hincmar of Reims, the apocrisiarius dates back to the time of Constantine, but according to De Marca (De Ord. Palatii, cap. xiii), the office dates from the Council of Colchis (451). From the letters of Gregory I, himself an apocrisiarius, and from a letter of Leo I to Julianus of Cos, whom he appointed apocrisiarius, can be deduced the powers of this officer and his duties, i. e. to look after the observance of ecclesiastical discipline, to resist the spread of heresy, and to defend the rights of the pope. For three centuries such a papal inter-

mediary existed at the Byzantine Court. During the Iconoclast troubles of the eighth century this office disappeared, but was temporarily revived in the West when the empire was restored by Leo III (795–816). Finally, however, the necessity and frequency of extraordinary legations, the weakening and later division of the empire among the successors of Charlemagne, rendered useless and almost impossible the presence of Apostolic legates at the Frankish court.

Legati Nati.—Almost contemporaneously with the apocrisiarius, the popes established in the fourth century another class of legates, of a purely ecclesiastical character, known eventually as *legati nati*, or perpetual legates. They may be regarded as originating from the "Apostolic vicars" established by Popes Damasus I (366–84) and Siricius (384–99). To provide more expeditiously for ecclesiastical discipline and to facilitate the dispatch of ecclesiastical affairs, the aforesaid popes deemed it opportune to attach to certain sees (and first to Thessalonica) the title and duties of Apostolic vicar. The same title and duties were conferred by later popes on other sees. The prelates who successively occupied those sees came to be known as legati nati, inasmuch as by their election to the said sees they became *ipso facto* Apostolic legates, that office being attached to the see itself. In the course of time legati nati became very numerous; in France those of Arles (545), Sens (876), Lyons (1097); in Spain those of Tarragona (517), Seville (520), Toledo (1088); in Germany those of Trier (969), Salzburg (973); in Italy that of Pisa; in England that of Canterbury, etc. In the beginning the faculties of legati nati were very ample, namely, the right of visiting the dioceses of the province, of examining the status of candidates for bishoprics, of consecrating the metropolitan, etc.; eventually, however, these faculties were much lessened, and in the eleventh century the legati nati practically ceased to exist. In our day the sees to which was annexed such privilege have no longer any extraordinary jurisdiction, though some enjoy an honorary distinction; the Archbishop of Salzburg, for example, may wear the cardinalatial purple, even in Rome.

Legati Missi.—The ecclesiastical conditions of the tenth and eleventh centuries were responsible for the cessation of the office of legati nati. Ecclesiastical life was then in many ways and places ill-regulated, and ecclesiastical discipline very lax; the legati nati proved incapable of remedying these evils, either because sometimes their own conduct was not exemplary or because they were negligent in the discharge of their duties. The Holy See was obliged to combat these abuses by choosing and sending into various countries persons who could be depended upon to secure the desired results (Luxardo, "Das päpstliche Vordekretalen-Gesandschaftsrecht", 1878). Thus came into existence the *legati missi*, or special envoys. Later all those whom the Holy See sent on a special mission were called legati missi, even those who were to preside at some solemn ceremony, e. g. a royal baptism or marriage; those appointed to meet an emperor or a sovereign visiting Rome, etc. This title was also given to those who were chosen to rule some provinces of the Pontifical States, e. g. the legate of Bologna, of Urbino, etc.

Legati a Latere.—About the same time another form of legation was established, which became and is the highest, i. e. the *legati a latere*. The legate a latere is always a cardinal, and this name arises from the fact that a cardinal, being a member of the senate of the pope, is considered as an intimate, one attached to the very side of the Roman Pontiff. Other authorities derive this title from the custom of receiving the insignia and the office in the presence, or at the side, of the pope. Such legates are sent on missions of the greatest importance, e. g. the legate a latere sent to France by Pius VII, in the person of Cardinal Giovanni Battista Caprara, to execute the famous Concordat of 1801. The last legate a latere was also sent to France in 1856, in the person of Cardinal Patrizi, to baptize the Prince Imperial. The "Diario di Roma" of that year gives all the particulars of the proclamation of the appointment in a consistory of 27 August, and of the ceremonies which accompanied the departure of the legate. The same Cardinal Patrizi on that occasion was deputed to present the Golden Rose to the Empress Eugénie. The powers of the legate a latere are of the most ample character, both in matters of litigation and favours. He journeys with an imposing suite; immediately after leaving Rome the cross is borne before him, and in his presence not even patriarchs have the right that their cross should precede them; bishops cannot give episcopal blessings without his consent. According to the present usage, however, a cardinal sent on a mission does not always bear the title of legate a latere, as in the case of a cardinal sent by the pope to represent him at some religious gathering, like the Eucharistic Congresses of Westminster, Cologne, and Montreal. The Decretals and the Council of Trent clearly defined the powers of legates missi and legates a latere. Since the latter were sent only for very important matters, the custom of sending legati missi became more frequent.

Nuncios.—In the thirteenth century legati missi came to be known as *nuncios*, by which name they are yet called. After the Council of Trent nuncios were established permanently in various countries. Besides an ecclesiastical mission, they have also a diplomatic character, having been from their origin accredited to courts or governments. Their jurisdiction is ordinary, but it is customary at present to grant them special faculties, according to the needs of the country to which they are sent; such faculties are conveyed in a special Brief. They are also given credential letters to be presented to the ruler of the country, and particular instructions in writing. The nuncios are usually titular archbishops; occasionally, however, bishops or archbishops of residential sees are appointed to the office. Some nuncios are of the first and some of the second class, the only difference between them being that, at the end of their mission, those of the first class are usually promoted to the cardinalate. Vienna, Madrid, and Lisbon have nuncios of the first class. Paris was also of this class, but, on account of the rupture of diplomatic relations between France and the Vatican which took place in 1907, it has at present no representative of the Holy See. Bavaria, Belgium, and Brazil have nuncios of the second class. There is no specified period for the duration of the term of a nuncio's office; it depends on circumstances and the will of the pope.

Internuncios.—According to the present discipline, there are also internuncios, who in the order of pontifical diplomacy follow immediately after nuncios. These also are frequently titular archbishops, always have a diplomatic character, and are sent to governments of less importance. They are equivalent to ministers of the second class, have the same faculties as nuncios, and are furnished with similar credentials and instructions. At present there are internuncios in Holland, Argentina, and Chile. In Holland, however, because of the exclusion of the Holy See from the Peace Conference of 1899, the internuncio, Monsignor Tarnassi, was recalled, and now there is only a papal chargé d'affaires. The internuncio of Holland is also accredited to the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg.

Apostolic Delegates and Envoys Extraordinary.—Actually there are also papal representatives known as Apostolic delegates and envoys extraordinary. Apostolic delegates, strictly speaking, are always ecclesiastical in character, and are usually sent by the Congregation of Propaganda to missionary countries. However, the pontifical secretariate of state is accustomed to send Apostolic delegates purely ecclesiastical in character to countries which have not diplomatic

relations with the Holy See; at the same time when sending an Apostolic delegate to a country which has diplomatic relations with the Holy See there is added the title of envoy extraordinary, by which title he is accredited to the Government. Such are the Apostolic delegates and envoys extraordinary to South America, e. g. to Colombia, Peru, Bolivia, Ecuador, Costa Rica, etc. Other Apostolic delegates, purely ecclesiastical in character, are those sent to the United States of America, Canada, Mexico, Philippines, Cuba, and Porto Rico. The Apostolic delegation to the United States deserves special mention. First, on account of its importance it is practically equivalent to a nunciature of the first class, as may be inferred from the Encyclical of 6 January, 1895, addressed by Leo XIII to the archbishops and bishops of the United States, which declares: "When the Council of Baltimore had concluded its labours, the duty still remained of putting, so to speak, a proper and becoming crown upon the work. This we perceived could scarcely be done in a more fitting manner than through the due establishment by the Apostolic See of an American legation. Accordingly, as you are well aware, we have done this. By this action, as we have elsewhere intimated, we wished, first of all, to certify that in our judgment and affection America occupied the same place and rights as other states, however powerful and imperial." Moreover, from the beginning all the incumbents of this office have been elevated to the cardinalate. Second, the Apostolic delegation to the United States has the power to decide appeals by definitive sentence; in other words it is a tribunal of third instance, and from its decision there is regularly no appeal to the Holy See. This power, although granted from the beginning, has been recently confirmed by a declaration of the Consistorial Congregation to an inquiry of the Apostolic delegate at Washington, as to whether the original papal grant of authority was to be continued, in view of the transfer of the United States from the jurisdiction of Propaganda to the common law of the Church (Sapienti Consilio, 4 November, 1908). The said reply, given 8 May, 1909, establishes once for all that the parties are free to appeal from a sentence of a diocesan or metropolitan curia directly to Rome or to the delegation, but, an appeal once made to the delegation, the sentence pronounced by the delegate is to be considered definitive.

The Delegation of the United States was established by Leo XIII, 24 January, 1893. The first delegate was Monsignor Francesco Satolli, who in 1892 had been selected to represent the Holy See in the United States at the World's Fair in Chicago, as papal commissioner. He was born at Marsciano, Archdiocese of Perugia, Italy, in 1839; d. at Rome, 8 Jan., 1910. Acknowledged as one of the leading theologians of the day, he was appointed by Leo XIII a professor in the most famous theological schools of Rome, the Propaganda college and Roman seminary. He was later made president of the Academy of Noble Ecclesiastics in Rome (1886), and titular Archbishop of Lepanto (1888); promoted to the cardinalate 29 November, 1895, he received the biretta in February, 1896, at the cathedral of Baltimore, from Cardinal Gibbons. Cardinal Satolli was succeeded 27 Aug., 1896, by Monsignor Sebastian Martinelli, an Augustinian. Born in August, 1848, he entered the Augustinian Order in 1863 and was ordained priest in 1874. He occupied many prominent positions in his order, and was elected prior general for the second term in 1895. While in Nice, he was appointed Apostolic Delegate to the United States and created Archbishop of Ephesus in August, 1896. He was made cardinal 15 April, 1901, and received the biretta 9 May of that year, in the cathedral of Baltimore, from Cardinal Gibbons. The present Apostolic delegate (1909), Monsignor Diomede Falconio, a Franciscan, succeeded Cardinal Martinelli 30 September, 1902, and took possession on 21 November, 1902. He was born 20 September, 1842, at Pescocostanzo in the Abruzzi, Italy, and entered the Franciscan Order 2 September, 1860. On the completion of his studies he was sent as missionary to the United States to the motherhouse of the Franciscans at Alleghany, New York, and was ordained priest by Bishop Timon of Buffalo, 4 January, 1866. After filling several important positions, he was sent, November, 1871, to Newfoundland, as rector of the cathedral, and secretary and chancellor to the bishop. He left Harbor Grace in 1882, and in 1883 returned to Italy. In 1889 he was chosen procurator-general of his order, and in July, 1892, was preconized titular Bishop of Lacedonia. A few years later, he was promoted to the archiepiscopal See of Acerenza and Matera in Southern Italy. Monsignor Falconio was appointed first permanent Apostolic Delegate to Canada, 3 August, 1899, and on 30 September, 1902, was nominated Apostolic Delegate to the United States.

The Holy See is also accustomed, according to circumstances, to send so-called Apostolic vicars, who may be either bishops or prelates or simply members of religious communities. Such representatives have always an ecclesiastical mission only, and are sent to examine the status of a diocese or seminaries, or some religious body.

To nunciatures and Apostolic delegations is attached a staff composed of an auditor and a secretary. They are nominated by the Holy See, and are either of the first or second class. Sometimes the Holy See sends also to nunciatures a counsellor and an attaché. In the absence of nuncio or delegate the auditor takes his place with the title of chargé d'affaires.

Among the envoys of the Holy See should be mentioned also the Apostolic ablegate and the bearer of the Golden Rose. The Apostolic ablegate is geneally a Roman prelate or private chamberlain, sent to bear the cardinal's biretta to a new cardinal who is absent from the residence of the pope. He is accompanied by a member of the Noble Guard, who carries the zucchetto, and by a private secretary. The ceremony of conferring the biretta is performed either by the head of the State, if in diplomatic relation with the Holy See, or by the highest ecclesiastical dignitary in the country. The bearer of the Golden Rose is appointed to carry the Golden Rose (blessed by the pope on Lætare Sunday of each year) to sovereigns or to distinguished individuals or to some famous church. In 1895 this office was established permanently.

RIGHT OF PRECEDENCE OF THE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE HOLY SEE.—The question of precedence among the various diplomatic representatives to foreign countries was treated at the Congress of Vienna in 1815, and it was decided that it always appertains to the representatives of the Holy See. Hence nuncios are by right and in fact deans of the diplomatic body. Some objections were afterwards made, especially by England and Sweden, as to the precedence of Apostolic delegates and internuncios, these not being mentioned in the Congress of Vienna; however, it ended in their practical recognition as included in the decision of said congress.

Sources.—*Decret. Grat.*, dist. xxi, c. xi, xxxvi, C. II, q. vi; *Compl.*, I, l. I, t. xxii, *de off. legati.*; II, I, t. xiii; see also *Decret. Gregor.*, IX; and *Liber Sextus*, I, t. xv; *Conc. Trid.*, Sess. XXII, cap. vii, *De Ref.*; and Sess. XXIV, cap. xx, *De Ref.*; PIUS VI, *Responsio ad Metropolitanos Mogunt., Trev., Colon., et Salisburg.* (14 Nov., 1789); PIUS IX, Const. *Apost. Sed.*, no. 5; *Acta SS.*, XVII, 861.

Authors.—Commentators on the *Corpus Juris* at this title; ZECH, *Hier. Eccles.*, XXV, *De Leg. et Nunt.*; PHILLIPS, *Kirchenrecht*, I, n. 30; DE LA TORRE, *De auctoritate . . . legatorum a latere;* FERRARIS, s. v. *Legatus;* BOUIX, *De Curia Romana*, 579 sqq.; see also THOMASSIN, *Vetus et Nova Eccles. disciplina*, I, l. II, cvii sqq.; and DE LUISE, *De jure publ. seu diplom. Eccl. Cath.*; AUDISIO, *Idea stor. e rag. della Diplom. Eccles.*; WERNZ, *Jus Decr.*, II; GIOBBIO, *Lezioni di Diplom. Eccles.*, I; PINCHETTI-SANMARCHI, *Guida Diplom. Eccles.*, II (Rome, 1908); TAUNTON, *The Law of the Church* (St. Louis, 1906), s.v.

B. CERRETTI.

Legatio Sicula. See SICILY.

Legend, THE GOLDEN. See JACOPO DE VORAGINE.

Legends, LITERARY OR PROFANE.—In the period of national origins history and legend are inextricably mingled. In the course of oral transmission historic narrative necessarily becomes more or less legendary. Details are emphasized or exaggerated, actions ascribed to different motives, facts are forgotten or suppressed, chronological and geographical data confused, and traits and *motifs* from older tales are added. Gradually this tradition, passing from mouth to mouth, takes on a more definite shape and a more distinct outline, and finally it passes into literature and receives a permanent and fixed form. We are seldom able to give a clear and connected account of the origin and development of a saga or legend. In most cases the literary sources on which we depend for our knowledge are of comparatively late date, and even the earliest of them present the legend in an advanced phase of evolution. Of preceding phases we can form an opinion only through a critical analysis and comparison of the sources. In this process of reconstruction much must be left to conjecture; uncertainty necessarily prevails, and difference of opinion is unavoidable.

Germanic Heroic Saga.—A brief notice of this vast subject must suffice. The Euhemeristic method of interpretation, which attempts to explain the sagas on a purely historical basis, is now generally discredited. A blending of mythic and historic elements is now conceded to be a necessary process in all saga-formation. But the view, until recently generally accepted, which interprets the mythical traits as due to the personification and symbolization of natural phenomena, has been criticized on good grounds. No doubt, nature symbolism plays a large rôle in mythology proper, but it seems to have little, if anything, to do with the development of the primitive hero-tales. Their roots seem to lie rather in fairy-lore. Thus in the greatest and oldest of Germanic heroic sagas, that of Siegfried, the nucleus is apparently a primitive Low German tale of greed and murder and cruel vengeance, amplified by *motifs* like those of the dragon-fight and the Sleeping Beauty. Siegfried, who owns a treasure, is murdered by his covetous brother-in-law Hagen. Grimhild (Kriemhild), Siegfried's widow, marries another king, who actuated by greed, murders Hagen. Grimhild in revenge murders her second husband. This seems to be the bare outline of the old tale which was combined with a new historic saga, traceable to the destruction of the Burgundians by the Huns in 437, and the sudden death of the great Hunnish leader, Attila, after his marriage to a German princess, Ildico (i. e. Hilde), in 452. Now, when the two sagas were fused, Ildico was conceived as a Burgundian princess who slew Attila in revenge for the destruction of her kin. Sweeping changes in the action and the motives of the story were a necessary consequence of this fusion. The Norse version ("Edda", "Volsungasaga") and the German version of the "Nibelungenlied" both tell of Grimhild's revenge. But in the former she kills her husband, the slayer of her brother, as in the older form of the legend; in the latter version she kills her brothers, in revenge for the murder of her husband (see GERMANY, sub-title *Literature*, III).

While Siegfried is a mythical figure, Dietrich of Bern is historic. He is the famous East-Gothic king, Theodoric, who ruled over Italy (493–526). Dietrich and Bern are the German forms of Theodoric and Verona. The heroic figure of the king became the centre of the great mass of Gothic tradition, and a whole cycle of sagas gathered about his name. Many local legends were drawn into this cycle. The basic historic facts were completely distorted in process of legendary formation, and when the great Dietrich saga appeared in literature, in the Old High German "Hildebrandslied", in numerous Middle High German epics (see GERMANY, sub-title *Literature*, III), and the "Thidrekssaga" (which, though written in Norse about 1250, is based on Low German tradition), little that is historical remained.

Myth and history are also combined in the Beowulf saga, which forms the subject of the oldest English epic. Beowulf, a prince of the Geátas, comes to help the Danish king, Hrothgar, against Grendel, a fiendish monster, who had ravaged the Danish realm. In two mighty combats he slays Grendel and Grendel's mother. Returning, he becomes king of his people, over whom he rules happily for fifty years. Once more the aged hero goes forth, to battle with a fire-breathing dragon that devastates the land. He kills the monster, but dies of injuries sustained in the fight. It is generally believed that the Beowulf saga is of Scandinavian origin. But whether the epic arose in Scandinavia or in England is a question that has not been decided.

On the subject in general consult SYMONS, *Germanische Heldensage* in PAUL, *Grundriss der Germanischen Philologie* (2nd ed., Strasburg, 1900), III, 606 sqq.; see also JIRICZEK, *Die deutsche Heldensage* (3rd ed., Leipzig, 1906). For the Nibelungen saga consult BOER, *Untersuchungen über den Ursprung und die Entwickelung der Nibelungensage* (Halle, 1907). The presentation of the genesis of the legend given above is based on this work. For the Dietrich saga see particularly JIRICZEK, *Deutsche Heldensagen* (Strasburg, 1898). For the Beowulf saga see SYMONS, *op. cit.*, 644–651, where bibliography is given.

Legends of Charlemagne.—It was inevitable that Charlemagne should become the hero of romance and legend. His actual exploits were magnified and additional ones were invented or transferred to him from other popular heroes, especially Frankish kings of the same name, like Charles Martel and Charles the Bald. The formation of legend relating to Charlemagne began even during the lifetime of the great ruler. In the book of the so-called Monachus Sangallensis, which was written after 883 on the basis of oral tradition, he appears already as a legendary figure. Among the stories there related are those of the Iron Charles entering Pavia, where the Langobardian King Desiderius, and Otker the Frank await his coming, and the latter swoons at the sight of the mailed emperor; or of the giant Eishere who, in battle against the Slavs, spears seven to nine heathens like frogs on the point of his lance; of the ruthless slaughter of all those captured Saxons whose stature exceeded the measure of the emperor's sword. Unlike the heroic sagas, the Charlemagne legends from their very inception show an ecclesiastical tinge. In this connexion we may recall the canonization of Charles by the antipope Paschal III in 1165, which, of course, never possessed validity.

When the Franks lost their Germanic character their hero became identified with the French nationality. Stories connected with his name were more or less current in various parts of Germany. It was said that he did not die, but resided in the Odenberg, Hessia, or the Untersberg (near Salzburg), whence he would reappear to bring back the empire to glory. His justice also was proverbial, as is attested by the story, told in German chronicles, of the serpent ringing the bell that Charles had set up before his palace for all those having a grievance to bring to his attention. But he never became prominent in German literature, whereas in France he became the very centre of the national heroic *épopées*. His legendary deeds and those of his paladins were celebrated in numerous epics or "Chansons de Geste" ("Chanson de Roland", "Pèlerinage", "Aspremont", "Fierabras", "Ogier", "Renaud de Montauban", etc.). At first these poems were only loosely connected; later on attempts were made at cyclic unification, resulting in such compilations as the "Charlemagne" of Girard d'Amiens (c. 1300), the German "Karlmeinet", the Norwegian "Karlamagnússaga" and the Italian prose romance

"Reali di Francia" of Andrea de' Magnabotti. Much legendary material is also found in chronicles, like those of the above-mentioned monk of St. Gall, of the monk of Saintonge, of Alberic de Trois Fontaines (c. 1250), of Philippe Mousket (c. 1241), and the German chronicle of Enenkel.

What is related of Charlemagne in these sources is a medley of fact and fiction. The story of his parents, Pepin the Short and Bertha (in "Berte aux grands pieds"), is the familiar theme of virtue slandered but in the end vindicated. To escape the persecutions of his bastard brothers, Charles takes refuge in Toledo with the heathen king Galafre, whose daughter Galienne he marries, after he has punished his wicked brothers and regained his father's kingdom ("Charlemagne", "Karlmeinet", "Karleto", "Cronica general"). Possibly this reflects historical events from the period of Charles Martel, who was of illegitimate birth, and experienced difficulties in his accession to the throne. At any rate, Pepin and Bertha are historic personages. Wholly fabulous, however, is the story of the pilgrimage undertaken by the emperor and his peers to the Holy Land, whence they bring back the Passion relics, which were deposited in the Church of St. Denis. Probably the legend arose in connexion with these relics, which were actually presented by the Patriarch of Jerusalem about 800.

In the poems and romances that deal with the wars of Charlemagne in Spain [(778) "Chanson de Roland"] and Italy [(773) "Ogier", "Fierabras", "Aspremont"] the principal rôle is assigned not to Charles, but to his paladins (Roland, Olivier, Turpin) or vassals (sons of Aimon, Ogier). The Saxon wars have left little trace in French poetry [Bodel's "Saisnes" (c. 1200), and an older "Guitalin", known only from the Norse version in the "Karlamagnússaga"]. In Germany their memory is preserved by many a legend concerning the heroic Widukind (Wittekind). In French versions the conversion of the Saxon chieftain is represented as insincere and of short duration, in German legend, on the contrary, it is glorified by miracle. While Widukind in the disguise of a beggar attends the Easter celebration in the Frankish camp, he sees the image of the Christ-Child at the moment of the elevation of the Host during Mass, and his conversion is the result (Grimm, "Deutsche Sagen", 448). In a narrative of the life of the Empress Mathilde (974) Widukind is made to fight in single combat with Charles, and on being defeated turns Christian. The French version also knows of this combat, but here Guiteclin is killed. The name of Frankfort (the ford of the Franks) is explained by a German legend which relates how the hard-pressed Franks were saved by a hind that showed them a place where they could cross the River Main in safety (Grimm, op. cit., 449).

In the older French epics, devoted to the glorification of royalty, Charlemagne is represented as the incarnation of majesty, valour, and justice, the champion of God's Church against the infidel. In the later epics, the so-called feudal *épopée* ("Ogier", "Renaud de Montauban", "Doon de Mayence", etc.), which reflect the historic struggles of the monarchy with turbulent vassals, the great emperor appears in quite a different light, as a vindictive tyrant and unjust oppressor. Nor does he appear to advantage in the various legends that tell of his love affairs, among which is the well-known German legend of his attachment to a dead woman due to the magic power of a jewel hidden in her mouth. This legend was localized at Aachen. A courtier who had gained possession of the talisman dropped it in a hot spring. Henceforth the emperor felt an irresistible love for this spot and caused Aachen to be built there.

Through French mediation the Carlovingian romances came to other nations. In England, Caxton published "The Lyfe of Charles the Grete" (1485) and "The four sonnes of Aymon" (1486). Lord Berners translated "Huon of Bordeaux" in 1534. In Germany the "Rolandslied" of Konrad der Pfaffe, the poem of Stricker (thirteenth century), the "Karlmeinet" (fourteenth century), and the chap-books of the fifteenth century, in Scandinavia the "Karlamagnússaga" (c. 1300), in the Netherlands numerous translations like "Carel ende Elegast" show the spread of the Charlemagne legend. In Italy, it was especially favoured. There it inspired the Franco-Italian epics and the bulky romance of Magnabotti, and culminated in the famous chivalric epics of Boiardo and Ariosto.

PARIS, *Histoire poétique de Charlemagne* (Paris, 1865; 2nd ed., 1905); LÉON GAUTIER, *Les Epopées françaises*, III (2nd ed., Paris, 1888–1897); GRÖBER in *Grundriss der romanischen Philologie*, II (Strasburg, 1902), 1, 461–469; 538–552; BECKER, *Grundriss der altfranzösischen Literatur*, I (Heidelberg, 1907), 62–92. Many of the legends, particularly those current in Germany, are found in GRIMM, *Deutsche Sagen* (4th ed., Berlin, 1905), nos. 22, 26–28, 437–454. See also KÖGEL, *Geschichte der deutschen Litteratur*, I (Strasburg, 1894), pt. II, 220–230.

Roland.—Of the paladins, usually twelve in number, with whom legend surrounds Charlemagne, the most famous is Roland, whose heroic death forms the theme of the "Chanson de Roland" (c. 1080). This poem relates how the rear-guard of the Frankish army, returning from a victorious campaign against the Saracens in Spain, is treacherously surprised by the enemy at Roncevaux, and how Roland, Olivier, and Turpin, after incredible deeds of valour, are slain before the emperor arrives to bring help. The events narrated here have a historical basis; the battle of Roncevaux (Roncesvalles) actually took place on 15 August, 778. According to Einhard (Vita Caroli Magni, IX) the Frankish rear-guard was cut to pieces by Basque marauders, among the slain being Hruodlandus, prefect of the March of Brittany. In the poem the defeat is laid to the treason of Ganelon; the vengeance which the emperor exacts from the enemy and the punishment of the traitor are vividly narrated. The legend represents Roland as Charlemagne's nephew, the son of the emperor's sister Bertha and of Duke Milo of Aglant. The story of their romantic love, their quarrel with the emperor, and their ultimate reconciliation to him figures prominently in Italian versions ("Reali di Francia"). Roland is a paragon of knightly virtue. Quite young he distinguishes himself in wars against the Saracens in Italy ("Aspremont") and the Saxons, in both campaigns saving his uncle from threatened disaster.

In Italian literature Roland becomes the chief hero of the chivalric *épopée* represented at its best by Pulci's "Morgante maggiore" (1482), Boiardo's "Orlando innamorato" (1486), and Ariosto's "Orlando Furioso" (1516). In Spain the tradition underwent a complete change; the defeat of the Franks was regarded as a Spanish victory, and the real hero of Roncevaux is the national champion, Bernaldo del Carpio, Roland's opponent. The German poem of Konrad der Pfaffe has been mentioned above.

PARIS, *op. cit.*, 259–285, 406–414, 415; see also his essay *Roncevaux* in *Légendes du moyen âge* (Paris, 1903), 1–63.

Geneviève (*Genovefa*) *of Brabant.*—This legend may be discussed in connexion with the Carlovingian cycle, inasmuch as the events therein related are usually assigned to the eighth century, to the period of the wars of Charles Martel against the Saracens. It has for its theme the familiar story of persecuted innocence, and is therefore closely akin to the legends of Griseldis, Hildegard, Hirlanda of Brittany, and other heroines of suffering. According to the usual version, Geneviève is the wife of the Count Palatine Siegfried, residing in the region of Trier. When he is called away on an expedition against the infidels, he entrusts his wife and castle to the care of his major-domo Golo. Inflamed with sinful passion, Golo makes advances to the countess, and on being repulsed, falsely accuses her to her absent lord of adultery. The count sends word to put

his wife and her new-born son to death, and Golo bids two servants execute this command. But moved by pity they let her go, and she takes refuge in a cave in the Ardennes together with her child, who is miraculously suckled by a roe. At the end of six years Count Siegfried, who has in the meantime repented of his rash deed, is led to this cave while pursuing the roe, and a happy reunion is the result. Golo dies a traitor's death, his limbs being torn asunder by four oxen. The legend adds that a chapel was built and dedicated to Our Lady at the very spot where the cave was. It is the Chapel of Frauenkirchen, near Laach, and there Geneviève is said to be buried.

The origin of the legend is wholly unknown. The oldest versions are found in manuscript dating from the fifteenth century, most of them hailing from Laach. An account was written in 1472 by Matthias Emichius (Emmich) a Carmelite friar, later auxiliary Bishop of Mainz. The learned antiquarian Marquard Freher appended a version of the legend drawn from a Laach manuscript to his "Origines Palatinæ" (1613). The legend is told in connexion with the foundation of the chapel of Frauenkirchen. In all these versions the time of action is that of a Bishop Hildulf of Trier. But no such bishop is known. Nor is it possible to identify Geneviève with any historic personage. As for Siegfried, there were several counts of that name, but nothing is known of them to permit of an identification. An historical basis for the legend has not been found. The arguments for a mythical origin are futile. So the opinion has been advanced (by Seuffert) that the legend is the fabrication of a monk from the monastery of Laach, and dates from the fourteenth century.

The fame of the story is due to the work of the French Jesuit René de Cerisiers. His book, entitled "L'Innocence reconnue ou Vie de Sainte Geneviève de Brabant", won immediate popularity. The oldest datable edition is from 1638. Two years later this story, together with those of Jeanne d'Arc and Hirlanda, was reprinted in "Les trois états de l'innocence affligée", etc. In Cerisiers' version the legend has been considerably amplified; its pious character is emphasized, especially through the copious introduction of miracles. Here also the child receives the Biblical name Benoni (i. e. son of my sorrow, Gen., xxxv, 18) whence the "Schmerzenreich" of the German version. Reference to Charles Martel fixed the eighth century as the time of action.

Cerisiers' work inspired a number of Dutch and German books on the legend, in all of which the material is treated with more or less freedom. The authors of the first two German versions are Jesuits; these versions were followed by the "Auserlesenes History-Buch" (Dillingen, 1687) of Father Martin of Cochem (d. 1712), a Capuchin friar. Here the story of St. Geneviève is given among a number of pious legends, and it was this version that made the legend popular in Germany, where it became the subject of chap-books. Some of these books base their account on Dutch versions, the first of which had appeared in 1645. In these Protestant influence is unmistakable; the miracles, already curtailed in the German version, are here completely expunged. Of English versions we have at least two, one of which "The Triumphant Lady, or the Crowned Innocence" (London, 1654) is by Sir W. Lower.

SAUERBORN, *Geschichte der Pfalzgräfin Genovefa und der Kapelle Frauenkirchen* (Ratisbon, 1856); SEUFFERT, *Die Legende von der Pfalzgräfin Genovefa* (Würzburg, 1877); GOLZ, *Pfalzgräfin Genovefa in der deutschen Dichtung* (Leipzig, 1897).

Arthur (*Artus*), a famous legendary King of the Britons, the central figure of a great medieval cycle of romance. His court is represented as a model court for the cultivation of every knightly virtue. He himself presides over the famous Round Table, about which is assembled a band of chosen knights. The adventures of these knights form the subject-matter of the numerous romances of the Arthurian cycle.

The history of the origin and development of the Arthurian legend is not clear. The very existence of Arthur has been doubted, and attempts have been made to reduce him to a myth. But it is now well known that he was an historic figure, a British chieftain of the end of the fifth and the beginning of the sixth century A. D., who championed the cause of the native Britons against the foreign invaders, especially the Angles and Saxons. The oldest British chronicler of Wales, Gildas, in his "De Excidio Britanniæ" (c. 540) knows of the great victory of the Britons at Mount Badon, but makes no mention of Arthur. The first record of him is found in the "Historia Brittonum" (written 796), ascribed to Nennius. There he appears already as a legendary figure, the champion of an oppressed people against the cruel invaders, whom he defeats in twelve great battles, the last being fought at *Mons Badonis*. So by the end of the eighth century the legend of a great champion was already current among the Celtic population of the British Isles and Brittany, and this legend was further developed and amplified by the addition of new legendary traits. It received its literary form in the "Historia regum Brittanniæ", a Latin chronicle, written between 1118 and 1135 by the Welsh monk Godfrey (Galfridus, Gruffydd) of Monmouth. This work, purporting to give a history of the British kings from the mythical Brutus to Cadwallo (689), is a curious medley of fact and fable. The exploits related of Arthur are wholly fabulous. His father is Uther Pendragon (Uther dragon-head), his mother Igerna, wife of the Duke of Cornwall. Merlin the Wizard by a trick has effected their union. Arthur becomes ruler at the age of fifteen and at once enters upon his career of victory by defeating the Saxons. He marries Guanhumara (Gwenhwyvar, Ginevra, Guinevere) and establishes a court the fame of which spreads far and wide. In a series of wars he conquers Scotland, Ireland, Norway, and Gaul. Finally he makes war against Rome, but, though victorious, is compelled to turn back to protect his wife and kingdom from the treacherous designs of his nephew Mordred. In the battle of Camlan (Cambula) the latter is killed, but Arthur, too, is mortally wounded and mysteriously removed to the Isle of Avalon, whence he will reappear (so other chronicles relate), some day to restore his people to power.

It is not known with certainty what sources Godfrey used. Probably he drew his information from Welsh chronicles, as well as from oral tradition preserved by Breton story-tellers. Much, also, is his own invention. The work won immediate favour, and became the basis of several other rhymed chronicles, such as the "Brut" of Wace (or Gace) written about 1157, and that of Layamon (c. 1200), the first English work in which the legend of Arthur appears. In Godfrey's history mention is made of Arthur's court as far-famed, but the first explicit reference to the Round Table is found in Wace's "Brut". From this reference it is perfectly clear that this legendary institution was already well known in Brittany when Wace wrote. At a later period, when the Grail legend was fused with that of Arthur, the Round Table was identified with the Grail table instituted by Joseph of Arimathea, and was then said to have been founded by Uther Pendragon at the suggestion of Merlin (so in the Grail romance of Robert de Boron).

Towards the end of the twelfth century the Arthurian legend makes its appearance in French literature in the epics of Chrestien de Troyes. How this material, the *matière de Bretagne*, was transmitted, is one of the most difficult and disputed questions in connexion with the history of medieval French literature. It is admitted that Godfrey and the chroniclers cannot have been the only sources; the subject matter of the romances is too varied for that, and points to the in-

fluence of popular tradition. Moreover, the material has been entirely transformed under the influence of the ideals of knight-errantry and courtly love. These deeds dominated all the Arthurian romances, and gave them their immense vogue with the polite society of the Middle Ages. Arthur plays but a passive rôle in them; the chief stress falls on the adventures of the Knights of the Table Round. Of these Gawain (Gwalchmai, Gauvain) already figured prominently in the history of Godfrey, where he is called Walgannus. Perceval, the Peredur of Welsh folk-tales and of Godfrey, has become especially famous as the hero of the quest of the Holy Grail. Originally his legend, like that of the Grail, was wholly independent of that of Arthur (for the Perceval legend see GRAIL, THE HOLY). Other famous legendary heroes like Lancelot and Tristram were also joined to the company of the Table Round, and their legends likewise incorporated into that of Arthur. So the great cycle of Arthurian romances gradually came into existence.

Through French mediation these romances spread through Europe. In Germany they inspired the courtly epics (see GERMANY, sub-title *Literature*, III). They also came to Italy, Spain, and Norway. In England Sir Thomas Malory gathered them and used them for his famous prose romance "Morte Arthure" (finished 1470, printed by Caxton, 1485). To Malory the legend of Arthur owes its popularity in England. Its influence is felt in Spenser's "Faerie Queene", and Milton, as is well known, thought of writing an English Arthuriad. In modern times Tennyson has revived the legend in his "Idylls of the King".

Consult the bibliography appended to the article on the Holy Grail. Many of the works there cited treat also of the Arthurian legend. See also ZIMMER, *Nennius vindicatus* (Berlin, 1893); RHYS, *Studies in the Arthurian Legend* (Oxford, 1891); NEWELL, *King Arthur and the Table Round* (Boston, 1897). On the question of the origin of the "matière de Bretagne" see VORETZSCH, *Einführung in das Studium der altfranzösischen Literatur* (Halle, 1905), 339–352, where the literature of the subject is given in full. Useful also for the later literature is MACCALLUM, *Tennyson's Idylls of the King and Arthurian Story from the Sixteenth Century* (Glasgow, 1894).

Tristan and Isolde.—Among the knights of Arthur appears also Tristan (Tristram), whose love for Isolde and its tragic end are the subject of some of the most famous romances in literature. Here, too, we have an originally independent legend of Celtic origin, but elaborated by French poets into a love romance. The names Tristan and Mark point to Celtic heroic saga as the root of the story—Drust or Drustan as a name of Pictish kings can be traced as far back as the eighth century. The name of Morholt is probably Germanic; so is Isold (i. e. Iswalda) or Iselt (i. e. Ishilt). These Germanic elements date from the period of Viking rule in Dublin during the ninth and tenth centuries. The legend, no doubt, took shape in Britain and then wandered to Brittany, experiencing in the course of its development various modifications. New *motifs*, like that of the love potion, the story of the vicarious wooing, the trick whereby Isolde successfully undergoes the ordeal, were added. They are familiar from story-literature. Other *motifs*, such as the ship with black sails, are clearly traceable to antique romance, in this case to the Theseus legend. By the middle of the twelfth century a full-fledged Tristan romance existed, but the literary versions that we possess are of a later date. It is known that Chrestien de Troyes wrote a poem about Mark and Isolde, but it is lost. The French versions extant are those of Bérol, a Breton *jongleur*, or glee-man, and of Thomas, an Anglo-Norman *trouvère*, who wrote between 1160 and 1170. Bérol's version, the date of which is a matter of dispute, is the basis of the German "Tristan" of Eilhard von Oberg, while Gottfried von Strassburg followed Thomas. Both versions agree for the main traits of the legend, however much they differ in detail.

For the content of the legend and its bibliography see the article on GOTTFRIED VON STRASSBURG.

Lohengrin, the Knight of the Swan.—In Wolfram's "Parzival", where a brief outline of the story of Lohengrin is given at the close, the legend appears as a part of the Grail cycle, and therefore also of the Arthurian cycle. But originally it was wholly independent of both. In the oldest literary versions, the French poems of the "Chevalier au cygne" (the earliest dates from the beginning of the thirteenth century), the tale of the Knight of the Swan is connected with Godfrey of Bouillon, and the French poems themselves are part of an epic cycle dealing with the Crusades. How this connexion came about is not known. But it was certainly well known by the end of the twelfth century, as is proved by an allusion to it in the history of the Crusades written by Bishop William of Tyre (d. about 1184). The purpose was evidently to glorify the House of Bouillon by ascribing to it a supernatural origin. The story as given in the French poems is as follows: before Emperor Otto holding court at Nymwegen the Duchess of Bouillon pleads for justice against the Saxon Duke Renier, who has made grave charges against her. She cannot find a champion to prove her innocence in single combat, when suddenly an unknown knight appears in a skiff drawn by a swan. He defeats her opponent and marries her daughter Beatris. But he imposes the condition that his wife must never ask his name or lineage. When, after seven years of wedded life, she breaks this command, the unknown knight leaves her. A daughter named Ida has resulted from this union. She marries Count Eustache of Boulogne and becomes the mother of Godfrey of Bouillon.

The kernel of this legend seems to be an old genealogical myth, such as that told of Scyld in "Beowulf". A mysterious stranger arrives in a rudderless ship among a people, becomes their ruler and the ancestor of the reigning house. When his time is fulfilled, he departs as mysteriously as he has come. Such a myth was current among Germanic tribes inhabiting the sea-coast. Possibly the mysterious stranger originally was a solar deity and the swan a symbol of the cloud. The story was designed to show the divine descent of the ruling house. Its origin, whether Celtic or Germanic, is in dispute. The theme of the Lohengrin legend, the union between a supernatural being and a mortal, is of frequent recurrence in mythology and folk-lore.

With the tale of the swan-knight was combined an old Germanic fairy tale of some children changed into swans by the evil arts of a wicked stepmother. Only the little girl escapes, and becomes the means of rescuing her brothers. This story is familiar to readers of Grimm's fairy tales. In the French poems on this subject, the children are the offspring of a union between a king and a fairy, and the king's mother plays the villain's part. Their transformation into swans is the result of their being deprived of the necklaces which they had when they were born. When these are restored they regain their human form, all but one, who has lost his necklace. He remains a swan and henceforth draws the skiff of his brother, who is therefore called the knight of the swan. It is clear that this story was added to account for the mysterious origin of the hero. Its earliest literary record occurs in the Latin romance "Dolopathos", a collection of stories, mostly of Oriental origin, written by Jean de Hauteseille (Johannes de Alta Silva) at the beginning of the thirteenth century. Here the characters are as yet unnamed. In the French poem known as "Elioxe" (end of twelfth century) the hero is a king named Lothair, the fairy is called Elioxe (Eliouse). In the versions of the "Chevalier au cygne" the king's name is Oriant, his wife is called Beatris, his mother Matabrune.

Through French mediation the legend passed into other lands. In England we have the poem of the "Chevalere Assigne" and the prose romance of "Hel-

yas, Knight of the Swan" (edited by Thoms in "Early English Prose Romances"). In Spain the legend was incorporated in the "Gran Conquista de Ultramar" (xlvii sq.). There are also versions in Italy and Iceland. Of special interest is the development of the legend in Germany.

In the French versions the swan-knight is called Helias (Elie). In Konrad von Würzburg's epic "Der Schwanritter" (c. 1260) he remains unnamed. The lady in distress is the Duchess of Brabant, the emperor is Charlemagne. The swan-knight is not the ancestor of Godfrey of Bouillon, but of the dukes of Cleves. Konrad's version is based on an unknown French source. So is the brief outline given by Wolfram at the close of his "Parzival". There the legend is connected with that of the Grail in that the hero is the son of Parzival, the Grail-king. Here also he is called Loherangrin (i. e. Loherenc Garin, Garin the Lotharingian). The duchess is Elsa of Brabant. Whether these changes in names are Wolfram's own, or whether they were in his French source cannot be decided. On the basis of Wolfram's outline, but amplified and expanded by the introduction of wholly extraneous matter, arose between 1283 and 1290 the bulky German epic "Lohengrin", the work, it seems, of two different authors, but unknown. The Lohengrin story is here a mere episode of the legendary minstrel contest held at the Wartburg castle and is put into the mouth of Wolfram himself. The accuser is here Count Friedrich Telramund, the emperor is Henry I the Fowler, and a Duchess of Cleves instigates Elsa to put the forbidden question. We see that in German versions Cleves figures in the legend; in fact, in some chronicles the scene of action is laid there (see Grimm, "Deutsche Sagen", 4th ed., ed. Steig, Berlin, 1905, no. 535), and the date given is 711. Fantastic continuations are found in the poem called "Der jüngere Titurel" (c. 1260) and in the bulky versified narrative of Ulrich Füetrer "Buch der Abenteue" (written c. 1490). According to the account there given, Lohengrin sallies forth a second time, and comes to Lyzabori (Luxemburg) where he marries the Princess Belaye. An attempt is made on his life by her jealous relatives, and, though it is repulsed, Lohengrin succumbs to a wound received in the struggle. His wife dies of grief.

GOLTHER in *Romanische Forschungen* (1890), V, 103–136; TODD, preface to *La Naissance du Chevalier au Cygne* in *Publication of the Modern Language Association of America*, IV (Baltimore, 1889); MUNCKER, *Die Dichtung des Lohengrin von Richard Wagner und ihre Quellen* in *Beilage zur Allgemeinen Zeitung* (1891), no. 148; PANZER, *Lohengrinstudien* (Halle, 1894); BLÖTE in *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, XXI (1897), 176 sq.; IDEM in *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum*, XLII (1898), 1 sq.

Tannhäuser.—This legend, as related in German folk-songs of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and their variants in Low German, Dutch, and Danish, is as follows: Tannhäuser, a minstrel knight, enters the mountain of Venus, a sort of subterranean paradise where the heathen goddess holds her voluptuous court, and for a year he revels in its unholy pleasures. Then a longing seizes upon him to return to earth, and when, through the aid of Mary, whom he invokes, his wish is realized, he hastens to Rome to implore pardon for his sin from Pope Urban IV. This the pope refuses to grant; Tannhäuser cannot be saved any more than the staff in the pontiff's hand can put forth fresh leaves. In despair the knight returns to the mountain of Venus and is not seen again. Soon after, the staff bursts into blossom and now messengers are sent to seek the knight, but too late.

No doubt we have here a tale of originally heathen character, subsequently Christianized. Its theme is the familiar story of the seduction of a human being by an elf or fairy. But all the delights of the fairy-realm cannot make him forget his earthly home, for which he longs. His desire is granted, but he is not happy, and in the end returns to the fairy-land. This *motif* is a commonplace in folk-lore literature. In the German legend the seductive fairy is identified with the ancient goddess of love, and the story is given a distinctly religious colour through the introduction of the pilgrimage of the repentant sinner to Rome. The *motif* of the withered staff bursting into blossom has also many parallels in sacred legend, and is evidently a later addition. How the legend came to assume the form outlined above can only be surmised. Of the poems that we possess on the subject none dates further back than the middle of the fifteenth century. The famous *Volkslied* that gives the above version is from the sixteenth century. A passage in Hermann von Sachsenheim's poem, "Die Mörin" proves that the legend, with its essential traits, was already known in 1453 when the poem was written. There Tannhäuser is referred to as the husband of Dame Venus. Now the historical Tannhäuser was a Minnesinger of the thirteenth century, who seems to have led a roving life, in the course of which he experienced many changes of fortune. His checquered career is reflected in his poems, which exhibit a strange mingling of dissolute boasting and pious sentiment. In one poem ascribed to him, repentance is expressed for foolish and sinful living, and this poem is supposed to be responsible for his appearing in the legend in the rôle of the penitent knight. But this is purely conjectural. As a matter of fact, the only connexion between the legendary and historical Tannhäuser is the identity of name.

It is noteworthy that a legend strikingly similar to that of Tannhäuser is attached in Italy to the Monte della Sibilla, near Norcia. It is related at length by Antoine de La Sale in his "Salade", written between 1438 and 1442. He visited the sibyl's cave in 1420, and heard the story from the people of the neighbouring region. A still earlier reference to the legend is found in the famous romance "Guerino il meschino" of Andrea dei Magnabotti (1391). The Italian version knows that the cavalier entering the cave is a German, but does not mention his name; the queen of the subterranean paradise is the Sibyl of ancient prophetic fame, transformed into the goddess of pleasure. In view of these parallels which antedate the appearance of the legend in German literature, Gaston Paris disputes the German origin of the Tannhäuser legend, and regards Italy as its home. Its ultimate source he finds in Celtic folk-lore. But this cannot be proved, since the earlier history of the legend is not attested by any extant literary monuments either in Italy or in Germany. It is to be noted that in the German version there is a distinct tone of hostility to the papacy, wholly lacking in the Italian variants. In fact the miracle of the blossoming staff is a pointed reproof of the pope's harshness. This can readily be explained if the legend developed in Germany, where antipapal feeling was strong after the days of the Hohenstaufens. The dominant idea of the legend is the glorification of God's infinite mercy to sinners. But this ideal is set forth in a spirit most unfriendly to the Church. The attitude ascribed to the pope by the *Volkslied* is wholly contrary to Catholic doctrine.

GRÄSSE, *Der Tannhäuser und ewige Jude* (Dresden, 1861); VON SCHLEINITZ, *Wagner's Tannhäuser und Sängerkrieg auf der Wartburg* (Meran, 1891), especially 127–178; GOLTHER, *Geschichte der Tannhäuser-Sage und Dichtung* in *Bayreuther Taschenkalender* (1891), 829 sq.; SCHMIDT, *Tannhäuser in Sage und Dichtung* in *Nord und Süd* (Nov., 1892); SÖDERHJELM, *Antoine de La Sale et la légende de Tannhäuser* in *Mémoires de la société néo-Philologique à Helsingfors* II (1897), 101–167; PARIS, *Légendes du Moyen Âge* (Paris, 1903), 111–145; REUSCHEL, *Die Tannhäusersage* in *Neue Jahrbücher für das Klassische Altertum, Geschichte und deutsche Literatur*, XIII (Leipzig, 1904), 653–667.

Robert the Devil.—God's boundless grace to sinners is also the theme of this legend as presented in French romances. Robert is the devil's own child, for his mother, despairing of heaven's aid in order to obtain a son, has addressed herself to the devil. From the

moment of his birth the boy shows his vicious instincts, which urge him, when grown to manhood, to a career of monstrous crime. At last the horror which he inspires everywhere causes him to reflect, and, having found out the awful secret of his birth, he hastens to Rome to confess to the pope. He undergoes the most rigorous penance, living in the disguise of a fool at the emperor's court in Rome. Three times he delivers the city from the assault of the Saracens, but, refusing all reward, he ends his life as a pious hermit. According to another version he marries the emperor's daughter, whose love he has won in his humble disguise, and succeeds to the throne.

The oldest known account of this legend is a Latin prose narrative by a Dominican friar, Etienne de Bourbon (c. 1250). Then it appears in a French metrical romance of the thirteenth century, also in a *dit* of somewhat later date, and in a miracle play of the fourteenth century. A French prose version was also prefixed to the old "Croniques de Normandie" (probably of the thirteenth century). But the legend owes its popularity to the story-books, of which the earliest known appeared at Lyons in 1496, and again at Paris in 1497, under the title "La vie du terrible Robert le dyable". Since the sixteenth century the legend was often printed together with that of Richard sans Peur; it was published in completely recast form in 1769 under the title "Histoire de Robert le Diable, duc de Normandie, et de Richard Sans Peur, son fils."

From France the legend spread to Spain, where it was very popular. In England the subject was treated in the metrical romance, "Sir Gowther", the work of an unknown minstrel of the fifteenth century. An English translation from the French chap-book was made by Wynkyn de Worde, Caxton's assistant, and published without date under the title "Robert deuyll" (reprinted in Thoms, "Early English Prose Romances", London and New York, 1907). Another version, not based on the preceding, was given by Thomas Lodge in his book on "Robin the Divell" (London, 1591). In the Netherlands the romance of Robrecht den Duyvel was put on the index of forbidden books by the Bishop of Antwerp (1621). In Germany the legend never attained much of a vogue; not until the nineteenth century did it pass into the *Volksbücher*, being introduced by Görres (q. v.). It was treated in epic form by Victor von Strauss (1854), in dramatic form by Raupach (1835). Meyerbeer's opera "Robert le Diable" (1831) enjoyed great favour for a time. The libretto, written by Scribe and Delavigne, has little in common with the legend except the name of the hero.

Du Méril, *La légende de Robert le Diable* in *Etudes sur quelques points d'archéologie et d'histoire littéraire* (1862), 272–317; introduction to Breul, *Sir Gowther* (Oppeln, 1886). In this book a complete bibliography is given. See also the introduction to Löseth's edition of *Robert le Diable* (Paris, 1903).

The Wandering Jew.—This legend has been widely popular ever since its first appearance in a German chap-book of 1602. There it is told as follows: When Jesus bore his Cross to Calvary, he passed the house of a cobbler, Ahasuerus by name, who had been one of the rabble to shout, "Crucify him." Sinking beneath his burden, Jesus stopped to rest at the threshold of the cobbler, but was driven away with the words; "Go where thou belongest." Thereupon Our Lord gazed sternly at Ahasuerus and said: "I will stand here and rest, but thou shalt go on until the last day." And since then the Jew has been roaming restlessly over the earth.

The first literary record of such a doomed wanderer is found in the "Flores Historiarum", a chronicle of Roger of Wendover, a monk of St. Albans (d. 1237). The account there given was incorporated with some slight amplifications into the "Historia Major" of Matthew Paris (d. 1259). The story is told on the authority of an Armenian bishop who visited England in 1228 and had personally known the doomed man. According to this version, Cartaphilus, a doorkeeper at Pilate's mansion, saw Jesus as he was led forth to be crucified and struck him contemptuously, crying at the same time: "Go Jesus, go faster, why dost thou linger?" Whereupon Jesus replied: "I go, but thou shalt wait till I come." And so the offender has not been able to die, but still waits for the coming of Christ. He is leading a quiet, saintly life. Whenever he reaches the age of a hundred years he is miraculously restored to the age of thirty. Since his conversion to Christianity his name is Joseph. A similar version, also on the authority of the Armenian bishop, is given by the Flemish chronicler, Philippe Mousket, Bishop of Tournai (about 1243). No doubt, this version is the basis for the story given in the chap-books.

Now the legend is surely not the invention of the Armenian bishop, as has been sometimes claimed. It was well known in Italy during the thirteenth century, and must have existed long before that. According to the astrologer Guido Bonatti, who is mentioned by Dante (Inf., xx, 118), the wanderer passed through Forli in 1267. Philip of Novara, a famous jurist, in his "Livre de Forme de Plait" (c. 1250), refers to a certain Jehan Boute Dieu as one proverbially long-lived. Now Philip resided for a long time in Jerusalem and Cyprus; this, together with the fact that the account in the English chronicles also localizes Cartaphilus in Armenia, seems to point to an Oriental origin for the legend. Probably it was part of a local cycle that sprang up in Jerusalem in connexion with the Passion, and was brought to Europe by crusaders or pilgrims. A legend of a surviving witness of the Crucifixion, who is represented as the victim of a curse, was certainly current in Jerusalem, and is repeatedly referred to in accounts of travels to the Holy Land. The name of the accursed wanderer is generally given as Joannes Buttadeus, in Italian as Bottadio, which evidently means "God-smiter". An old Italian legend knows of a similar punishment inflicted on the soldier who struck Christ before the High Priest (John, xviii, 22), and later on this soldier was identified with Malchus whose ear was cut off by Peter. This legend was furthermore confused, it seems, with one current about St. John, to whom tradition ascribed immortality on the basis of a passage in John, xxi, 20 sqq. The names Johannes and Cartaphilus (κάρτα φίλος "much beloved"), given to the wanderer, lend some colour to this theory.

But, whatever its origin, the legend owes its fame and popularity to the above-mentioned German chap-book, which appeared anonymously in 1602 under the title: "Kurtze Beschreibung und Erzehlung von einem Juden mit Namen Ahasverus", etc. There the story is related on the authority of a Lutheran clergyman, Paulus von Eitzen (d. 1598), who claimed to have met the Jew in person in Hamburg in 1542, and to have heard the story from Ahasuerus himself. In a later edition of 1603, "Wunderbarlicher Bericht von Einem Juden Ahasver", etc., where the anonymous author assumes the pen-name of Chrysostomus Dudulæus Westphalus, the meeting is assigned to the year 1547, and in an appendix the fate of the Jew is made the subject of an exhortation to the Christian reader.

The legend at once sprang into popular favour, and numerous editions followed. From Germany it spread to Sweden, Denmark, the Netherlands, and especially to France, where it has enjoyed a great vogue up to the present. The best-known French version is the "Histoire admirable d'un Juif Errant" dating from the seventeenth century. Here a tragic touch is added by the recital of the dangers which the Jew courts in the vain hope of ending his misery in death. Stories of the actual appearance of the Jew also began to be common, many of them, no doubt, traceable to impostors who played the rôle with success. Of such

a one we have a well authenticated record from Italy in 1415.

Various names are given to the Wandering Jew in different countries. The English chronicles call him Cartaphilus. The Italian form is Bottadio, and this corresponds to Boudedeo in Brittany and Bedeus in Saxon Transylvania. In Belgium he is known as Isaac Laquedem, probably a name of Hebrew origin. In Spain his name has undergone the significant change to Juan Espera-en-Dios (John Trust-in-God). Why the German version calls him Ahasverus is not clear. This name is familiar from the Old Testament (Esther, i, 1) as the surname of a Persian monarch (written Assuerus in Catholic versions). It is to be noted that the original wanderer was not necessarily a Jew; Cartaphilus, the door-keeper in Pilate's mansion, must have been a Roman.

GRÄSSE, *Der Tannhäuser und der ewige Jude* (Dresden, 1861); CONWAY, *The Wandering Jew* (London and New York, 1881); SCHOEBEL, *La Légende du Juif-Errant* (Paris, 1877); MORPURGO, *L'Ebreo Errante in Italia* (Florence, 1890); PARIS, *Le Juif Errant* in *Légendes du Moyen Age* (Paris, 1903), 149–186; 187–221; the most exhaustive discussion of the legend is the work of NEUBAUR, *Die Sage vom ewigen Juden* (2nd ed., Leipzig, 1893). For a history of the legend in literature see KAPSTEIN, *Ahasverus in der Weltpoesie* (Berlin, 1906).

The Flying Dutchman.—The theme of the doomed Wanderer recurs in this legend of the sea. The superstitious belief in a spectre ship is widespread among mariners. But the legend springing from this belief never attained a fixed form; the versions given of it vary considerably. The most common version as current among Dutch sailors relates how a captain by the name of Vanderdecken or Vanderstraaten from the Terneuse district, while on a voyage to India, is delayed off the Cape of Good Hope by a calm or a storm. In his rage he swears a blasphemous oath to double the Cape, if he were to sail until the Judgment Day. Offended, God took him at his word, and he is doomed to sail the seas forever, an omen of ill-luck to all mariners by whom his spectre-ship is sighted.

The legend does not appear in literature before the nineteenth century. It was made familiar to American readers by Washington Irving's tale "The Storm-ship", an episode in his "Bracebridge Hall" (1822). But it became widely known through Heine, who probably took it from oral tradition, and related it in his "Reisebilder aus Norderney" (1826) and again in "Memoiren des Herrn von Schnabelewopski" (in his "Salon", 1834). Heine mentions neither names nor places, and in the second version the setting of the story is undignified, if not vulgar. Nevertheless the legend was given a much deeper import through the introduction of the *motif* of redemption. Every seven years the Dutchman may land and look for a woman whose self-sacrificing love will lift the curse. At length he finds a maiden who pledges him her love, but at the last moment he refuses her generous sacrifice, reveals himself to her and leaves. She heroically insists on keeping her promise and casts herself into the sea. This noble act of self-sacrifice removes the curse; the Dutchman and his ship sink beneath the waves.

GRÄSSE, *op. cit.*, 122, note 32; see also the essays of PASQUÉ in *Nord und Süd* (1884), and of GOLTHER in *Bühne und Welt* (1901), III, 866 sq.

William Tell.—The story of Tell, connected with the origin of the Swiss Confederation, until comparatively recent times passed for history, but its fabulous character is now universally recognized. Tell, a yeoman of Uri, famed for his skill with the cross-bow, having refused to salute the hat, the symbol of Austrian sovereignty which Gessler, the most notoriously cruel of the Austrian governors, had caused to be placed on a pole at Altdorf, is brought before the governor and ordered to show his skill by shooting an apple on the head of his son. He successfully performs the feat and on being asked to explain why he had taken two arrows from his quiver, avows that had he injured the child he would have pierced the governor. He is put on board a ship to be transported to Küssnacht, but a storm coming up, he escapes, and eventually liberates his country. This in brief is the legend. As early as 1607 its truth was questioned on the ground that not the slightest documentary proof of Tell's existence could be found. Swiss patriotism, however, for a long time silenced scepticism, until the work of scholars of the nineteenth century separated fact from fiction and consigned Tell's exploit to the realm of fable.

RILLIET, *Les Origines de la Confédération Suisse, Histoire et Légende* (2nd ed., Geneva, 1869); ROCHHOLZ, *Tell und Gessler in Sage und Geschichte* (Heilbronn, 1877); GISLER, *Die Tellfrage* (Berne, 1895); DANDLIKER, *Geschichte der Schweiz*, I (4th ed., Zurich, 1900), 426–454, contains a full bibliography; see also the introduction to PALMER'S edition of SCHILLER'S *Tell* (New York, 1900) 34–43.

Faust.—The origin and development of this famous legend is tolerably clear. Its hero is an actual personage, a man who lived in Germany during the sixteenth century. To be sure, many of the exploits related of him are so manifestly fabulous that some scholars have doubted his very existence and have regarded the legend as purely mythical. But against this view we are able to adduce the explicit testimony of a number of contemporaries: Trithemius of Sponheim, Mutianus Rufus, Johann Gast, Agrippa von Nettesheim, and others, who claim to have known Faust either in person or by reputation. They all agree in representing him as a charlatan, who went about the country under assumed high-sounding names, boasting of his skill in fortune-telling and magic, and preying on the credulity and superstitious ignorance of the people. Philip Begardi, a physician of Worms, author of an "Index Sanitatis" (1539), knew a number of persons duped by the swindler. He mentions Faust as a man who was well known, but of whom nothing had been heard lately. Melanchthon (as reported by Manlius, 1590) and Johann Weyer (d. 1588) tell us that Faust was born in Kundlingen (i. e. Knittlingen) in Würtemberg and studied magic at Cracow; also that he came to a violent end, being found dead one morning with a twisted neck.

The boasting of Faust did not seem so absurd in an age when the belief in demonology and magic was universal. What more natural than that his supernatural powers should be ascribed to the aid of the Devil? Stories about men in league with the Evil One had been current since early Christian times. Zoroaster, Virgil, Apollonius, Albertus Magnus, Popes Sylvester II and Paul II were some of the eminent men of whom such tales were related. Of especial significance in this connexion are the legends of Cyprian of Antioch and Theophilus of Adana, in which we meet with the type of the wicked magician, who, to gratify ambition or to accomplish some unholy purpose, sells his soul to the Devil. So, when Faust met with a sudden and violent death under mysterious circumstances, rumour had it that the Devil had carried him off, and thus arose the story of his compact with Satan. Now the tales that were current concerning former sorcerers who had entered into such an unholy partnership were repeated concerning Faust, and gradually the obscure charlatan became the arch-magician, around whose name gathered a mass of fable and tradition dealing with black art. So the Faust legend gradually took shape. Its first appearance in literature dates from 1587, when the first Faust book appeared anonymously at Frankfort-on-the-Main under the title "Historia von D. Johann Fausten dem weitbeschreyten Zauberer und Schwartzkünstler". In a preface the publisher, whose name was Johann Spies, tells us that he obtained the manuscript from "a good friend in Speyer". According to the version of this book, Faust studies theology at Wittenberg, but, being of a "foolish and arrogant" turn of mind, and desirous of searching "into all things in heaven and

earth", he resorts to magic and evokes the Devil. A demon, who is called Mephistopheles, appears, and a compact is made whereby for a stated term (later on fixed at twenty-four years) he agrees to be Faust's servant, in return for which the latter pledges his soul to the Devil. This compact is sealed with Faust's blood. For a time the sorcerer lives in power and splendour, performing strange deeds and experiencing marvellous adventures. But at the end of the stated term the Devil claims his prey. A strange tumult is heard at night, and the next morning Faust's mangled corpse is found on a heap of refuse.

The book itself is totally devoid of literary merit. Its purpose is purely didactic; the magician's awful fate is held up as a solemn warning to all who might be tempted to resort to black art. The fundamental idea of the story is the wickedness of striving for forbidden knowledge by sinful means. The anonymous author, who, judging from the general tone of the book, was probably a Lutheran pastor, emphatically disapproves of the spirit of free inquiry that characterizes the period following the great discoveries and the Reformation. Of subsequent editions, that of Widmann (1599) seems to have been the chief source of later versions. Here the anti-Catholic tendency, unmistakable in the first edition, is still further emphasized. Faust's downfall is directly attributed to the cult of the Catholic Church. There are besides a number of changes, usually with a didactic purpose and to the detriment of the literary quality of the book. A lengthy commentary is also added. A new edition of Widmann's version was given by Pfitzer in 1674, and an abbreviated edition was brought out about 1725, by one who calls himself a "man of Christian sentiments". But the popularity of the legend was due not so much to the chap-books as to the crude dramatic performances given by bands of strolling players. In these performances English actors played an important part. On the basis of an English translation of the German chap-book, Christopher Marlowe wrote his well known drama of Faustus (first performed in 1595), and this play was performed in Germany by English actors. Of the German Faust plays we have but scanty knowledge. As we know them from the eighteenth century, they were coarse farces in which buffoonery and sensationalism were relied on for success. Such plays disappeared from the literary stage when French classicism prevailed. But the Faust play survived as a puppet-show given by showmen at fairs to amuse the young and uncritical, and such a show inspired the young Goethe with the idea of writing his famous masterpiece. Already Lessing had called attention to the dramatic possibilities of the subject, and tried his hand at a Faust drama of which he had sketched a scene (cited in the seventeenth "Literaturbrief", 1759).

The old Faust legend as presented in the chap-books and the plays is essentially a tragedy of sin and damnation, a characteristic product of the age of the Reformation. In older legends of great sinners like Robert the Devil, the efficacy of penitence was proclaimed, the saving power of the Church was emphasized. With the Reformation this was changed. The rigid Lutheran orthodox theology denied the redeeming powers of the ancient Church and this harsh spirit is reflected in the legend. The sinner who leagues with the Devil was irrevocably damned. Goethe, the enlightened humanitarian, disagreed with this conception. For him Faust was not a presumptuous sensualist, but a titanic striver after truth, a representative of humanity's noblest aspirations, and, whatever his sins and errors might be, in the end he was to be saved. In Goethe's "Faust" (see GERMANY, loc. cit. *supra*) the legend has received its classic form.

For a fairly complete bibliography of the immense literature of the subject down to 1884 consult ENGEL, *Zusammenstellung der Faust-Schriften vom 16. Jahrhundert bis mitte 1884* (Oldenburg, 1885); see also FISCHER, *Goethes Faust* in *Goethe-Schriften* (Heidelberg, 1901), I; SCHMIDT, *Faust und das 16. Jahrhundert* in *Charakteristiken* (2nd ed., Berlin, 1902), I 1–36; WITKOWSKI, *Der historische Faust* in *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft*, VII (Freiburg im Br. and Liepzig, 1897), 298–350 (here all the literary testimonials concerning the historical Faust are adduced and discussed). Consult also the introduction to THOMAS, *Goethe's Faust* (Boston, 1899).

ARTHUR F. J. REMY.

Legends of the Saints.—Under the term *legend* the modern concept would include every untrue tale. But it is not so very long since its meaning has been extended thus far, nor is such a definition historically justifiable. That which was understood by the word *legend*, at the time when the concept arose, included both truth and fiction (considered from the standpoint of modern historical criticism). And this is what the numerous friends of the legend among the German poets, since the days of the Romantic School, understand by the term. The *legenda* included facts which were historically genuine, as well as narrative which we now class as unhistorical legend. The term is a creation of the Middle Ages, and has its source in the reading of the prayers used in Divine service. Since the days of the martyrs, the Church recalled to mind her famous dead in the prayers of the Mass and in the Office, by commemorating the names noted in the martyrologies and making mention of incidents in their lives and martyrdom. When the *lectio* became a matter of precept, the reading matter in the office for the day became in a precise sense *legenda* (that which must be read). After the thirteenth century the word *legenda* was regarded as the equivalent of *vita* and *passio*, and, in the fifteenth century, the *liber lectionarius* is comprised under what is known as "legend". Thus, historically considered, legend is the story of the saints. As by this time it had unfortunately happened that the stories of the saints were supplemented and embellished by the people according to their primitive theological conceptions and inclinations, the legend became to a large extent fiction. The age of the Reformation received the legend in this form. On account of the importance which the saints possessed even among Protestants, especially as the instruments of Divine grace, the legends have remained in use to this day, particularly in sermons. The edition of the "Vitæ Patrum", which Georg Major published at Wittenberg in 1544 by Luther's orders, closely follows Athanasius, Rufinus, and Jerome, rejecting merely the obvious fantasies and aberrations, such as, for example, were to be seen in the "Vita s. Barbaræ", the "Legenda Aurea" of the thirteenth century, or in the "Vita s. Simeonis Stylitæ" of Pseudo-Antonius. But the opposition to the ancient Church became intensified, and led to the Reformers' breach with the saints. Simultaneously, the legends of the saints disappear from Protestantism, and it is only in the nineteenth century, after the brief appearance of Romanticism, that they again find entrance into official Protestantism in connexion with the attempts of Ferdinand Piper (d. 1899 at Berlin) to revive the popular calendars.

In the usage of the Catholic Church and of the people, the legend plays the same part to-day as in the Middle Ages. Here also science has taught that distinctions are to be made. Thus it was felt that not all the legends we possess were of equal value, and especially that the editions of the lives of the saints were entirely unsatisfactory. It was the Jesuit Heribert Rosweyde of Utrecht who, at the beginning of the seventeenth century, undertook to remedy matters by referring to the most ancient texts, and by pointing out how the tales developed. Rosweyde wished merely to correct the old collections; his idea was to treat the martyrologies, beginning with the most ancient, from the philological standpoint. But his scheme was forthwith taken up by his order, and after his death (1629) was carried out on a large scale, with

an eye also to sectarian opponents, who might learn from the lives of the saints the continuity of Catholic teaching and Catholic life. Thus there came into existence the "Acta Sanctorum" of the Bollandists (q. v.). This monumental work has become the foundation of all investigation in hagiography and legend.

In their present state of development, we would do well to keep these two departments separate. The meaning of the word *legend* has indeed been practically transformed; the Roman Breviary officially designates the lesson for the day as *lectio*, and the Church now recognizes the legend rather as a popular story, since the populace are always more impressed by the extraordinary and the grotesque. The legend has thus come to be regarded merely as a fictitious religious tale. Nothing therefore stands in the way of a distinction, which besides is indispensable to those who desire clearness in hagiography. Hagiography is to-day the province of the historian, who must, even more carefully in the history of the saints than in other historical questions, test the value of the sources of the reports. Only thus will it be possible to arrive at the fundamental question of all hagiography, the question of miracles in history. Are matters, which the modern man is inclined to take as legend, authentically vouched for, or are they met with only in doubtful sources? The belief in miracles, considered as such, does not affect the historian. He has only to gather the original authorities together and to say: This is what happened, so far as historical science can determine. If this presentation of the facts be correct, then no objection can be raised against the results. We have now an abundance of hagiographic memorials which are just as truly history as any other memorials. Reports of miracles which partake of a vague and general character we may and must exclude from this category—e. g., when St. Gregory the Great, in a letter to St. Augustine, makes mention of the miracles which followed on Augustine's zealous activity in England: "Scio quod omnipotens Deus per dilectionem tuam in gente, quam eligi voluit, magna miracula ostendit" ("I know that Almighty God by His love for thee has shown forth great miracles among the people, whom he wished to be saved"—"Gregorii Registrum", XI, ep. xxxvi). We possess hagiographic reports on the best possible authority in numerous legal documents and official registers concerning depositions under oath. Such vouchers, however, cannot in the nature of the case be applicable to the entire life of a saint, but only to individual occurrences, and, for the most part, not to occurrences in the saint's lifetime, but to those which took place at his shrine. The miracles of healing at the shrine of Bishop Willehad at Bremen (d. about 790) in 860, the miracles of Bernard in the "Liber Miraculorum" of 1146–47, the cures at the grave of Bishop Bruno of Würzburg (d. 1045) in 1202–03, are related in a manner open to no objection.

Concerning the miraculous occurrences at the grave of St. Peter Parenzo at Orvieto (d. 1199)—an exhaustive list cannot be attempted here; we quote but a few examples—of St. Bertrand of Aquileia (d. 1350), of St. Helena of Udina (1458), of St. James Philippi of Faenza (1483), of St. Hypolistus of Atripalda (1637–46), of St. Juventius in Casa Dei (at Rouen, 1667–74), we have documentary accounts (Acta SS., May, V, 98–9; June, I, 791 sqq.; April, III, 255; May, VI, 166 sqq.; 1 May, appendix, VII, 528; June, I, 45 sqq.). In addition to these records we possess an imposing array of reports of eyewitnesses in every century, lucid Acts of martyrs, relations like that of the monk Cuthbert on the death of the Venerable Bede (735), of Willebald of Mainz on the life of Boniface the Great, the history of the holy virgin Oda (d. 1158) at Gutehoffnung near Bingen, the life of Cardinal Nicholas Albergati of Bologna (d. 1443). Whoever gives fair consideration to all these facts must come to a double conclusion: (1) that the extraordinary does not necessarily appertain to the life of the saint; and (2) that in every case these signs and wonders are not unworthy of the saint, e. g. cures, apparitions, prophecies, visions, transfigurations, stigmata, pleasant odour, incorruption. But the historian ought likewise to remember that (leaving the stigmata, an essentially Christian manifestation, out of the question) all these phenomena were also known to antiquity. Ancient Greece exhibits stone monuments and inscriptions which bear witness to cures and apparitions in the ancient mythology. History tells of Aristeas of Proconnesus, Hermotimus of Clazomenæ, Epimenides of Crete, that they were ascetics and thereby became ecstatic, even to the degree of the soul leaving the body, remaining far removed from it, and being able to appear in other places. Nor is it essential that medieval mysticism be something different from the ancient *hieromania;* in both cases the presumption is the same as regards the faculties of the soul.

History, therefore, knows of miracles, and the nature of the historical miracle itself leads us to the distinction between history and legend. If the authentic reports are held to be trustworthy, and within the bounds of physical and psychical experience, and the unauthentic reports repel us owing to their fantastic embellishments, then we will be justified in claiming that the surplus of these latter narratives over the authentic reports is untrue, and is legend in the modern sense of the word. The establishment of this distinction is, therefore, entirely a matter of historical method. But, since mistrust of the historical work may lead to the suspicion that the estimation of the value of the sources has been influenced by the subject matter of the miracle, the proof must be carried a step farther, and the origin of the superfluous matter demonstrated. Hence arises as our next task, to indicate (1) the contents and (2) the sources of legends.

Manifold as the varieties of legends now seem to be, there are fundamentally not so very many different notions utilized. The legend considers the saint as a kind of lord of the elements, who commands the water, rain, fire, mountain, and rock; he changes, enlarges, or diminishes objects; flies through the air; delivers from dungeon and gallows; takes part in battles, and even in martyrdom is invulnerable; animals, the wildest and the most timid, serve him (e. g. the stories of the bear as a beast of burden; the ring in the fish; the frogs becoming silent, etc.); his birth is glorified by a miracle; a voice, or letters, from Heaven proclaim his identity; bells ring of themselves; the heavenly ones enter into personal intercourse with him (betrothal of Mary); he speaks with the dead and beholds heaven, hell, and purgatory; forces the Devil to release people from compacts; he is victorious over dragons; etc. Of all this the authentic Christian narratives know nothing. But whence then does this world of fantastic concepts arise? A glance at the pre-Christian religious narratives will dispel every doubt. All these stories are anticipated by the Greek chroniclers, writers of myths, collectors of strange tales, neo-Platonism, and neo-Pythagorism. One need only refer to the Ἑλλάδος περιήγησις of Pausanias, or glance through the codices collected by Photius in his "Bibliotheca", to recognize what great importance was attached to the reports of miracles in antiquity by both the educated and uneducated. The legend makes its appearance wherever the common people endeavoured to form theological concepts, and in its main features it is everywhere the same. Like the myth (the explanatory fable of nature) and the doctrinal fable, it has its independent religious and hortatory importance. The legend claims to show the auxiliary power of the supernatural, and thus indicate to the people a "saviour" in every need. The worshipper of divinity, the hero-

worshipper, is assured of the supernatural protection to which he has established a claim. With the old mythologies and genealogies of gods, of which they serve after a certain fashion as corroborative evidence, these tales may be regarded as the theology of the people. The guiding thoughts are in every case taken from life; they deal with the fulfilment of the simple wishes and expectations likely to arise in the minds of men whose lives were spent in contest with the forces and laws of nature.

Hellenism had already recognized this characteristic of the religious fable, and would thus have been obliged to free itself from it in the course of time, had not the competition with Christianity forced the champions of the ancient polytheism to seek again in the ancient fables incidents to set against the miraculous power of Christ. In this way popular illusions found their way from Hellenism to Christianity, whose struggles in the first three centuries certainly produced an abundance of heroes. The genuine Acts of the martyrs (cf., for example, R. Knopf, "Ausgewählte Märtyreracten", Tübingen, 1901; Ruinart, "Acta Martyrum sincera", Paris, 1689, no longer sufficient for scientific research) have in them no popular miracles. After the persecutions, however, when, with the lapse of time, there was no longer any standard by which to measure the unexampled heroism of the martyrs, it became easy to transfer to the Christian martyrs the conceptions which the ancients held concerning their heroes. This transference was promoted by the numerous cases in which Christian saints became the successors of local deities, and Christian worship supplanted the ancient local worship. This explains the great number of similiarities between gods and saints. For the often maintained metamorphosis of gods into saints no proof is to be found. The earliest Catholics of whom legends are told are therefore the martyrs. And from them the conceptions are then transferred to the confessors, as, after the days of persecution, the scene of the contest for salvation was changed from the rack and the amphitheatre to the human soul.

But how was the transference of legends to Christianity consummated? The fact that the Talmud also uses the same ideas, with variations, proves that the guiding thoughts of men during the period of the first spread of Christianity ran in general on parallel lines. There is no doubt, therefore, that these Christian legends are to be traced to a common oral tradition, which was unconsciously transferred from one subject of a legend to another. For the hypothesis of this literary transference, no proofs can be given. If St. Augustine (De cura pro mortuis gerenda, xii) and also St. Gregory the Great (Dialogues, IV, xxxvi) relate of a man, who died by an error of the Angel of Death and was again restored to life, the same story which is already given by Lucian in his "Philopseudes", such an example at once shows that the literary style was not the model, but that the oral relation was. Augustine and Gregory received the story of the occurrence from those who claimed to have seen it. To such an extent had certain imaginary conceptions become the common property of the people that they repeated themselves as auto-suggestions and dreams. There are ideas of so pronounced a peculiarity that they can be invented only once, and their successive reappearances in new surroundings must, therefore, be due to oral transmission. Such is the characteristic tale of the impostor, who concealed the money he owed in a hollow stick, gave this stick to the creditor to hold, and then swore that he had given back the money; this tale is found in Conon the Grammarian (at Rome in Cæsar's time), in the Haggada of the Talmud (Nedarim, 25a), and in the Christian legends of the thirteenth century in Vincent of Beauvais. The leading ideas of the legends were transferred individually, and appeared later in literary form in the most varied combinations. Not till the sixth century may the literary type of martyr be considered as perfected, and we are subsequently able to verify the literary associations of ideas. This Catholic type had indeed had models in the distant past. The pre-Christian religious narrative had already worked up the old motives into romances, and, starting from this example, there arose in Gnostic circles after the second century the apocryphal accounts of the lives of the Apostles, indicating dogmatic prepossessions. The Church combatted these stories, but the opposition of centuries—the Decree of Gelasius in 496 is well-known—was unable to prevent the genuine narratives from becoming infected, and the ideals of the common people from obtaining preponderance over historical facts. The place of origin and of dissemination of these mere legends was the East. With the termination of the sixth century the taste for them was transplanted to the West also, owing to the active intercourse between Syria and Gaul. Even Gregory of Tours (d. 594) was acquainted with the apocryphal lives of the Apostles. At the beginning of the seventh century we already find related in Gaul (in the "Passio Tergeminorum" of Warnahar of Langres), as an incident in the local history of Langres, a story of martyrdom originating in Cappadocia.

The seventh century sees the literary form of legend domiciled in the West. Bede's "Martyrology" and Aldhelm of Malmesbury (d. 709) indicate a wide knowledge of this foreign literature. Ireland and England eagerly follow in the new direction. In the western part of the continent the taste changes according to the times. Rough times require more abundant consolations; thus the legends of the "saviour" make their appearance in the Merovingian seventh century up to the middle of the eighth; others in the time of the perils from the Northmen, of the religious wars, and the Crusades, and especially towards the end of the Middle Ages with its social calamities. During the millenarian tenth century, the era of the Cluniacs and mysticism make the biographies of the saints subjective. The twelfth century brings with the new religious orders the contemplative legends of Mary. The thirteenth sees the development of the cities and the citizens, hand in hand with which goes the popularization of the legend by means of collections compiled for the purposes of sermons, *vitæ sanctorum*, *exempla*, or merely to give entertainment (Vincent of Beauvais, Cæsarius of Heisterbach, James of Vitry, Thomas of Chantimpré, "Legenda Aurea"); in this century also arise the legends of Mary and, in connexion with the new feast of Corpus Christi (1264), a strong interest in tales of miracles relating to the Host. Indeed it was in the very nature of the case that the new legend should appear otherwise than the old. Transubstantiation is something specifically Christian. Still, we find only variations of the old concepts of transformation and apparitions, as in the innumerable stories which now circulated of visible incarnation of the Divine Child or of the Crucified One, or of the monstrance being suspended in the air. But the continuity of the concepts is quite evident in the case of the legend of Mary. If Mary considers herself as betrothed to the priest who serves her, the meaning of this is not far to seek; but nevertheless Callimachus (third century B. C.) had also treated this idea in a legend of Artemis, and Antoninus Liberalis and the Talmud have variations of it. And if, in this legend of Mary, the Blessed Virgin put a ring on the hand of her betrothed under quite characteristic circumstances, that is nothing else than the Roman local legend of the betrothal of Venus, as it has been preserved by William of Malmesbury and the "Deutsche Kaiserchronik" of the twelfth century.

Therefore: (1) the original reports of martyrdoms and lives do not present what is called "legend"; (2) legends repeat the conceptions found in the pre-Christian religious tales. From this it follows that we

have a right to identify the pre- and post-Christian popular religious tales; the legend is not Christian, only Christianized. But where then lie its ultimate sources? In many cases it has obviously the same origin as the myth, when it refers the incomprehensible to religious heroes. Antiquity traced back sources, whose natural elements it did not understand, to the heroes; such was also the case with many legends of the saints, although others should rather be regarded as outgrowths of the genuine history of the saints. Etymology also has often led to the promotion of legends; thus, Christopher becomes the actual Christ-carrier. Again, there must be taken into consideration the inexhaustible imagination of the common people; merely because the people expected help, or punishment, in certain situations, the fulfilment of such expectations was soon related. And, finally, general axioms of experience (as in Pantschatantra) or, in the case of the Talmud and Christianity, merely sentences and figures of speech from the Holy Scripture are clothed in the garb of narrative.

DELEHAYE, *Les légendes hagiographiques* (Brussels, 1905), tr. CRAWFORD, *Legends of the Saints* (London and New York, 1908); GÜNTER, *Legenden-Studien* (Cologne, 1906); IDEM, *Die christl. Legende des Abendlandes* (Heidelberg, 1910).

HEINRICH GÜNTER.

Leger, SAINT. See LEODEGAR.

Leghorn, DIOCESE OF (LIBURNENSIS), suffragan of Pisa. Leghorn (Ital. *Livorno*), in Tuscany, is the capital of the smallest of the provinces of Italy. The city is situated on marshy ground, and is in consequence intersected by many canals, hence it has been called "Little Venice". A larger canal puts it in communication with Pisa. It has two ports, the old, or Medici, port, and the new port constructed in 1854. In former times Leghorn was the most important port in the Grand Duchy of Tuscany; even now it is outranked only by Genoa and Naples. Among its numerous teaching establishments are a naval academy, and an observatory erected in 1881. The public library is important, and the prehistoric museum contains many Etruscan and Roman antiquities. The town likewise possesses a gallery of paintings, and its archives have an historical interest. Among the more important industries are shipbuilding, ironworks, and trade in alabaster and coral. The cathedral dates from the sixteenth century; there are also churches belonging to the Greek, the Maronite, and the Armenian Rites. The synagogue (1603) is second only to that at Amsterdam. The royal palace was erected by Cosimo I. Of note also are the Torre del Marzocco, now used as a signal station, and the Torre della Meloria, near which, in 1241, the Pisans surprised and defeated the Genoese fleet on its way to Rome with the French bishops who were going to the council summoned against Frederick II. Among the ancients Leghorn was known as *Portus Liburni*, and was of small importance until the sixteenth century. It belonged to the Pisans, and was captured from them by the Genoese. In 1421 the Florentines bought it for 100,000 florins, and thus Leghorn came to be the main outlet for Florentine commerce, to the detriment of Pisa, which from that time began to wane. The Medici family took great interest in the prosperity of this stronghold; Alessandro de' Medici built the old fortress; Cosmo I, under the supervision of Vasari, built a breakwater and a new canal. But the real author of its greatness was Ferdinand I, who called Leghorn "his mistress". To increase its population he showered his favours on it and on those who went to live there, and made it a town of refuge for men from every nation, so that there flocked to it not only outlaws from all over Italy, but even Greeks, Jews, and Moors driven out of Spain. Exiled English Catholics found a home there. Cosmo II erected a monument to Ferdinand, the work of Giovanni dell' Opera. Owing to the bombardment (by the English in 1651, and by the French in 1671) of the Dutch fleet stationed in the harbour, Ferdinand II caused Leghorn to be declared a neutral port by international treaty (1691). This neutrality was violated for the first time in 1796 by Bonaparte, whose idea of a "Continental blockade" did immense damage to the commerce of the town. In 1848 Leghorn was the hotbed of the Tuscan revolution.

The episcopal see was created by Pius VII in 1806. Its first bishop was Filippo Canucci. The diocese has 32 parishes with 170,000 souls. The number of religious houses for men is 9, and for women, 12. It has 3 educational institutions for boys, and 7 for girls.

REPETTI, *Dizionario Geografico ecc. della Toscana* (Florence, 1835); TARGIONI-TOZZETTI AND BORSI, *Liburni civitas* (Leghorn, 1906).

U. BENIGNI.

Legio, titular see of Palestina Secunda, suffragan of Scythopolis. It figures for the first time in a Latin episcopal *notitia*, dating probably from the eleventh century, where it is given under the name of *Legionum*, between the Bishoprics of Diocæsarea and Capitolias (Tobler and Molinier, "Itinera Hierosolymitana", I, Geneva, 1880, 343). If, however, we consult the Greek "Notitiæ Episcopatuum", of which the Latin is only a translation, we find in that place, not Legio, but Maximianopolis ("Byzant. Zeitschr.", I, Leipzig, 1892, 253, 256). The See of Legio is, therefore, identical with Maximianopolis; in the Middle Ages both cities were identified, being near neighbours, though really distinct places in the same see. Legio is now Ledjun, well known in the Bible and in history under the name of Mageddo. S. VAILHÉ.

Legipont, OLIVER, Benedictine, bibliographer, b. at Soiron, Limburg, 2 Dec., 1698; d. at Trier, 16 Jan., 1758. Having received his early education from the Franciscans at Verviers, he proceeded for higher studies to Cologne, where he entered the abbey of Great St. Martin, received the priesthood on 22 May, 1723, and the degree of Licentiate in 1728. His life was practically a succession of journeys to the numerous libraries, which he was commissioned to examine and put in order. Though zealous in the sacred ministry, he had little opportunity of exercising it; nor did he devote much time to teaching, though he was instrumental in promoting the higher studies in his order by the erection of a Benedictine college in the University of Heidelberg. Most of his writings remain unedited, but among the printed works his edition of Magnoald Ziegelbauer's "Historia rei litterariæ ord. Sti. Benedicti" (1754—), "Monasticum Moguntiacum" (Prague, 1746), "Dissertationes philologico-bibliographicæ" (Nuremberg, 1747), "Itinerarium peregrinationis nobilis" (Augsburg, 1751; the same also in Spanish, Valencia, 1759) have lasting value.

Allg. Deutsch. Biog., XVIII, 126.

BENEDICT ZIMMERMAN.

Legists, teachers of civil or Roman law, who, besides expounding sources, explaining terms, elucidating texts, summarizing the contents of chapters, etc., illustrated by cases, real or imaginary, the numerous questions and distinctions arising out of the "Corpus Juris" enactments of the ancient Roman code. From the twelfth century, when a fresh impulse was given to legal researches, the terms *legist* and *decretist*—the latter applied, in the narrower sense, to the interpreter of ecclesiastical law and commentator on the canonical texts—have been carefully distinguished.

P. J. MACAULEY.

Legitimation (Lat. *legitimatio*), the canonical term for the act by which the irregularity contracted by being born out of lawful wedlock is removed (see IRREGULARITY). Legitimation consequently presup-

poses illegitimacy. It is to be noted that all children born of marriage are presumed in canon law to be legitimate. This holds, not only for valid marriages, but also for such as are commonly reputed to be valid, though really invalid, provided such marriages were entered into, by at least one of the parties, in good faith. A marriage of this latter kind is called a putative marriage. If both parties to such marriage were in bad faith, the children would be held legitimate in the external forum, as this bad faith would not be manifest. In case both contractors were in good faith, the children would be legitimate, even if the marriage were afterwards declared to be null. Presumption of legitimacy is always in favour of the children born of a person in wedlock, unless evident proof be given that physical reasons make the paternity of the husband impossible, such as absence, impotence, etc.; and even a sworn confession of wrongdoing on the part of either reputed parent will not otherwise affect the legitimacy of the children. Infants born before the usual time of gestation or after it, as, for example, at the beginning of the seventh month after the marriage ceremony, or at the completion of the tenth month after the death of the husband, are held to be legitimate. When marriage is entered into by two parties who suspect there is an impediment but make no inquiry into the truth, and it afterwards be made plain that such obstacle to validity did exist, their offspring is illegitimate, because affected ignorance is equivalent to knowledge. If, however, the doubt arise after the consummation of the marriage, children conceived before a sentence of invalidity is rendered have the standing of legitimate children.

Illegitimate offspring are designated by various names in canon law, according to the circumstances attending their procreation: they are called natural (*naturales*) children, if born of unmarried persons between whom there could have been a legitimate marriage at the time either of the conception or the birth of their offspring; if born of a prostitute, illegitimate children are called *manzeres;* if of a woman who is neither a prostitute nor a concubine, they are designated *bastardi;* those who are sprung from parents, who either at the time of conception or of birth could not have entered into matrimony, are termed *spurii;* if, however, valid marriage would be impossible both at the time of the conception and of the birth of the children, the latter are said to be born *ex damnato coitu;* when one parent is married, the illegitimate children are called *nothi;* if both are wedded, *adulterini;* if the parents were related by collateral consanguinity or affinity, *incestuosi;* if related in the direct line of ascent or descent, *nefarii.* Illegitimate natural children are legitimated by a valid or putative marriage subsequently contracted between their parents, even if that marriage be not consummated. Hence such a marriage could be contracted even by a dying person. But this privilege is extended only to those between whose parents a legitimate marriage would be possible either at the time of birth or conception, or, at least, at some intermediate time, not to those whose parents, during that whole period, would be bound by a diriment impediment. The legitimation of children does not depend on the will of their parents, and takes place even when the latter are unwilling, or even when the marriage has been celebrated after other marriages contracted during the interim. This legitimation extends to natural children who are already dead and consequently to their living descendants. An infant thus legitimated is held equal to legitimate children in all respects as to sacred orders and as to ecclesiastical dignities, except the cardinalate. This last exception was made by Sixtus V (3 Dec., 1586). It is not required that mention of such legitimation be made either in public documents or nuptial banns. Such legitimation is termed *plenior* in canon law to distinguish it from the *plena* legitimation which is granted by papal rescript, and from the *plenissima* which follows on the radical validation of a marriage (*sanatio in radice*). Illegitimate children who are not *naturales* cannot be legitimated by a subsequent marriage of their parents. This privilege may however be granted them by dispensation from the pope.

The sovereign pontiff has the power of legitimating all children born out of wedlock and thus making them capable of hereditary succession, and of receiving sacred orders, honours, dignities, and ecclesiastical benefices. A legitimation by a civil law does not remove the canonical irregularity, as laymen have no ecclesiastical jurisdiction. By common canon law, it is forbidden to ordain illegitimate persons, unless they be lawfully dispensed or be professed in a religious order. In the latter case, however, they are not capable of receiving prelacies, unless a special rescript be conceded. For major orders, dignities, and canonries in a cathedral church, the pope alone can dispense; the power of the bishop extends only to minor orders and simple benefices. If an episcopal see be vacant, the cathedral chapter has the same power as the bishop. Legitimation for Sacred orders carries with it the dispensation to obtain a benefice, but not that for minor orders, unless it be expressly stated. A son born lawfully to one who afterwards receives Sacred orders cannot immediately succeed to the paternal benefice; if unlawfully begotten, he may not succeed at all. A father, however, may succeed his lawful son in a benefice without any dispensation, because there is then no question of hereditary succession. Canon law and the Roman civil law are not in accord in the matter of legitimation, as the latter restricts the privilege to children born of concubinage, whose parents afterwards married. The church law, as we have seen, extends to all illegitimate children the benefit of possible legitimation. The laws of England and those of many states of the American Union do not recognize legitimation of children as following upon a subsequent marriage.

FERRARIS, *Bibliotheca Canonica*, s. v. *Filius* and *Legitimatio* (Rome, 1886); TAUNTON, *The Law of the Church*, s. v. *Illegitimate Children* (London, 1906); AICHNER, *Compendium Juris Ecclesiastici* (Brixen, 1895); LAURENTIUS, *Institutiones juris ecclesiastici* (Freiburg, 1903).

W. FANNING.

Le Gobien, CHARLES, French Jesuit and founder of the famous collection of "Lettres édifiantes et curieuses", one of the most important sources of information for the history of Catholic missions, b. at St-Malo, Brittany, 25 November, 1671; d. at Paris, 5 March, 1708. He entered the Society of Jesus on 25 November, 1671. As professor of philosophy and especially while procurator of the Franco-Chinese mission, he sought in a series of admirable papers to awaken the interest of the cultivated classes in the great work of Christianizing Eastern Asia. In 1697 appeared at Paris his "Lettres sur les progrèz de la religion à la Chine". Apropos of the violent literary feud then in progress concerning the so-called "Chinese Rites", he published among other things "Histoire de l'édit de l'empereur de la Chine en faveur de la religion chrétienne avec un éclaircissement sur les honneurs que les Chinois rendent à Confucius et aux morts" (Paris, 1698); and in the year 1700: "Lettre à un Docteur de la Faculté de Paris sur les propositions déférées en Sorbonne par M. Prioux". Under the same date there appeared in Paris the "Histoire des Isles Mariannes nouvellement converties à la religion chrétienne". The second part, translated into Spanish by J. Delgado, is found in the latter's "Historia General de Filipinas" (Manila, 1892). In 1702 Père Le Gobien published "Lettres de quelques missionnaires de la Compagnie de Jésus, écrites de la Chine et des Indes Orientales"; this was the beginning of the collection soon to become celebrated under the title of "Lettres édifiantes et curieuses écrites des

missions étrangères par quelques missionnaires de la Compagnie de Jésus". The first eight series were by Père le Gobien, the later ones by Fathers Du Halde, Patouillet, Geoffroy, and Maréchal. The collection was printed in thirty-six vols. duodecimo (Paris, 1703–76), and reissued in 1780–81 by Fathers Yves, de Querbeux, and Brotier in twenty-six vols. duodecimo, unfortunately omitting the valuable prefaces. New editions appeared in 1819, 1829–32, and 1838–43. One abridgment in four vols. octavo, was entitled "Panthéon Littéraire", by L. Aimé Martin (1834–43). A partial English translation came out in London in 1714. The publication incited the Austrian Jesuit Stöcklein to undertake his "Neuer Welt Bott" (about 1720), at first considered merely a translation, but soon an independent and particularly valuable collection (five vols., folio in forty parts) substantially completing the "Lettres Edifiantes" (see Kath. Missionen, 1904–05).

SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibl. de la Comp. de Jésus*, s. v. *Gobien;* DE GUILHERMY, *Ménologe de la Comp. de Jésus*, I (Paris, 1892), 324; *Nouv. biogr. gén.*, XXX (Paris, 1883), 403; FELLER, *Dict. hist.*, IV, 82.

A. HUONDER.

Legrand, LOUIS, French theologian and noted doctor of the Sorbonne, b. in Burgundy at Lusigny-sur-Ouche, 12 June, 1711, d. at Issy (Paris), 21 July, 1780. After studying philosophy and theology at St. Sulpice, Paris, he taught philosophy at Clermont, 1733–1736, resumed his studies at Paris, where he entered the Society of St. Sulpice in 1739 and obtained the licentiate in 1740, professed theology at Cambrai, 1740–1743, was superior of the seminary of Autun, 1743–1745, and having been recalled to Paris received the doctorate in theology from the Sorbonne in 1746. Henceforth he remained at the seminary of St. Sulpice in various employments. Appointed director of studies in 1767 he exercised in this capacity a great influence over the brightest young ecclesiastics of France, who were preparing to take their degrees at the Sorbonne. As a doctor of the Sorbonne he was called upon to take a prominent part in framing the decisions and censures of the theological faculty; in that time of intense opposition to Christian dogma no question of importance was decided by the Sorbonne, it is said, without consulting M. Legrand. It was he who wrote the condemnation of Jean-Jacques Rousseau's "Emile", which has been accounted a remarkable analysis and refutation of that celebrated work, "learned, exact, well thought out, deep, and singularly clear" (reprinted in Migne's "Theologiæ Cursus Completus", II, col. 1111–1248). Unfortunately, Legrand's condemnation is forgotten or little read, while the genius of Rousseau has made "Emile" immortal. Legrand also drafted the censures of Marmontel's "Bélisaire" and Père Berruyer's "Histoire du Peuple de Dieu", which, like the censure of "Emile", were regarded by divines as model expositions of theological knowledge and clear thinking. He helped to avert a censure from Buffon's "Epoques de la Nature", in consideration of the author's retraction. Legrand's moderation and kindliness gained the esteem and good will of both Buffon and Marmontel. Nearly all the writings of Legrand, most of which, however, are his only in part, have had the honour of being selected by Migne in his "Theologiæ Cursus Completus". The most important are: "Prælectiones Theologicæ de Deo ac divinis attributis", a work by La Fosse based on Tournély's treatise, re-edited by Legrand, who added about 400 pages of additional matter. It is still considered a very solid and valuable treatise; reprinted in Migne, VII. "Tractatus de Incarnatione Verbi Divini" (in Migne, IX), also based on Tournély; a work of high value. Parts of his "Tractatus de Ecclesia" have been reproduced by Migne in his "Scripturæ Sacræ Cursus Completus", IV. Legrand left a posthumous treatise, "De Existentia Dei" (Paris, 1812), which, though unfinished, is considered "equally remarkable for the depth of its doctrine and the clearness of its arguments".

BERTRAND, *Histoire littéraire de la Compagnie de St-Sulpice*, I (Paris, 1900), gives the complete list of Legrand's writings; MONTAIGNE, *Notice* prefixed to the above mentioned treatise *De Existentia Dei* (Paris, 1812).

JOHN F. FENLON.

Le Gras, LOUISE DE MARILLAC, VENERABLE, foundress of the Sisters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, b. at Paris, 12 August, 1591, daughter of Louis de Marillac, Lord of Ferrières, and Marguerite LeCamus; d. there, 15 March, 1660. Her mother having died soon after the birth of Louise, the education of the latter devolved upon her father, a man of blameless life. In her earlier years she was confided to the care of her aunt, a religious at Poissy. Afterwards she studied under a preceptress, devoting much time to the cultivation of the arts. Her father's serious disposition was reflected in the daughter's taste for philosophy and kindred subjects. When about sixteen years old, Louise developed a strong desire to enter the Capuchinesses (Daughters of the Passion). Her spiritual director dissuaded her, however, and, her father having died, it became necessary to decide her vocation. Interpreting her director's advice, she accepted the hand of Antoine Le Gras, a young secretary under Maria de' Medici. A son was born of this marriage on 13 October, 1613, and to his education Mlle Le Gras devoted herself during the years of his childhood. Of works of charity she never wearied. In 1619 she became acquainted with St. Francis de Sales, who was then in Paris, and Mgr Le Camus, Bishop of Belley, became her spiritual adviser. Troubled by the thought that she had rejected a call to the religious state, she vowed in 1623 not to remarry should her husband die before her.

M. Le Gras died on 21 Dec., 1625, after a long illness. In the meantime his wife had made the acquaintance of a priest known as M. Vincent (St. Vincent de Paul), who had been appointed superior of the Visitation Monastery by St. Francis de Sales. She placed herself under his direction, probably early in 1625. His influence led her to associate herself with his work among the poor of Paris, and especially in the extension of the Confrérie de la Charité, an association which he had founded for the relief of the sick poor. It was this labour which decided her life's work, the founding of the Sisters of Charity. The history of the evolution of this institute, in which Mlle Le Gras plays so prominent a part, has been given elsewhere (see CHARITY, SISTERS OF); it suffices here to say that, with formal ecclesiastical and state recognition, Mlle Le Gras' life-work received its assurance of success. Her death occurred in 1660, a few months before the death of St. Vincent, with whose labours she had been so closely united. The process of her beatification has been inaugurated at Rome.

BAUNARD, *La Vénérable Louise de Marillac* (Paris, 1904); *Life of Mademoiselle Le Gras* (New York, 1884); Archives of the Congregation of the Mission (Paris).

JOSEPH S. GLASS.

Le Hir, ARTHUR-MARIE, Biblical scholar and Orientalist; b. at Morlaix (Finisterre), in the Diocese of Quimper, France, 5 Dec., 1811; d. at Paris, 13 Jan., 1868. Entering the seminary of St. Sulpice, Paris, in 1833, he joined the Sulpicians after ordination, and was appointed professor of theology. He was then made professor of Sacred Scripture and also of Hebrew, to which branches he had been thoroughly formed by Garnier, a scholar, says Renan, "who had a very solid knowledge of languages and the most complete knowledge of exegesis of any Catholic in France" (Souvenirs d'enfance et de jeunesse, 269). Le Hir continued in this teaching till his death, about thirty years later, and through his own work and that of his pupil, Renan, he influenced powerfully the revival of Biblical and Oriental studies in France. Renan regarded him as

the best Hebrew and Syriac scholar of France in his generation, and one, moreover, who was thoroughly versed in Biblical science, including the current German works thereon, whose theories he exposed and strongly combatted. Some lay to his uncompromising attitude the defection of Renan, which was so harmful to religion in France. He was as eminent in sanctity and modesty as in science, and no doubt this contributed to the extraordinary impression he left upon his intimates, which his writings (partly because they are chiefly posthumous) fail to produce. Most students of his books would hesitate about accepting Renan's judgment, that he "was certainly the most remarkable man in the French clergy of our day" (op. cit., 273). Le Hir published only a few articles, which, along with others, were collected, after his death, in the two volumes entitled "Etudes Bibliques", Paris, 1869. This work shows him at his best, in the range and solidity of his acquirements, and in the breadth of his views. His other writings, all posthumous, and not left by him ready for the press, are studies in the translation and exegesis of certain Biblical works: "Le Livre de Job" (Paris, 1873); "Les Psaumes" (Paris, 1876); "Les trois Grands Prophètes, Isaie, Jérémie, Ezéchiel" (Paris, 1876); "Le Cantique des Cantiques" (Paris, 1883).

BERTRAND, *Bibliothèque Sulpicienne*, II (Paris, 1900), with a lengthy description of Le Hir's writings and references to articles concerning him; cf. IDEM in VIG., *Dict. de la Bible*, s. v.; RENAN, *Souvenirs d'enfance et de jeunesse* (Paris, 1883), 221, 269, 274, 288; IDEM in *Journal Asiatique*, XII (Paris, 1868), 19; JULES SIMON, *Quatre Portraits* (Paris, 1896), containing the reminiscences—evidently mistaken—of a pretended judgment of Renan upon Le Hir, totally at variance with that given in the *Souvenirs* and *Journal Asiatique*.

JOHN F. FENLON.

Lehnin, ABBEY OF, founded in 1180 by Otto II, Margrave of Brandenburg, for Cistercian monks. Situated about eight miles to the south-east of Brandenburg, its church was a fine example of Romanesque architecture. It is not of great importance in history save for the famous "Vaticinium Lehninense", supposed to have been written in the thirteenth or fourteenth century by a monk named Hermann. Manuscripts of the prophecy, which was first printed in 1722, exist in Berlin, Dresden, Breslau, and Göttingen. It begins by lamenting the end of the Ascanian line of the margraves of Brandenburg, with the death of Henry the Younger in 1319, and gives a faithful portraiture of several of the margraves till it comes to deal with Frederick William I. Here the writer leaves the region of safety and ceases to make any portraiture of the people about whom he is prophesying. Frederick III, who became first King of Prussia in 1701, he makes suffer a terrible loss, and he sends Frederick William II to end his days in a monastery. He makes Frederick the Great die at sea, and ends the House of Hohenzollern with Frederick William III. A Catholic ruler, who re-establishes Lehnin as a monastery (it had been secularized at the Reformation), is also made to restore the union of the Empire. The work is anti-Prussian, but the real author cannot be discovered. The first to unmask the fraud was Pastor Weiss, who proved in his "Vaticinium Germanicum" (Berlin, 1746) that the pseudo-prophecy was really written between 1688 and 1700. Even after the detection of its true character, attempts were made to use it in anti-Prussian polemics. Its last appearance was in 1848.

ZÖCKLER in *Realencyk. für prot. Theol.*, s.v. *Lehninsche Weissagung;* KAMPERS, *Lehninsche Weissagung über das Haus Hohenzollern* (Ratisbon, 1897).

R. URBAN BUTLER.

Leibniz, SYSTEM OF.—I. LIFE OF LEIBNIZ.—Gottfried Wilhelm von Leibniz was born at Leipzig on 21 June (1 July), 1646. In 1661 he entered the University of Leipzig as a student of philosophy and law, and in 1666 obtained the degree of Doctor of Law at Altdorf. The following year he met the diplomat Baron von Boineburg, at whose suggestion he entered the diplomatic service of the Elector of Mainz. The years 1672 to 1676 he spent as diplomatic representative of Mainz at the Court of Louis XIV. During this time he paid a visit to London and made the acquaintance of the most learned English mathematicians, scientists, and theologians of the day. While at Paris he became acquainted with prominent representatives of Catholicism, and began to interest himself in the questions which were in dispute between Catholics and Protestants. In 1676 he accepted the position of librarian, archivist, and court councillor to the Duke of Brunswick. The remaining years of his life were spent at Hanover, with the exception of a brief interval in which he journeyed to Rome and to Vienna for the purpose of examining documents relating to the history of the House of Brunswick. He died at Hanover on 14 Nov., 1716.

As a mathematician Leibniz claims with Newton the distinction of having invented (in 1675) the differential calculus. As a scientist he appreciated and encouraged the use of observation and experiment: "I prefer," he said, "a Leeuwenhoek who tells me what he sees to a Cartesian who tells me what he thinks." As a historian he emphasized the importance of the study of documents and archives. As a philologist he laid stress on the value of the comparative study of languages, and made some contributions to the history of German. As a philosopher he is undoubtedly the foremost German thinker of the eighteenth century, Kant being generally reckoned among nineteenth-century philosophers. Finally, as a student of statecraft he realized the importance of freedom of conscience, and made persistent, well-meant, though unsuccessful efforts to reconcile Catholics and Protestants.

GOTTFRIED WILHELM VON LEIBNIZ

II. LEIBNIZ AND CATHOLICISM.—When Leibniz became librarian and archivist of the House of Brunswick in 1676, the Duke of Brunswick was Johann Friedrich, a recent convert to Catholicism. Almost immediately Leibniz began to exert himself in the cause of reconciliation between Catholics and Protestants. At Paris he had come to know many prominent Jesuits and Oratorians, and now he began his celebrated correspondence with Bossuet. With the sanction of the duke and the approval, not only of the vicar Apostolic, but of Innocent XI, the project to find a basis of agreement between Protestants and Catholics in Hanover was inaugurated. Leibniz soon took the place of Molanus, president of the Hanoverian Consistory, as the representative of the Protestant claims. He tried to reconcile the Catholic principle of authority with the Protestant principle of free enquiry. He favoured a species of syncretic Christianity first proposed at the University of Helmstadt, which adopted for its creed an eclectic formula made up of the dogmas supposed to have been held by the primitive Church. Finally, he drew up a statement of Catholic doctrine, entitled "Systema Theologicum", which he tells us met the approval not only of Bishop Spinola of Wiener-Neustadt, who conducted, so to speak, the case for the Catholics, but also of "the Pope, the Cardinals, the General of

the Jesuits, the Master of the Sacred Palace and others" (Rommel, "Leibniz u. der Landgraf Ernst V. H. Pheinfels," II, Frankfort, 1847, p. 196). The negotiations were continued even after the death of Duke Johann Friedrich in 1679. Leibniz, it should be understood, was actuated as much by patriotic motives as he was by religious considerations. He saw clearly that one of the greatest sources of weakness in the German States was the lack of religious unity and the absence of the spirit of toleration. Indeed, the rôle he played was that of a diplomat rather than that of a theologian. However, his correspondence with Bossuet and Pelisson and his acquaintance with many prominent Catholics produced a real change in his attitude towards the Church, and, although he adopted for his own creed a kind of eclectic rationalistic Christianity, he ceased in 1696 to frequent Protestant services. The causes of the failure of his negotiations have been variously summed up by different historians. One thing seems clear: Louis XIV, who, through Bossuet, professed his approval of Leibniz's project, had very potent political reasons for placing obstacles in the way of Leibniz's irenic efforts. Leibniz, it should be added, met with little success in his other plan of conciliation, namely, his scheme for the union of Protestants among themselves.

III. Leibniz and Learned Societies.—In 1700 Leibniz, through the munificence of his royal pupil Princess Sophie Charlotte, wife of Frederick the First of Prussia, founded the Society (afterwards called the Academy) of Sciences of Berlin, and was appointed its first president. In 1711, and again in 1712 and 1716, he was accorded an interview with Peter the Great, and suggested the formation of a similar society at St. Petersburg. In 1689, during his visit to Rome, he was elected a member of the pontifical Accademia Fisico-Mattematica.

IV. Leibniz's Works.—Since the discovery in 1903 of fifteen thousand letters and unedited fragments of Leibniz's works at Hanover, the learned world has come to realize the full force of a saying of Leibniz himself: "He who knows me by my published works alone does not know me at all" (Qui me non nisi editis novit, non novit). The works published during his lifetime or immediately after his death are, for the most part, treatises on particular portions of his philosophy. None of them gives an adequate account of his system in its entirety. The most important are "Disputatio metaphysica de principio individui", "La monadologie", "Essais de théodicée", and "Nouveaux essais sur l'entendement humain". The last of these is a reply, chapter by chapter, to Locke's "Essay". In the account given below, these works are used; but use is also made of the fragments published by Couterat in his "Opuscules et fragments inédits de Leibniz" (Paris, 1903), and by Baruzi in his "Leibniz" (Paris, 1909). Of Leibniz's treatises on religious topics the most important are: (1) "Dialogus de religione rustici", a fragment, dated Paris, 1673, and treating of predestination; (2) "Dialogue effectif sur la liberté de l'homme, et sur l'origine du mal" dated 1695, still unpublished, and treating of the same topic; (3) "Letters" to Arnauld and others on transubstantiation; (4) Letters, tracts, opuscula, etc., of an irenic character, e. g. "Variæ definitiones ecclesiæ" "De persona Christi", "Appendix, de resurrectione corporum", "De cultu sanctorum", letters to Pelisson, Bossuet, Mme de Brinon, etc.; (5) contributions to mystical theology, e. g. "Von der wahren Theologia Mystica", "Dialogues" on the psychology of mysticism (cf. "Revue de Metaph. et de Morale", Jan., 1905).

V. Leibniz's Philosophy.—As a philosopher Leibniz exhibited that many-sidedness which characterized his mental activity in general. His sympathies were broad, his convictions were eclectic, and his aim was not so much that of the synthetic thinker who would found a new system of philosophy, as that of a philosophic diplomatist who would reconcile all existing systems by demonstrating their essential harmony. Consequently, his starting-point is very different from that of Descartes. Descartes believed that his first duty was to doubt all the conclusions of all his predecessors; Leibniz was of the opinion that his duty was to show how near all his predecessors had come to the truth. Descartes was convinced, or at least assumed the conviction, that all the philosophers who went before him were in error, because they appeared to be involved in inextricable contradictions; Leibniz was equally well convinced that all the great systems agree fundamentally, and that their unanimity on essentials is a fair indication that they are in the right. Leibniz therefore resolved, not to isolate himself from the philosophical, scientific, and literary efforts of his predecessors and contemporaries, but, on the contrary, to utilize everything that the human mind had up to his time achieved, to discover agreement where discord and contradiction semed to reign, and thus to establish a permanent peace among contending schools. Even thinkers so widely separated as Plato and Democritus, Aristotle and Descartes, the Scholastics and modern physicists, hold certain doctrines in common, and Leibniz makes it the business of his philosophy to single out those doctrines, explain the manifold bearings of each, remove apparent contradictions, and so accomplish a diplomatic triumph where others had, like Descartes, but made confusion worse confounded. The philosophy, to which Leibniz thus ascribed irenics as one of its chief aims, is a partial idealism. Its principal tenets are: (1) The doctrine of monads, (2) pre-established harmony, (3) the law of continuity, and (4) optimism.

(1) *The Doctrine of Monads.*—Like Descartes and Spinoza, Leibniz attaches great importance to the notion of substance. But, while they define substance as independent existence, he defines substance in terms of independent action. The notion of substance as essentially inert (see Occasionalism) is fundamentally erroneous. Substance is essentially active: to be is to act. Now, since the independence of substance is an independence in regard to action, not in regard to existence, there is no reason for maintaining, as Descartes and Spinoza maintained, that substance is one. Substance is, indeed, essentially individual, because it is a centre of independent action; but it is no less essentially manifold, since actions are many and varied. The independent, manifold centres of activity are called *monads*. The monad has been compared to the atom, and is, indeed, like it in many respects. Like the atom, it is simple (devoid of parts), indivisible, and indestructible. However, the indivisibility of the atom is not absolute but only relative to our power of analysing it chemically, while the indivisibility of the monad is absolute, the monad being a metaphysical point, a centre of force, incapable of being analysed or separated in any way. Again, according to the Atomists, all atoms are alike: according to Leibniz no two monads can be exactly alike. Finally, the most important difference between the atom and the monad is this: the atom is material, and performs only material functions; the monad is immaterial and, in so far as it represents other monads, functions in an immaterial manner. The monads, therefore, of which all substances are composed, and which are, in reality, the only substances existing, are more like souls than bodies. Indeed, Leibniz does not hesitate to call them souls and to draw the obvious inference that all nature is animated (panpsychism).

The immateriality of the monad consists in its power of representation. Each monad is a microcosm, or universe in miniature. It is, rather, a mirror of the entire universe, because it is in relation with all other monads, and to that extent reflects them all, so

that an all-seeing eye looking at one monad could see reflected in it all the rest of creation. Of course, this representation is different in different kinds of monads. The uncreated monad, God, mirrors all things clearly and adequately. The created monad which is the human soul—the "queen-monad"—represents consciously but not with perfect clearness. And, according as we descend the scale from man to the lowest mineral substance, the region of clear representation diminishes and the region of obscure representation increases. The extent of clear representation in the monad is an index of its immateriality. Every monad, except the uncreated monad, is, therefore, partly material and partly immaterial. The material element in the monad corresponds to the passivity of *materia prima*, and the immaterial element to the activity of the *forma substantialis*. Thus, Leibniz imagined, the Scholastic doctrine of matter and form is reconciled with modern science. At the same time, he imagined, the doctrine of monads embodies what is true in the atomism of Democritus and does not exclude what is true in Plato's immaterialism.

The universe, therefore, as Leibniz represented it, is made up of an infinite number of indivisible monads which rise in a scale of ascending immaterialism from the lowest particle of mineral dust up to the highest created intellect. The lowest monad has only a most imperfect glimmering of immateriality, and the highest has still some remnant of materiality attached to it. In this way, the doctrine of monads strives to reconcile materialism and idealism by teaching that everything created is partly material and partly immaterial. For matter is not separated from spirit by an abrupt difference, such as Descartes imagined to exist between body and mind. Neither are the functions of the immaterial generically different from the functions of material substance. The mineral, which attracts and is attracted, has an incipient or inchoate power of perception; the plant, which in so many different ways adapts itself to its environment, is in a sense aware of its surroundings, though not conscious of them. The animal by its power of sensation rises by imperceptible steps above the mentality of the plant, and between the highest or most "intelligent" animals and the lowest savages there is no very violent break in the continuity of the development of mental power. All this Leibniz maintains without any thought, apparently, of genetic dependence of man on animal, animal on plant, or plant on mineral. He has no theory of descent or ascent. He merely records the absence of "breaks" in the plan of continuity, as it presents itself to his mind. He is not concerned with the problem of origins, but rather with the Cartesian problem of the alleged antithesis between mind and matter. How to bridge the imaginary chasm between mind which thinks, and matter which is extended, was the problem to which all the philosophers of the eighteenth century addressed themselves. Spinoza merged mind and matter in the one infinite substance; the materialists merged mind in matter; the immaterialists merged matter in mind; Hume denied the terms of the problem, when he reasoned away both matter and mind and left only appearances. Leibniz, diplomat and peacemaker, toned matter up and toned mind down until they gave forth what he considered unison. Or, if we are to go back to the original figure of speech, he spanned the chasm by his definition of substance as action. Representation is action; representation is a function of so-called material things as well as of those which are generally called immaterial. Representation, rising from the most rudimentary "little perception" (*petite perception*) in the mineral up to "apperception" in the human soul, is the bond of substantial continuity, the bridge that joins together the two kinds of substances, matter and mind, which Descartes so inconsiderately separated. There is no doubt that Leibniz was conscious of this aim of his philosophy. His opposition to "immoderate Cartesianism" was openly acknowledged in his philosophical treatises as well as in his lectures. He looked upon Spinoza's conclusions as being the logical outcome of Descartes's erroneous definition of substance. "Spinoza", he wrote, "simply said out loud what Descartes was thinking, but did not dare to express". But, while he had in view the refutation of extreme Cartesianism, he must have intended also by means of his doctrine of monads to stem the current of materialism which had set in in England and was soon to sweep before it in France many of the ideas which he cherished.

(2) *The Doctrine of Pre-established Harmony.*—"Every present state of a simple substance is a natural consequence of its preceding state, in such a way that its present is always the cause of its future" ("Monadologie," thesis xxii). "The soul follows its own laws, and the body has its laws. They are fitted to each other in virtue of the pre-established harmony among all substances, since they are all representations of one and the same universe" (op. cit., thesis lxxviii). From Descartes's doctrine that matter is essentially inert, Malebranche (q. v.) had drawn the conclusion that material substances cannot be true causes, but only occasions of the effects produced by God (Occasionalism). Leibniz wished to avoid this conclusion. At the same time, he had reduced all the activity of the monad to immanent activity. That is, he had defined substance as action, and explained that the essential action of substance is representation. He saw clearly, then, that there can be no interaction among monads. The monad, he said, has "no windows" through which the activity of other monads can enter it. The only recourse left him is to maintain that each monad unfolds its own activity, pursues, as it were, its career of representation independently of other monads. This would make each monad a monarch. If, however, there were no control of the activities of the monad, the world would be a chaos, not the cosmos that it is. We must, therefore, conceive that God at the beginning of creation so arranged things that the changes in one monad correspond perfectly to those in the other monads which belong to its system. In the case of the soul and body, for instance, neither has a real influence on the other: but, just as two clocks may be so perfectly constructed and so accurately adjusted that, though independent of each other, they keep exactly the same time, so it is arranged that the monads of the body put forth their activity in such a way that to each physical activity of the monads of the body there corresponds a psychical activity of the monad of the soul. This is the famous doctrine of pre-established harmony. "According to this system", says Leibniz, "bodies act as if (to suppose the impossible) there were no souls at all, and souls act as if there were no bodies, and yet both body and soul act as if the one were influencing the other" (op. cit., thesis lxxxii). Thus the monad is not really a monarch, but a subject of God's Kingdom, which is the universe, "the true city of God".

If we take this doctrine literally, and deny all influence of one monad on another, we are forced at once to ask: How, then, is it possible for the monad to represent, if it is not acted upon? Leibniz's answer would be that he denied to the monad all communication from without, he affirmed that the monad has no windows on the outside, but he did not deny that in the heart of the monad is a door that opens on the Infinite, and from that side it is in communication with all other monads. Here Leibniz passes over the problem from metaphysics to mysticism. If harmony is unity in diversity, the unity in the pre-established harmony is not so much a unity of source, as a unity of final destiny. All things "co-operate" in the universe not only because God is the Source from whom they all spring, but still more so because God is the

End towards which they are all tending, and the Perfection which they are all striving to attain.

(3) *Law of Continuity.*—From the description of the monads given above, it is clear that all kinds and conditions of created things shade off by gradual differences, the lower appearing to be merely an inferior degree of the higher. There are no "breaks" in the continuity of nature, no "gaps" between mineral, plant, animal, and man. The counter-view is the *law of indiscernibles.* There can be no meaningless duplication in nature. No two monads can be exactly alike. No two objects, no two events can be entirely similar, for, if they were, they would not, Leibniz thinks, be two but one. The application of these principles led Leibniz to adopt the view that, while every thing differs from every other thing, there are no true opposites. Rest, for instance, may be considered as infinitely minute motion; the fluid is a solid with a lower degree of solidity; animals are men with infinitely small reason, and so forth. The application to the theory of the differential calculus is obvious.

(4) *Optimism.*—In the centre of the vast harmonious system of monads which we call the universe is God, the original, infinite monad. His power, His wisdom, His goodness are infinite. When, therefore, He created the system of monads, He created them as good as they could possibly be, and established among them the best possible kind of harmony. The world, therefore, is the best possible world, and the supreme law of finite being is the *lex melioris.* The Will of God must realize what His understanding recognizes as more perfect. Leibniz represents the possible monads as present for all eternity in the mind of God; in them was the impulse towards actualization; and the more perfect the possible monad the more strongly did it possess this impulse. There went on, therefore, so to speak, a competition before the throne of God, in which the best monads conquered, and, as God could not but see that they were the best, He could not but will their realization. Behind the *lex melioris* is, therefore, a more fundamental law, the *law of sufficient reason,* which is that "things or events are real when there is a sufficient reason for their existence." This is a fundamental law of thought, as well as a primary law of being.

The four doctrines here outlined may be said to sum up Leibniz's metaphysical teaching. They find their principal application in his psychology and his theodicy.

(5) *Psychology.*—In the "Nouveaux Essais", which were written in refutation of Locke's "Essay", Leibniz develops his doctrines regarding the human soul and the origin and nature of knowledge. The power of representation, which is common to all monads, makes its first appearance in souls as perception. Perception, when it reaches the level of consciousness, becomes apperception. The Cartesians "have fallen into a serious error in that they treat as non-existent those perceptions of which we are not conscious." Perception is found in all monads; in those monads which we call souls there is apperception, but there is a large subconscious region of souls in which there are perceptions. Perceptions are the source of apperceptions. They are the source also of volitions, because impulse, or appetite, is nothing but the tendency of one perception towards another. From perception, therefore, which is found in everything, up to intelligence and volition, which are peculiar to man, there are imperceptibly small grades of differentiation.

Whence, then, come our ideas? The question is already answered in Leibniz's general principles. Since intelligence is only a differentiation of that immanent action which all monads possess, our ideas must be the result of the self-activity of the monad called the human soul. The soul has "no doors or windows" towards the side facing the external world. No ideas can come from that direction. All our ideas are innate. The Aristotelian maxim, "there is nothing in the intellect that was not previously in the senses," must be amended by the addition of the phrase, "except the intellect itself". The intellect is the source as well as the subject of all our ideas. These ideas, however subjective their origin, have objective value, because, by virtue of the harmony pre-established from the beginning of the universe, the evolution of the psychic monad from virtual to actual knowledge is paralleled by the evolution in the outside world of the physical monad from virtual to actual activity.

Leibniz has no difficulty in establishing the immateriality of the soul. All monads are immaterial, or rather, partly immaterial and partly material. The human soul is no exception; its "immateriality" is not absolute, but only relative, in the sense that in it the region of clear representation is so much greater than the region of obscure representation that the latter is practically a negligible quantity. Similarly, the immortality of the human soul is not, absolutely speaking, a unique privilege. All monads are immortal. Each monad being an independent, self-active, source of action, neither dependent on other monads nor influenced by them, it can continue acting without interference forever. The human soul is peculiar in this, that its consciousness (apperception) enables it to realize this independence, and therefore the soul's consciousness of its immortality is what makes human immortality to be different from every other immortality.

(6) *Theodicy.*—The work entitled "Théodicée", a treatise on natural theology, was intended as a refutation of the Encyclopædist, Bayle, who had tried to show that reason and faith are incompatible. In it Leibniz takes up: (a) the existence of God (b) the problem of evil, and (c) the question of optimism.

(a) Existence of God.—Leibniz, true to his eclectic temperament, admits the validity of all the various arguments for the existence of God. He adduces the argument from the contingency of finite being, recasts the ontological argument used by Descartes (see GOD), and adds the argument from the nature of the necessity of our ideas. The third of these arguments is really Platonic in its origin. Its validity depends on the fact that our ideas are necessary, not merely in a hypothetical, but in an absolute and categorical sense, and on the further contention that a necessity of that kind cannot be explained unless we grant that an absolutely necessary Being exists.

(b) Problem of Evil.—This problem is discussed at length in the "Théodicée" and in many of Leibniz's letters. The law of continuity requires that there be no abrupt differences among monads. God, therefore, although He wished to create the best possible world, and did, in fact, create the best world that was *in se* possible, could not create monads which were all perfect, each in its own kind. He was under no necessity of His own Nature, but He was obliged, as it were, by the terms of the problem, to lead up to perfection by passing through various degrees of imperfection. Leibniz distinguishes *metaphysical evil,* which is mere finiteness, or imperfection in general, *physical evil,* which is suffering, and *moral evil,* which is sin. God permits these to exist, since the nature of the universe demands variety and gradation, but He reduces them to the minimum, and makes them to serve a higher purpose, the beauty and harmony of creation as a whole. Leibniz faces resolutely the problem of reconciling the existence of evil with the goodness and omnipotence of God. He reminds us that we see only a part of God's creation, that part, namely, which is nearest to ourselves, and, for that reason, makes the largest demand on our sympathy. We should learn, he says, to look beyond our own immediate environment, to observe the larger and more perfect world above us. Where our sympathies are involved, we should not allow the prevalence of evil to overpower

our feelings, but should exercise our faith and our love of God; where we can view God's works more impersonally, we should realize that evil and imperfection are always and everywhere made to serve the purpose of harmony, symmetry, and beauty.

(c) Optimism.—Leibniz is, therefore, an optimist, both because he maintains as a general metaphysical principle that the world which exists is the best possible world, and because in his discussion of the problem of evil he tries to trace out principles that will "justify the ways of God to man" in a manner compatible with God's goodness. It had become the fashion among materialists and freethinkers to draw an over-gloomy picture of the universe as a place of pain, suffering, and sin, and to ask triumphantly: "How can a good God, if He is omnipotent, permit such a state of things?" Leibniz's answer, though not entirely original, is correct. Evil should be considered in relation not to the parts of reality, but to reality as a whole. Many evils are "in other respects" good. And, when, in the final resort, we cannot see a definite rational solution of a perplexing problem, we should fall back on faith, which, especially in regard to the problem of evil, aids reason.

(7) *Leibniz's Ethics.*—We have seen that, although the monad is by definition independent, and, therefore, a monarch in its own realm, yet, by virtue of pre-established harmony, the multitude of monads which make up the universe are organized into a kingdom of spirits, of which God is the Supreme Ruler, a city of God, governed by Divine Providence, or, more correctly still, a family, of which God is the Father. Now, there is "a harmony between the physical realm of nature and the moral realm of grace" ("Monadologie", thesis lxxxviii); monads making progress along natural lines towards perfection are progressing at the same time along moral lines towards happiness. The essential perfection of a monad is, of course, perfect distinctness of representation. The more the human soul progresses in distinctness of ideas, the more insight it obtains into the the connexion of all things and the harmony of the whole universe. From this realization springs the impulse to love others, that is to seek the happiness of others as well as one's own. The road to happiness is, therefore, through an increase of theoretical insight into the universe, and through an increase in love which naturally follows an increase of knowledge. The moral man, while he thus promotes his own happiness by seeking the happiness of others, fulfils at the same time the Will of God. Goodness and piety are, therefore, identical.

VII. Influence of Leibniz.—Through his controversy with Clarke concerning the nature of space and the existence of atoms, and also on account of the rivalry between himself and Newton in respect to the discovery of the calculus, Leibniz came to be well-known to the learned world in England at the end of the seventeenth century and the beginning of the eighteenth. His residence in Paris brought him into contact with the great men of the court of Louis XIV, as well as with almost all the writers of that age who were distinguished either in the world of science or in that of theology. It was, however, in his own country that he became best known as a philosopher. The multiplicity of his interests and the variety of the tasks he set himself to accomplish were unfavourable to the systematic development of his philosophical doctrines. It was due to the efforts of his follower, Christian Wolff (1679–1754), who reduced his teachings to more compact form, that he exerted the influence which he did on the movement known as the German Illumination. In point of fact, until Kant (see Kant, Philosophy of) began the public exposition of his critical philosophy, Leibniz was the dominant mind in the world of philosophy in Germany. And his influence was, on the whole, salutary. It is true that his philosophy is unreal. His fundamental conception, that of substance, is more worthy of a poet and a mystic than of a philosopher and a scientist; nevertheless, like Plato, he is to be judged by the loftiness of his speculations, not by his lack of scientific precision. He did his share in stemming the tide of materialism; and helped to preserve spiritual and æsthetic ideals until such time as they could be treated constructively, as they were by the greatest thinkers in the nineteenth century.

Leibnitii opera omnia, ed. Dutens (6 vols., Geneva, 1768); *Leibniz's gesammelte Werke*, ed. Klopp (11 vols., Hanover, 1864–84); *Œuvres de Leibniz*, ed. Foucher de Careil (7 vols., Paris, 1859–77); *Œuvres philos.*, ed. Raspe (Amsterdam, 1765); *Opera philosophica*, ed. Erdmann (2 pts., Berlin, 1839–40); *Die philosophischen Schriften*, ed. Gerhart (7 vols., Berlin, 1875–90). There are numerous editions of separate works; the letters, also, are published in various editions, e. g. his correspondence with Clarke (London, 1717); and there are many valuable fragments in *Opuscules etc.*, ed. Couterat (Paris, 1903). Translations: *Philosophical Works*, tr. Duncan (New Haven, 1890), also in different nos. of the *Journal of Spec. Phil.* (1868–); *Discourse on Metaph., etc.*, tr. Montgomery (Chicago, 1902); *New Essays*, tr. Langley (London and New York, 1896); *System of Theology*, tr. Russell (London, 1850). Consult Russell, *Critical Exposition of the Philosophy of Leibniz* (Cambridge, 1900); Mertz, *Leibniz* (London and Edinburgh, 1886); Dillmann, *Eine neue Darstellung der Monadenlehre* (Leipzig, 1891); Jasper, *Leibniz u. die Scholastik* (Leipzig, 1899); Kirchner, *Leibniz's Stellung zur kathol. Kirche* (Cothen, 1874); Piat, *La monadologie avec étude et notes* (Paris, 1900); Watson, *Leibnitz and Protestant Theology* in *New World*, V(1896), pp. 102–22); *Leibniz and the Catholic Church* in *Dublin Review*, X (1841), pp. 394–429. For complete list of articles etc., cf. Baldwin, *Dictionary of Phil.*, III, pt. i, 332 sqq.

William Turner.

Leigh, Richard, Venerable, English martyr, b. in Cambridgeshire about 1561; d. at Tyburn, 30 August, 1588. Ordained priest at Rome in February, 1586–7, he came on the mission the same year, was arrested in London, and banished. Returning he was committed to the Tower in June, 1588, and was condemned at the Old Bailey for being a priest. With him suffered four laymen and a lady, all of whom have been declared "Venerable". Edward Shelley, of Warminghurst, Sussex, and East Smithfield, London (son of Edward Shelley, of Warminghurst, a Master of the Household of the sovereign, and the settlor in "Shelley's case", and Joan, daughter of Paul Eden, of Penshurst, Kent), aged 50 or 60, who was already in the Clink for his religion in April, 1584, was condemned for keeping a book called "My Lord Leicester's Commonwealth" and for having assisted the Venerable William Dean (q. v.). He was apparently uncle by marriage to Benjamin Norton, afterwards one of the seven vicars of Dr. Richard Smith. Richard Martin, of Shropshire, was condemned for being in the company of the Ven. Robert Morton, and paying sixpence for his supper. Richard Lloyd, better known as Flower (*alias* Fludd, *alias* Graye), a native of the Diocese of Bangor (Wales), aged about 21, younger brother of Father Owen Lloyd, was condemned for entertaining a priest named William Horner, *alias* Forrest. John Roche (*alias* Neele), an Irish serving-man, and Margaret Ward, gentlewoman of Cheshire, were condemned for having assisted a priest named William Watson (as to whom see Gillow, op. cit. inf., V, 575) to escape from Bridewell.

Pollen, *Acts of the English Martyrs* (London, 1891), 110, 118, 286–7, 306–7, 311–12; *Catholic Record Society's Publications* (London, privately printed, 1905, etc.), II, 235, 282, III, 28, V, passim; Gillow, *Bibl. Dict. of the Eng. Cath.* (London and New York, 1885–1902), IV, 194, 493; Challoner, *Missionary Priests*, I (Leamington and London, s. d.), 231–8; Berry, *Sussex Genealogies* (London, 1830), 63, 66; Dallaway and Cartwright, *Sussex*, II (London, 1819–30), ii, 257.

John B. Wainewright.

Leighlin. See Kildare and Leighlin, Diocese of.

Leipzig, chief town in the Kingdom of Saxony, situated at the junction of the Pleisse, Parthe, and Weisse Elster. In 1905 it contained 503,672 inhabitants, of whom 22,864 were Catholics; the population to-day numbers about 545,000. The meaning of the

word Leipzig, which is probably of Slavonic origin, is still uncertain. The latest investigations have proved beyond doubt that the region about Leipzig was originally occupied by the Teutons. With the migration of the nations, the Slavs settled there, but in the ninth century, the Germans succeeded in re-establishing themselves. In 922 King Henry I conquered the Daleminzians, and laid out the fortified town of Meissen. Other strongholds were subsequently founded in the vicinity. The first mention of Leipzig is to be found in the chronicle of Bishop Thietmar of Merseburg (1009–18). Another German colony grew up beside this stronghold, to which Margrave Otto of Meissen gave a charter (about 1160), the so-called *Stadtbrief* of Leipzig. According to this charter Leipzig was given the Magdeburg code of laws, and at the same time an important plan of extension was decided upon.

The expansion of the German people was followed everywhere by the growth of Christianity. Leipzig belonged to the Diocese of Merseburg. The oldest church was Peterskapelle, the larger Nikoläikirche was built later. Of this, parts are still extant in the present church of that name. The Thomaskloster, the first monastery, was founded in the reign of Margrave Dietrich (1197–1221); both the Nikoläikirche and the Peterskapelle were made subordinate to this monastery, which was governed by the Augustinian Canons. By purchase and through foundations the monastery, whose prior was freely elected by the friars, gradually became possessed of considerable real estate and valuable tithes. A school, the oldest in Saxony, was soon founded in connexion with the monastery. Three other convents were founded in the town after the Thomaskloster; first that of the Cistercian Sisters mentioned between 1220 and 1230, which found a great benefactor in Margrave Heinrich (1230–88); then the monastery of the Dominican fathers, founded about 1229 and consecrated in 1240 in the presence of the Archbishop of Magdeburg and the bishops of Merseburg, Naumburg, and Meissen; and lastly the monastery of the Franciscans, which existed at least as early as 1253. Including these four convent churches, Leipzig thus possessed six churches in the Middle Ages; to these were added the Katharinenkapelle (1240), the Marienkapelle (about 1262), and the chapels belonging to the townhall and the castle (fifteenth century). The oldest hospital in the town was that founded together and in connexion with the Thomaskloster in 1213; its management was transferred from the convent to the town in 1439. St. John's hospital, erected at the end of the thirteenth century, was originally devoted to the care of lepers.

From the latter part of the twelfth century Leipzig was looked upon as the most important military station between the Saale and the Mulde. The *Messen* or annual fairs added greatly to the prosperity of the town; at first they were held in the Spring (*Jubilatemesse*) and Autumn (*Michaelismesse*), but after 1458 they were also held at Christmas or the New Year. In 1419 Leipzig obtained from Pope Martin V privileges on account of her fair, and received in 1515 a papal market privilege. The fame and importance of the city was greatly increased by still another event, namely the foundation of the university in 1449 by the students and professors who had seceded from Prague on account of the tyrannical actions of the Czech-Hussite faction. The foundation was confirmed by Pope Alexander V in 1409. Towards the latter part of the Middle Ages the state of the Church had changed for the worse. The convents were becoming more worldly; in 1445 the Bishop of Merseburg found it necessary to attempt a reform of the Thomaskloster, but met with no success. The remedial measures tried by Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa in 1451 brought about no permanent improvement. The preaching activity of St. John Capistran in 1455 was more successful, at least among members of his own order (the Franciscans), but the Cistercian Sisters in Leipzig did everything in their power to impede a reform. Later on there was a division in both the Dominican and Franciscan orders, which led to mutual opposition, some contending for a more rigorous and some for a laxer interpretation of the rule. The relations between the town council and the townspeople on the one side and the clerics, more particularly the regulars, on the other, became strained in the fifteenth century. The situation was further aggravated by the quarrel between the secular clergy and the monasteries. Small wonder, therefore, that Luther's reform movement soon found adherents in Leipzig.

Another connexion which the city had with the new movement was that Tetzel was a citizen, and also that Luther's Theses of 1517 were printed there. The celebrated Disputation between Luther and Karlstadt on one side and Eck on the other also took place in Leipzig; this was held under the most brilliant auspices, and lasted from 27 June until 15 July, 1519. Although both sides claimed the victory, Luther's adherents increased so greatly that neither the Bishop of Meissen nor the university dared announce in Leipzig before 1521 the Bull of excommunication against Luther, which Eck had brought from Rome. Among the many scholars of the town who energetically opposed the new movement by word and writing, particular mention must be made of the Dominican Petrus Sylvius, Professor Dungersheim of the university, the Franciscan Augustin Alfeld, Hieronymus Emser, and later Cochlæus. The Reformation made no headway in Saxony and Leipzig as long as Duke George lived; he even commanded four hundred adherents of the new teaching to leave the town in 1552, and forbade the people of Leipzig to attend the University of Wittenberg. After his death in 1539 the Reformation was introduced, and in 1543 all the convents were suppressed, their lands sold, the buildings mostly torn down, and Catholic public worship abolished. Besides the Disputation, there is another important event of the Reformation period connected with the town of Leipzig: the so-called Leipzig Interim (see INTERIM).

In connexion with the political history of the town there are many events which deserve special mention. The town suffered greatly during the Thirty Years War. In 1631 Tilly appeared before it with his army and captured it, but was defeated at Breitenfeld by Gustavus Adolphus on 17 September. Leipzig was besieged seven times and was captured six; from 1642 until 1650 it was in the possession of the Swedes; in 1706 it had to pay heavy tribute to Charles XII. Even more oppressive were the burdens of war imposed on the town by the Prussians during the Second Silesian War in 1745 and during the Seven Years War. In consequence its trade and industries were ruined for years. In the Napoleonic Wars Leipzig was occupied by the French Marshal Davoust in 1806 after the battle of Jena and Auerstädt; in 1809 it was pillaged by the Duke of Brunswick; and it was only after the battle of Leipzig (16–18 October, 1813) that the town was freed from heavy taxation and oppression. Half a million men fought in this mammoth battle, by which Germany was liberated from Napoleon's yoke. After Saxony's accession to the German Customs' Union in the year 1834, the town received a new impetus. While in 1834 it only numbered 45,000 inhabitants, it had 107,000 in 1871, 149,000 in 1880, 455,000 in 1900, and at the present time (1910) has 545,000.

After the Reformation was accomplished, Catholicism became wholly extinct; at least there is no mention of any Catholic parish until about 1710. Only during the time of the fair Franciscans came from Halberstadt to Leipzig to say Mass. No mention is made of where the services were held. In 1710 the Catholics received permission to celebrate Mass openly, and Elector Frederick Augustus I, who became a Catholic

in order to be King of Poland, gave up the chapel of the Pleissenburg to them, where on 3 June, 1710, Mass was again said. The parish was in charge of the Jesuits, at first two fathers, but after 1743 there were three. As chaplains of the elector, or king, they received from the court in Dresden their salaries and rent allowance. The Catholic school also found a place in the Pleissenburg. When in 1738 the chapel became too small for the faithful, the elector gave funds to replace it by a larger one. The fathers did not confine their activity to Leipzig alone, but extended it as far as Merseburg, Chemnitz, Naumburg, Wittenberg etc.; and from 1749 they were also entrusted with the spiritual care of the prisoners. After the suppression of the Society of Jesus, the fathers remained as secular priests. The priests, who subsequently laboured in Leipzig, came for the most part from Austria, particularly Bohemia. When in the nineteenth century the chapel of the Pleissenburg became dilapidated, and had to be given up, the town council placed the Matthäikirche at certain hours at the disposal of the Catholics. The necessary means for the building of a new church had been partly collected by the zealous efforts of the chief pastor of the Saxon Catholics in those days, Bishop and Apostolic Vicar Franz Laurens Mauermann. In 1845 the foundation stone of the first Catholic church was laid, and in 1847 it was consecrated by the new bishop, Joseph Dittrich. As the town developed, the Catholic congregation also grew; their esteemed pastor Franz Stolle built the rectory in 1871, founded the Societies of St. Vincent and St. Elizabeth with their homes, the reading association, etc. In 1892 the corner-stone of the second Catholic church was laid in Leipzig-Reudnitz; in 1907 the Marienkirche in Leipzig-Plagwitz-Lindenau, and in 1888 a new large Catholic school was built, in addition to which chapels and schools have been established in the newly incorporated suburbs.

At the present time Leipzig has three Catholic parish churches and two chapels; a *Stammschule* comprising a public school and a high school; three branch schools; three institutions belonging to the Grey Sisters of St. Elizabeth, who have charge of St. Vincent's establishment (institution for the care of the sick, boarding school, and public kitchen), St. Joseph's Home (institution for the care of the sick and surgical clinic), and St. Elizabeth's Home (home for single persons and servants). Among the well-developed Catholic institutions worthy of mention are the Society of St. Vincent and also of St. Elizabeth, the Apprentices' Club, the Club for Catholic Business Men, the Association of Catholic Teachers, two students' corporations, the Workingmen's Guild, the Marienverein, the Catholic Casino, the Borromean Society, and others.

Urkundenbuch der Stadt Leipzig in *Codex diplomaticus Saxoniæ regiæ*, div. II, vols. VIII–X, XVI–XVIII; WUSTMANN, *Aus Leipzigs Vergangenheit* (Leipzig, 1885 and 1898); IDEM, *Quellen zur Gesch. L.'s* (2 vols., Leipzig, 1889–95); IDEM, *L. durch drei Jahrh.* (Leipzig, 1891); IDEM, *Gesch. der Stadt L.*, I (Leipzig, 1905); SEIFERT, *Die Reformation in L.* (Leipzig, 1883); BUCHWALD, *Reformationsgesch. der Stadt L.* (1900); *L. u. seine Bauten* (Leipzig, 1892); GURLITT, *Beschreibende Darstellung der älteren Bau- u. Kunstdenkmäler des Königreichs Sachsen*, parts xvii, xviii (Dresden, 1896); *L. im Jahre 1904* (Leipzig, 1904), for St. Louis Exhibition; WOERL, *L. im Universitäts-Jubiläums-Jahr 1909* (Leipzig, 1909); *Schriften des Vereins für die Gesch. L.'s*, I–XIII (Leipzig, 1873–1909). For information concerning the Catholic position in Leipzig see *Einst u. Jetzt. Festschrift zum fünfzigjährigen Jubiläum der Pfarrkirche SS. Trinitatis* (Leipzig, 1887); DEUTSCHMANN, *Handweiser für d. kathol. Pfarrbezirk L.* (Leipzig, 1902); *Benno-Kalendar* (Dresden, 1850–).

JOSEPH LINS.

Leipzig, UNIVERSITY OF.—The University of Leipzig in Saxony is, next to Heidelberg, the oldest university in the German Empire. It was established when the German students under the leadership of Johannes of Münsterberg, who had been deposed as rector by King Wenceslaus, left Prague in May, 1409, and went to Leipzig. The cause of this withdrawal was the national disorders provoked in Bohemia by John Hus. At Leipzig Friedrich and Wilhelm, Landgraves of Thuringia and Margraves of Meissen, founded a *studium generale*, the Bull for the foundation being issued by Pope Alexander V at Pisa, 9 September, 1409. The charter was signed on 2 December of the same year, and the first rector was Johannes of Münsterberg. In the first semester 369 students matriculated. The Bishop of Merseburg was appointed chancellor. At the opening of the sixteenth century Leipzig was, like Cologne, a stronghold of scholasticism, and a large part of the "Epistolæ virorum obscurorum", written in Erfurt near by, refers to it. The university, especially the theological faculty, remained true to the Church at the beginning of the Reformation, while Wittenberg, founded in 1502, was a starting-point for Luther's doctrine. During the period of religious dissension the University of Leipzig declined greatly. Through the efforts of its rector, Kaspar Borner, the university obtained from Duke Maurice of Saxony an annual grant of 2000 gold gulden. In 1543 it was housed in the Paulinum, a secularized Dominican monastery. In 1559 the amendment of the statutes by the rector, Joachim Camerarius, was completed. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the university suffered considerably from wars, epidemics, and the billeting of soldiers. It remained, however, especially in the eighteenth century, a centre of scholarly and literary activity, well-known representatives of which were Johann Christian Gottsched and Christian Fürchtegott Gellert.

In 1768 Prince Joseph Alexander Jablonowskỳ founded a learned society for history, mathematics, physics, and economics, which is still in existence. The Linnæan Society for the Advancement of the Natural Sciences was founded in 1789, and in 1824 was united with the Society for Physical Research. In 1812 the university dropped its Protestant ecclesiastical character; and in 1830 received a new constitution. A decree of King Anthony of Saxony abolished the old division of professors and students into "nations" and entrusted the administration of the university to the rector and the four faculties. By a ministerial decree of 1851, the body of the ordinary professors form the university assembly; they elect the rector and a member of the Lower House of the Saxon Diet, and have the bestowal of the benefices belonging to the university. Besides this assembly there is a smaller body, the senate, composed of the rector, the pro-rector, the four deans, and twelve representatives elected by the faculties. In 1836 a new university building named the Augusteum, in honour of Frederick Augustus, first King of Saxony, was opened; in 1871 an auditorium called the Bornerianum, in honour of the rector Kaspar Borner, was added to the Augusteum. In the summer of 1897 there was opened a new building, erected from the plans of Arved Rossbach, on the site of the original university. From old and new donations the university has a large endowment in land and funds, over which the Saxon Government has the right of supervision and administration. In 1909 its property amounted to thirty-one million marks. The basis of the university library consists of the valuable collections taken from the suppressed Saxon monasteries; it contains about 600,000 volumes and 6500 manuscripts. At the instance of the rector of that period, Dukes Maurice and Augustus of Saxony founded, 22 April, 1544, a refectory (*mensa communis*) for needy students, where meals could be obtained either without cost, or at moderate prices. At the present day from two to three hundred students share in this privilege.

Among the distinguished scholars may be mentioned: in the evangelical theological faculty, Tisch-

endorf, Luthardt, and the ecclesiastical historian, Hauck; in the faculty of law, von Wächter, and Windscheid; the Germanic scholar Wilhelm Albrecht, and his pupil von Gerber, later Minister of Worship and Education in Saxony; the historians of German jurisprudence, Stobbe and Sohm, and the authorities on criminal law, Binding and Wach. More than one-fifth of all the law students of Germany in the years 1875–85 took a part of their course at Leipzig. At the present date the law faculty of Leipzig ranks third in Germany, after Berlin and Munich. In the medical faculty, Benno Schmidt, Trendelenburg, and Kölliker have especially aided in the advancement of surgery; in anatomy, Bock and His; in pathological anatomy, Birch-Hirschfeld and Marchand; in physics and physiology, Ludwig; in the philosophical faculty, Weber, the founder of psychophysics; Volkelt, writer on æsthetics; the philosopher Gustav Theodore Fechner, and Wilhelm Wundt, the founder of the widely known institute for experimental psychology. Pedagogics developed at Leipzig into an independent science, and, when a pedagogical seminary was founded by Ziller in 1861, the study acquired a still greater importance. In the department of classical philology should be mentioned the names of Hermann, Ritschl, Ribbeck, and the archæologist Overbeck; in Germanic philology, Haupt and Zarncke; in comparative philology, Brugmann; in the languages of Eastern Asia, Conradi; in the science of history, Mommsen and Lamprecht, who of late years has been known far beyond the circle of specialists in his department. In political economy, Roscher was the founder of the historical school; also Bücher, who is well known for his investigations into the relations of the State to trade and manufacture, and applied statistics. The matriculated students at Leipzig number nearly 5000.

Friedberg, *Die Univ. Leipzig in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart* (Leipzig, 1898); *Leipziger Kalender. Illustriertes Jahrbuch und Chronik* (Leipzig, 1909); Eulenburg, *Die Entwicklung der Universität Leipzig in den letzten hundert Jahren* (Leipzig, 1909); Stieda, *Die Universität Leipzig in ihrem tausendsten Semester* (Leipzig, 1909); *Festschrift zur Feier des 500 jährigen Bestehens der Universität Leipzig*, issued by the rector and senate: I, Kern, *Die Leipziger Theologische Fakultät in fünf Jahrhunderten*; II, Friedberg, *Die Leipziger Juristenfakultät, ihre Doktoren und ihr Heim*; III, *Die Institute der medizinischen Fakultät an der Universität Leipzig*; IV, *Die Institute und Seminare der philosophischen Fakultät an der Universität Leipzig*; part I, *Die philologische und die philosophisch-historische Sektion*; part II, *Die mathematisch-naturwissenschaftliche Sektion* (Leipzig, 1909); Liebmann, *Festgabe der deutschen Juristenzeitung zum 500 jährigen Jubiläum der Universität Leipzig* (Berlin, 1909).

Karl Hoeber.

Leitmeritz, Diocese of (Litomericensis), in Austria, embraces the northern part of the Kingdom of Bohemia (see map accompanying Austria-Hungary).

I. History.—After the introduction of Christianity under Charlemagne and Louis the German, the present Diocese of Leitmeritz formed part of the Diocese of Ratisbon. Before the end of the tenth century the Christian religion was so widespread that Emperor Otto I founded the first Bohemian diocese (Prague) in 973, which included all Bohemia. The first church in Leitmeritz, dedicated to St. Wenceslaus, was built in 925, while in 1057 Duke Spitihněw built St. Stephen's church and founded a collegiate chapter. In time numerous monasteries were built; in 1384 the city, with its suburbs, possessed thirteen churches and chapels, and, besides numerous religious, twenty secular priests engaged in the cure of souls. The Hussite Wars put an end to this flourishing ecclesiastical organization. In 1421 Ziska appeared before Leitmeritz, which was spared only on condition of accepting the Hussite religion. The collegiate church alone, despoiled of its possessions, held firm to the old rite of Communion under one kind. Hussitism was the forerunner of Protestantism, which found the ground already prepared on account of the long religious wars, the decline of learning among ecclesiastics, the lack of priests, and the insubordination of the nobles, who had become rich and powerful through the wealth and possessions of the Church. At first the nobility accepted the teaching of Luther, and in many cities the transition from Utraquism to Lutheranism soon followed. Through the priest Gallus Cahera, a disciple of Luther, Leitmeritz was also won over to Protestantism. The Thirty Years War brought a reaction. By the victorious campaign of the emperor in Bohemia the revolutionary nobles were overthrown, the cities lost their privileges, and the people emigrated or again became Catholics. For the better administration of the large Archdiocese of Prague, the bishop of that time, Count Ernst Adalbert von Harrach, a nephew of Wallenstein, divided its territory, and created the dioceses of Königgrätz (q. v.) and Leitmeritz as its suffragans.

In 1655 the then provost of the collegiate chapter of Leitmeritz, Baron Max Rudolf von Schleinitz, was named first Bishop of Leitmeritz (1655–75). He built the cathedral to replace the small collegiate church, organized the diocese, and expended his whole fortune on the improvement of his see. His successor, Count Jaroslaus Franz Ignaz von Sternberg (1676–1709), finished the cathedral and erected the episcopal curia (1694–1701). The fourth bishop, Johann Adam, Count Wratislaus von Mitrowitz (1721–33), appears to have administered also the Archdiocese of Prague. In the Seven Years War, during the administration of Duke Moritz Adolf of Sachsen-Zeitz (1733–59), who built the seminary, the diocese had much to suffer from the Prussians. His successor, Count Emanuel Ernst von Waldstein (1760–89), made little opposition to the efforts of the Government to spread through the diocese the ideas of Febronius; the convents of the Jesuits, Augustinians, Servites, etc. were confiscated, many churches closed as superfluous, and all brotherhoods disbanded. In 1784 the territory of the diocese was increased by two districts. The next bishop, Ferdinand Kindermann, Ritter von Schulstein (1790–1801), had before his appointment to the bishopric won deserved fame as a reformer and organizer of the whole educational system of Bohemia; as bishop he continued to direct education in his diocese, built the cathedral parochial school, and erected an institute for the education of girls at Leitmeritz. The eighth bishop, Wenzel Leopold Chlumčansky, Ritter von Přestawlk and Chlumčan (1802–15), a true father of the poor, built the ecclesiastical seminary in 1805. Joseph Franz Hurdalek (1815–1823) was obliged to resign. Vincenz Eduard Milde (1823–32) became Archbishop of Vienna. Augustin Bartholomäus Hille (1832–65) opened in 1851 the school for boys and a normal college. He was succeeded by Augustin Paul Wahala (1866–77), in whose time originated in Warnsdorf the sect of the Old Catholics; Anton Ludwig Frind (1879–81), the learned author of the "Ecclesiastical History of Bohemia"; and Emanuel Johann Schöbel (1882–1909), to whom the diocese is indebted for many churches and for the introduction of popular missions: and Joseph Gross (consecrated 23 May, 1910).

II. Statistics.—In 1909 the diocese numbered 28 vicariates, 2 provostships, 3 archdeaneries, 37 deaneries, 392 parishes, 7 *Exposituren* (substantially independent filial churches), 343 stations, chaplaincies, and curacies, 26 other benefices, 628 churches, 397 public chapels, 756 secular priests engaged in the cure of souls, 87 other secular priests, 140 religious priests, 1,598,900 Catholics, 33,560 Protestants, 10,400 Old Catholics, and 18,300 Jews. The Church in this diocese has much to contend with. For centuries two different races (German and Czech), and two different beliefs (Catholic and Protestant), have existed side by side, and national and religious diputes are of frequent occurrence. The *Los-von-Rom* movement, having its origin in Germany, sought in the Diocese of Leitmeritz, situated on the borders, a vantage ground for the propagation of its ideas, and as a result thousands of

Catholics drifted away from the Church. Another difficulty is the lack of priests, over a hundred vacancies existing in the parishes. The language spoken in twenty of the vicariates is German, in six Czech, and in two is mixed. More than a third of the priests are Czech. There are 309 German parishes, 95 Czech, and the rest mixed. The cathedral chapter possesses a provost, a dean, five capitulary, and six honorary canons. The clergy are trained in the episcopal seminary and in the theological training school at Leitmeritz. The Catholic intermediate schools of the diocese are the private gymnasium of the Jesuits at Mariaschein, which is at the same time the diocesan school for boys, and five seminaries, of which two are in Reichenberg and one each at Leitmeritz, Teplitz-Schönau, and Jungbunzlau. In the public primary and secondary schools the Church has very little opportunity to impart religious instruction. For girls, however, there are several institutions for instruction and training conducted by sisters: 8 boarding schools, 10 primary schools, 2 secondary schools, and 20 advanced and industrial schools.

The following orders have foundations in the diocese (1909): Cistercians at Ossegg, 1 abbey (founded in 1293), with an extensive library and gallery of paintings; the fathers teach in the Gymnasium of Komotau; Jesuits, 1 college in Mariaschein; Piarists; Redemptorists; Dominicans; Augustinians; Reformed Franciscans; Minorites; Capuchins; Order of Malta; Crosier Fathers; Premonstratensians; the Congregation of the Sacred Heart. In 1909 the female orders and congregations in the diocese had 68 foundations, with 654 sisters, 93 novices, and 15 postulants: Congregation of St. Elizabeth, 1; Ursulines, 1; Borromeans, 23; Sisters of the Cross, 22; Poor School Sisters of Our Lady, 5; Daughters of Divine Charity, 2; Poor Handmaids of Jesus Christ, 4; Franciscan Sisters, 3; Sisters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, 5; and Sisters of Christian Charity, 1 foundation. Among the charitable institutions of the diocese under religious management are 20 orphan asylums, 7 asylums for children, 14 kindergartens, 1 reformatory, and 20 infant asylums; the diocese conducts also its own institute for the deaf and dumb at Leitmeritz. Of the many associations, the following are worthy of mention: Cäcilienverein (Association of St. Cecilia), the Apostleship of Prayer, the Marian Confraternities, the Catholic Teachers' Association, the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, the Gesellenvereine, the Catholic People's Unions (60), and others. There are 55 shrines and places of pilgrimage in the diocese, the most popular being Mariaschein, Böhmisch-Kamenitz, Ossegg, Philippsdorf, and Krieschitz. The principal church of the diocese is the cathedral, built in 1671 in Renaissance style. The most ancient is St. Clement's in Levy-Hradec. Among others, the beautiful churches of Melnik, Nimburg, Aussig and Saaz, the chief churches of their respective deaneries, and the town church of Brüx date from Gothic times, and the cathedral, the collegiate church of Ossegg, and the pilgrimage church of Mariaschein from the Renaissance period. The churches of Eichwald, Philippsdorf, St. Vincent in Reichenberg, the church of St. Elizabeth in Teplitz-Schönau, and others, were built in the nineteenth century.

BRETFELD, *Umriss einer kurzen Gesch. des Leitmeritzer Bistums* (Vienna, 1811); FRIND, *Die Kirchengesch. Böhmens im allgemeinen und in ihrer besonderen Beziehung auf die jetzige Leitmeritzer Diöcese* (4 vols., Prague, 1864–78); SEIFERT, *Die Leitmeritzer Diöcese nach ihren geschichtl., kirchl. u. topograph. Beziehungen* (Saaz, 1899); ENDLER, *Das soziale Wirken der kathol. Kirche in Oesterreich*, XI: *Die Diöcese Leitmeritz* (Vienna, 1903); *Directorium divini officii et catalogus universi cleri diœcesani Litomericensis* (Leitmeritz, 1910).

JOSEPH LINS.

Lejeune, JEAN, b. at Poligny in 1592; d. at Limoges, 19 Aug., 1672; member of the Oratory of Jesus, founded by de Bérulle in 1611. He was distinguished by the sanctity of his life, but his reputation mainly depends upon his renown as a preacher. The energy with which he conducted his apostolate, gained for him the name of "The Missionary of the Oratory" and the blindness which overtook him at the age of thirty-five, the further appellation of "The Blind Father". He was the son of a lawyer at Dôle, of a family, which during the previous century had attained to a high position in the magistracy and was renowned for the piety and virtue of its members. Owing to the early loss of his father, his education devolved upon his mother who devoted herself to his spiritual advancement. Having studied theology at the University of Dôle, he fell under the influence of de Bérulle and entered the Oratory in 1614. He was appointed director of the seminary at Langres but soon manifested his vocation to mission work among the poor, and henceforward all his effort was directed to this. His life was unmarked by any external event except the loss of sight which occurred in 1627, while he was preaching the Lenten course at Rouen, but this caused no cessation in his apostolic work. The bishops employed him in preaching the Lent and Advent courses and the Government in the conversion of Protestants. He avoided the custom of treating controversial matter in the pulpit and confined himself to the exposition of fundamental truths. It was a novel idea of his to introduce after his discourses an abridgement of Christian doctrine. He also held conferences for the instruction of the clergy in his methods and was recommended by Massillon to young ecclesiastics for their imitation. The French Oratory was suspected of Jansenism, and he was himself criticized on the ground that his preaching led to unsatisfactory results. In 1660 he appealed for advice to Arnauld, who ascribed these results to the laxity of imprudent confessors under the influence of casuistry, and dissuaded him from the design of abandoning his mission work. His sermons in twelve volumes were published at Toulouse, Paris, and Rouen before his death, and a Latin translation at Mainz in 1667. There is an edition published at Lyons in 1826, but the latest and best edition is that of Peltier in ten volumes issued in 1889. Four volumes of extracts also appeared at Avignon in 1825 under title of "Pensées du P. Lejeune".

CLOYSEAULT, *Recueil des Vies de quelques prêtres de l'Oratoire;* PERRAUD, *L'Oratoire de France* (Paris, 1866); RENOUX, *Vie du P. Lejeune* (Paris, 1875); TABARAUD, *Vie du P. Lejeune* (Limoges, 1830), and *Life* in Vol. XII of Lyons edition of sermons.

HENRY TRISTRAM.

Lellis, CAMILLUS OF. See CAMILLUS DE LELLIS, SAINT.

Lelong, JACQUES, French bibliographer, b. at Paris, 19 April, 1665; d. there, 13 Aug., 1721. As a boy of ten, he entered the Order of the Knights of St. John of Malta, and, after a very brief and unhappy sojourn in Malta, made his studies at Paris. He left the Order of the Knights and entered the Oratory in 1686. He then taught at the college of Juilly in the Diocese of Meaux, where he was ordained priest in 1689, and was later librarian at the seminary of Notre-Dame des Vertus in Aubervilliers near Paris. He was transferred in 1699 to the Oratory of St-Honoré at Paris, and remained there as librarian till his death twenty-two years later. The title of the first work which brought him fame indicates its contents fairly completely: "Bibliotheca Sacra in binos Syllabos distincta quæ (I) omnes sive Textus sacri sive Versionum ejusdem quavis lingua expressarum Editiones, necnon præstantiores MSS. Codices cum notis historicis et criticis, (II) omnia eorum opera quovis idiomate conscripta, qui hucusque in s. Scripturam quidpiam ediderunt, et grammaticas et Lexica linguarum præsertim orientalium, quæ ad illustrandas sacras paginas aliquid adjumenti conferre possunt, continet" (2 vols. 8vo, Paris, 1709;—Vigouroux, contradicting other authorities, says 1702; 2nd ed., 1709); edited by Boerner with additions chiefly of German works (Antwerp, 1709); folio edition by the author (Paris, 1719);

edited after the author's death with many additions and corrections by Lelong and by his confrère, Desmolets, who prefixed the life from which we draw our facts (2 vols., fol., Paris, 1723). The last and best edition is by Andrew Gottlieb Masch (6 vols., 4to, Halle, 1775–83). The work is still valuable as a bibliography of the printed Bible in its various editions, and of the early modern literature concerning them. Lelong also wrote a "Discours historique sur les principales editions des Bibles polyglottes" (Paris, 1713). His other work, which shows his variety of tastes and has proved very useful to students of French history, is entitled "Bibliothèque historique de la France, contenant le catalogue des ouvrages imprimés et manuscrits qui traitent de l'histoire de ce royaume, ou qui y ont rapport, avec des notes critiques et historiques" (Paris, 1719).

DESMOLETS' notice seems to be the only source. See also INGOLD, *Essai de bibliographie oratorienne* (Paris, 1880–2), 82.

JOHN F. FENLON.

Le Loutre, LOUIS-JOSEPH, missionary to the Micmac Indians and Vicar-General of Acadia under the Bishop of Quebec, b. in France about 1690; d. there about 1770. He was a conspicuous figure in Nova Scotia in the middle of the eighteenth century, and his portrait as drawn by some writers lends colour to the charge that history is often a conspiracy against truth. Anxious to justify the memorable deportation of the Acadians in 1755, partisan annalists and chroniclers of the period represent Le Loutre as the evil genius and tyrant of the Acadians, the sworn enemy of the English, and a pastor who threatened with excommunication and with massacre by his Indians all who favoured measures of reconciliation with the English Government. Better accredited historians, however, such as Haliburton, acknowledge that this picture of the abbé is more caricature than portrait. The truth appears to be that Le Loutre was a typical French missionary of forceful character and initiative, with a natural desire, so long as the matter was in dispute, to hold the Acadians to their allegiance to France; that he showed himself more than once an excellent friend of individual Englishmen in their time of need; and that his accompanying the Micmacs on several expeditions against the English, expeditions which he had done his best to prevent, was for the sole purpose of restraining the cruelty and vengeance of his Indian flock. A letter sent in 1757 by the Bishop of Quebec to the Abbé of l'Isle-Dieu proclaims Le Loutre to have been "irreproachable in every respect, both in the functions of his sacred ministry and in the part he took in the temporal affairs of the colony". Captured by the English while on the way to France, Le Loutre was held prisoner by them for some years in the Isle of Jersey; on his release he returned to France, where a few years later he died.

HALIBURTON, *History of Nova Scotia* (Halifax, 1862); RICHARD, *Acadia* (1894); BOURGEOIS, *Histoire du Canada* (Montreal, 1903).

ARTHUR BARRY O'NEILL.

Le Mans, DIOCESE OF (CENOMANENSIS), comprises the entire Department of Sarthe. Prior to the Revolution it included 636 parishes and was one of the most extensive dioceses of France; at the time of the Concordat of 1801, it lost some parishes in Vendômois and Normandy, and acquired some in Anjou. The Diocese of Le Mans embraced 665 communes from then up to the year 1855, when the Department of Mayenne was detached from it to form the Diocese of Laval. The origin of the Diocese of Le Mans has given rise to very complicated discussions among scholars, based on the value of the "Gesta domni Aldrici", and of the "Actus Pontificum Cenomannis in urbe degentium", both compiled during the episcopate of Aldric (832–857). The "Gesta" relate that Aldric had the bodies of Saints Julianus, Turibius, Pavatius, Romanus, Liborius, and Hadoindus, first bishops of Mans, brought to his cathedral; the Acts make St. Julianus one of the seventy-two disciples of Christ and state that he arrived at Le Mans with two companions: Turibius, who became bishop under Antoninus (138–161), and Pavatius who was bishop under Maximinus (235–238) and under Aurelian (270–275), in which event, Pavatius would have lived over two hundred years. Liborius, successor of Pavatius, would have been the contemporary of Valentinian (364–375). These chronological absurdities of the Acts have led Mgr Duchesne to conclude that the first Bishop of Le Mans whose episcopate can be dated with certainty is Victurius, who attended the Councils of Angers and of Tours, in 453 and 461, and to whom Gregory of Tours alludes



THE CATHEDRAL, LE MANS
South side

as "a venerable confessor". Turibius who, according to the Acts, was the successor of Julianus, was, on the contrary, successor to Victurius and occupied the see from 490 to 496.

Among the subsequent bishops of Le Mans are mentioned the following saints: Principius (497–511), Innocentius (532–43), Domnolus (560–81), Bertechramnus or Bertram (587–623), founder of the Abbey of Notre-Dame de la Couture, Hadoindus (623–54), Berecharius or Béraire (655–70), and Aldric (832–57). If we admit the theory according to which the False Decretals were compiled at Le Mans by the author of the "Actus pontificum", then Aldric must have used these false documents as a weapon against the institution of the *chorepiscopi* and also against the pretensions of the Breton usurper Nomenoe to the ecclesiastical province of Tours. It was Aldric who had the relics of St. Liborius conveyed to Paderborn. Other bishops were: Blessed Geoffroy de Loudun (1234–55), whom Gregory IX made papal legate for the entire Kingdom of France, and who, in 1254, consecrated the cathedral of Le Mans and founded the superb monastery of Notre-Dame du Parc d'Orques, where he was interred and where miracles were wrought at his tomb; and Martin Berruyer (1452–67), who left a memoir written in defence of Joan of Arc. From 1468 to 1519 the See of Le Mans was occupied

by prelates of the House of Luxemburg, and from1519 to 1537 by their cousin, Louis de Bourbon. Jean, Cardinal du Bellay, Dean of the Sacred College, was bishop from 1546 to 1556; and Bouvier, the theologian, from 1834 to 1854.

During the episcopate of St. Berecharius (655–70) the body of St. Scholastica was brought from the monastery of Fleury to Le Mans; the monastery erected to shelter the remains of the saint was destroyed by the Northmen in the second half of the ninth century. A portion of her relics was brought in 874 by the Empress Richilda to the monastery of Juvigny les Dames. The remaining portion was conveyed to the interior of the citadel and placed in the apse of the collegiate church of St. Pierre la Cour, which served the counts of Maine as a domestic chapel. The fire that destroyed Le Mans 3 September, 1134, also consumed the shrine of St. Scholastica, and only a few calcined bones were left. On 11 July, 1464, a confraternity was erected in honour of St. Scholastica, and on 23 November, 1876, she was officially proclaimed patroness of Le Mans. The Jesuit college of La Flèche, founded in 1603 by Henry IV, enjoyed a great reputation for a century and a half, and Marshal de Guébriant, Descartes, Father Mersenne, Prince Eugene of Savoy, and Séguier were all numbered among its students. The Dominican convent of Le Mans, begun about 1219, in fact during the lifetime of St. Dominic, was eminently prosperous, thanks to the benefactions of John of Troeren, an English lord; the theologian Nicolas Coeffeteau, who died in 1623, was one of its glories, prior to becoming Bishop of Marseilles. The Revolution swept away this convent.

The diocese honours in a special manner as saints: Peregrinus, Marcoratus, and Viventianus, martyrs; Hilary of Oizé, nephew of St. Hilary of Poitiers (in the fifth century); Bommer, Almirus, Leonard, and Ulphace, hermits; Gault, Front, and Brice, solitaries and previously monks of Micy; Fraimbault, hermit, founder of a small monastery in the valley of Gabrone; Calais, hermit and founder of the monastery of Anisole, from whom the town of Saint-Calais took its name; Laumer, successor to St. Calais; Guingalois or Guénolé, founder of the monastery of Landevenec in Brittany, whose relics are venerated at Château du Loir; all in the sixth century: Rigomer, monk at Souligné, and Ténestine, his penitent, both of whom were acquitted before Childebert, through the miracle of Palaiseau, of accusations made against them (d. about 560); Longis, solitary, and Onofletta, his penitent; Siviard, Abbot of Anisole and author of the life of St. Calais (d. 681); the Irish St. Cérota, and her mistress Osmana, daughter of a king of Ireland, died a solitary near St-Brieuc, in the seventh century; Ménélé, and Savinian (d. about 720), natives of Précigné, who repaired to Auvergne to found the Abbey of Ménat, on the ruins of the hermitage where St. Calais had formerly lived; there is also a particular devotion in Le Mans to Blessed Ralph de La Fustaye, monk (twelfth century), disciple of Blessed Robert d'Arbrissel and founder of the Abbey of St. Sulpice, in the forest of Nid de Merle in the Diocese of Rennes. The celebrated Abbot de Rancé made his novitiate at the Abbey of Persaigne in the Diocese of Le Mans. Also there may be mentioned as natives of the diocese, Urbain Grandier, the celebrated curé of Loudun, burned to death for sorcery in 1634; and Mersenne, the Minim (d. 1648), philosopher and mathematician and friend of Descartes and Pascal. The cathedral of St. Julian of Mans, rebuilt towards the year 1100, exhibits specimens of all styles of architecture up to the fifteenth century, its thirteenth-century choir being one of the most remarkable in France. The church of Notre-Dame de la Couture dates from the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries. The Abbey of Solesmes, founded by Geoffroy de Sablé in 993 and completed in 1095, has a thirteenth-century church which is a veritable museum of sculptures of the end of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Its "Entombment of Christ", in terra cotta, is famous; the Magdalen in the group, already celebrated even in the fifteenth century for its beauty, attracted the attention of Richelieu, who thought of having it brought to Paris. Several sculptures depicting scenes in the life of the Blessed Virgin form a series unique in France..

Pilgrimages to Notre-Dame de Toutes Aides at Saint-Remy du Plein, Notre-Dame de La Faigne at Pontvallain, and Notre-Dame des Bois at La Suze, date back to primitive times. The chapel of Notre-Dame de Torcé, erected in the sixth century, has been much frequented by pilgrims since the eleventh century. Besides these places of pilgrimage may be mentioned those of Notre-Dame de Labit at Domfront, and of Notre-Dame du Chêne at Vion, near Sablé, which can be traced to 1494. It was established in the place where in former times Urban II had preached the crusade.

Prior to the application of the Associations law of 1901, there were in the Diocese of Le Mans, Capuchins, Jesuits, and the monks of Solesmes, where, through the efforts of Dom Guéranger, a Benedictine house of the Congregation of France was founded in 1833. Several congregations of women originated in the diocese; the nuns of Notre-Dame de l'Avé at La Flèche, a teaching order, founded in 1622; the Sisters of the Visitation Sainte Marie, at Le Mans, a contemplative order founded in 1634; the Sisters of St. Joseph at La Flèche, a nursing order, founded in 1636; the Sisters of Charity of Providence, devoted to teaching and hospital work, founded in 1806 by Abbé Dujarié, the mother-house being at Ruillé-sur-Loir; the Sisters of the Child Jesus, teachers and nurses, founded in 1835, with their mother-house at Le Mans; the Marianite Sisters of the Holy Cross, founded in 1841, with their mother-house at Le Mans and important educational institutions in New York and Louisiana; the Benedictine nuns of the Congregation of France known as the Benedictines of St. Cecilia, founded at Solesmes in 1867 by Dom Guéranger and Mother Cecilia. At the close of the nineteenth century the following institutions in the diocese were under the direction of religious: 3 infants' asylums, 39 infants' schools, 1 boys' orphanage, 10 girls' orphanages, 3 industrial schools, 2 houses of shelter, 2 reformatories, 32 hospitals or hospices, 12 private hospitals and retreats, 1 asylum for idiots, 1 asylum for the blind, 1 asylum for insane women and 8 homes for the aged. In 1905 (the last year of the concordatory regime), the Diocese of Le Mans had a population of 422,699, with 38 parishes, 350 chapels of ease, and 111 curacies subventioned by the State.

Gallia christiana (nova, 1856), XIV, 338–432; *instrumenta,* 99–142; LOTTIN AND CAUVIN, *Cartularium insignis ecclesiæ cenomanensis, quod dicitur liber albus capituli* (Le Mans, 1869); *Gesta Aldrici*, ed. CHARLES AND FROGER (Mamers, 1889); DUCHESNE, *Fastes épiscopaux*, II (Paris, 1900), 309, 340; HAVET, *Œuvres*, I (Paris, 1900), 275–317; BUSSON AND LEDRU, *Actus pontificum Cenomannis in urbe degentium* (Le Mans, 1901); DE BROUSILLON, *Cartulaire de l'évêché—986–1790* (Le Mans, 1900); CHAMBOIS, *Répertoire historique et biographique du diocèse du Mans* (Le Mans, 1896); LEDRU, *La cathédrale Saint-Julien du Mans, ses évêques, son architecture, son mobilier* (Mamers, 1900); LAUDE, *Recherches sur les pèlerinages manceaux* (Le Mans, 1899); HEURTEBIZE AND TRIGER, *Sainte Scholastique, patronne de la ville du Mans* (Solesmes, 1897); COSNARD, *Histoire du couvent des frères prêcheurs du Mans* (Le Mans, 1879); *Cartulaire des abbayes de Saint-Pierre de La Couture et de Saint-Pierre de Solesmes*, published by the Benedictines of Solesmes (Le Mans, 1881); DE LA TREMBLAYE, *Solesmes, les sculptures de l'église abbatiale, 1496–1553* (Solesmes, 1892); DE ROCHEMONTEIX, *Un collège de jésuites au 17e et 18e Siècles: le collège Henri IV de La Flèche*, 4 vols. (Le Mans, 1889); CHEVALIER, *Topo-bibliographie*, pp. 1832–33.

GEORGES GOYAU.

Lemberg, seat of a Latin, a Uniat Ruthenian, and a Uniat Armenian archbishopric. The city is called Lwow in Polish, Leopol in latinized Polish,

Löwenburg in German, Lwihohrod in Ruthenian. It was founded in 1259 by the Ruthenian King Daniel for his son Leo, Prince of Halicz, and took its name from that prince. Destroyed by the Tatars in 1261, it was rebuilt in 1270 on the same spot by Prince Leo, as is recorded by the inscription on one of its gates: "Dux Leo mihi fundamenta jecit, posteri nomen dedere Leontopolis" (Duke Leo laid my foundations, posterity gave me the name of Leontopolis). In 1340 Casimir the Great, King of Poland, took possession of it, built two new castles, attracted German colonists to it, and gave it a charter modelled on that of Magdeburg. In 1372 Louis of Hungary entrusted the administration of the city to Wladislaw, Prince of Oppeln; in 1387 it was given as dowry to the Princess Hedwig, by whose marriage with Jagellon it became a possession of the Polish Crown. Lemberg was thenceforward the recognized capital of the Russian territories dependent on Poland (i. e. Red Russia), which preserved their autonomy undiminished until 1433. The city was one of the great entrepôts of European commerce with the East, which, after the taking of Constantinople by the Turks, followed for the most part the overland route. Lemberg was besieged many times—by the Lithuanians in 1350, the Wallachians in 1498, the Turks in 1524 and 1672, and the Cossacks in 1648 and 1655. Charles XII of Sweden took and plundered it in 1704. By the first partition of Poland it was assigned to Austria in 1772; finally, in 1848, it revolted and was bombarded.

Lemberg is situated in a deep and narrow valley on the Pelter, a tributary of the Bug; the capital of the Austrian Kingdom of Galicia and Lodomeria, it contains—including its many and populous suburbs—about 160,000 inhabitants, of whom 45,000 are Jews. Of the convents which, in the seventeenth century, gained for it the name of "City of Monks", some still exist. Emperor Joseph II reduced the number of its churches from seventy-two to about twenty; some of them are very noteworthy—e. g. the Latin cathedral, built in the Gothic style in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries; the Ruthenian Catholic cathedral, built in 1740–9 in the neo-Italian style; the church of the Bernardines, with the tomb of St. John of Dukla, Patron of Lemberg; the Dominican, the Jesuit, the Wallachian, and other churches. The national Ossolinski Institute possesses a library of the highest value for the study of Polish literature and local history, containing more than 100,000 volumes and 4000 manuscripts. The university, founded in 1660 by Casimir of Poland, suffered especially from the withdrawal of the Jesuits and the political changes which culminated in Galicia becoming an Austrian province. It was restored in 1784, though with curtailed privileges and a much restricted staff, by Joseph II, who desired to keep the Polish youth from going to Vilna or Warsaw. Reduced in 1807 to the rank of a lyceum, the university was once more established with some measure of its former autonomy in 1816. It now numbers about 200 professors and tutors, with 1900 students, 300 of whom attend the faculty of Catholic theology. The city also possesses a large number of educational establishments for boys and girls, besides many benevolent institutions.

Latin Archbishopric.—The Latin Bishopric of Halicz, in which that of Lemberg originated, appears to have been established no earlier than the year 1361. On 8 April, 1363, Urban V wrote to the Bishop of Gnesen to insist that King Casimir III of Poland should build a cathedral in the city of Lemberg, which he had recently taken from the Russian schismatics. Nevertheless, letters of Gregory XI, dated 13 February, 1375, mention only the metropolitan See of Halicz, and the Bishoprics of Przemysl, Chelm, and Vladimir, sufficient evidence that that of Lemberg was not yet established. On 3 March, 1375, the question is raised of transferring the See of Halicz to Lemberg, a transfer which was effected only in December, 1414, by John XXIII. In 1501 Bishop Andreas Rosza was given the administration of Przemysl, but was transferred in 1503 to the See of Gnesen; his successor, Bernardine Wilczek (1503–40), rebuilt the cathedral, which had been destroyed by fire. Many of the subsequent bishops were famous; such were Stanislaus Grochovski (1634–45), a writer of religious poetry, and Nicholas Poplavski (1709–11), an ecclesiastical writer. A great many synods were held here from the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries. Upon the opening of the Estates (or Diet) of Galicia, 13 February, 1817, Archbishop Skarbel Ankvicz obtained the title of Primate of the Kingdoms of Galicia and Lodomeria, which title has been accorded since 1849 to the Ruthenian Catholic metropolitan. The Latin archdiocese has two suffragan bishoprics: Przemysl and Tarnov. It numbers 920,000 faithful, 36,000 Protestants, and 550,000 Jews. There are 249 parishes, 579 secular and 290 regular priests—Dominicans, Franciscans, Capuchins, Jesuits, Carmelites, etc. There are also a great many religious women engaged in teaching and works of mercy. The seminary numbers 60 students.

Uniat Ruthenian Archbishopric.—After the conversion of the Ruthenians in this region to Christianity, the Bishopric of Halicz, suffragan to Kiev, was established for their benefit between 1152 and 1180. Halicz had been made a metropolitan see in 1345 by John Calecas, Patriarch of Constantinople, but in 1347 it was again placed under the jurisdiction of Kiev, at the request of the Grand Duke Simeon of Moscow. Its metropolitan rank was restored to Halicz only after the Polish occupation of the province about 1371; it had four suffragans: Kulm, Przemysl, Turof, and Vladimir. In 1414 King Ladislaus, for some unknown reason, transferred the Latin See of Halicz to Leopol, and suppressed the Ruthenian metropolitan See of Halicz. The see was subsequently administered by vicars of the Metropolitan of Kiev until 28 October, 1539, when it was restored as a simple bishopric. Macarius Tuczapsti, the titular, next year changed his residence to Lemberg and took the combined titles of Halicz and Lemberg, which his successors have borne, adding those of Kamenets and Podolia, when their jurisdiction extended so far. With the establishment of the Jesuits in this country began the reform of the extremely ignorant schismatic clergy, who gradually turned towards Rome. In 1597 the Bishop of Lemberg, the celebrated Gideon Balaban, brought his diocese back to Catholicism, but afterwards, through his ambition, he relapsed into schism, and with him nearly all his subjects. A council held at Lemberg in October, 1629, laboured in vain for the conversion of the diocese, and it was not until the end of the seventeenth century that Bishop Joseph Czumlanski embraced the cause of union, secretly at first in 1677, and then openly in 1700. After Joseph came Barlaam Czeptyski (1710–5) and Athanasius Czeptyski (1715–46), who, being promoted to the metropolitan See of Kiev, retained that of Lemberg with it. This example was followed by Leo Louis Czeptyski (1749–79), when he became metropolitan in 1762.

Under Peter Bielanski (1779–98) the Diocese of Lemberg, to which were united those of Halicz and Kamenets, fortunately became the possession of Austria, whose government took in hand the education of the clergy, who were poor and so ignorant as hardly to know their own rite. Maria Theresa had students sent to the seminary established at Vienna for the Hungarian Uniats. Joseph II turned the Dominican convent into a seminary for Ruthenians, adding to it the church and the garden, and soon the Ruthenian students had places reserved for them in the theological faculty of the city. On 22 February, 1807, Pius VII, by the Bull "In universalis ecclesiæ regimine", withdrew Lemberg from the metropolitan jurisdiction of Kiev and made it a metropolitan see, with Kulm and

Przemysl as suffragans. The Diocese of Kulm was dependent on Lemberg until 1837, when it was made immediately subject to the Holy See until its suppression by Russia. In its place another suffragan diocese, that of Stanislaov, was given to Lemberg in 1856. The Emperor of Austria obtained from Rome the right to nominate the metropolitan and his suffragans, while the metropolitan was authorized to confirm their nomination and to consecrate them, as had formerly been granted to the Metropolitan of Kiev by Clement VIII. The Habsburg monarchy has seriously taken up the task of developing education among the clergy, and of putting them upon the same footing as the Latin clergy by giving them the same political rights, and lastly of teaching the Ruthenian language in the schools—a point as to which the Poles had previously cared little. Between the Poles and Ruthenians, indeed, there has always existed a certain hostility, which, during the nineteenth century, resulted in violent controversies, and eventually, in 1862, necessitated the intervention of the Holy See. In addition, the young Ruthenian clergy, with their exaggerated ideas of their rite and nationality, have accentuated their peculiarities and fostered the spirit of schism together with an excessive affection for Russia. Thus, they have shown an inclination to return to the primitive Græco-Slavic Rite, and to suppress the modifications which in former times had been—wrongly perhaps—introduced into the Liturgy, but which, in the minds of the people, have now become to a certain extent identified with Catholicism. Hence continual religious troubles have arisen, and indeed numerous defections. The reform of the Basilian monks inaugurated by Leo XIII has in part remedied these fatal tendencies, which, however, are still the chief danger threatening the Uniat Catholics of this archdiocese.

The Ruthenian archdiocese comprises the districts of Lemberg, Stryj, Brzezany, Zloczow, and Tarnopol, and numbers 1,400,000 faithful. There are 881 priests—21 religious, 25 celibate seculars, 148 widowers, and 687 married. There is a chapter of 10 canons and a diocesan consistory of 23 members. The archdiocese is divided into 30 deaconeries and 752 parishes. There are 749 churches with, and 500 without, resident priests, and 36 chapels. The seminary, which counts 248 students, is intended also for the service of the other two Galician dioceses, Przemysl and Stanislaov; 108 of these students belong to the Archdiocese of Lemberg, while other clerics are educated at Vienna and in the Ruthenian seminary at Rome. The Basilian monks have 3 houses with 23 religious; the Basilian nuns, 2 houses with 68 religious; the Servants of the Blessed Virgin Mary (founded in 1892), 6 houses with 39 religious.

UNIAT ARMENIAN ARCHBISHOPRIC.—As early as 1062 there were Armenians settled at Kiev, in consequence of the various invasions and persecutions of Tatars, Turks, and Greeks. Thence these exiles migrated to Lemberg, Kamenets, and Lutzk. The Catholic archdiocese was founded in 1365, upon the union of the titular, Gregory, with Rome; the cathedral was built two years later. From 1492 to 1516 the see remained vacant, after which it was occupied by schismatics until 24 October, 1630, when Nicholas Toroszewicz took the oath of fidelity to Urban VIII. Since then the succession of archbishops has been regular (Gams, "Series epis. Ecclesiæ cath.", 351; suppl., lxxxiii; Petit in Vacant, "Dict. de théol. cath.", I, 1916). In 1635 the Armenian Metropolitan of Lemberg obtained from Rome the two suffragan Bishoprics of Kamenets-Podolski and Mohileff, which had been taken from him when they passed under Russian domination. In 1808 his jurisdiction was restricted to the territory of Galicia and Bukovina. Even the Armenian Catholics of Transylvania, numbering 10,000, have been unable to obtain a bishop of their own rite or to become subject to the Armenian Archbishop of Lemberg, and they are obliged to submit to the authority of the Latin bishops. Until the nineteenth century the popes had the direct nomination to this archbishopric, and the kings of Poland only granted the *exequatur*. By a Brief of 20 September, 1819, Pius VII conceded to the new sovereign, the Emperor of Austria, the choice of an archbishop from three candidates presented by the Armenian clergy of Lemberg. The present archdiocese numbers 4000 faithful, 20 priests, 9 churches, 13 chapels, and 10 parishes. There is no seminary, the clergy being prepared in the Latin seminary. There are two houses for the education of poor orphans. Besides the Catholic, there are about 800 schismatic Armenians.

NEHER in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.; LEQUIEN, *Oriens Christ.*, I, 1283; EUBEL, *Hierarchia cath. medii ævi*, I (Münster, 1898), 308; II, 194; GAMS, *Series episcoporum Eccl. cath.* (Ratisbon), 351; supplem., lxxxiii; *Missiones catholicæ* (Rome, 1907), 760, 790; HARASIEVICZ, *Annales Ecclesiæ ruthenæ* (Lemberg, 1862); MARKOVITCH, *Gli Slavi ed i Papi*, I (Agram), 166–73.

S. VAILHÉ.

Lemcke, HENRY, missionary in the United States, b. at Rhena, Mecklenburg, 27 July, 1796; d. at Carrolltown, Pennsylvania, 29 November, 1882. From a Protestant preacher he became a Catholic on 21 April, 1824, and was ordained priest by Bishop Sailer at Ratisbon on 11 April, 1826. In 1834 he came as missionary to the United States and after being stationed a short time at Holy Trinity Church, Philadelphia, he was sent as assistant to the aged and infirm Prince Gallitzin at Loretto, Pennsylvania. He took up his residence in the neighbouring town of Ebensburg, from where he attended to a portion of Father Gallitzin's district, about fifty miles in extent. In 1836 he bought some land on which two years later he laid out a town which, in honour of the first Catholic Bishop in the United States, he called Carrolltown. He succeeded the deceased Father Gallitzin as pastor of Loretto in 1840. Father Lemcke was instrumental in bringing to the United States the first Benedictines, under the leadership of Father Boniface Wimmer, the future Archabbot of St. Vincent's, in Pennsylvania. Father Lemcke himself joined the new Benedictine community in 1852. In 1855 he went as missionary to Kansas, and prepared the way for the foundation of St. Benedict's Abbey at Atchison. From 1861 to 1877 he was stationed at Elizabeth, New Jersey, the remainder of his life he spent at Carrolltown. He is the author of a life of Prince Gallitzin: "Leben und Wirken des Prinzen Demetrius Augustin von Gallitzin" (Münster, 1861).

LAMBING, *Memoir of Rev. Henry Lemcke, O.S.B.* in *Ave Maria* (Notre Dame, Indiana, 1883), XIX, 41–45, 68–71, 88–91, 110–113, 128–132, 141–143.

MICHAEL OTT.

Le Mercier, FRANÇOIS, one of the early missionaries of New France, b. at Paris, 4 October, 1604; d. in the island of Martinique, 12 June, 1690. He entered the Society of Jesus at Paris, 19 October, 1620. He taught in succession all the classes of grammar and humanities in the Jesuit college of the capital, and, after completing his own philosophical and theological studies, was sent to Canada, where he arrived 20 July, 1635, and with Father Pierre Pijart set out for the Huron country the third day after landing at Quebec, reaching his destination on 13 August. He devoted himself to the work of the Huron mission for fifteen years uninterruptedly, save for a brief absence at Quebec on business of the mission during the summer months of 1639. He received the Huron name of Chaüosé, but years after when among the Onondagas he went by the Iroquois name Teharonhiagannra. Father Jean de Brébeuf, an exacting judge of what was required of an Apostolic labourer, wrote his panegyric in two words when he described him as "a perfect missioner". While in Huronia he was stationed from 1635 to 1637 at Ihonatiria, from 1637 to 1639 at Ossossané, from 1639 to 1640 at Ste-Marie I, again

at Ossossané until 1642, at Ste-Marie I until 1649, and finally at Ste-Marie II, on St. Joseph's Island, from 16 June, 1649. He left Huronia only after the laying waste of the country by the Iroquois, and the complete abandonment of the mission, subsequent to their inroads, on 10 June, 1650.

On his return to Quebec he was engaged in the ministry there and at Three Rivers until 1653, when he was appointed rector of the college and superior of the whole Canada mission, a post he occupied until 1656. But while yet in office, on 11 May of the latter year, not willing to expose the lives of others to perils he was not ready to face, he named Father Jérôme Lalemant vice-superior, so as to be himself free to head a tentative missionary expedition, fraught with danger, to the Onondagas. While on his way to this fierce Iroquois nation he wrote from Montreal on 6 June, 1656, to his provincial in France a letter setting forth vividly the difficulties of the undertaking (see "Relation, 1657", Quebec ed., 50–54). On 1 June, 1657, he was back at Quebec, but started to return on 27 June. He could not have proceeded far when he was recalled, for the "Jesuits' Journal" mentions his saying the Christmas midnight Mass for the Hurons at the Quebec hospital. From 1659 to 1660, though in charge of the parish with Father Dablon, he had also to attend the outlying mission at Beaupré. He was formally named assistant parish priest, 21 October, 1660, by Mgr de Petrée, the first Bishop of Quebec, who had arrived in June of the previous year. On 6 August, 1665, for the second time, he was promoted to the office of rector and superior of the whole Canada Mission, and continued to act as such until replaced by Father Dablon on 12 July, 1671, Le Mercier becoming *procurator et primarius in convictu*, or, in modern parlance, "bursar and vice-president" of the Jesuit college at Quebec. Father Le Mercier was recalled from Canada and was deputed by the general of the order as visitor of the French missions in South America and in the Antilles, in 1673. By 12 December of the same year he was already acting in that capacity in Cayenne. On 12 October, 1674, he was named superior of all these missions. For ten years he acquitted himself of his onerous duties to the satisfaction of all, and died at Martinique at an advanced age with a widespread reputation for sanctity of life.

We are indebted to Le Mercier for the compiling of nine of the annual "Relations", 1653, 1654, 1655, and 1665 to 1670 inclusively, besides the two written by him on the Huron mission, those of the years 1637 and 1638.

[Martin], *Jesuit Relations* (Quebec ed., 1858); Thwaites, *Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents;* Laverdière and Casgrain, *Journal des Jésuites* (Quebec, 1871); *Manuscript Catalogues of the Society*, and Martin, *Catalogue Raisonné des Relations*, both in St. Mary's Coll. Archives, Montreal.

A. E. Jones.

Lemercier, Jacques, b. at Pontoise, about 1585; d. at Paris, 1654. Lemercier shares with Mansart and Le Muet the glory of representing French architecture most brilliantly under Louis XIII and Richelieu. He was likewise a sculptor and engraver. He imitated in a measure the strong but somewhat prosaic style of Salamon de Brosse. The French Renaissance had at that time already reached its last stage, but it still retained an important heritage from the days of Lescot. Lemercier was in Italy, presumably from 1607 to 1613, and, while in Rome, probably engraved a model of St. Peter's. As early as 1618 he appears as royal architect with a salary of 1200 livres. In 1639 he became chief architect, in which capacity, having the supervision of all the royal building enterprises, he fell into a disagreeable dispute with the cultivated Poussin about the decorations in the Louvre. In general, he is considered a well-meaning, discreet character. Living entirely for his art, he thought very little of his profit, and, in spite of the great works which he executed, it was found necessary after his death to sell his entire large library to cover his debts. He was highly extolled as the exponent of the classic tendencies of Palladio. Richelieu, in particular, entrusted him with a series of important works. As yet Lescot's plan for the Louvre had been scarcely half finished. The cardinal, an enthusiastic patron of architecture, placed Lemercier at the head of this undertaking in 1624. In carrying on the work begun by Lescot, Lemercier subordinated himself to the latter's style and design, but he followed his own ideas in his more substantial plan and in quadrupling the building area, each of the four sides having a pavilion at its centre. In this manner he built the northern half of the west side—the celebrated Pavilion de l'Horloge—and the western part of the north side. It is, however, an exaggerated opinion to regard the Pavilion de l'Horloge as the best example of French architecture.

After 1627, in Richelieu's personal service, Lemercier built the Château de Richelieu in Poitou and the parish church of the same town, in which he displayed his talents to splendid advantage. The castle was worthy of a king. In addition, he began the Palais-Cardinal at Paris in 1629, which, after its donation to the king, was known as the Palais Royal. He was likewise entrusted with the subsequent extension of this building, of which there remains at present only an interior wing. It is wanting in lightness and proportion in the disposal of its masses. The master earned great and well-merited renown by his work on the Sorbonne which was begun at the same time. The college and the church are both his work. The latter is noteworthy for its domical shape in the style of the Italian Renaissance (like Val-de-Grâce and the Invalides of the two Mansarts). In France, contrary to the Italian custom, the exterior dome was made of wood, which was less monumental, though about the same in appearance. Lemercier inaugurated this economical method in his claustral dome over the Pavilion de l'Horloge. The dome presents a harmonious effect. It is a complete hemisphere, with four small cupolas in the Greek cross above the two orders of columns on the façade. The interior also makes a better effect than Mansart's dome of the Invalides, and was formerly intended to be beautifully decorated. The square intersection is surrounded by cylindrical vaults and a semicircular choir apse. The north side consists of a portico in classic style. The whole may be considered one of the finest buildings of that time.

Lemercier produced a similar result with his work on the abbey church of Val-de-Grâce, which he took up as the successor of Father Mansart. The latter had refused to execute an order requiring a change in the design, whereupon the principal part as far as the entablature appears to have been carried on by Lemercier and finished by other masters. The foundation of the church and royal abbey was determined upon at the birth of Louis XIV, and Louis himself, when six years of age (1645), laid the cornerstone. Here too the different orders of columns harmonize beautifully with the principal dome and the four smaller domes and their *tambour*. The front view is truly magnificent. In the details of execution a noble taste, as well as great care, is evident. In 1635 Richelieu once again claimed the services of Lemercier for work on the Château de Rueil, near Paris, which he had acquired at that time. The artist's great patron was buried in the church of the Sorbonne in 1642. Lemercier continued to enjoy the favour of the court and the public. In 1645 he received as first of the royal architects a salary of 3000 livres. His last work was the plan of the church of St. Roch in Paris. He completed only the choir and part of the nave. A few unimportant earlier works, which are not unani-

mously ascribed to Lemercier, may also be mentioned. In 1630 he built the choir of the church of the Oratorians in Paris after the design of Clément Métezeau, who had laid the cornerstone in 1621. The façade belongs to a later period. He also erected the Hôtels de Liancourt and de La Rochefoucauld. Also ascribed to him are the Hôtel de Longueville and the Château Silly, or Chilly, of Marshal d'Effiat. A hunting seat of Louis XIII, with splendid pleasure grounds, was a remarkable Versailles in miniature, forecasting the celebrated pleasure palace of a later period. The statue of Henry IV with the sarcophagus in the Lateran is a fine piece of plastic work.

Jacques Lemercier had a younger brother François, who in 1636 represented him for a time in the capacity of architect. His two sons Jacques and François received a pension from the state to enable them to study architecture. The Lemerciers of Pontoise were indeed one of those gifted families in which several members had a vocation for the same branch of art. The two celebrated churches of St. Maclou at Pontoise and St. Eustache in Paris have been traced to one Pierre Lemercier, who at Pontoise was succeeded immediately by Nicholas Lemercier and more remotely by a connexion by marriage, Charles David. But the glorious church of St. Eustache was a greater source of renown for the family. According to Geymüller, whose opinion is hardly to be disputed, Pierre Lemercier's entire share in St. Maclou consisted in the somewhat unusual dome tower, and further inferences concerning St. Eustache would be without foundation. Everything else is uncertain.

Trou, *Recherches historiques, archéologiques et biographiques sur la ville de Pontoise* (Pontoise, 1841); Berty, *Les grands architects français* (Paris, 1860); Lance, *Dict. des architectes* (Paris, 1873); Geymüller in *Handbuch der Architektur von Durm, etc.*, II, vi (Stuttgart, 1901), 2; Gurlitt, *Gesch. des Barockstils* (Stuttgart, 1887).

G. Gietmann.

Lemos, Thomas de, Spanish theologian and controversialist, b. at Rivadavia, Spain, 1555; d. at Rome, 23 Aug., 1629. At an early age he entered the Order of St. Dominic in his native town; he obtained, in 1590, the lectorate in theology and was at the same time appointed regent of studies in the convent of St. Paul at Valladolid. In 1594 he was assigned to the chair of theology in the university of that city. The intellectual atmosphere of the time was troubled; theological discussion was rife. The controversy aroused in 1588 by the publication of Molina's work "Concordia liberi arbitrii cum gratiæ donis", between the Dominicans and Jesuits, had reached a heated and turbulent stage not only at Valladolid but also at Salamanca, Cordova, Saragossa, and other cities of Spain. The almost daily disputations, both public and private, showed a tendency to drift away from the hitherto universally accepted teaching of Augustine and Thomas Aquinas. In 1600 Lemos was chosen to represent his province in the public defence of selected theses before the general chapter of his order held at Naples. The propositions embraced the doctrine of St. Thomas and his school on grace and free-will. In his defence Lemos proved himself a disputant of the highest order. His familiarity with the works of St. Augustine on the question under discussion was such that the slightest deviation from them, either in content or in diction, would not pass him uncorrected; and that he was no less familiar with the writings of St. Thomas is evident from his own words: "nec nos in Hispania aliis armis nisi armis S. Thomæ incœpimus hanc doctrinam impugnare" (Acta Congreg., disp. ii, col. 176). His ability and success prompted the general of his order to send him to Rome to assist his confrère, Father Alvarez, in defending the teaching of his order against the Molinists before the Congregatio de Auxiliis established by Clement VIII to settle the controversy.

Upon his arrival he was given first place in the defence, which he held till the termination of the Congregation (26 Feb., 1606). For four years, in forty-seven public conferences, in the presence of Clement VIII and Paul V, he defended the teaching of St. Thomas with extraordinary skill against five no less able adversaries, the élite of the great Jesuit theologians of the time. Referring to this event he himself writes: "Fuit ista Congregatio celebris, de qua multi mirati sunt, quod tot ac tantis, ubi fecerunt summum prœlium patres Societatis, sic ex tempore fuisset responsum. Sed gratia Dei sum id quod sum" (Acta Congreg., 1231). At the conclusion of the commission, Pope Paul V and Philip III of Spain offered him a bishopric, but he declined the honour, preferring to remain in Rome in the convent Sopra Minerva to devote himself to literary work. Three years before his death he became totally blind. During his lifetime he published nothing. The work which has given him a permanent and prominent place in the history of theology appeared about fifty years after his death, the "Panoplia gratiæ seu de rationalis creaturæ in finem supernaturalem gratuita divina suavipotente ordinatione, ductu, mediis, liberoque progressu, dissertationes theologicæ" (Liège, 1676). The "Acta omnia Congregationum et disputationum, quæ coram SS. Clemente VIII et Paulo V Summis Pontificibus sunt celebratæ in causa et controversia illa magna de auxiliis divinæ gratiæ" (Louvain, 1702) appeared nearly a hundred years after his death. While he is the author of a large number of works, these are the only ones which have thus far been published.

Quétif-Echard, *SS. Ord. Præd.*, II, 461; Touron, *Hist. des hommes illust. de l'ordre de S. Dom.*, IV, 767; Hurter, *Nomenclator;* Serry, *Hist. Congregationis de auxiliis*, passim.

Joseph Schroeder.

Le Moyne, the name of one of the most illustrious families of the New World, whose deeds adorn the pages of Canadian history.

Charles Le Moyne, founder of the family, b. of Pierre Le Moyne and Judith Duchesne at Dieppe on 1 August, 1626; d. at Ville-Marie (Montreal), 1683. On reaching Canada in 1641, he spent four years in the Huron country, and then settled at Ville-Marie, his knowledge of the Indian languages rendering him useful as an interpreter, and his valour contributing to defend the colony. He often fought single-handed against Iroquois marauders. This unusual bravery encouraged the settlers to cultivate the soil. In 1653 he negotiated a peace which lasted five years. He married Catherine Primot in 1654. Surprised by a party of Iroquois in 1665, he was preparing to sell his life dearly, when he tripped and was captured. Awed by his valour and fearing reprisals, his captors did not torture, but soon released him. He accompanied Courcelles and Tracy against the Five Nations and shared their success. In recognition of his services Louis XIV ennobled him with the title of Sieur de Longueuil. He served as interpreter to Courcelles and the Governors of Montreal and Three Rivers during a visit to the Iroquois country, and was re-



warded by Intendant Talon with a vast concession on the St. Lawrence, reaching from Varennes to Laprairie, henceforth named the Longueuil fief. He was the father of fourteen children, seven of whom honoured Canada by their prowess, three dying in battle and four becoming governors of cities or provinces. Of his sons, surnamed for their bravery the "Machabees of New France", the two most renowned are treated in separate articles (see Iberville, Pierre Le Moyne, Sieur d'; Bienville, Jean-Baptiste Le Moyne, Sieur de); each of the five others deserves here a short notice.

Charles Le Moyne, eldest son of the preceding, b. at Ville-Marie, 10 Dec., 1656; d. in 1729. After serving in France, he returned to Canada with the rank of lieutenant, and, at the age of twenty-seven, was appointed major of Montreal by Governor de la Barre. He married Elizabeth Souart. In 1700 he received for his services an additional grant of land and promotion to the rank of baron. He won fame in battle against the Iroquois and in the defence of Quebec (1690). The cross of St. Louis was awarded him, and he was successively Governor of Three Rivers and Montreal. In 1711, preceded by the religious standard embroidered by Jeanne Leber, he marched to Chambly against the invading army, which retreated on hearing of the wreck of Walker's fleet.

Jacques Le Moyne, Sieur de Sainte-Hélène, b. at Ville-Marie, 16 April, 1659; d. at Quebec, 1690. A soldier from early youth, he trained for warfare his illustrious brother, d'Iberville. During Phipps's siege of Quebec, Ste-Hélène with 200 volunteers repulsed a troop of 1300 men commanded by Major Whalley, who had attempted to cross River St. Charles. Mortally wounded in this encounter, Ste-Hélène died shortly after, mourned by the whole colony for his courtesy and valour. The Iroquois of Onondaga sent a wampum collar as a token of sympathy, and released two captives to honour his memory.

Paul Le Moyne, Sieur de Maricourt, b. 15 Dec., 1663; d. on 21 March, 1704. He accompanied d'Iberville to Hudson's Bay, and amply shared his success, particularly in boarding and capturing with only two canoes a large English cruiser. In 1690 he aided Ste-Hélène in defeating Whalley. Frontenac having undertaken a decisive campaign against the Iroquois, Maricourt forced them to surrender. Skilful diplomat as well as intrepid warrior, he was chosen to negotiate peace. His success was due to the affection and esteem of the Iroquois for his uprightness, which moderated their dread of his bravery. They had begged him to act as their protector and mediator. In 1691 he married M. Madeleine Dupont de Neuville.

François Le Moyne, Sieur de Bienville I, b. 1666; d. 1691. After several valourous exploits, he was shot in an encounter with a party of Onneyouts at Repentigny, while assailing the window of a house where they had taken refuge.

Joseph Le Moyne, Sieur de Sérigny, b. 22 July, 1668; d. at Rochefort, France, in 1704. A worthy emulator of d'Iberville, he commanded the vessels sent from France to enable his brother to take possession of Hudson's Bay. In that expedition, as well as in Florida and Louisiana, he displayed great valour. With his brothers he drove the Spaniards from Pensacola, after which he fortified Mobile and expelled the Spaniards from Ile Dauphin. He was promoted captain in 1720, and in 1722 became Governor of Rochefort, France, where he died in 1734. He had married M. Elisabeth Héron.

Louis Le Moyne, Sieur de Châteauguay I, b. 4 Jan., 1676; d. 1694. He fought under d'Iberville at Hudson's Bay, assisting when only a boy at the capture of Fort Monsipi. In the years following he so often defeated the English that they were at last reduced to Fort Nelson (Bourbon), their most important post. This stronghold was likewise captured after a long and difficult attack, during which Châteauguay was killed at the age of eighteen.

Charles Le Moyne, second baron de Longueuil, b. at Longueuil, 18 Oct., 1687; d. on 17 Jan., 1755. He entered the army quite young, and, after having served in France, was appointed major of Montreal (1733), and received the cross of St. Louis (1734). As Governor of Montreal (1749) he administered the colony after Jonquière's death. He saved from suppression the General Hospital of Venerable Madame d'Youville, maliciously threatened with destruction. He married Catherine Charlotte de Gray in 1720.

Paul-Joseph Le Moyne, b. 1701; d. at Port-Louis, France, in 1778. Inheriting the military spirit of his ancestors, he joined the army at the age of seventeen, and served as lieutenant in Normandy. He was successively commander of Fort Frontenac, Governor of Detroit, of Three Rivers, and finally commander of the citadel of Quebec. He fought under Vaudreuil, Montcalm, and Lévis, and won the cross of St. Louis. After the Conquest, he returned to France, where he died at Port-Louis in 1778. He married (1728) Geneviève Joybert de Soulanges.

Joseph-Dominique-Emmanuel Le Moyne, second son of preceding, b. at Soulanges on 2 April, 1738. He began his military career at the age of twelve. After serving as captain and major under the French régime, he later served under the British flag after the change of domination, bravely defending Fort St. John in 1755 against the American invaders. He was successively appointed inspector general of militia (1777), colonel of the Royal Canadians (1796), and legislative councillor. He died in 1807.

Daniel, *Histoire des grandes familles françaises du Canada* (Montreal, 1867); Faillon, *Histoire de la colonie française en Canada* (Ville-Marie, 1865); Marmette, *Les Machabées de la Nouvelle France* (Quebec, 1882); *Documents inédits* (Montreal, 1890); Jodoin, *Histoire de Longueuil* (Montreal, 1889).

Lionel Lindsay.

Le Moyne, Simon, Jesuit missionary, b. at Beauvais, 1604; d. in 1665 at Cap de la Madeleine, near Three Rivers. He joined the Society in 1622, and reached Canada in 1638. He worked on the Huron mission with Chaumonot, Bressani, and the future martyrs. Second to Chaumonot alone in his mastery of the Huron-Iroquois language, he was unequalled in the knowledge of the character of the Indians, their customs and traditions, even the artifices of their savage eloquence and diplomacy. The ascendancy he thereby enjoyed made him a desirable ambassador on all delicate and arduous occasions. He was the first European to penetrate among the Onondagas, where his eloquence and acquaintance with their traditions won their admiration. They begged for a missionary to teach them about the Great Spirit (1654). His second mission was to the fierce Mohawks, the murderers of Father Jogues, jealous of the favour shown to the Onondagas. They received him well, and he journeyed to Manhattan or New Amsterdam, where the governor, Peter Stuyvesant, treated him courteously. When a fresh outburst of Mohawk jealousy threatened to disturb the peace, Le Moyne again volunteered to pacify them, visiting Ossernenon a second and third time, and, though outwardly honoured, he frequently faced death. When after two years of warfare against the French and their allies the Cayuga Iroquois sued for peace in Montreal, and craved for a "black gown", Le Moyne went to test their sincerity (1661). This was his fifth embassy, and during it he was seized, tortured, and even condemned to death. He was always ready for martyrdom. He owed his preservation to the chief Garakontié, whom Bishop Laval had baptized. He consoled the Indians and French captives, many of whom owed him their release. When the regular missions were established he longed to return to the Onondagas, but death overtook him at Cap de la

Madeleine. Garakontié eloquently eulogized his undaunted courage and eminent virtues.

ROCHEMONTEIX, *Les Jésuites et la Nouvelle France* (Paris, 1896); CAMPBELL, *Pioneer Priests of North America* (New York, 1908).

LIONEL LINDSAY.

Lemuel. See LAMUEL.

L'Enfant, PIERRE-CHARLES, engineer, b. in France, August, 1755; d. near Bladensburg, Maryland, U. S. A., 4 June, 1833. He was educated as an engineer and joined Lafayette as a volunteer to help the revolted American colonists in 1777. Appointed a captain of engineers on 18 Feb., 1778, and brevet major on 2 May, 1783, in Washington's army, he did valiant service during the Revolutionary War. At its close he remodelled the old City Hall in New York for the meeting of the First Congress, and later arranged the Federal Hall in Philadelphia. When the site for the Federal city was finally adopted, he spent much of his time during the year 1791 considering a plan for the new city, which he finally drew up with the title: "Plan of the City, intended for the Permanent Seat of the Government of the United States. Projected agreeable to the direction of the President of the United States in pursuance of an act of Congress passed the sixteenth day of July, MDCCXC, establishing the Permanent Seat on the bank of the Potomac". L'Enfant had a quick temper and an overbearing disposition, and, as he quarrelled with his superiors before his plans could be carried out, President Washington dismissed him from the service on 1 March, 1792. He refused an appropriation offered him for his work on the plan for the Capitol, and also the appointment of professor of engineering at the Military Academy, West Point. During the War of 1812 with England he set to work constructing fortifications near Washington, but again quarrelled with his superior officers, and through pique left the service. He haunted the doors of Congress for years with applications for recompense for his work that were never heeded. Poor and forgotten he spent the rest of his days at the home of his friend, William Dudley Digges, near Bladensburg, Maryland, and his body was buried there. In April, 1909, in accordance with an Act of Congress, the remains of Major L'Enfant were removed from his grave in Maryland, and, after lying in state for a short time in the Capitol at Washington, were reinterred in the National Cemetery at Arlington with the ceremonies of the Church and the military honours due to his rank in the Continental Army.

VARNUM, *The Seat of Government of the U. S.* (Washington, 1854); *American Cath. Hist. Researches* (Philadelphia, January, 1907); MEEHAN in *America* (New York, 1 May, 1909); *Encycl. Am. Biog.*, s. v.

THOMAS F. MEEHAN.

Lenihan, MATHIAS C. See GREAT FALLS, DIOCESE OF.

Lennig, ADAM FRANZ, theologian, b. 3 Dec., 1803, at Mainz; d. there, 22 Nov., 1866. He studied at Bouchsal under the private tutorship of the ex-Jesuit Laurentius Doller, and afterwards at the bishop's gymnasium at Mainz. Being too young for ordination, he went to Paris to study Oriental languages under Sylvestre de Sacy, then to Rome for a higher course in theology. Here he was ordained priest, 22 Sept., 1827, and then taught for a year at Mainz. Lennig was a strenuous defender of the rights of the Church, and when on 30 Jan., 1830, the Hessian Government, which for quite a time had been trying to interfere in church matters, passed thirty-nine articles on ecclesiastical administration, he sent them to Rome. Rome sent back a protest, but, since the bishops remained silent, and since Bishop Burg of Mainz even defended the articles, Lennig left for Bonn, and attended the lectures of Sailer, Windischmann, and Klee. In June, 1832, he accepted the pastorate of Gaulsheim, declining to take the chair of theology and exegesis at Mainz. In 1839 he was made pastor at Seligenstadt. Bishop Kaiser of Mainz in 1845 promoted him to the cathedral chapter. In March, 1848, he established the "Piusverein", which did much good among the Catholics of Germany. He organized the first meeting of Catholic societies and of Catholics in general, held at Mainz, October, 1848. In the same month he was present at the meeting of the German bishops at Würzburg, acting as representative of his bishop, who was ill. About this time he founded at great expense the "Mainzer Journal". After the death of Bishop Kaiser (30 Dec., 1848), troubles arose about the choice of a successor. Lennig was acknowledged by all as a leader of true Christian spirit and suffered much abuse from the Liberals. In 1852 he was made vicar-general by Bishop von Ketteler, and in 1856 dean of the chapter. He zealously assisted his bishop in bringing the Capuchins and Jesuits into the diocese. In 1854 he was in Rome at the definition of the Immaculate Conception, and later visited Rome twice. In 1859 he wrote a protest against the spoliation of the Holy See, and had it signed by 20,000 Catholics. He was undoubtedly one of the most influential and zealous German priests of his day. Lennig published in 1849 his "Panegyric on Bishop Kaiser", and in 1862 his "Funeral Oration on the Archduchess Mathilde of Hesse". His meditations on the Passion and on the Our Father and Hail Mary were published 1867 and 1869 by his nephew, Chr. Moufang.

BRÜCK, *Adam Franz Lennig*, etc. (Mainz, 1870); *Allg. Deutsche Biogr.*, XVIII, 261; *Katholik*, 1867, I, 257; PFÜLF, *Bischof von Ketteler* (Mainz, 1899), passim; MAY, *Gesch. der Generalversamml. der Kath. Deutschl.* (Cologne, 1904), 22, 26, 33.

FRANCIS MERSHMAN.

Lenormant, CHARLES, French archæologist, b. in Paris, 1 June, 1802; d. at Athens, 24 November, 1859. After pursuing his studies at the Lycée Charlemagne and the Lycée Napoléon, he took up law, but a visit to Italy and Sicily (1822–23) made him an enthusiastic archæologist. In 1825 he was named sub-inspector of fine arts and a few months later married Amelia Syvoct, niece and adopted daughter of the celebrated Mme Récamier. He visited Italy, Belgium, Holland, and accompanied Champollion to Egypt, where he devoted himself to the study of architectural works. Later he travelled through Greece as assistant director of the archæological department of the Morea scientific commission. On his return he was appointed curator of the works of art in the royal palaces (1829). In 1835 he was Guizot's substitute at the Sorbonne. Although the chair was that of modern history, he lectured chiefly on ancient history, more especially on the origins of Greek civilization. In 1836 he was appointed curator of printed books in the Royal Library, and in 1839 was elected member of the Academy. In 1840 he was made curator of the Cabinet of Medals. Guizot, who became minister of foreign affairs in 1841, sent him on a mission to Greece. On returning from this second visit to the East he continued his lectures at the Sorbonne, and made a particular study of Christian civilization in its sources. This study made of him a true Christian, and from that

CHARLES LENORMANT

time his lectures bore the impress of his deep Catholic belief. He gave voice to his convictions in his "Questions historiques" (Paris, 1845), in his work on the "Associations religieuses dans la société chrétienne" (Paris, 1866), and in many serious articles in the "Correspondant". His writings greatly influenced the much discussed question of freedom of teaching (*liberté d'enseignement*). In 1846, the students, in retaliation for the suppression of M. Quinet's chair, compelled Lenormant to give up his professorship; he was then given the editorship of the "Correspondant" which he resigned in 1855. In 1848 he was named director of the commission of historical monuments, and in 1849 an almost unanimous vote of the members of the Academy appointed him to the chair of archæology in the Collège de France. From that time he devoted himself entirely to the teaching of Egyptian archæology. He died while on an expedition undertaken for the sake of initiating his son into the knowledge of the monuments of antiquity.

Many articles from the pen of Lenormant appeared in the "Annales de l'Institut Archéologique de Rome", the "Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions", the "Revue de Numismatique", and the "Correspondant". His chief independently published works are: "Les Artistes contemporains" (Paris, 1833, 2 vols.); "Introduction à l'histoire de l'Asie occidentale" (Paris, 1838); "Musée des Antiquités égyptiennes" (Paris, 1842); "Questions historiques" (Paris, 1845), besides two valuable collections, "Trésor de numismatique et de glyptique" (Paris, 1834–50) (in collaboration with Paul Delaroche and Henriquel Dupont) and "Elite des monuments céramographiques" (1844–58) (with De Witte).

De Witte, *Annuaire de l'Académie de Belgique* (Brussels, 1861), 129–86; *Mémoires de l'Institut de France*, XXXI, (Paris), p. 547–608.

F. Mayence.

Lenormant, François, archæologist, son of the preceding, b. at Paris, 17 January, 1837; d. there, 9 December, 1883. His father personally supervised his education and exercised great influence over his mind and studies. He gave early proofs of classical scholarship, by publishing, when only fourteen, an article in the "Revue archéologique": "Lettre à M. Hase sur des tablettes grecques trouvées à Memphis". In 1857 he was awarded the numismatic prize by the Academy of Inscriptions for a remarkable essay published in the "Revue numismatique": "Essai sur la classification des monnaies des Lagides". While pursuing his classical studies, he attended the lectures of the faculty of law and in 1857 received his degree as licentiate. In 1858 he visited Italy and in 1859 accompanied his father to the East. The latter having died during the journey François returned to France with the body, but set out soon again for Greece. He conducted important excavations at Eleusis and as a result published several essays, notably: "Recherches archéologiques à Eleusis" (Paris, 1862). While thus engaged, he heard of the massacre of Christians by the Druses, and immediately ceasing his researches sailed for Syria to go to the rescue of the victims of Moslem fanaticism. When the French expedition reached Syria, he felt free to return to Eleusis. In 1862 he was appointed sub-librarian of the Institut de France. In 1865 and 1866 he travelled again through the East, and shortly after this, summarized his studies in a "Manuel d'histoire ancienne de l'Orient jusqu'aux guerres Médiques" (Paris, 1868), a very popular work. In 1869 he visited Egypt and familiarized himself with Egyptian antiquities; he published numerous essays on the cuneiform texts and on the language spoken in Babylon and Nineveh. During the siege of Paris, 1870, he took part in several engagements. Two years later, his "Essai de commentaire des fragments cosmogoniques de Bérose" (Paris, 1872) was published.

In 1874 Lenormant succeeded Beulé as professor of archæology at the Bibliothèque Nationale, and delivered brilliant lectures on Greek and Eastern antiquities. With de Witte, a Belgian archæologist, he founded in 1875 the "Gazette archéologique" for the publication of unknown monuments and miscellaneous archæological studies. In this review he published many articles on ancient monuments of every description and origin. From 1879 to 1883 he visited Southern Italy several times, and as a result of his travels published a work on Lucania and Apulia. In 1880 he produced the first volume of "Origines de l'histoire d'après la Bible et les traditions des peuples orientaux" (3 vols., Paris, 1880–83), a work that attained wide publicity. The writer thought it impossible to maintain a unity of composition in the books of the Pentateuch. He held that there were certain traces of "two distinct original documents; the Elohistic and the Jehovistic which served as a basis for the final compiler of the first four books of the Pentateuch, and he is satisfied with establishing between them a certain concordance, leaving untouched their original redaction". The first chapters of Genesis, according to him, are a "book of origins" and represent the story of Israel as told from generation to generation since the time of the Patriarchs; in all fundamental facts this narrative tallied with the sacred books of the Euphrates and the Tigris. For him, inspiration lies in the absolutely new spirit which animates the narrative, though in composition it is quite similar to the stories of neighbouring tribes. Four years after the death of the author this book was put on the Index (19 December, 1887). Quite probably Lenormant would have submitted, since in his introduction he asserts his attachment to the Catholic Faith and his devotion to the Church. He died from the after effects of a disease contracted during one of his visits to Southern Italy. In 1881 he had been made a member of the Academy of Inscriptions and Belles-Lettres.

Lenormant wrote many works. Aside from those referred to above, must be mentioned: "Sur l'origine chrétienne des inscriptions sinaïtiques" in "Journal Asiatique", XIII (Paris, 1859), fifth series; "Histoire des Massacres de Syrie en 1860" (Paris, 1861); "La Révolution en Grèce" (Paris, 1862); "Essai sur l'organisation politique et économique de la monnaie dans l'antiquité" (Paris, 1863); "Chefs-d'œuvres de l'art antique" (Paris, 1867–1868) in 7 vols.; "Histoire du peuple juif" (Paris, 1869); "Le déluge et l'épopée babylonnienne" (Paris, 1873); "Les premières civilisations" (Paris, 1873—2 vols.); "La langue primitive de Chaldée et les idiomes touraniens" (Paris, 1875); "La monnaie dans l'antiquité" (Paris, 1878–1879); "A travers l'Apulie et la Lucanie" (Paris, 1883): "La Genèse traduite d'après l'hébreu, avec distinction des éléments constitutifs du texte, suivi d'un essai de restitution des textes dont s'est servi le dernier rédacteur" (Paris, 1884).

Le Hir, *François Lenormant, étude biographique* (Lyons, 1884); van den Gheyn, *F. Lenormant* (Brussels, 1884); Babelon, *Adrien de Longpérier, François Lenormant, Ernest Muret, trois nécrologies* (Berlin, 1885); de Witte in *Annuaire de l'Académie de Belgique* (1887), 247–291.

F. Mayence.

Le Nourry, Denis-Nicolas, of the Congregation of St-Maur, ecclesiastical writer, b. at Dieppe in Normandy, 18 Feb., 1647; d. at the Abbey of St-Germain in Paris, 24 March, 1724. He received his first education from the priests of the Oratory at his native place; then entered the Benedictine Order at Jumièges, 8 July, 1665. After completing his theological studies and being ordained to the priesthood, he was sent to Rouen, where, in the Abbey of Bonnenouvelle, he assisted John Garet in publishing the writings of Cassiodorus (1679). For this work he wrote the preface and the life of the author. In the edition of the works of St. Ambrose he aided Jean du Chesne and Julien

Bellaise at Rouen, and later Jacques du Frische at Paris, where he spent the last forty years of his life. His greatest work is the "Apparatus ad bibliothecam maximam veterum patrum et antiquorum scriptorum", published at Paris in two volumes (1703 and 1715) as an aid to the study of the Lyons collection of the Fathers. In extensive dissertations he gives the biography of each writer; the occasion, design, scope, and genuineness of every writing; a history of the time in which the author lived; its dogmatical and moral tendency, and its struggles against heathenism or heresies. The work was well received. In 1710 he edited the "Liber ad Donatum confessorem de mortibus persecutorum", and in a special dissertation tries hard to prove that the book was written by Lucius Cæcilius and not by Lactantius. Besides these he edited the "Epitome institutionum divinarum" of Lactantius, the "Expositum de die paschæ et mensis" of Hilarianus, and a fragment "De origine generis humani".

TASSIN, *Histoire litt. de la cong. de Saint-Maur* (Paris, 1770), 436; HURTER, *Nomenclator*, II (Innsbruck, 1893), 1117; *Tübinger Quartalschrift* (1834), 15; DÜX in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.; NICÉRON, *Mémoires*, I (Paris, 1727–38), 275–8.

FRANCIS MERSHMAN.

Lent.—The Teutonic word *Lent*, which we employ to denote the forty days' fast preceding Easter, originally meant no more than the spring season. Still it has been used from the Anglo-Saxon period to translate the more significant Latin term *quadragesima* (Fr. *carême*, It. *quaresima*, Span. *cuaresma*), meaning the "forty days", or more literally the "fortieth day". This in turn imitated the Greek name for Lent, *τεσσαρακοστή* (fortieth), a word formed on the analogy of Pentecost (*πεντηκοστή*), which last was in use for the Jewish festival before New-Testament times. This etymology, as we shall see, is of some little importance in explaining the early developments of the Easter fast.

Origin.—Some of the Fathers as early as the fifth century supported the view that this forty days' fast was of Apostolic institution. For example, St. Leo (d. 461) exhorts his hearers to abstain that they may "fulfil with their fasts the Apostolic institution of the forty days"—ut apostolica institutio quadraginta dierum jejuniis impleatur (P. L., LIV, 633), and the historian Socrates (d. 433) and St. Jerome (d. 420) use similar language (P. G., LXVII, 633; P. L., XXII, 475). But the best modern scholars are almost unanimous in rejecting this view, for in the existing remains of the first three centuries we find both considerable diversity of practice regarding the fast before Easter and also a gradual process of development in the matter of its duration. The passage of primary importance is one quoted by Eusebius (Hist. Eccl., V, xxiv) from a letter of St. Irenæus to Pope Victor in connexion with the Easter controversy (q. v.). There Irenæus says that there is not only a controversy about the time of keeping Easter but also regarding the preliminary fast. "For", he continues, "some think they ought to fast for one day, others for two days, and others even for several, while others reckon forty hours both of day and night to their fast." He also urges that this variety of usage is of ancient date, which implies that there could have been no Apostolic tradition on the subject. Rufinus, who translated Eusebius into Latin towards the close of the fourth century, seems so to have punctuated this passage as to make Irenæus say that some people fasted for forty days. Formerly some difference of opinion existed as to the proper reading, but modern criticism (e. g., in the edition of Schwartz commissioned by the Berlin Academy) pronounces strongly in favour of the text translated above. We may then fairly conclude that Irenæus about the year 190 knew nothing of any Easter fast of forty days. The same inference must be drawn from the language of Tertullian only a few years later. When writing as a Montanist, he contrasts the very slender term of fasting observed by the Catholics (i. e., "the days on which the bridegroom was taken away", probably meaning the Friday and Saturday of Holy Week) with the longer but still restricted period of a fortnight which was kept by the Montanists. No doubt he was referring to fasting of a very strict kind (*xerophagiæ*—dry fasts), but there is no indication in his works, though he wrote an entire treatise, "De Jejunio", and often touches upon the subject elsewhere, that he was acquainted with any period of forty days consecrated to more or less continuous fasting (see Tertullian, "De Jejun.", ii and xiv; cf. "De Orat.", xviii; etc.). And there is the same silence observable in all the pre-Nicene Fathers, though many had occasion to mention such an Apostolic institution if it had existed. We may note for example that there is no mention of Lent in St. Dionysius of Alexandria (ed. Feltoe, 94 sqq.) or in the "Didascalia", which Funk attributes to about the year 250; yet both speak diffusely of the paschal fast. Further, there seems much to suggest that the Church in the Apostolic Age designed to commemorate the Resurrection of Christ, not by an annual, but by a weekly celebration (see "The Month", April, 1910, 337 sqq.). If this be so, the Sunday liturgy constituted the weekly memorial of the Resurrection, and the Friday fast that of the Death of Christ. Such a theory offers a natural explanation of the wide divergence which we find existing in the latter part of the second century regarding both the proper time for keeping Easter and also the manner of the paschal fast. Christians were at one regarding the weekly observance of the Sunday and the Friday, which was primitive, but the annual Easter festival was something superimposed by a process of natural development, and it was largely influenced by the conditions locally existing in the different Churches of the East and West. Moreover, with the Easter festival there seems also to have established itself a preliminary fast, not as yet anywhere exceeding a week in duration, but very severe in character, which commemorated the Passion, or, more generally, "the days on which the bridegroom was taken away".

Be this as it may, we find in the early years of the fourth century the first mention of the term *τεσσαρακοστή*. It occurs in the fifth canon of the Council of Nicæa (A. D. 325), where there is only question of the proper time for celebrating a synod, and it is conceivable that it may refer not to a period but to a definite festival, e. g., the feast of the Ascension, or the Purification, which Ætheria calls *quadragesimæ de Epiphania*. But we have to remember that the older word *πεντηκοστή*, Pentecost, from meaning the fiftieth day, had come to denote the whole of the period (which we should call Paschal Time) between Easter Sunday and Whit-Sunday (cf. Tertullian, "De Idololatria", xiv—"pentecosten implere non poterunt"). In any case it is certain from the "Festal Letters" of St. Athanasius that in 331 the saint enjoined upon his flock a period of forty days of fasting preliminary to, but not inclusive of, the stricter fast of Holy Week, and secondly that in 339 the same Father, after having travelled to Rome and over the greater part of Europe, wrote in the strongest terms to urge this observance upon the people of Alexandria as one that was universally practised, "to the end that while all the world is fasting, we who are in Egypt should not become a laughing-stock as the only people who do not fast but take our pleasure in those days". Although Funk formerly maintained that a Lent of forty days was not known in the West before the time of St. Ambrose, this is evidence which cannot be set aside.

Duration and Nature of the Fast.—In determining this period of forty days the example of Moses, Elias, and Christ must have exercised a predominant influ-

ence, but it is also possible that the fact was borne in mind that Christ lay forty hours in the tomb. On the other hand just as Pentecost (the fifty days) was a period during which Christians were joyous and prayed standing, though they were not always engaged in such prayer, so the Quadragesima (the forty days) was originally a period marked by fasting, but not necessarily a period in which the faithful fasted every day. Still, this principle was differently understood in different localities, and great divergences of practice were the result. In Rome, in the fifth century, Lent lasted six weeks, but according to the historian Socrates there were only three weeks of actual fasting, exclusive even then of the Saturday and Sunday, and, if Duchesne's view may be trusted, these weeks were not continuous, but were the first, the fourth, and the sixth of the series, being connected with the ordinations (Christian Worship, 243). Possibly, however, these three weeks had to do with the "scrutinies" preparatory to Baptism (q. v.), for by some authorities (e. g., A. J. Maclean in his "Recent Discoveries") the duty of fasting along with the candidate for baptism is put forward as the chief influence at work in the development of the forty days. But throughout the Orient generally, with some few exceptions, the same arrangement prevailed as St. Athanasius's "Festal Letters" show us to have obtained in Alexandria, namely, the six weeks of Lent were only preparatory to a fast of exceptional severity maintained during Holy Week. This is enjoined by the "Apostolic Constitutions" (V, xiii), and presupposed by St. Chrysostom (Hom. xxx in Gen., i). But the number *forty*, having once established itself, produced other modifications. It seemed to many necessary that there should not only be fasting during forty days but forty actual fasting days. Thus we find Ætheria in her "Peregrinatio" speaking of a Lent of eight weeks in all observed at Jerusalem, which, remembering that both the Saturday and Sunday of ordinary weeks were exempt, gives five times eight, i. e. forty days for fasting. On the other hand, in many localities people were content to observe no more than a six weeks' period, sometimes, as at Milan, fasting only five days in the week after the oriental fashion (Ambrose, "De Elia et Jejunio", 10). In the time of Gregory the Great (590–604) there were apparently at Rome six weeks of six days each, making thirty-six fast days in all, which St. Gregory, who is followed therein by many medieval writers, describes as the spiritual tithing of the year, thirty-six days being approximately the tenth part of three hundred and sixty-five. At a later date the wish to realize the exact number of forty days led to the practice of beginning Lent upon our present Ash Wednesday, but the Church of Milan even to this day adheres to the more primitive arrangement, which still betrays itself in the Roman Missal when the priest in the Secret of the Mass on the first Sunday of Lent speaks of "sacrificium quadragesimalis initii", the sacrifice of the opening of Lent. Neither was there originally less divergence regarding the nature of the fast. For example, the historian Socrates (Hist. Eccl., V, 22) tells of the practice of the fifth century: "Some abstain from every sort of creature that has life, while others of all the living creatures eat of fish only. Others eat birds as well as fish, because, according to the Mosaic account of the Creation, they too sprang from the water; others abstain from fruit covered with a hard shell and from eggs. Some eat dry bread only, others not even that; others again when they have fasted to the ninth hour (three o'clock) partake of various kinds of food." Amid this diversity some inclined to the extreme limits of rigour. Epiphanius, Palladius, and the author of the "Life of St. Melania the Younger" seem to contemplate a state of things in which ordinary Christians were expected to pass twenty-four hours or more without food of any kind, especially during Holy Week, while the more austere actually subsisted during part or the whole of Lent upon one or two meals a week (see Rampolla, "Vita di S. Melania Giuniore", appendix xxv, p. 478). But the ordinary rule on fasting days was to take but one meal a day and that only in the evening, while meat and, in the early centuries, wine were entirely forbidden. During Holy Week, or at least on Good Friday, it was common to enjoin the *xerophagia*, i. e. a diet of dry food, bread, salt, and vegetables. There does not seem at the beginning to have been any prohibition of *lacticinia*, as the passage just quoted from Socrates would show. Moreover, at a somewhat later date, Bede tells us of Bishop Cedda, that during Lent he took only one meal a day consisting of "a little bread, a hen's egg, and a little milk mixed with water" (Hist. Eccl., III, xxiii), while Theodulphus of Orléans in the eighth century regarded abstinence from eggs, cheese, and fish as a mark of exceptional virtue. None the less St. Gregory writing to St. Augustine of England laid down the rule, "We abstain from flesh meat, and from all things that come from flesh, as milk, cheese, and eggs." This decision was afterwards enshrined in the "Corpus Juris", and must be regarded as the common law of the Church. Still exceptions were admitted, and dispensatious to eat "lacticinia" were often granted upon condition of making a contribution to some pious work. These dispensations were known in Germany as *Butterbriefe*, and several churches are said to have been partly built by the proceeds of such exemptions. One of the steeples of Rouen cathedral was for this reason formerly known as the Butter Tower. This general prohibition of eggs and milk during Lent is perpetuated in the popular custom of blessing or making gifts of eggs at Easter, and in the English usage of eating pancakes on Shrove Tuesday.

Relaxations of the Lenten Fast.—From what has been said it will be clear that in the early Middle Ages Lent throughout the greater part of the Western Church consisted of forty weekdays, which were all fast days, and six Sundays. From the beginning to the end of that time all flesh meat, and also, for the most part, "lacticinia", were forbidden even on Sundays, while on all the fasting days only one meal was taken, which single meal was not permitted before evening. At a very early period, however (we find the first mention of it in Socrates), the practice began to be tolerated of breaking the fast at the hour of none, i. e., three o'clock. We learn in particular that Charlemagne, about the year 800, took his lenten repast at 2 p. m. This gradual anticipation of the hour of dinner was facilitated by the fact that the canonical hours of none, vespers, etc., represented rather periods than fixed points of time. The ninth hour, or none, was no doubt strictly three o'clock in the afternoon, but the Office of none might be recited as soon as sext, which, of course, corresponded to the sixth hour, or midday, was finished. Hence none in course of time came to be regarded as beginning at midday, and this point of view is perpetuated in our word *noon*, which means midday and not three o'clock in the afternoon. Now the hour for breaking the fast during Lent was after Vespers (the *evening* service), but by a gradual process the recitation of Vespers was more and more anticipated, until the principle was at last officially recognized, as it is at present, that Vespers in Lent may be said at midday. In this way, although the author of the "Micrologus" in the eleventh century still declared that those who took food before evening did not observe the lenten fast according to the canons (P. L., CLI, 1013), still, even at the close of the thirteenth century, certain theologians, for example the Franciscan Richard Middleton, who based his decision in part upon contemporary usage, pronounced that a man who took his dinner at midday did not break the lenten fast. Still more material was the relaxation afforded by the introduction of

"collation". This seems to have begun in the ninth century, when the Council of Aix la Chapelle sanctioned the concession, even in monastic houses, of a draught of water or other beverage in the evening to quench the thirst of those who were exhausted by the manual labour of the day. From this small beginning a much larger indulgence was gradually evolved. The principle of *parvitas materiæ*, i. e., that a small quantity of nourishment which was not taken directly as a meal did not break the fast, was adopted by St. Thomas Aquinas and other theologians, and in the course of centuries a recognized quantity of solid food, which according to received authorities must not exceed eight ounces, has come to be permitted after the midday repast. As this evening drink, when first tolerated in the ninth-century monasteries, was taken at the hour at which the "Collationes" (Conferences) of Abbot Cassian were being read aloud to the brethren, this slight indulgence came to be known as a "collation", and the name has continued since. Other mitigations of an even more substantial character have been introduced into lenten observance in the course of the last few centuries. To begin with, the custom has been tolerated of taking a cup of liquid (e. g., tea or coffee, or even chocolate) with a fragment of bread or toast in the early morning. But, what more particularly regards Lent, successive indults have been granted by the Holy See allowing meat at the principal meal, first on Sundays, and then on two, three, four, and five weekdays, throughout nearly the whole of Lent. Quite recently Maundy Thursday, upon which meat was hitherto always forbidden, has come to share in the same indulgence. In the United States the Holy See grants faculties whereby working men and their families may use flesh meat once a day throughout the year, except Fridays, Ash Wednesday, Holy Saturday, and the vigil of Christmas. The only compensation imposed for all these mitigations is the prohibition during Lent against partaking of both fish and flesh at the same repast. [See ABSTINENCE; FAST; IMPEDIMENTS, CANONICAL (III); LÆTARE SUNDAY; SEPTUAGESIMA; SEXAGESIMA; QUINQUAGESIMA; QUADRAGESIMA; VESTMENTS.]

VACANDARD in VACANT, *Dict. de Théol. Cath.*, s. v. *Carême*. An admirable summary of the question may also be found in ERMONI, *Le Carême* in *Science et Religion* series (Paris, 1907). See also THURSTON, *Lent and Holy Week* (London, 1904); FUNK in *Kirchengesch. Abhandl.*, I (Paderborn, 1897), 241–78; LINZENMAYR, *Entwicklung des kirchlichen Fastendisciplins* (Munich, 1877); LIEMKE, *Die Quadragesimalfasten der Kirche* (Munich, 1853); SINKER in *Dict. Christ. Antiq.*, s. v. *Lent;* HEUSER in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v. *Fastenzeiten;* MACLEAN, *Recent Discoveries illustrating early Christian Life and Worship* (London, 1904).

HERBERT THURSTON.

Lentulus, PUBLIUS, is a fictitious person, said to have been Governor of Judea before Pontius Pilate, and to have written the following letter to the Roman Senate: "Lentulus, the Governor of the Jerusalemites to the Roman Senate and People, greetings. There has appeared in our times, and there still lives, a man of great power (virtue), called Jesus Christ. The people call him prophet of truth; his disciples, son of God. He raises the dead, and heals infirmities. He is a man of medium size (*statura procerus, mediocris et spectabilis*); he has a venerable aspect, and his beholders can both fear and love him. His hair is of the colour of the ripe hazel-nut, straight down to the ears, but below the ears wavy and curled, with a bluish and bright reflection, flowing over his shoulders. It is parted in two on the top of the head, after the pattern of the Nazarenes. His brow is smooth and very cheerful, with a face without wrinkle or spot, embellished by a slightly reddish complexion. His nose and mouth are faultless. His beard is abundant, of the colour of his hair, not long, but divided at the chin. His aspect is simple and mature, his eyes are changeable and bright. He is terrible in his reprimands, sweet and amiable in his admonitions, cheerful without loss of gravity. He was never known to laugh, but often to weep. His stature is straight, his hands and arms beautiful to behold. His conversation is grave, infrequent, and modest. He is the most beautiful among the children of men."

Different manuscripts vary from the foregoing text in several details: Dobschütz ("Christusbilder", Leipzig, 1899) enumerates the manuscripts and gives an "apparatus criticus". The letter was first printed in the "Life of Christ" by Ludolph the Carthusian (Cologne, 1474), and in the "Introduction to the works of St. Anselm" (Nuremberg, 1491). But it is neither the work of St. Anselm nor of Ludolph. According to the manuscript of Jena, a certain Giacomo Colonna found the letter in 1421 in an ancient Roman document sent to Rome from Constantinople. It must be of Greek origin, and translated into Latin during the thirteenth or fourteenth century, though it received its present form at the hands of a humanist of the fifteenth or sixteenth century. The description agrees with the so-called Abgar picture of our Lord; it also agrees with the portrait of Jesus Christ drawn by Nicephorus, St. John Damascene, and the Book of Painters (of Mt. Athos). Munter ("Die Sinnbilder und Kunstvorstellungen der alten Christen", Altona, 1825, p. 9) believes he can trace the letter down to the time of Diocletian; but this is not generally admitted. The letter of Lentulus is certainly apocryphal: there never was a Governor of Jerusalem; no Procurator of Judea is known to have been called Lentulus; a Roman governor would not have addressed the senate, but the emperor; a Roman writer would not have employed the expressions, "prophet of truth", "sons of men", "Jesus Christ". The former two are Hebrew idioms, the third is taken from the New Testament. The letter, therefore, shows us a description of our Lord such as Christian piety conceived him.

VON DOBSCHÜTZ, *Christusbilder* in *Texte und Untersuchungen*, XVIII (Leipzig, 1899), supplement, 308–29; KRAUS, *Real-Encyklopädie der christlichen Alterthümer*, s. v.; HARNACK in HERZOG, *Realencyklopädie*, VIII (1881), 548; VIG., *Dict. de la Bible.*

A. J. MAAS.

Leo I (THE GREAT), SAINT, POPE (440–61), place and date of birth unknown; d. 10 November, 461. Leo's pontificate, next to that of St. Gregory I, is the most significant and important in Christian antiquity. At a time when the Church was experiencing the greatest obstacles to her progress in consequence of the hastening disintegration of the Western Empire, while the Orient was profoundly agitated over dogmatic controversies, this great pope, with far-seeing sagacity and powerful hand, guided the destiny of the Roman and Universal Church. According to the "Liber Pontificalis" (ed. Mommsen, I, 101 sqq., ed. Duchesne, I, 238 sqq.), Leo was a native of Tuscany and his father's name was Quintianus. Our earliest certain historical information about Leo reveals him a deacon of the Roman Church under Pope Celestine I (422–32). Even during this period he was known outside of Rome, and had some relations with Gaul, since Cassianus in 430 or 431 wrote at Leo's suggestion his work "De Incarnatione Domini contra Nestorium" (Migne, P. L., L, 9 sqq.), prefacing it with a letter of dedication to Leo. About this time Cyril of Alexandria appealed to Rome against the pretensions of Bishop Juvenal of Jerusalem. From an assertion of Leo's in a letter of later date (ep. cxvi, ed. Ballerini, I, 1212; II, 1528), it is not very clear whether Cyril wrote to him in the capacity of Roman deacon, or to Pope Celestine. During the pontificate of Sixtus III (432–40), Leo was sent to Gaul by Emperor Valentinian III to settle a dispute and bring about a reconciliation between Aëtius, the chief military commander of the province, and the chief magistrate, Albinus. This commission is a proof of the great confidence placed in the clever and able deacon by the Imperial Court. Sixtus III died on 19 August, 440, while Leo was in

Gaul, and the latter was chosen his successor. Returning to Rome, Leo was consecrated on 29 September of the same year, and governed the Roman Church for the next twenty-one years.

Leo's chief aim was to sustain the unity of the Church. Not long after his elevation to the Chair of Peter, he saw himself compelled to combat energetically the heresies which seriously threatened church unity even in the West. Leo had ascertained through Bishop Septimus of Altinum, that in Aquileia priests, deacons, and clerics, who had been adherents of Pelagius, were admitted to communion without an explicit abjuration of their heresy. The pope sharply censured this procedure, and directed that a provincial synod should be assembled in Aquileia, at which such persons were to be required to abjure Pelagianism publicly and to subscribe to an unequivocal confession of Faith (epp. i and ii). This zealous pastor waged war even more strenuously against Manichæism, inasmuch as its adherents, who had been driven from Africa by the Vandals, had settled in Rome, and had succeeded in establishing a secret Manichæan community there. The pope ordered the faithful to point out these heretics to the priests, and in 443, together with the senators and presbyters, conducted in person an investigation, in the course of which the leaders of the community were examined. In several sermons he emphatically warned the Christians of Rome to be on their guard against this reprehensible heresy, and repeatedly charged them to give information about its followers, their dwellings, acquaintances, and rendezvous (Sermo ix, 4, xvi, 4; xxiv, 4; xxxiv, 4 sq.; xlii, 4 sq.; lxxvi, 6). A number of Manichæans were converted and admitted to confession; others, who remained obdurate, were in obedience to imperial decrees banished from Rome by the civil magistrates. On 30 January, 444, the pope sent a letter to all the bishops of Italy, to which he appended the documents containing his proceedings against the Manichæans in Rome, and warned them to be on their guard and to take action against the followers of the sect (ep. vii). On 19 June, 445, Emperor Valentinian III issued, doubtless at the pope's instigation, a stern edict in which he established severe punishments for the Manichæans ("Epist. Leonis", ed. Ballerini, I, 626; ep. viii inter Leon. ep.). Prosper of Aquitaine states in his "Chronicle" (ad an. 447; "Mon. Germ. hist. Auct. antiquissimi", IX, I, 341 sqq.) that, in consequence of Leo's energetic measures, the Manichæans were also driven out of the provinces, and even Oriental bishops emulated the pope's example in regard to this sect. In Spain the heresy of Priscillianism still survived, and for some time had been attracting fresh adherents. Bishop Turibius of Astorga became cognizant of this, and by extensive journeys collected minute information about the condition of the churches and the spread of Priscillianism. He compiled the errors of the heresy, wrote a refutation of the same, and sent these documents to several African bishops. He also sent a copy to the pope, whereupon the latter sent a lengthy letter to Turibius (ep. xv) in refutation of the errors of the Priscillianists. Leo at the same time ordered that a council of bishops belonging to the neighbouring provinces should be convened to institute a rigid enquiry, with the object of determining whether any of the bishops had become tainted with the poison of this heresy. Should any such be discovered, they were to be excommunicated without hesitation. The pope also addressed a similar letter to the bishops of the Spanish provinces, notifying them that a universal synod of all the chief pastors was to be summoned; if this should be found to be impossible, the bishops of Galicia at least should be assembled. These two synods were in fact held in Spain to deal with the points at issue (Hefele, "Konziliengesch." II, 2nd ed., pp. 306 sqq.).

The greatly disorganized ecclesiastical condition of certain countries, resulting from national migrations, demanded closer bonds between their episcopate and Rome for the better promotion of ecclesiastical life. Leo, with this object in view, determined to make use of the papal vicariate of the bishops of Arles for the province of Gaul for the creation of a centre for the Gallican episcopate in immediate union with Rome. In the beginning his efforts were greatly hampered by his conflict with St. Hilary, then Bishop of Arles (see HILARY OF ARLES, SAINT). Even earlier, conflicts had arisen relative to the vicariate of the bishops of Arles and its privileges. Hilary made excessive use of his authority over other ecclesiastical provinces, and claimed that all bishops should be consecrated by him, instead of by their own metropolitan. When, for example, the complaint was raised that Bishop Celidonius of Besançon had been consecrated in violation of the canons—the grounds alleged being that he had, as a layman, married a widow, and, as a public officer, had given his consent to a death sentence—Hilary deposed him, and consecrated Importunus as his successor. Celidonius thereupon appealed to the pope and set out in person for Rome. About the same time Hilary, as if the see concerned had been vacant, consecrated another bishop to take the place of a certain Bishop Projectus, who was ill. Projectus recovered, however, and he too laid a complaint at Rome about the action of the Bishop of Arles. Hilary then went himself to Rome to justify his proceedings. The pope assembled a Roman synod (about 445) and, when the complaints brought against Celidonius could not be verified, reinstated the latter in his see. Projectus also received his bishopric again. Hilary returned to Arles before the synod was over; the pope deprived him of jurisdiction over the other Gallic provinces and of metropolitan rights over the province of Vienne, only allowing him to retain his Diocese of Arles.

These decisions were disclosed by Leo in a letter to the bishops of the Province of Vienne (ep. x). At the same time he sent them an edict of Valentinian III of 8 July, 445, in which the pope's measures in regard to St. Hilary were supported, and the primacy of the Bishop of Rome over the whole Church solemnly recognized ("Epist. Leonis," ed. Ballerini, I, 642). On his return to his bishopric Hilary sought a reconciliation with the pope. After this there arose no further difficulties between these two saintly men and, after his death in 449, Hilary was declared by Leo as "beatæ memoriæ". To Bishop Ravennius, St. Hilary's successor in the see of Arles, and the bishops of that province, Leo addressed most cordial letters in 449 on the election of the new metropolitan (epp. xl, xli). When Ravennius consecrated a little later a new bishop to take the place of the deceased Bishop of Vaison, the Archbishop of Vienne, who was then in Rome, took exception to this action. The bishops of the province of Arles then wrote a joint letter to the pope, in which they begged him to restore to Ravennius the rights of which his predecessor Hilary had been deprived (ep. lxv inter ep. Leonis). In his reply dated 5 May, 450 (ep. lxvi), Leo acceded to their request. The Archbishop of Vienne was to retain only the suffragan Bishoprics of Valence, Tarentaise, Geneva, and Grenoble; all the other sees in the Province of Vienne were made subject to the Archbishop of Arles, who also became again the mediator between the Holy See and the whole Gallic episcopate. Leo transmitted to Ravennius (ep. lxvii), for communication to the other Gallican bishops, his celebrated letter to Flavian of Constantinople on the Incarnation. Ravennius thereupon convened a synod, at which forty-four chief pastors assembled. In their synodal letter of 451, they affirm that they accept the pope's letter as a symbol of faith (ep. xcix inter ep. Leonis). In his answer Leo speaks further of the condemnation of Nestorius (ep. cii). The Vicariate of

Arles for a long time retained the position Leo had accorded it. Another papal vicariate was that of the bishops of Thessalonica, whose jurisdiction extended over Illyria. The special duty of this vicariate was to protect the rights of the Holy See over the district of Eastern Illyria, which belonged to the Eastern Empire. Leo bestowed the vicariate upon Bishop Anastasius of Thessalonica, just as Pope Siricius had formerly entrusted it to Bishop Anysius. The vicar was to consecrate the metropolitans, to assemble in a synod all bishops of the Province of Eastern Illyria, to oversee their administration of their office; but the most important matters were to be submitted to Rome (epp. v, vi, xiii). But Anastasius of Thessalonica used his authority in an arbitrary and despotic manner, so much so that he was severely reproved by Leo, who sent him fuller directions for the exercise of his office (ep. xiv).

In Leo's conception of his duties as supreme pastor, the maintenance of strict ecclesiastical discipline occupied a prominent place. This was particularly important at a time when the continual ravages of the barbarians were introducing disorder into all conditions of life, and the rules of morality were being seriously violated. Leo used his utmost energy in maintaining this discipline, insisted on the exact observance of the ecclesiastical precepts, and did not hesitate to rebuke when necessary. Letters (ep. xvii) relative to these and other matters were sent to the different bishops of the Western Empire—e. g., to the bishops of the Italian provinces (epp. iv, xix, clxvi, clxviii), and to those of Sicily, who had tolerated deviations from the Roman Liturgy in the administration of Baptism (ep. xvi), and concerning other matters (ep. xvii). A very important disciplinary decree was sent to Bishop Rusticus of Narbonne (ep. clxvii). Owing to the dominion of the Vandals in Latin North Africa, the position of the Church there had become extremely gloomy. Leo sent the Roman priest Potentius thither to inform himself about the exact condition, and to forward a report to Rome. On receiving this Leo sent a letter of detailed instructions to the episcopate of the province about the adjustment of numerous ecclesiastical and disciplinary questions (ep. xii). Leo also sent a letter to Dioscurus of Alexandria on 21 July, 445, urging him to the strict observance of the canons and discipline of the Roman Church (ep. ix). The primacy of the Roman Church was thus manifested under this pope in the most various and distinct ways. But it was especially in his interposition in the confusion of the Christological quarrels, which then so profoundly agitated Eastern Christendom, that Leo most brilliantly revealed himself the wise, learned, and energetic shepherd of the Church (see Monophysitism). From his first letter on this subject, written to Eutyches on 1 June, 448 (ep. xx), to his last letter written to the new orthodox Patriarch of Alexandria, Timotheus Salophaciolus, on 18 August, 460 (ep. clxxi), we cannot but admire the clear, positive, and systematic manner in which Leo, fortified by the primacy of the Holy See, took part in this difficult entanglement. For particulars refer to the articles: Eutyches; Flavian, Saint; Ephesus, Robber Council of.

Eutyches appealed to the pope after he had been excommunicated by Flavian, Patriarch of Constantinople, on account of his Monophysite views. The pope, after investigating the disputed question, sent his sublime dogmatic letter to Flavian (ep. xxviii), concisely setting forth and confirming the doctrine of the Incarnation, and the union of the Divine and human natures in the one Person of Christ. In 449 the council, which was designated by Leo as the "Robber Synod", was held. Flavian and other powerful prelates of the East appealed to the pope. The latter sent urgent letters to Constantinople, particularly to Emperor Theodosius II and Empress Pulcheria, urging them to convene a general council in order to restore peace to the Church. To the same end he used his influence with the Western emperor, Valentinian III, and his mother Galla Placidia, especially during their visit to Rome in 450. This general council was held in Chalcedon in 451 under Marcian, the successor of Theodosius. It solemnly accepted Leo's dogmatical epistle to Flavian as an expression of the Catholic Faith concerning the Person of Christ. The pope confirmed the decrees of the Council after eliminating the canon, which elevated the Patriarchate of Constantinople, while diminishing the rights of the ancient Oriental patriarchs. On 21 March, 453, Leo issued a circular letter confirming his dogmatic definition (ep. cxiv). Through the mediation of Bishop Julian of Cos, who was at that time the papal ambassador in Constantinople, the pope tried to protect further ecclesiastical interests in the Orient. He persuaded the new Emperor of Constantinople, Leo I, to remove the heretical and irregular patriarch, Timotheus Ailurus, from the See of Alexandria. A new and orthodox patriarch, Timotheus Salophaciolus, was chosen to fill his place, and received the congratulations of the pope in the last letter which Leo ever sent to the Orient.

In his far-reaching pastoral care of the Universal Church, in the West and in the East, the pope never neglected the domestic interests of the Church at Rome. When Northern Italy had been devastated by Attila Leo by a personal encounter with the King of the Huns prevented him from marching upon Rome. At the emperor's wish, Leo, accompanied by the Consul Avienus and the Prefect Trigetius, went in 452 to Upper Italy, and met Attila at Mincio in the vicinity of Mantua, obtaining from him the promise that he would withdraw from Italy and negotiate peace with the emperor. The pope also succeeded in obtaining another great favour for the inhabitants of Rome. When in 455 the city was captured by the Vandals under Genseric, although for a fortnight the town had been plundered, Leo's intercession obtained a promise that the city should not be injured and that the lives of the inhabitants should be spared. These incidents show the high moral authority enjoyed by the pope, manifested even in temporal affairs. Leo was always on terms of intimacy with the Western Imperial Court. In 450 Emperor Valentinian III visited Rome, accompanied by his wife Eudoxia and his mother Galla Placidia. On the feast of Cathedra Petri (22 February), the Imperial family with their brilliant retinue took part in the solemn services at St. Peter's, upon which occasion the pope delivered an impressive sermon. Leo was also active in building and restoring churches. He built a basilica over the grave of Pope Cornelius in the Via Appia. The roof of St. Paul's without the Walls having been destroyed by lightning, he had it replaced, and undertook other improvements in the basilica. He persuaded Empress Galla Placidia, as seen from the inscription, to have executed the great mosaic of the Arch of Triumph, which has survived to our day. Leo also restored St. Peter's on the Vatican. During his pontificate a pious Roman lady, named Demetria, erected on her property on the Via Appia a basilica in honour of St. Stephen, the ruins of which have been excavated.

Leo was no less active in the spiritual elevation of the Roman congregations, and his sermons, of which ninety-six genuine examples have been preserved, are remarkable for their profundity, clearness of diction, and elevated style. The first five of these, which were delivered on the anniversaries of his consecration, manifest his lofty conception of the dignity of his office, as well as his thorough conviction of the primacy of the Bishop of Rome, shown forth in so outspoken and decisive a manner by his whole activity as supreme pastor. Of his letters, which are of great importance for church history, 143 have come down to us: we also possess thirty which were sent to him. The

so-called "Sacramentarium Leonianum" is a collection of orations and prefaces of the Mass, prepared in the second half of the sixth century. Leo died on 10 November, 461, and was buried in the vestibule of St. Peter's on the Vatican. In 688 Pope Sergius had his remains transferred to the basilica itself, and a special altar erected over them. They rest to-day in St. Peter's, beneath the altar specially dedicated to St. Leo. In 1754 Benedict XIV exalted him to the dignity of Doctor of the Church (*doctor ecclesiæ*). In the Latin Church the feast day of the great pope is held on 11 April, and in the Eastern Church on 18 February.

Leonis Opera omnia, ed. ARDICINIO DELLA PORTA (Rome, 1470); ed. QUESNEL (2 vols., Paris, 1675); edd. PETRUS AND HIERONYMUS BALLERINI (3 vols., Venice, 1753–7); ed. in *P. L.*, LIV–VI; AMELLI, *S. Leone Magno e l'Oriente* (Rome, 1882; Montecassino, 1890); MOMMSEN in *Neues Archiv*, XI (1886), 361–8; JAFFÉ, *Regesta Rom. Pont.*, 2nd ed., I, 58 sqq.; VON NOSTITZ-RIENECK, *Die Briefe Papst Leos I. im Codex Monacen. 14540* in *Historisches Jahrbuch* (1897), 117–33; IDEM, *Die päpstlichen Urkunden für Thessalonike und deren Kritik durch Prof. Friedrich* in *Zeitschr. für kath. Theologie* (1897), 1–50. Translation of letters and sermons given in FELTOE, *A select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, XII (2nd series, New York, 1896); *Sacramentarium Leonianum*, ed. FELTOE (Cambridge, 1897). Concerning the *Sacramentarium*, cf. DUCHESNE, *Christian Worship; its origin and evolution* (London, 1903), 135 sqq.; and PROBST, *Die ältesten römischen Sakramentarien und Ordines erklärt* (Münster, 1892).—*Liber Pontificalis*, ed. DUCHESNE, I, 238 sqq.; TILLEMONT, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire eccléss.*, XV, 414 sqq.; ARENDT, *Leo der Grosse u. seine Zeit* (Mainz, 1835); PERTHEL, *Papst Leos I. Leben u. Lehren* (Jena, 1843); DE SAINT-CHÉRON, *Hist. du Pontificat de Saint-Léon le Grand* (Paris, 1845; 2nd ed., 1861–4); FR. AND P. BÖHRINGER, *Die Väter des Papsttums Leo I. und Gregor I* in *Die Kirche Christi u. ihre Zeugen* (Stuttgart, 1879); BERTANI, *Vita di Leone Magno* (3 vols., Monza, 1880–2); GORE in *Dict. Christ. Biog.* (London, 1882), s. v.; LANGEN, *Gesch. der röm. Kirche*, II (Bonn, 1885), 1 sqq.; GRISAR, *Gesch. Roms u. der Päpste im Mittelalter*, I, 308 sqq.; IDEM, *Il Primato romano nel secolo quinto* in *Analecta Romana*, I (Rome, 1900), 307–52); IDEM, *Rom u. die frankische Kirche vornehmlich im VI. Jahrhundert* in *Zeitschr. für kath. Theologie* (1890), 447–93; GUNDLACH, *Der Streit der Bistümer Arles u. Vienne um den Primatus Galliarum* in *Neues Archiv* (1889), 250 sqq.; (1890), 9 sqq., 233 sqq.; KUHN, *Die Christologie Leos I. des Grossen* (Würzburg, 1894); HEFELE, *Konziliengesch.*, II (2nd ed.), passim.

J. P. KIRSCH.

Leo II, SAINT, POPE (682–83), date of birth unknown; d. 28 June, 683. He was a Sicilian, and son of one Paul. Though elected pope a few days after the death of St. Agatho (10 Jan., 681), he was not consecrated till after the lapse of a year and seven months (17 Aug., 682). Under Leo's predecessor St. Agatho, negotiations had been opened between the Holy See and Emperor Constantine Pogonatus concerning the relations of the Byzantine Court to papal elections. Constantine had already promised Agatho to abolish or reduce the tax which for about a century the popes had had to pay to the imperial treasury on the occasion of their consecration, and under Leo's successor he made other changes in what had hitherto been required of the Roman Church at the time of a papal election. In all probability, therefore, it was continued correspondence on this matter which caused the delay of the imperial confirmation of Leo's election, and hence the long postponement of his consecration. The most important act accomplished by Leo in his short pontificate was his confirmation of the acts of the Sixth Œcumenical Council (680–1). This council had been held in Constantinople against the Monothelites, and had been presided over by the legates of Pope Agatho. After Leo had notified the emperor that the decrees of the council had been confirmed by him, he proceeded to make them known to the nations of the West. The letters which he sent for this end to the king and to the bishops and nobles of Spain have come down to us. In them he explained what the council had effected, and he called upon the bishops to subscribe to its decrees. At the same time he was at pains to make it clear that in condemning his predecessor Honorius I, he did so, not because he taught heresy, but because he was not active enough in opposing it. In accordance with the papal mandate, a synod was held at Toledo (684) in which the Council of Constantinople was accepted.

The fact that Ravenna had long been the residence of the emperors or of their representatives, the exarchs, had awakened the ambition of its archbishops. They aspired to the privileges of patriarchs and desired to be autocephalous, i. e. free from the direct jurisdiction of the pope, considered as their primate. As they could not succeed in inducing the popes to agree to their wishes, they attempted to secure their accomplishment by an imperial decree recognizing them as autocephalous. But this did not prove sufficient to enable the archbishops to effect their purpose, and Leo obtained from Constantine Pogonatus the revocation of the edict of Constans. On his side, however, Leo abolished the tax which the archbishops had been accustomed to pay when they received the pallium. And though he insisted that the archbishops-elect must come to Rome to be consecrated, he consented to the arrangement that they should not be obliged to remain in Rome more than eight days at the time of their consecration, and that, while they were not to be bound to come again to Rome themselves in order to offer their homage to the pope, they were each year to send a delegate to do so in their name. Perhaps because he feared that the Lombards might again ravage the catacombs, Leo transferred thence many of the relics of the martyrs into a church which he built to receive them. This pope, who is called by his contemporary biographer both just and learned, is commemorated as a saint in the Roman Martyrology on 28 June.

Liber Pontificalis, ed. DUCHESNE, I (Paris, 1886), 359 sqq.; VILLANUÑO, *Summa Concil. Hispaniæ*, I (Barcelona, 1850), 310 sq.; *Acta SS.*, June, V, 375 sqq.; MANN, *Lives of the Popes*, I (London, 1902), pt. II, 49 sqq.

HORACE K. MANN.

Leo III, SAINT, POPE, date of birth unknown; d. 816. He was elected on the very day his predecessor was buried (26 Dec., 795), and consecrated on the following day. It is quite possible that this haste may have been due to a desire on the part of the Romans to anticipate any interference of the Franks with their freedom of election. Leo was a Roman, the son of Atyuppius and Elizabeth. At the time of his election he was Cardinal-Priest of St. Susanna, and seemingly also *vestiarius*, or chief of the pontifical treasury, or wardrobe. With the letter informing Charlemagne that he had been unanimously elected pope, Leo sent him the keys of the confession of St. Peter, and the standard of the city. This he did to show that he regarded the Frankish king as the protector of the Holy See. In return he received from Charlemagne letters of congratulation and a great part of the treasure which the king had captured from the Avars. The acquisition of this wealth was one of the causes which enabled Leo to be such a great benefactor to the churches and charitable institutions of Rome.

Prompted by jealousy or ambition, or by feelings of hatred and revenge, a number of the relatives of Pope Adrian I formed a plot to render Leo unfit to hold his sacred office. On the occasion of the procession of the Greater Litanies (25 April, 799), when the pope was making his way towards the Flaminian Gate, he was suddenly attacked by a body of armed men. He was dashed to the ground, and an effort was made to root out his tongue and tear out his eyes. After he had been left for a time bleeding in the street, he was hurried off at night to the monastery of St. Erasmus on the Cœlian. There, in what seemed quite a miraculous manner, he recovered the full use of his eyes and tongue. Escaping from the monastery, he betook himself to Charlemagne, accompanied by many of the Romans. He was received by the Frankish king with the greatest honour at Paderborn, although his enemies had filled the king's ears with malicious accu-

sations against him. After a few months' stay in Germany, the Frankish monarch caused him to be escorted back to Rome, where he was received with every demonstration of joy by the whole populace, natives and foreigners. The pope's enemies were then tried by Charlemagne's envoys and, being unable to establish either Leo's guilt or their own innocence, were sent as prisoners to France (Frankland). In the following year (800) Charlemagne himself came to Rome, and the pope and his accusers were brought face to face. The assembled bishops declared that they had no right to judge the pope; but Leo of his own free will, in order, as he said, to dissipate any suspicions in men's minds, declared on oath that he was wholly guiltless of the charges which had been brought against him. At his special request the death sentence which had been passed upon his principal enemies was commuted into a sentence of exile.

A few days later, Leo and Charlemagne again met. It was on Christmas Day in St. Peter's. After the Gospel had been sung, the pope approached Charlemagne, who was kneeling before the Confession of St. Peter, and placed a crown upon his head. The assembled multitude at once made the basilica ring with the shout: "To Charles, the most pious Augustus, crowned by God, to our great and pacific emperor life and victory!" By this act was revived the Empire in the West, and, in theory, at least, the world was declared by the Church subject to one temporal head, as Christ had made it subject to one spiritual head. It was understood that the first duty of the new emperor was to be the protector of the Roman Church and of Christendom against the heathen. With a view to combining the East and West under the effective rule of Charlemagne, Leo strove to further the project of a marriage between him and the Eastern empress Irene. Her deposition, however (801), prevented the realization of this excellent plan. Some three years after the departure of Charlemagne from Rome (801), Leo again crossed the Alps to see him (804). According to some he went to discuss with the emperor the division of his territories between his sons. At any rate, two years later, he was invited to give his assent to the emperor's provisions for the said partition. Equally while acting in harmony with the pope, Charlemagne combatted the heresy of Adoptionism which had arisen in Spain; but he went somewhat further than his spiritual guide when he wished to bring about the general insertion of the *Filioque* in the Nicene Creed. The two were, however, acting together when Salzburg was made the metropolitical city for Bavaria, and when Fortunatus of Grado was compensated for the loss of his see of Grado by the gift of that of Pola. The joint action of the pope and the emperor was felt even in England. Through it Eardulf of Northumbria recovered his kingdom, and the dispute between Eanbald, Archbishop of York, and Wulfred, Archbishop of Canterbury, was regulated.

Leo had, however, many relations with England solely on his own account. By his command the synod of Beccanceld (or Clovesho, 803) condemned the appointing of laymen as superiors of monasteries. In accordance with the wishes of Ethelheard, Archbishop of Canterbury, Leo excommunicated Eadbert Praen for seizing the throne of Kent, and withdrew the pallium which had been granted to Lichfield, authorizing the restoration of the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the See of Canterbury "just as St. Gregory the Apostle and Master of the nation of the English had arranged it". Leo was also called upon to intervene in the quarrels between Archbishop Wulfred and Cenulf, King of Mercia. Very little is known of the real causes of the misunderstandings between them, but, whoever was the more to blame, the archbishop seems to have had the more to suffer. The king appears to have induced the pope to suspend him from the exercise of his episcopal functions, and to keep the kingdom under a kind of interdict for a period of six years. Till the hour of his death (822), greed of gold caused Cenulf to continue his persecution of the archbishop. It also caused him to persecute the monastery of Abingdon, and it was not until he had received from its abbot a large sum of money that, acting, as he declared, at the request of "the lord Apostolic and most glorious Pope Leo", he decreed the inviolability of the monastery.

During the pontificate of Leo, the Church of Constantinople was in a state of unrest. The monks, who at this period were flourishing under the guidance of such men as St. Theodore the Studite, were suspicious of what they conceived to be the lax principles of their patriarch Tarasius, and were in vigorous opposition to the evil conduct of their emperor Constantine VI. To be free to marry Theodota, their sovereign had divorced his wife Maria. Though Tarasius condemned the conduct of Constantine, still, to avoid greater evils, he refused, to the profound disgust of the monks, to excommunicate him. For their condemnation of his new marriage Constantine punished the monks with imprisonment and exile. In their distress the monks turned for help to Leo, as they did when they were maltreated for opposing the arbitrary reinstatement of the priest whom Tarasius had degraded for marrying Constantine to Theodota. The pope replied, not merely with words of praise and encouragement, but also by the dispatch of rich presents; and, after Michael I came to the Byzantine throne, he ratified the treaty between him and Charlemagne which was to secure peace for East and West.

Not only in the last mentioned transaction, but in all matters of importance, did the pope and the Frankish emperor act in concert. It was on Charlemagne's advice that, to ward off the savage raids of the Saracens, Leo maintained a fleet, and caused his coast line to be regularly patrolled by his ships of war. But because he did not feel competent to keep the Moslem pirates out of Corsica, he entrusted the guarding of it to the emperor. Supported by Charlemagne, he was able to recover some of the patrimonies of the Roman Church in the neighbourhood of Gaeta, and again to administer them through his rectors. But when the great emperor died (28 Jan., 814), evil times once more broke on Leo. A fresh conspiracy was formed against him, but on this occasion the pope was apprised of it before it came to a head. He caused the chief conspirators to be seized and executed. No sooner had this plot been crushed than a number of nobles of the Campagna rose in arms and plundered the country. They were preparing to march on Rome itself, when they were overpowered by the Duke of Spoleto, acting under the orders of the King of Italy (Langobardia). The large sums of money which Charlemagne gave to the papal treasury enabled Leo to become an efficient helper of the poor and a patron of art, and to renovate the churches, not only of Rome, but even of Ravenna. He employed the imperishable art of mosaic not merely to portray the political relationship between Charlemagne and himself, but chiefly to decorate the churches, especially his titular church of St. Susanna. Up to the end of the sixteenth century a figure of Leo in mosaic was to be seen in that ancient church.

Leo III was buried in St. Peter's, (12 June, 816), where his relics are to be found along with those of Sts. Leo I, Leo II, and Leo IV. He was canonized in 1673. The silver *denarii* of Leo III still extant bear the name of the Frankish emperor upon them as well as that of Leo, showing thereby the emperor as the protector of the Church, and overlord of the city of Rome.

Liber Pontificalis, ed. DUCHESNE, II (Paris, 1892), 1 sqq.; *Codex Carolinus*, ed. JAFFÉ (Berlin, 1867); *Annales Einhardi*



ST. PETER GIVING THE PALLIUM TO LEO III AND THE STANDARD TO CHARLEMAGNE

COPY OF AN VIII-CENTURY MOSAIC IN THE TRICLINIUM OF LEO III, THE LATERAN, ROME

(so called) and other *Chronicles*, in *Mon. Germ.: Script.*, I; *Carmen de Carolo Magno*, in *P. L.*, XCVIII. Cf. BRYCE, *The Holy Roman Empire* (London, 1889); KLEINCLAUSZ, *L'Empire Carolingien* (Paris, 1902); HODGKIN, *Italy and her Invaders*, VIII (Oxford, 1899); BÖHMER, *Regesta Imperii*, ed. MÜHLBACHER, I (Innsbruck, 1908); MANN, *The Lives of the Popes in the Early Middle Ages*, II (London, 1906), 1 sqq.

HORACE K. MANN.

Leo IV, SAINT, POPE (847–55), a Roman and the son of Radoald, was unanimously elected to succeed Sergius II, and as the alarming attack of the Saracens on Rome in 846 caused the people to fear for the safety of the city, he was consecrated (10 April, 847) without the consent of the emperor. Leo received his early education at Rome in the monastery of St. Martin, near St. Peter's. His pious behaviour attracted the notice of Gregory IV, who made him a subdeacon; and he was created Cardinal-Priest of the church of the Quatuor Coronati by Sergius II. As soon as Leo, much against his will, became pope, he began to take precautions against a repetition of the Saracen raid of 846. He put the walls of the city into a thorough state of repair, entirely rebuilding fifteen of the great towers. He was the first to enclose the Vatican hill by a wall. To do this, he received money from the emperor, and help from all the cities and agricultural colonies (*domus cultæ*) of the Duchy of Rome. The work took him four years to accomplish, and the newly fortified portion was called the Leonine City, after him. In 852 the fortifications were completed, and were blessed by the pope with great solemnity.

Whilst the work of refortifying the city was in progress, a great fleet of the Saracens sailed for Rome, seemingly from Sardinia, but it was completely destroyed off Ostia by the allied fleets of Rome, Naples, Amalfi, and Gaeta, and by a tempest (849). When the rebuilding of the walls of Rome was accomplished, Leo rebuilt Portus, and handed it over to a number of Corsican exiles, whom the ravages of the Saracens had driven from their homes. Other cities too in the Roman duchy were fortified, either by the pope himself or in consequence of his exhortations. Leo also endeavoured to make good the damage which the Saracen raid of 846 had done to the different churches. St. Peter's had suffered very severely, and though as a whole it never again reached its former magnificence, Leo managed to make it in parts at least more beautiful than it had been before. St. Martin's, where he had been educated, the Quatuor Coronati, of which he had been the priest, the Lateran Palace, the Anglo-Saxon Borgo, Subiaco, and many other places both in Rome and out of it were renovated by the energetic Leo. It was by this pope that the church of S. Maria Nova was built, to replace S. Maria Antiqua, which the decaying Palace of the Cæsars threatened to engulf, and of which the ruins have recently been brought to light. In 850 Leo associated with Lothair in the empire his son Louis, by imposing on him the imperial crown. Three years later "he hallowed the child Alfred to king [says an old English historian] by anointing; and, receiving him for his own child by adoption, gave him confirmation, and sent him back [to England] with the bessing of St. Peter the Apostle."

The same year (853) he held an important synod in Rome, in which various decrees were passed for the furtherance of ecclesiastical discipline and learning, and for the condemnation of the refractory Anastasius, Cardinal of St. Marcellus, and sometime librarian of the Roman Church. Equally rebellious conduct on the part of John, Archbishop of Ravenna, forced Leo to undertake a journey to that city to inspire John and his accomplices with a respect for the law. It was while engaged in endeavouring to inspire another archbishop, Hincmar of Reims, with this same reverence, that Leo died. Another man who, till his death (851), defied the authority of the pope was Nomenoë, Duke of Brittany. Anxious to be independent of the imperial authority Nomenoë, in defiance both of Leo and Charles the Bald, not only deposed a number of bishops, but made new ones, and subjected them to a metropolitan see (Dol) of his own creation. It was not till the thirteenth century that the Archbishop of Tours recovered his jurisdiction over the Breton bishops. For consecrating a bishop outside his own diocese, St. Methodius, Patriarch of Constantinople, had suspended Gregory Asbestas, Bishop of Syracuse. St. Ignatius, who succeeded St. Methodius, in consequence forbade Gregory to be present at his consecration. This led Gregory to break all bounds. St. Ignatius accordingly caused him to be deposed, and begged the pope to confirm the deposition. This, however, Leo would not do, because, as he said, Ignatius had assembled bishops and deposed others without his knowledge, whereas he ought not to have done so "in the absence of our legates or of letters from us". Despite the fact that Leo was then in opposition to the Patriarch of Constantinople, one of his dependents, Daniel, a *magister militum*, accused him to the Frankish Emperor Louis of wishing to overthrow the domination of the Franks by a Greek alliance. Leo had, however, no difficulty in convincing Louis that the charge was absolutely groundless. Daniel was condemned to death and only escaped it by the intercession of the emperor. Shortly after this Leo died, and was buried in St. Peter's (17 July, 855). He is credited with being a worker of miracles both by his biographer and by the Patriarch Photius. His name is found in the Roman Martyrology.

Liber Pontificalis, ed. DUCHESNE, II, 106 sq.; his letters in *P. L.*, CXV, CXXIX; the letters of Hincmar in *P. L.*, CXXVI; the annals of Hincmar etc. *Mon. Germ. Hist.: Script.*, I; *Life of St. Ignatius* and other documents in LABBE, *Concilia*, VIII; cf. LANCIANI, *The Destruction of Ancient Rome* (London, 1901), 132 sq.; THURSTON, *The Roman Sacring of King Alfred* in *The Month* (Oct., 1901); FORTESCUE, *The Orthodox Eastern Church* (London, 1907), 136 sq.; DE BROLO, *Storia della Chiesa in Sicilia* (Palermo, 1884), II, 265 sq.; MANN, *Lives of the Popes*, II (London, 1902), 258 sqq.

HORACE K. MANN.

Leo V, POPE.—Very little is known of him. We have no certainty either as to when he was elected or as to exactly how long he reigned. It is highly probable that he was pope during August, 903. He was a native of Priapi, a small place in the district of Ardea. When chosen he was not one of the cardinal-priests of Rome, but was attached to some church outside the City. Hence, in contemporary catalogues of the popes he is called a *presbiter forensis*. Auxilius, a writer of the time, says that he held "the rudder of the Holy Roman Church" for thirty days, and that "he was a man of God and of praiseworthy life and holiness." Except that he issued a Bull exempting the canons of Bologna from the payment of taxes, we know of nothing that he did as pope. The circumstances of his death are as obscure as those of his life. After a pontificate of somewhat over a month he was seized by Christopher, Cardinal-Priest of St. Damasus, and cast into prison. The intruder promptly seated himself in the chair of Peter, but was soon after displaced by Sergius III. According to one authority, Sergius took "pity" on the two imprisoned pontiffs, and caused them both to be put to death. However, it seems more likely that Leo died a natural death in prison or in a monastery.

Liber Pontificalis, ed. DUCHESNE, II (Paris, 1892), 234; JAFFÉ, *Reg. Pontif.*, II (Leipzig, 1888), 746. Cf. MANN, *Lives of the Popes in the Early Middle Ages*, IV (London, 1906), 111 sqq.

HORACE K. MANN.

Leo VI, POPE.—The exact dates of the election and death of Leo VI are uncertain, but it is clear that he was pope during the latter half of 928. If, as some suppose, he was elected in June, 928, then he died in February, 929, as he reigned seven months and five days. Others, however, believe he became pope before the month of June. He was a Roman, the son of the *primicerius*, Christopher, who had been prime

minister of John VIII. When Leo became pope, he was Cardinal-Priest of St. Susanna. His immediate predecessor, John X, had been engaged in settling questions of ecclesiastical jurisdiction in Dalmatia; some of these were decided by Leo VI, and there is extant a Bull of his in which he states that he has granted the pallium to Archbishop John of Spalato, orders all the bishops of Dalmatia to obey him, and to confine their operations within the limits of their own dioceses, and instructs Bishop Gregory to be content with the Diocese of Scodra. The only other item of information regarding Leo which has reached us is that "according to most writers he was buried in St. Peter's".

Liber Pontificalis, ed. DUCHESNE, II (Paris, 1892), 242; MANN, *Lives of the Popes in the Early Middle Ages*, IV, 188.

HORACE K. MANN.

Leo VII, POPE, date of birth unknown; d. 13 July, 939. A Roman and priest of St. Sixtus, and probably a Benedictine monk, he was elected pope 3 January, 936. He seems to have been placed upon the Chair of Peter by the power of Alberic, prince and senator of the Romans. Alberic's authority in Rome was disputed by Hugo, who bore the title of King of Italy (Langobardia). The city was being besieged by Hugo when the famous Odo, Abbot of Cluny, reached it. He had been summoned by Leo, who knew his great influence with both Alberic and Hugo, to make peace between them. Odo accomplished the desires of the pope, and a marriage between Alberic and Hugo's daughter Alda effected at least a temporary understanding between the belligerents. The Bulls of Leo consist for the most part of grants of privilege to various monasteries, especially to Cluny. One, however, is a letter to Frederick, Archbishop of Mainz. With a view to co-operating in the work of reform which was being accomplished in Germany by Henry I (the Fowler) and his son Otho I, Leo named Frederick his vicar throughout all Germany, with power to proceed against all erring clerics. He would not, however, allow the archbishop to baptize the Jews by force, though he did authorize their expulsion from the cities on their refusal to embrace Christianity.

Liber Pontificalis, ed. DUCHESNE, II (Paris, 1892), 244; JAFFÉ, *Reg. Pontif.*, I (Leipzig, 1888), 3597 sqq.; MANN, *Lives of the Popes in the Early Middle Ages*, IV (London, 1906), 205 sqq.

HORACE K. MANN.

Leo VIII, POPE, date of birth unknown; d. between 20 February and 13 April, 965. When the Emperor Otho I illegally brought about the deposition of the unworthy Pope John XII (Nov., 963), he equally illegally caused to be elected, to fill his place, a layman, "Leo, the venerable protonotary". Leo was a Roman and the son of one John. His family was well known in the Clivus Argentarii (now Via di Marforio, between the Corso and the Forum Romanum), and he himself gave his name to various streets in the neighbourhood of his home. Chosen pope on 4 December, he was consecrated Bishop of Rome on 6 December, all the lesser orders having, in violation of the canon law, been bestowed upon him in the meantime by Sico, Bishop of Ostia. A few weeks after Leo's consecration, the Romans made a vain effort to overthrow the authority of the emperor. They were severely punished for their attempt; but, through the intercession of Leo, Otho restored to them the hostages he had received from them. No sooner, however, did the emperor leave Rome, than the people rose and expelled his nominee (Feb., 964). John XII at once returned to the city, summoned a council, condemned Leo "one of the employees of our curia, who has broken his faith with us", and degraded those clerics who had been ordained by him. Soon after this John died (14 May, 964), and the Romans unwisely elected to succeed him the Cardinal-Deacon Benedict. Indignant at the expulsion of Leo, and the election of Benedict, Otho hurried to Rome, and was soon in possession of both it and the new pope. Leo returned with the emperor, and at once brought Benedict to trial. With the consent of all his would-be judges, Benedict was degraded to the rank of a deacon, Leo himself tearing the pallium from his shoulders (July, 964). If it be the fact, as is asserted by a contemporary, that Benedict acquiesced in his deposition, and if, as seems certain, no further protest was made against Leo's position, he may well be regarded as a true pope from July, 964, to his death in 965, about the month of March.

No extant records inform us of any deeds which Leo performed during the period when he may be safely regarded as a true pope. He is said, indeed, to have given Otho the right of nominating any one he chose to be pope or bishop, and to have restored to Otho all the lands which his predecessors had bestowed upon the papacy. It is generally allowed, however, that the documents which make these statements are imperial productions forged during the investiture quarrel.

Liber Pontificalis, ed. DUCHESNE, II (Paris, 1892), 250; LIUTPRAND, *Hist. Ottonis* (Hanover, 1877), ix sqq.; *Ann. Altahenses majores* (Hanover, 1868), an., 963 sq.; JAFFÉ, *Reg.*, I (Leipzig, 1888), 467 sqq. Cf. FISHER, *The Medieval Empire*, II (London, 1897), 113; DUCHESNE, *The Beginnings of the Temporal Sovereignty of the Popes* (London, 1908), 222 sqq.; MANN, *The Lives of the Popes in the Early Middle Ages*, IV, 260–81.

HORACE K. MANN.

Leo IX, SAINT, POPE (1049–54), b. at Egisheim, near Colmar, on the borders of Alsace, 21 June, 1002; d. 19 April, 1054. He belonged to a noble family which had given or was to give saints to the Church and rulers to the Empire. He was named Bruno. His father Hugh was first cousin to Emperor Conrad, and both Hugh and his wife Heilewide were remarkable for their piety and learning. As a sign of the tender conscience which soon began to manifest itself in the saintly child, we are told that, though he had given abundant proofs of a bright mind, on one occasion he could not study out of an exceptionally beautiful book which his mother had bought and given to him. At length it transpired that the book had been stolen from the Abbey of St. Hubert in the Ardennes. When Heilewide had restored the volume to its rightful owners, the little Bruno's studies proceeded unchecked. When five years of age, he was committed to the care of the energetic Berthold, Bishop of Toul, who had a school for the sons of the nobility. Intelligent, graceful in body, and gracious in disposition, Bruno was a favourite with his schoolfellows. Whilst still a youth and at home for his holidays, he was attacked when asleep by some animal, and so much injured that for some time he lay between life and death. In that condition he saw, as he used afterwards to tell his friends, a vision of St. Benedict, who cured him by touching his wounds with a cross. This we are told by Leo's principal biographer, Wibert, who was his intimate friend when the saint was Bishop of Toul.

Bruno became a canon of St. Stephen's at Toul (1017), and though still quite young exerted a soothing influence on Herimann, the choleric successor of Bishop Berthold. When, in 1024, Conrad, Bruno's cousin, succeeded the Emperor Henry I, the saint's relatives sent him to the new king's court "to serve in his chapel". His virtue soon made itself felt, and his companions, to distinguish him from others who bore the same name, always spoke of him as "the good Bruno". In 1026 Conrad set out for Italy to make his authority respected in that portion of his dominions, and as Herimann, Bishop of Toul, was too old to lead his contingent into the peninsula, he entrusted the command of it to Bruno, then a deacon. There is reason to believe that this novel occupation was not altogether uncongenial to him, for soldiers seem always to have had an attraction for him. While he was thus in the midst of arms, Bishop Herimann died and Bruno was at once elected to succeed him.

Conrad, who destined him for higher things, was loath to allow him to accept that insignificant see. But Bruno, who was wholly disinclined for the higher things, and wished to live in as much obscurity as possible, induced his sovereign to permit him to take the see. Consecrated in 1027, Bruno administered the Diocese of Toul for over twenty years, in a season of stress and trouble of all kinds. He had to contend not merely with famine, but also with war, to which as a frontier town Toul was much exposed. Bruno, however, was equal to his position. He knew how to make peace, and, if necessary, to wield the sword in self-defence. Sent by Conrad to Robert the Pious, he established so firm a peace between France and the empire that it was not again broken even during the reigns of the sons of both Conrad and Robert. On the other hand, he held his episcopal city against Eudes, Count of Blois, a rebel against Conrad, and "by his wisdom and exertions" added Burgundy to the empire. It was whilst he was bishop that he was saddened by the death not merely of his father and mother, but also of two of his brothers. Amid his trials Bruno found some consolation in music, in which he proved himself very efficient.

The German Pope Damasus II died in 1048, and the Romans sent to ask Henry III, Conrad's successor, to let them have as the new pope either Halinard, Archbishop of Lyons, or Bruno. Both of them were favourably known to the Romans by what they had seen of them when they came to Rome on pilgrimage. Henry at once fixed upon Bruno, who did all he could to avoid the honour which his sovereign wished to impose upon him. When at length he was overcome by the combined importunities of the emperor, the Germans, and the Romans, he agreed to go to Rome, and to accept the papacy if freely elected thereto by the Roman people. He wished, at least, to rescue the See of Peter from its servitude to the German emperors. When, in company with Hildebrand he reached Rome, and presented himself to its people clad in pilgrim's guise and barefooted, but still tall, and fair to look upon, they cried out with one voice that him and no other would they have as pope. Assuming the name of Leo, he was solemnly enthroned 12 February, 1049. Before Leo could do anything in the matter of the reform of the Church on which his heart was set, he had first to put down another attempt on the part of the ex-Pope Benedict IX to seize the papal throne. He had then to attend to money matters, as the papal finances were in a deplorable condition. To better them he put them in the hands of Hildebrand, a man capable of improving anything.

He then began the work of reform which was to give the next hundred years a character of their own, and which his great successor Gregory VII was to carry so far forward. In April, 1049, he held a synod at which he condemned the two notorious evils of the day, simony and clerical incontinence. Then he commenced those journeys throughout Europe in the cause of a reformation of manners which gave him a pre-eminent right to be styled *Peregrinus Apostolicus*. Leaving Rome in May, he held a council of reform at Pavia, and pushed on through Germany to Cologne, where he joined the Emperor Henry III. In union with him he brought about peace in Lorraine by excommunicating the rebel Godfrey the Bearded. Despite the jealous efforts of King Henry I to prevent him from coming to France, Leo next proceeded to Reims, where he held an important synod, at which both bishops and abbots from England assisted. There also assembled in the city to see the famous pope an enormous number of enthusiastic people, "Spaniards, Bretons, Franks, Irish, and English". Besides excommunicating the Archbishop of Compostela (because he had ventured to assume the title of *Apostolicus*, reserved to the pope alone), and forbidding marriage between William (afterwards called the Conqueror) and Matilda of Flanders, the assembly issued many decrees of reform. On his way back to Rome Leo held another synod at Mainz, everywhere rousing public opinion against the great evils of the time as he went along, and everywhere being received with unbounded enthusiasm. It is apparently in connexion with this return journey that we have the first mention of the Golden Rose. The Abbess of Woffenheim, in return for certain privileges bestowed by the pope, had to send to Rome "a golden rose" before Lætare Sunday, on which day, says Leo, the popes are wont to carry it. Also before he returned to Rome, he discussed with Adalbert, Archbishop of Bremen, the formation of all the Scandinavian countries, including Iceland and Greenland, into a patriarchate, of which the see was to be Bremen. The scheme was never accomplished, but meanwhile Leo authorized the consecration by Adalbert of the first native bishop for Iceland.

In January, 1050, Leo returned to Rome, only to leave it again almost immediately for Southern Italy, whither the sufferings of its people called him. They were being heavily oppressed by the Normans. To the expostulations of Leo the wily Normans replied with promises, and when the pope, after holding a council at Siponto, returned to Rome, they continued their oppressions as before. At the usual paschal synod which Leo was in the habit of holding at Rome, the heresy of Berengarius of Tours was condemned—a condemnation repeated by the pope a few months later at Vercelli. Before the year 1050 had come to a close, Leo had begun his second transalpine journey. He went first to Toul, in order solemnly to translate the relics of Gerard, bishop of that city, whom he had just canonized, and then to Germany to interview the Emperor Henry the Black. One of the results of this meeting was that Hunfrid, Archbishop of Ravenna, was compelled by the emperor to cease acting as though he were the independent ruler of Ravenna and its district, and to submit to the pope. Returning to Rome, Leo held another of his paschal synods in April, 1051, and in July went to take possession of Benevento. Harassed by their enemies, the Beneventans concluded that their only hope of peace was to submit themselves to the authority of the pope. This they did, and received Leo into their city with the greatest honour. While in this vicinity, Leo again made further efforts to lessen the excesses of the Normans, but they were crippled by the native Lombards, who with as much folly as wickedness massacred a number of the Normans in Apulia. Realizing that nothing could then be done with the irate Norman survivors, Leo retraced his steps to Rome (1051).

The Norman question was henceforth ever present to the pope's mind. Constantly oppressed by the Normans, the people of Southern Italy ceased not to implore the pope to come and help them. The Greeks, fearful of being expelled from the peninsula altogether, begged Leo to co-operate with them against the common foe. Thus urged, Leo sought assistance on all sides. Failing to obtain it, he again tried the effect of personal mediation (1052). But again failure attended his efforts. He began to be convinced that appeal would have to be made to the sword. At this juncture an embassy arrived from the Hungarians, entreating him to come and make peace between them and the emperor. Again Leo crossed the Alps, but, thinking he was sure of success, Henry would not accept the terms proposed by the pope, with the result that his expedition against the Hungarians proved a failure. And though he at first undertook to let Leo have a German force to act against the Normans, he afterwards withdrew his promise, and the pope had to return to Italy with only a few German troops raised by his relatives (1053). In March, 1053, Leo was back in Rome. Finding the state of affairs in Southern Italy worse than ever, he raised what forces he

could among the Italian princes, and, declaring war on the Normans, tried to effect a junction with the Greek general. But the Normans defeated first the Greeks and then the pope at Civitella (June, 1053). After the battle Leo gave himself up to his conquerors, who treated him with the utmost respect and consideration, and professed themselves his soldiers.

Though he gained more by defeat than he could have gained by victory, Leo betook himself to Benevento, a broken-hearted man. The slain at Civitella were ever before him, and he was profoundly troubled by the attitude of Michael Cærularius, Patriarch of Constantinople. That ambitious prelate was determined, if possible, to have no superior in either Church or State. As early as 1042, he had struck the pope's name off the sacred diptychs, and soon proceeded, first in private and then in public, to attack the Latin Church because it used unfermented bread (azymes) in the Sacrifice of the Mass. At length, and that, too, in a most barbarous manner, he closed the Latin churches in Constantinople. In reply to this violence, Leo addressed a strong letter to Michael (Sept., 1053), and began to study Greek in order the better to understand the matters in dispute. However, if Michael had taken advantage of the pope's difficulties with the Normans to push his plans, the Greek Emperor, seeing that his hold on Southern Italy was endangered by the Norman success, put pressure on the patriarch to make him more respectful to the pope. To the conciliatory letters which Constantine and Cærularius now dispatched to Rome, Leo sent suitable replies (Jan., 1054), blaming the arrogance of the patriarch. His letters were conveyed by two distinguished cardinals, Humbert and Frederick, but he had departed this life before the momentous issue of his embassy was known in Rome. On 16 July, 1054, the two cardinals excommunicated Cærularius, and the East was finally cut off from the body of the Church.

The annals of England show that Leo had many relations with that country, and its saintly King Edward. He dispensed the king from a vow which he had taken to make a pilgrimage to Rome, on condition that he give alms to the poor, and endow a monastery in honour of St. Peter. Leo also authorized the translation of the See of Crediton to Exeter, and forbade the consecration of the unworthy Abbot of Abingdon (Spearhafoc) as Bishop of London. Throughout the troubles which Robert of Jumièges, Archbishop of Canterbury, had with the family of Earl Godwin, he received the support of the pope, who sent him the pallium and condemned Stigand, the usurper of his see (1053?). King Macbeth, the supposed murderer of Duncan, whom Shakespeare has immortalized, is believed to have visited Rome during Leo's pontificate, and may be thought to have exposed the needs of his soul to that tender father. After the battle of Civitella Leo never recovered his spirits. Seized at length with a mortal illness, he caused himself to be carried to Rome (March, 1054), where he died a most edifying death. He was buried in St. Peter's, was a worker of miracles both in life and in death, and found a place in the Roman Martyrology.

WIBERT and other contemporary biographers of the saint in WATTERICH, *Pont. Rom. Vitæ*, I (Leipzig, 1862); *P. L.*, CXLIII, etc.; ANSELM OF REIMS, *ibid.*, CXLII; LIBUIN in WATTERICH and in *P. L.*, CXLIII; see also BONIZO OF SUTRI, ST. PETER DAMIAN, LANFRANC, and other contemporaries of the saint. His letters are to be found in *P. L.*, CXLIII; cf. DELARC, *Un pape Alsacien* (Paris, 1876); BRUCKER, *L'Alsace et l'église au temps du pape S. Léon* (Paris, 1889); MARTIN, *S. Léon IX* (Paris, 1904); BRÉHIER, *Le Schisme Oriental du XI^e Siècle* (Paris, 1899); FORTESCUE, *The Orthodox Eastern Church* (London, 1907), v; MANN, *Lives of the Popes*, VI (London, 1910). HORACE K. MANN.

Leo X, POPE (GIOVANNI DE' MEDICI), b. at Florence, 11 December, 1475; d. at Rome, 1 December, 1521, was the second son of Lorenzo the Magnificent (1469–1492) and Clarice Orsini, and from his earliest youth was destined for the Church. He received tonsure in 1482 and in 1483 was made Abbot of Font Douce in the French Diocese of Saintes and appointed Apostolic prothonotary by Sixtus IV. All the benefices which the Medici could obtain were at his disposal; he consequently became possessed of the rich Abbey of Passignano in 1484 and in 1486 of Monte Cassino. Owing to the constant pressure brought to bear by Lorenzo and his envoys, Innocent VIII in 1489, created the thirteen year old child a cardinal, on condition that he should dispense with the insignia and the privileges of his office for three years. Meanwhile his education was completed by the most distinguished Humanists and scholars, Angelo Poliziano, Marsilio Ficino, and Bernardo Dovizi (later Cardinal Bibbiena). From 1489 to 1491 Giovanni de' Medici studied theology and canon law, at Pisa, under Filippo Decio and Bartolomeo Sozzini. On 9 March, 1492, at Fiesole, he was invested with the insignia of a cardinal and on 22 March entered Rome. The next day the pope received him in consistory with the customary ceremonies. The Romans found the youthful cardinal more mature than his age might warrant them to expect. His father sent him an impressive letter of advice marked by good sense and knowledge of human nature, besides bearing witness to the high and virtuous sentiments to which the elder Lorenzo returned towards the end of his life. In this letter he enjoins upon his son certain rules of conduct, and admonishes him to be honourable, virtuous, and exemplary, the more so as the College of Cardinals at that time was deficient in these good qualities.

In the very next month Lorenzo's death recalled the cardinal to Florence. He returned once more to Rome for the papal election, which resulted, very much against his approval, in the elevation of the unworthy Alexander VI, after which Giovanni remained in Florence from August, 1492, until the expulsion of the Medici in 1494, when he fled from his native city in the habit of a Franciscan monk. After several fruitless attempts to restore the supremacy of his family, he went on a long journey through Germany, Holland, and France, from which he returned to Rome in 1500. There, in keeping with the habits of his family, he led the life of a literary and artistic amateur. Patronage, liberality, and poor financial administration frequently reduced him even then to distressing straits; indeed, he remained a bad manager to the last. But though his manner of life was quite worldly he excelled in dignity, propriety, and irreproachable conduct most of the cardinals. Towards the end of the pontificate of Julius II (1503–1513), fortune once more smiled on Giovanni de' Medici. In August, 1511, the pope was dangerously ill and the Medici cardinal already aspired to the succession. In October, 1511, he became legate in Bologna and Romagna, and cherished the hope that his family would again rule in Florence. The Florentines had taken the part of the schismatic Pisans (see JULIUS II) for which reason the pope supported the Medici. Meanwhile the cardinal suffered another reverse. The army, Spanish and papal, with which he was sojourning, was defeated in 1512 at Ravenna by the French and he was taken prisoner. But it was a Pyrrhic victory, for the French soon lost all their possessions in Italy, and the cardinal, who was to have been taken to France, succeeded in making his escape. The supremacy of the Medici in Florence was re-established in September, 1512, and this unexpected change in the fortunes of his family was only the prelude to higher honours.

Julius II died on 21 February, 1513, and on 11 March Giovanni de' Medici, then but thirty-eight years old, was elected pope. In the first scrutiny he received only one vote. His adherents, the younger cardinals, held back his candidacy until the proper moment. The election met with approval even in France, although here and there a natural misgiving

was felt as to whether the youthful pope would prove equal to his burden. In many quarters high hopes were placed in him by politicians who relied on his pliancy, by scholars and artists of whom he was already a patron, and by theologians who looked for energetic church reforms under a pacific ruler. Unfortunately he realized the hopes only of the artists, literati, and worldlings who looked upon the papal court as a centre of amusement.

Leo's personal appearance has been perpetuated for us in Raphael's celebrated picture at the Pitti Gallery in Florence, which represents him with Cardinals Medici and Rossi. He was not a handsome man. His fat, shiny, effeminate countenance with weak eyes protrudes in the picture from under a close-fitting cap. The unwieldy body is supported by thin legs. His movements were sluggish and during ecclesiastical functions his corpulence made him constantly wipe the perspiration from his face and hands, to the distress of the bystanders. But when he laughed or spoke the unpleasant impression vanished. He had an agreeable voice, knew how to express himself with elegance and vivacity, and his manner was easy and gracious. "Let us enjoy the papacy since God has given it to us", he is said to have remarked after his election. The Venetian ambassador who related this of him was not unbiased, nor was he in Rome at the time, nevertheless the phrase illustrates fairly the pope's pleasure-loving nature and the lack of seriousness that characterized him. He paid no attention to the dangers threatening the papacy, and gave himself up unrestrainedly to amusements, that were provided in lavish abundance. He was possessed by an insatiable love of pleasure, that distinctive trait of his family. Music, the theatre, art, and poetry appealed to him as to any pampered worldling. Though temperate himself, he loved to give banquets and expensive entertainments, accompanied by revelry and carousing; and notwithstanding his indolence he had a strong passion for the chase, which he conducted every year on the largest scale. From his youth he was an enthusiastic lover of music and attracted to his court the most distinguished musicians. At table he enjoyed hearing improvisations, and though it is hard to believe, in view of his dignity and his artistic tastes, the fact remains that he enjoyed also the flat and absurd jokes of buffoons. Their loose speech and incredible appetites delighted him. In ridicule and caricature he was himself a master. Pageantry, dear to the pleasure-seeking Romans, bull-fights, and the like, were not neglected. Every year he amused himself during the carnival with masques, music, theatrical performances, dances, and races. Even during the troubled years of 1520 and 1521 he kept up this frivolous life. In 1520 he took part in unusually brilliant festivities. Theatrical representations, with agreeable music and graceful dancing, were his favourite diversions. The papal palace became a theatre and the pope did not hesitate to attend such improper plays as the immoral "Calendra" by Bibbiena and Ariosto's indecent "Suppositi". His contemporaries all praised and admired Leo's unfailing good temper, which he never entirely lost even in adversity and trouble. Himself cheerful, he wished to see others cheerful. He was good-natured and liberal and never refused a favour either to his relatives and fellow Florentines, who flooded Rome and seized upon all official positions, or to the numerous other petitioners, artists and poets. His generosity was boundless, nor was his pleasure in giving a pose or desire for vainglory; it came from the heart. He never was ostentatious and attached no importance to ceremonial. He was lavish in works of charity; convents, hospitals, discharged soldiers, poor students, pilgrims, exiles, cripples, the blind, the sick, the unfortunate of every description were generously remembered, and more than 6000 ducats were annually distributed in alms.

Under such circumstances, it is not surprising that the large treasure left by Julius II was entirely dissipated in two years. In the spring of 1515 the exchequer was empty and Leo never after recovered from his financial embarrassment. Various doubtful and reprehensible methods were resorted to for raising money. He created new offices and dignities, and the most exalted places were put up for sale. Jubilees and indulgences were degraded almost entirely into financial transactions, yet without avail, as the treasury was ruined. The pope's income amounted to between 500,000 and 600,000 ducats. The papal household alone, which Julius II had maintained on 48,000 ducats, now cost double that sum. In all, Leo spent about four and a half million ducats during his pontificate and left a debt amounting to 400,000 ducats. On his unexpected death his creditors faced financial ruin. A lampoon proclaimed that "Leo X had consumed three pontificates; the treasure of Julius II, the revenues of his own reign, and those of his successor." It is proper, however, to pay full credit to the good qualities of Leo. He was highly cultivated, susceptible to all that was beautiful, a polished orator and a clever writer, possessed of good memory and judgment, in manner dignified and majestic. It was generally acknowledged, even by those who were unfriendly towards him, that he was unfeignedly religious and strictly fulfilled his spiritual duties. He heard Mass and read his Breviary daily and fasted three times a week. His piety cannot truly be described as deep or spiritual, but that does not justify the continued repetition of his alleged remark: "How much we and our family have profited by the legend of Christ, is sufficiently evident to all ages." John Bale, the apostate English Carmelite, the first to give currency to these words in the time of Queen Elizabeth, was not even a contemporary of Leo. Among the many sayings of Leo X that have come down to us, there is not one of a sceptical nature. In his private life he preserved as pope the irreproachable reputation that he had borne when a cardinal. His character shows a remarkable mingling of good and bad traits.

TITLE OF THE BULL OF LEO X Condemning Luther, 15 June, 1520

The fame of Leo X is due to his promotion of literature, science, and art. Under him Rome became more than ever the centre of the literary world. "From all parts", wrote Cardinal Riario in 1515 to Erasmus at Rotterdam, "men of letters are hurrying to the Eternal City, their common country, their support, and their patroness." Poets were especially numerous in Rome and few princes have been so lauded in verse as Leo X. He lavished gifts, favours, positions, titles, not only on real poets and scholars, but often on poetasters and commonplace jesters. He esteemed particularly the papal secretaries Bembo and Sadoleto, both celebrated poets and prose writers. Bembo charmed everyone by his polish and wit. His classic, Ciceronian letters exhibit a remarkably varied intercourse with almost all the celebrities of his day. Among other things, he prepared a critical edition of Dante's works and was a zealous collector of manuscripts, books, and works of art. His conduct was not

in accord with his position as papal notary, count palatine, and incumbent of numerous benefices, for he was worldly and self-indulgent. Sadoleto was quite another man. He led a pure and spotless life, was a model priest, united in himself the different phases of ancient and modern culture and was an ardent enthusiast for antiquity. In elegance and polish he was in no way inferior to Bembo. Among the Latin poets of Medicean Rome we may briefly mention Vida, who composed a poem of great merit, the "Christiade" and was extolled by his contemporaries as the Christian Virgil; Sannazaro, author of an epic poem on the birth of Christ which is a model of style; the Carmelite Spagnolo Mantovano with his "Calendar of Feasts"; Ferreri, who in the most naïve way recast the hymns in the Breviary with heathen terms, images, and allusions. The total number of these poets exceeds one hundred; and a lampoon of 1521 says they were more numerous than the stars in heaven. Most of them have fallen into well-deserved oblivion.

This is equally true of the contemporary Italian poetry—more prolific than notable. Among the Italian poets Trissino wrote a tragedy, "Sophonisba", and an epic "L'Italia liberata dai Gothi", but had no real success with either in spite of earnest purpose and beauty of language. Rucellai, a relative of the pope, whose clever and sympathetic didactic poem on bees met with great approval from his contemporaries, owed his reputation chiefly to an inferior work, the tragedy of "Rosmonda". The celebrated *improvisatore*, Tebaldeo wrote in both Latin and Italian. Towards Ariosto the pope was remarkably harsh. Archæology received great encouragement. One of its most distinguished representatives was Manetti. In 1521 the first collection of Roman topographical inscriptions appeared and introduced a new era. Important progress was due to the works of the learned antiquary, Fulvio. Fulvio, Calvo, Castiglione, and Raphael had planned an archæological survey of ancient Rome with accompanying text. Raphael's early death abruptly interrupted the work which was carried on by Fulvio and Calvo. The Greek language also found favour and encouragement; Aldus Manutius, the Venetian publisher, whose excellent and correct editions of Greek classics became so popular, was one of Leo's protégés. Andreas Johannes Lascaris and Musurus were summoned from Greece to Rome and founded a Greek college, the "Medicean Academy". Moreover the pope encouraged the collection of manuscripts and books. He recovered his family library which had been sold by the Florentines in 1494 to the monks of San Marco, had it brought to Rome, and enforced the regulations of Sixtus IV for the Vatican Library. The most distinguished of his librarians was Inghirami, less indeed through any learned works than for his gift of eloquence. He was called the Cicero of his age and played an important rôle at court. In 1516 he was succeeded by the Bolognese Humanist Beroaldo. Leo tried, as Nicholas V had formerly done, to increase the treasures of the Vatican Library, and with this object sent emissaries in all directions, even to Scandinavia and the Orient, to discover literary treasures and either obtain them, or borrow them for the purpose of making copies. The results, however, were unimportant. The Roman university, which had entered on decay, was reformed, but did not long flourish. On the whole, Leo, as a literary Mæcenas, has been overrated by his biographer Giovio and later panegyrists. Relatively little was accomplished, partly on account of the constant lack of money and partly because of the thoughtlessness and haste which the pope often showed in distributing his favours. He was in reality only a dilettante. Yet he gave an important stimulus to scientific and literary life, and was a potent factor in the cultural development of the West.

More important results ensued from his promotion of art, though he was unquestionably inferior in taste and judgment to his predecessor Julius II. Leo encouraged painting beyond all other branches of art; pre-eminent in this class stand the immortal productions of Raphael. In 1508 he had come to Rome, summoned by Julius II, and remained there until his death in 1520. The protection extended to this master genius is Leo's most enduring claim on posterity. Raphael's achievements, already numerous and important, took on more dignity and grandeur under Leo. He painted, sketched, and engraved from antique works of art, modeled in clay, made designs for palaces, directed the work of others by order of the pope, gave advice and assistance alike to supervisors and workmen. "Everything pertaining to art the pope turns over to Raphael", wrote an ambassador in 1518. This is not, of course, the place to treat Raphael's prodigious activity. We limit ourselves to brief mention of a few of his works. He finished the decoration of the Vatican halls or "Stanze" begun under Julius II, and in the third hall cleverly referred to Leo X by introducing scenes from the pontificates of Leo III and Leo IV. A more important commission was given him to paint the cartoons for the tapestries of the Sistine Chapel, the highest of Raphael's achievements, the most magnificent of them being "St. Peter's miraculous draught of fishes" and "St. Paul preaching in Athens". A third famous enterprise was the decoration of the Vatican Loggia done by Raphael's pupils under his direction, and mostly from his designs. The most exquisite of his paintings are the wonderful Sistine Madonna and the "Transfiguration". Sculpture showed a marked decline under Leo X. Michelangelo offered his services and worked from 1516 to 1520 on a marble façade for the church of San Lorenzo in Florence, but did not finish it. On the other hand the pope gave especial attention and encouragement to the minor arts, e. g. decorative carving, and furthered the industrial arts. The greatest and most difficult task of Leo was in the field of architecture and was inherited from his predecessor, viz., the continuation of the new St. Peter's. Bramante remained its chief architect until his death in 1514. Raphael succeeded him, but in his six years of office little was done, much to his regret, through lack of means.

We may now turn to the political and religious events of Leo's pontificate. Here the bright splendour that diffuses itself over his literary and artistic patronage, is soon changed to deepest gloom. His well-known peaceable inclinations made the political situation a disagreeable heritage, and he tried to maintain tranquillity by exhortations, to which, however, no one listened. France desired to wreak vengeance for the defeat of 1512 and to reconquer Milan. Venice entered into an alliance with her, whereupon Emperor Maximilian, Spain, and England in 1513 concluded a Holy League against France. The pope wished at first to remain neutral but such a course would have isolated him, so he decided to be faithful to the policy of his predecessors and sought accordingly to oppose the designs of France, but in doing so, to avoid severity. In 1513 the French were decisively routed at Novara and were forced to effect a reconciliation with Rome. The schismatic cardinals (see JULIUS II) submitted and were pardoned, and France then took part in the Lateran Council which Leo had continued.

But success was soon clouded by uncertainty. France endeavoured to form an alliance with Spain and to obtain Milan and Genoa by a matrimonial alliance. Leo feared for the independence of the Papal States and for the so-called freedom of Italy. He negotiated on all sides without committing himself, and in 1514 succeeded in bringing about an Anglo-French alliance. The fear of Spain now gave way to the bugbear of French supremacy and the pope began negotiating in a deceitful and disloyal manner with France and her

LEO X

RAPHAEL, PITTI PALACE, FLORENCE

enemies simultaneously. Before he had decided to bind himself in one way or the other, Louis XII died and the young and ardent Francis I succeeded him. Once more Leo sought delay. He supported the League against France, but until the last moment hoped for an arrangement with Francis. But the latter shortly after his descent upon Italy, won the great victory of Marignano, 13–14 September, 1515, and the pope now made up his mind to throw himself into the arms of the Most Christian King and beg for mercy. He was obliged to alter his policy completely and to abandon to the French king Parma and Piacenza, which had been reunited with Milan. An interview with King Francis at Bologna resulted in the French Concordat (1516), that brought with it such important consequences for the Church. The Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges (1438), deeply inimical to the papacy, was revoked, but the pope paid a high price for this concession, when he granted to the king the right of nomination to all the sees, abbeys, and priories of France. Through this and other concessions, e. g. that pertaining to ecclesiastical jurisdiction, the royal influence over the French Church was assured. Great discontent resulted in France among the clergy and in the parliaments. The abolition of the Pragmatic Sanction, drawn up in compliance with the decrees of the Council of Basle, affected the adherents of the conciliar system of church government. The abolition of free ecclesiastical elections affected grievously the interests of many and opposition to the Concordat was maintained for centuries. The advantage to the Church and the pope of such a great sacrifice was that France, hitherto schismatical in attitude, now stood firmly bound to the Holy See, which thus turned aside the danger of complete estrangement. However, the way in which the French crown abused its control over the Church led at a later period to great evils.

Meanwhile the Lateran Council, continued by Leo after his elevation to the papacy, was nearing its close, having issued numerous and very timely decrees, e. g. against the false philosophical teachings of the Paduan professor, Pietro Pomponazzi, who denied the immortality of the soul. The encroachments of pagan Humanism on the spiritual life were met by the simultaneous rise of a new order of philosophical and theological studies. In the ninth session was promulgated a Bull that treated exhaustively of reforms in the Curia and the Church. Abbeys and benefices were henceforth to be bestowed only on persons of merit and according to canon law. Provisions of benefices and consistorial proceedings were regulated; ecclesiastical depositions and transfers made more difficult; commendatory benefices were forbidden; and unions and reservations of benefices, also dispensations for obtaining them, were restricted. Measures were also taken for reforming the curial administration and the lives of cardinals, clerics, and the faithful. The religious instruction of children was declared a duty. Blasphemers and incontinent, negligent, or simoniac ecclesiastics were to be severely punished. Church revenues were no longer to be turned to secular uses. The immunities of the clergy must be respected, and all kinds of superstition abolished. The eleventh session dealt with the cure of souls, particularly with preaching. These measures, unhappily, were not thoroughly enforced, and therefore the much-needed genuine reform was not realized. Towards the close of the council (1517) the noble and highly cultured layman, Gianfrancesco Pico della Mirandola, delivered a remarkable speech on the necessity of a reform of morals; his account of the moral condition of the clergy is saddening, and reveals the many and great difficulties that stood in the way of a genuine reform. He concluded with the warning that if Leo X left such offences longer unpunished and refused to apply healing remedies to these wounds of the Church, it was to be feared that God Himself would cut off the rotten limbs and destroy them with fire and sword. That very year this prophetic warning was verified. The salutary reforms of the Lateran Council found no practical acceptance. Pluralism, commendatory benefices, and the granting of ecclesiastical dignities to children remained customary. Leo himself did not scruple to set aside repeatedly the decrees of the council. The Roman Curia, then much despised and against which so many inveighed with violence, remained as worldly as ever. The pope was either unwilling or not in a position to regulate the unworthy and immoral conduct of many of the Roman courtiers. The political situation absorbed his attention and was largely responsible for the premature close of the council.

In March, 1516, Emperor Maximilian crossed the Alps to make war on the French and Venetians. The pope followed his usual course of shifting and dissimulation. At first, when events seemed favourable for the French, he supported Francis. But his former double-dealing had left Francis in such ill-humour that he now adhered to an antipapal policy, whereupon Leo adopted an unfriendly attitude towards the king. Their relations were further strained apropos of the Duchy of Urbino. During the French invasion the Duke of Urbino had withheld the assistance which he was in duty bound to render the pope, who now exiled him and gave the title to his nephew, Lorenzo de' Medici. The French king was highly displeased with the papal policy, and when Francis I and Maximilian formed the alliance of Cambrai in 1517 and agreed on a partition of Upper and Central Italy, Pope Leo found himself in a disagreeable position. In part by reason of his constant vacillation he had drifted into a dangerous isolation, added to which the Duke of Urbino reconquered his duchy; to crown all other calamities came a conspiracy of cardinals against the pope's life. The ringleader, Cardinal Petrucci, was a young worldly ecclesiastic who thought only of money and pleasure. He and the other cardinals who had brought about Leo's election, made afterwards such numerous and insistent demands that the pope could not yield to them. Other causes for discontent were found in the unfortunate war with Urbino and in the abolition of the election capitulations and the excessive privileges of the cardinals. Petrucci bore personal ill-will towards the "ungrateful pope", who had removed his brother from the government of Siena. He tried to have the pope poisoned by a physician, but suspicion was aroused and the plot was betrayed through a letter. The investigation implicated Cardinals Sauli, Riario, Soderini, and Castellesi; they had been guilty at least of listening to Petrucci, and perhaps had desired his success, though their full complicity was not actually proved. Petrucci was executed and the others punished by fines; Riario paid the enormous sum of 150,000 ducats.

The affair throws a lurid light on the degree of corruption in the highest ecclesiastical circles. Unconcerned by the scandal he was giving, Leo took advantage of the proceeding to create thirty-one new cardinals, thereby obtaining an entirely submissive college and also money to carry on the unlucky war with Urbino. Not a few of these cardinals were chosen on account of the large sums they advanced. But this wholesale appointment also brought several virtuous and distinguished men into the Sacred College, and it was further important because it definitively established the superiority of the pope over the cardinals. The war with Urbino, encouraged by Francis I and Maximilian for the purpose of increasing Leo's difficulties, was finally brought to a close, after having cost enormous sums and emptied the papal treasury. Lorenzo de' Medici remained in possession of the duchy (1517). Faithful to the ancient tradition of the Holy See, from the very beginning of his reign, Leo zealously

advocated a crusade against the Turks, and at the close of the war with Urbino took up the cause with renewed determination. In November, 1517, he submitted an exhaustive memorial to all the princes of Europe, and endeavored to unite them in a common effort, but in vain. The replies of the powers proved widely dissimilar. They were suspicious of one another and each sought naturally to realize various secondary purposes of its own. Leo answered a threatening letter from the sultan by active exertions. Religious processions were held, a truce of five years was proclaimed throughout Christendom and the Crusade was preached (1518). The pope showed real earnestness, but his great plan miscarried through lack of co-operation on the part of the powers. Moreover, Cardinal Wolsey, Lord Chancellor of England, thwarted the pope's peaceful efforts and thus dealt a grievous blow to the international prestige of the papacy. When the Crusade was preached in Germany, it found a large section of the people strongly predisposed against the Curia, and furnished them with an occasion to express their views in plain terms. It was believed that the Curia merely sought to obtain more money. One of the numerous spiteful pamphlets issued declared that the real Turks were in Italy and that these demons could only be pacified by streams of gold. The good cause was gradually merged with an important political question, the succession to the imperial throne. Maximilian sought the election for his grandson, Charles of Spain. A rival appeared in the person of Francis I, and both he and Charles vied with each other in seeking to win the pope's favour by repeated assurances of their willingness to move against the Turks. The event of the election relegated the crusade to the background. In 1519 the pope realized that there was no longer any prospect of carrying out his design.

Leo's attitude towards the imperial succession was influenced primarily by his anxiety concerning the power and independence of the Holy See and the so-called freedom of Italy. Neither candidate was acceptable to him, Charles, if possible, less than Francis, owing to the preponderance of power that must result from his accession. The pope would have preferred a German electoral prince, that of Saxony or later, the Elector of Brandenburg. He "sailed", as usual, "with two compasses", held both rivals at bay by a double game played with matchless skill, and even succeeded in concluding simultaneously an alliance with both. The deceitfulness and insincerity of his political dealings cannot be entirely excused, either by the difficult position in which he was placed or by the example of his secular contemporaries. Maximilian's death (January, 1519) ended the pope's irresolution. First he tried to defeat both candidates by raising up a German elector. Then he worked zealously for Francis I in the endeavour to secure his firm friendship in case Charles became emperor, an event which grew daily more likely. Only at the last moment when the election of Charles was certain and unavoidable did Leo come over to his side; after the election he watched in great anxiety the attitude the new emperor might assume.

The most important occurrence of Leo's pontificate and that of gravest consequence to the Church was the Reformation, which began in 1517. We cannot enter into a minute account of this movement, the remote cause of which lay in the religious, political, and social conditions of Germany. It is certain, however, that the seeds of discontent amid which Luther threw his firebrand had been germinating for centuries. The immediate cause was bound up with the odious greed for money displayed by the Roman Curia, and shows how far short all efforts at reform had hitherto fallen. Albert of Brandenburg, already Archbishop of Magdeburg, received in addition the Archbishopric of Mainz and the Bishopric of Halberstadt, but in return was obliged to collect 10,000 ducats, which he was taxed over and above the usual confirmation fees. To indemnify him, and to make it possible to discharge these obligations Rome permitted him to have preached in his territory the plenary indulgence promised all those who contributed to the new St. Peter's; he was allowed to keep one half the returns, a transaction which brought dishonour on all concerned in it. Added to this, abuses occurred during the preaching of the Indulgence. The money contributions, a mere accessory, were frequently the chief object, and the "Indulgences for the Dead" became a vehicle of inadmissible teachings. That Leo X, in the most serious of all the crises which threatened the Church, should fail to prove the proper guide for her, is clear enough from what has been related above. He recognized neither the gravity of the situation nor the underlying causes of the revolt. Vigorous measures of reform might have proved an efficacious antidote, but the pope was deeply entangled in political affairs and allowed the imperial election to overshadow the revolt of Luther; moreover, he gave himself up unrestrainedly to his pleasures and failed to grasp fully the duties of his high office.

The pope's last political efforts were directed to expanding the States of the Church, establishing thereby a dominating power in Central Italy by means of the acquisition of Ferrara. In 1519 he concluded a treaty with Francis I against Emperor Charles V. But the selfishness and encroachments of the French and the struggle against the Lutheran movement, induced him soon to unite with Charles, after he had again resorted to his double-faced method of treating with both rivals. In 1521 pope and emperor signed a defensive alliance for the purpose of driving the French out of Italy. After some difficulty, the allies occupied Milan and Lombardy. Amid the rejoicings over these successes, the pope died suddenly of a malignant malaria. His enemies are wrongly accused of having poisoned him. The magnificent pope was given a simple funeral and not until the reign of Paul III was a monument erected to his memory in the Church of Santa Maria sopra Minerva. It is cold, prosaic, and quite unworthy of such a connoisseur as Leo.

The only possible verdict on the pontificate of Leo X is that it was unfortunate for the Church. Sigismondo Tizio, whose devotion to the Holy See is undoubted, writes truthfully: "In the general opinion it was injurious to the Church that her Head should delight in plays, music, the chase and nonsense, instead of paying serious attention to the needs of his flock and mourning over their misfortunes". Von Reumont says pertinently—"Leo X is in great measure to blame for the fact that faith in the integrity and merit of the papacy, in its moral and regenerating powers, and even in its good intentions, should have sunk so low that men could declare extinct the old true spirit of the Church."

PASTOR, *History of the Popes*, VII (St. Louis, 1908); *Leonis X. P. M. Regesta*, ed. HERGENRÖTHER, Fasc. I.–VIII (to 16 October, 1515), (Freiburg, 1884–91); JOVIUS, *De vita Leonis X* (Florence, 1548, 1551); FABRONIUS, *Leonis X. P. M. vita* (Pisa, 1797); ROSCOE, *Life and Pontificate of Leo X* (Liverpool, 1805, London, 1883); Italian tr. with new materials by BOSSI (Milan, 1816), AUDIN, *Histoire de Léon X. et de son siècle* (Paris, 1844); NITTI, *Leone X e la sua politica* (Florence, 1892); CONFORTI, *Leone X ed il suo secolo* (Parma, 1896); VON REUMONT, *Geschichte der Stadt Rom*, III (Berlin, 1870), part ii; GREGOROVIUS, *Geschichte der Stadt Rom*, VIII (Stuttgart, 1896); GEIGER, *Renaissance und Humanismus in Deutschland und Italien* (Berlin, 1882).

KLEMENS LÖFFLER.

Leo XI (ALESSANDRO OTTAVIANO DE' MEDICI), POPE, b. at Florence in 1535; d. at Rome 27 April, 1605, on the twenty-seventh day after his election to the papacy. His mother, Francesca Salviati, was a daughter of Giacomo Salviati and Lucrezia Medici, the latter being a sister of Leo X. From his boyhood he led a life of piety and always had an earnest desire

to enter the ecclesiastical state, but could not obtain his mother's consent. After her death he was ordained priest and somewhat later Grand Duke Cosimo of Tuscany sent him as ambassador to Pius V, a position which he held for fifteen years. Gregory XIII made him Bishop of Pistoia in 1573, Archbishop of Florence in 1574, and cardinal in 1583. Clement VIII sent him,

Monument of Leo XI
Vatican Basilica, Rome

in 1596, as legate to France where he did good service for the Church in repressing the Huguenot influence at the court of Henry IV, and helping to restore the Catholic religion. On his return to Italy he was appointed prefect of the Congregation of Bishops and Regulars. In 1600 he became Bishop of the suburbicarian Diocese of Albano, whence he was transferred to Palestrina in 1602. Alessandro was an intimate friend of Saint Philip Neri with whom he spent much time in spiritual conversation and whose advice he sought in all important matters. When Alessandro was Tuscan ambassador at the court of Pius V Philip predicted his election to the papacy.

On 14 March, 1605, eleven days after the death of Clement VIII, sixty-two cardinals entered the Conclave. Prominent among the candidates for the papacy were the great historian Baronius and the famous Jesuit controversialist Bellarmine. But Aldobrandini, the leader of the Italian party among the cardinals, made common cause with the French party and brought about the election of Alessandro against the express wish of King Philip III of Spain. King Henry IV of France, who had learned to esteem Alessandro when papal legate at his court, and whose wife, Maria de' Medici was related to Alessandro, is said to have spent 300,000 écus in the promotion of Alessandro's candidacy. On 1 April, 1605, Alessandro ascended the papal throne as Leo XI, being then seventy years of age. He took sick immediately after his coronation. During his sickness he was importuned by many members of the Curia and by a few ambassadors from foreign courts to confer the cardinalate on one of his grandnephews, whom he had himself educated and whom he loved dearly, but he had such an aversion for nepotism that he firmly refused the request. When his confessor urged him to grant it, he dismissed him and sent for another confessor to prepare him for death.

Cardella, *Memorie storiche de' cardinali della s. romana chiesa* V (Rome, 1792), 181 sq.; Capecelatro, *Life of Philip Neri*, tr. Pope, II (2nd ed., London, 1894), 227–232.

Michael Ott.

Leo XII, Pope (Annibale Francesco Clemente Melchiore Girolamo Nicola della Genga), b. at the Castello della Genga in the territory of Spoleto, 22 August, 1760; d. in Rome, 10 February, 1829. His father's family had been ennobled by Leo XI in 1605; his mother was Maria Luisa Periberti of Fabriano. They had a large family, seven sons and three daughters, of which Annibale was the fifth son and sixth child. At the age of thirteen he was placed in the Collegio Campana of Osimo, whence he was transferred, in 1778, to the Collegio Piceno in Rome and shortly afterwards to the Accademia dei Nobili Ecclesiastici. He was ordained subdeacon four years later, and deacon in 1783. Two months later he was ordained priest, dispensation being obtained for the defect of age, as he was only twenty-three. He was of handsome person and engaging manners and, soon after his ordination, attracted the notice of Pius VI, who was visiting the Accademia, and by him was raised to the prelature as *cameriere segreto*. In 1790 he was chosen to deliver in the Sixtine Chapel the oration on the death of the Emperor Joseph II and accomplished his difficult task to the admiration of all hearers, without offending the susceptibilities of Austria or compromising the authority of the Holy See. In 1792 he became a canon of the Vatican church, and the following year was consecrated titular Archbishop of Tyre and sent as nuncio to Lucerne. Thence he was transferred to the nunciature at Cologne in 1794, a post which he occupied with great success for eleven years. In 1805 he was accredited as nuncio extraordinary to the Diet of Ratisbon by Pius VII in order that he might deal with the difficulties between the German Church and its Prussian rulers. Returning to Rome to confer with Consalvi on these matters, he learnt that Napoleon desired the substitution of another nuncio more devoted to his interests, in the person of Bernier, Bishop of Orléans. Pius VII, however, was firm and Della Genga returned to Munich. In 1808 he went with Cardinal Caprara to Paris with the object of arranging some agreement between the Holy See and Napoleon I. He was received, however, but coldly, and the negotiations soon came to nothing. Della Genga returned to Rome where he witnessed the indignities offered to Pius VII by the French. He returned in dismay to the Abbey of Monticelli, which had been granted to him *in commendam* for life by Pope Pius VI. Here he spent his time teaching his choir of peasants to play the organ and to sing plain-chant.

Leo XII

Expecting to end his days there, he built in the abbey church the tombs of his mother and himself. But in 1814, with the fall of Napoleon, Pius VII returned to Rome and Mgr Della Genga was sent to Paris as envoy extraordinary to convey the pope's con-

gratulations to King Louis XVIII. Consalvi, however, who was accredited to all the sovereigns then at Paris, strongly resented this mission, which he held to be a slight to himself. Louis XVIII endeavoured to smooth over matters, but the powerful Secretary of State had his way, and Della Genga returned to Rome, whence he again retired to Monticelli. Here he remained for two years, when Pius VII created him cardinal of Santa Maria in Trastevere and appointed him Bishop of Sinigaglia. But his ill-health necessitated residence in the healthy air of Spoleto and he never entered his diocese, which he resigned two years later. In 1820, his health being improved, he was made Vicar of Rome, archpriest of the Liberian Basilica and prefect of several congregations. Three years later, on 20 August, Pius VII died, and on 2 September the conclave opened at the Quirinal. It lasted for twenty-six days. At first the most prominent candidates were Cardinal Severoli, the representative of the Zelanti, and Cardinal Castiglioni (afterwards Pius VIII), the representative of the moderate party. Castiglioni was the candidate most desired by the great Catholic powers, but, in spite of their wishes Severoli's influence grew daily and by the morning of 21 September, he had received as many as twenty-six votes. As this meant that he would probably be elected at the next scrutiny, Cardinal Albani, who represented Austria at the conclave, informed his colleagues that the election of Cardinal Severoli would not be acceptable to the emperor and pronounced a formal veto. The Zelanti were furious, but, at Severoli's suggestion, transferred their support to Della Genga, and before the powers realized what was happening, triumphantly elected him by thirty-four votes on the morning of 28 September. At first, however, the pope-elect was unwilling to accept the office. With tears he reminded the cardinals of his ill-health. "You are electing a dead man", he said, but, when they insisted that it was his duty to accept, he gave way and gracefully assuring Cardinal Castiglioni that he some day was to be Pius VIII, announced his own intention of taking the style of Leo XII.



Monument of Leo XII
Vatican Basilica, Rome

Immediately after his election he appointed Della Somaglia, an octogenarian, Secretary of State, an act significant of the policy of the new reign. Leo was crowned on 5 October. His first measures were some not very successful attempts to repress the brigandage and license then prevalent in Marittima and the Campagna, and the publication of an ordinance that confined again to their Ghettoes the Jews, who had moved into the city during the period of the Revolution. These measures are typical of the temper and policy of Leo XII. There is something pathetic in the contrast between the intelligence and masterly energy displayed by him as ruler of the Church and the inefficiency of his policy as ruler of the Papal States. In face of the new social and political order, he undertook the defence of ancient custom and accepted institutions; he had little insight into the hopes and visions of those who were then pioneers of the greater liberty that had become inevitable. Stern attempts were made to purify the Curia and to control the crowd of inefficient and venal officials that composed its staff. Indifferentism and the Protestant proselytism of the period were combated; the devotion of the Catholic world was stimulated by the jubilee of 1825, in spite of the opposition of timid and reactionary prelates or sovereigns; the persecution of the Catholics in the Netherlands was met and overcome, and the movement for the emancipation of the Catholics in the British Isles was managed and encouraged till success was assured. Popular discontent with the government of the Papal States was met by the severities of Cardinal Rivarola.

The legitimist cause in France and in Spain, though marked in both countries by the misuse of religion as an instrument of political reaction, was supported, even when (as in the suppression of the Jesuit schools in France, and the vacancy of Mexican sees owing to the claims of Spain over her former colonies) the representatives of that cause showed themselves indifferent or opposed to the interests of the Faith. Consalvi was consulted and admired by the pope, who, both in this case and that of the treasurer Cristaldi, showed himself too magnanimous to allow personal grievances to weigh against the appreciation of merit, but the cardinal's death in 1824 prevented the contribution of his wisdom to the councils of the Holy See. The Collegio Romano was restored to the efficient hands of the Jesuits in 1824; the Freemasons and other secret societies were condemned in 1825; the Vatican printing press was restored and the Vatican Library enriched; scholars like Zurla, Martucci, and Champollion were encouraged; much was done towards the rebuilding of St. Paul's and the restoration of the seemliness of worship. But Leo's health was too frail to support his unremitting devotion to the affairs of the Church. Even in December, 1823, he had nearly died, and recovered only as by a miracle, through the prayers of the venerable Bishop of Marittima, Vincenzo Strambi, whose life was offered to God and accepted in the stead of the pope's. On 5 February, 1829, after a private audience with Cardinal Bernetti, who had replaced Somaglia as Secretary of State in 1828, he was suddenly taken ill and seemed himself to know that his end was near. On the eighth he asked for and received the Viaticum and was anointed. On the evening of the ninth he lapsed into unconsciousness and on the morning of the tenth he died. He had a noble character, a passion for order and efficiency, but he lacked insight into, and sympathy with, the temporal developments of his period. His rule was unpopular in Rome and in the Papal States, and by various measures of his reign he diminished greatly for his successors their chances of solving the new problems that confronted them.

Artaud de Montor, *Histoire du Pape Léon XII* (Paris, 1843); Chateaubriand, *Mémoires d'outre-tombe* II (Brussels,

1852), 149–202; XXXVIII, 50–83; WISEMAN, *Recollections of the Last Four Popes* (London, 1858); 209–352.
Non-Catholic: BENRATH in HERZOG AND HAUCK, *Real-encyklopädie*, XI, (Leipzig, 1902), 390–393. NIELSEN, *History of the Papacy in the XIXth Century*, II (London, 1906), 1–30.

LESLIE A. ST. L. TOKE.

Leo XIII, POPE, b. 2 March, 1810, at Carpineto; elected pope 20 February, 1878; d. 20 July, 1903, at Rome. Gioacchino Vincenzo Raffaele Luigi was the sixth of the seven sons of Count Lodovico Pecci and his wife Anna Prosperi-Buzi. There was some doubt as to the nobility of the Pecci family, and when the young Gioacchino sought admission to the Accademia dei Nobili in Rome he met with a certain opposition, whereupon he wrote the history of his family, showing that the Pecci of Carpineto were a branch of the Pecci of Siena, obliged to emigrate to the Papal States in the first half of the sixteenth century, under Clement VII, because they had sided with the Medici.

At the age of eight, together with his brother Giuseppe, aged ten, he was sent to study at the new Jesuit school in Viterbo, the present seminary. He remained there six years (1818–24), and gained that classical facility in the use of Latin and Italian afterwards justly admired in his official writings and his poems. Much credit for this is due to his teacher, Padre Leonardo Garibaldi. When, in 1824, the Collegio Romano was given back to the Jesuits, Gioacchino and his brother Giuseppe entered as students of humanities and rhetoric. At the end of his rhetoric course Gioacchino was chosen to deliver the address in Latin, and selected as his subject, "The Contrast between Pagan and Christian Rome". Not less successful was his three years' course of philosophy and natural sciences.

He remained yet uncertain as to his calling, though it had been the wish of his mother that he should embrace the ecclesiastical state. Like many other young Romans of the period who aimed at a public career, he took up meanwhile the study of theology as well as canon and civil law. Among his professors were the famous theologian Perrone and the scripturist Patrizi. In 1832 he obtained the doctorate of theology, whereupon, after the difficulties referred to above, he asked and obtained admission to the Academy of Noble Ecclesiastics, and entered upon the study of canon and civil law at the Sapienza University. Thanks to his talents, and to the protection of Cardinals Sala and Pacca, he was appointed domestic prelate by Gregory XVI in January, 1837, while still in minor orders, and in March of that year was made "referendario della Segnatura", which office he soon exchanged for one in the Congregazione del Buon Governo, or Ministry of the Interior for the Pontifical States, of which his protector Cardinal Sala was at that time prefect. During the cholera epidemic in Rome he ably assisted Cardinal Sala in his duties as overseer of all the city hospitals. His zeal and ability convinced Cardinal Sala that Pecci was fitted for larger responsibilities, and he again urged him to enter the priesthood, hinting in addition that before long he might be promoted to a post where the priesthood would be necessary. Yielding to these solicitations, he was ordained priest 31 Dec., 1837, by Cardinal Odeschalchi, Vicar of Rome, in the chapel of St. Stanislaus on the Quirinal. The post hinted at by Cardinal Sala was that of Delegate or civil Governor of Benevento, a city subject to the Holy See but situated in the heart of the Kingdom of Naples. Its condition was very unsatisfactory; the brigands of the Neapolitan territory infested the country in great numbers, survivals of the Napoleonic Wars and the guerrilla of the Sanfedisti. Gregory XVI thought a young and energetic delegate necessary. Cardinal Lambruschini, secretary of state, and Cardinal Sala suggested the name of Mgr. Pecci, who set out for Benevento 2 February, 1838. On his recovery from an attack of typhoid fever, he set to work to stamp out brigandage, and soon his vigilance, indomitable purpose, and fearless treatment of the nobles who protected the brigands and smugglers, pacified the whole province. Aided by the nuncio at Naples, Mgr. di Pietro, the youthful delegate drew up an agreement with the Naples police for united action against brigands. He also turned his attention to the roads and highways, and arranged for a more just distribution of taxes and duties, until then the same as those imposed by the invading French, and, though exorbitant, exacted with the greatest rigour. Meanwhile the Holy See and Naples were discussing the exchange of Benevento for a stretch of Neapolitan territory bordering on the Papal States. When Mgr. Pecci heard of this he memorialized the Holy See so strongly against it that the negotiations were broken off.

The results obtained in three years by the delegate at Benevento led Gregory XVI to entrust another delegation to him where a strong personality was required, though for very different reasons. He was first destined for Spoleto, but on 17 July, 1841, he was sent to Perugia, a hotbed of the anti-papal revolutionary party. For three years he improved the material conditions of his territory and introduced a more expeditious and economical administration of justice. He also began a savings bank to assist small tradesmen and farmers with loans at a low rate of interest, reformed educational methods, and was otherwise active for the common welfare.

In January, 1843, he was appointed nuncio to Brussels, as successor of Mgr. Fornari, appointed nuncio at Paris. On 19 Feb., he was consecrated titular Archbishop of Damiata by Cardinal Lambruschini, and set out for his post. On his arrival he found rather critical conditions. The school question was warmly debated between the Catholic majority and the Liberal minority. He encouraged the bishops and the laity in their struggle for Catholic schools, yet he was able to win the good will of the Court, not only of the pious Queen Louise, but also of King Leopold I, strongly Liberal in his views. The new nuncio succeeded in uniting the Catholics, and to him is owing the idea of a Belgian college in Rome (1844). He made a journey (1845) through Rhenish Prussia (Cologne, Mainz, Trier), and owing to his vigilance the schismatic agitation of the priest Ronge, on the occasion of the exposition of the Holy Coat of Trier in 1844, did not affect Belgium. Meanwhile the See of Perugia became vacant, and Gregory XVI, moved by the wishes of the Perugians and the needs of that city and district, appointed Mgr. Pecci Bishop of Perugia, retaining however the title of archbishop.

With a very flattering autograph letter from King Leopold, Mgr. Pecci left Brussels to spend a month in London and another in Paris. This brought him in touch with both courts, and afforded him opportunities for meeting many eminent men, among others Wiseman, afterwards cardinal. Rich in experience and in new ideas, and with greatly broadened views, he returned to Rome on 26 May, 1846, where he found the pope on his deathbed, so that he was unable to report to him. He made his solemn entry into Perugia 26 July, 1846, where he remained for thirty-two years. Gregory XVI had intended to make him a cardinal, but his death and the events that troubled the opening years of the pontificate of Pius IX postponed this honour until 19 December, 1853. Pius IX desired to have him near his person, and repeatedly offered him a suburbicarian see, but Mgr. Pecci preferred Perugia, and perhaps was not in accord with Cardinal Antonelli. It is certainly untrue that Pius IX designedly left him in Perugia, much more untrue that he did so because Pecci's views were liberalistic and conciliatory. As Bishop of Perugia he sought chiefly to inculcate piety and knowledge of the truths of Faith.

He insisted that his priests should preach, and should catechize not only the young but the grown up; and for this purpose he wished one hour in the afternoon set apart on Sundays and feast days, thus forestalling one of the regulations laid down by Pius X in 1905 for the whole Church. He brought out a new edition of the diocesan catechism (1856), and for his clergy he wrote a practical guide for the exercise of the ministry (1857). He provided frequently for retreats and missions. After the Piedmontese occupation and the suppression of the religious orders the number of priests was greatly diminished; to remedy this lack of ecclesiastical ministers, he established an association of diocesan missionaries ready to go wherever sent (1875). He sought to create a learned and virtuous clergy, and for this purpose spent much care on the material, moral, and scientific equipment of his seminary, which he called the apple of his eye. Between 1846 and 1850 he enlarged its buildings at considerable personal sacrifice, secured excellent professors, presided at examinations, and himself gave occasional instruction. He introduced the study of the philosophy and theology of St. Thomas, and in 1872 established an "Accademia di S. Tommaso", which he had planned as far back as 1858.

In 1872 also he introduced the government standards for studies of the secondary schools and colleges. When the funds of the seminary were converted into state bonds, its revenues were seriously affected, and this entailed new sacrifices on the bishop. With the exception of a few troublesome priests who relied on the protection of the new government, the discipline of the clergy was excellent. For the assistance of many priests impoverished by the confiscation of church funds, he instituted in 1873 the Society of S. Gioacchino, and for charitable works generally, conferences of St. Vincent de Paul. He remodelled many educational institutions for the young and began others, for the care of which he invited from Belgium nuns of the Sacred Heart and Brothers of Mercy. During his episcopate thirty-six new churches were built in the diocese. His charity and foresight worked marvels during the famine of 1854, consequent on the earthquake which laid waste a large part of Umbria. Throughout the political troubles of the period, he was a strong supporter of the temporal power of the Holy See, but he was careful to avoid anything that might give the new government pretext for further annoyances.

Shortly after his arrival in Perugia there occurred a popular commotion which his personal intervention succeeded in appeasing. In 1849, when bands of Garibaldians expelled from Rome were infesting the Umbrian hills, the Austrians under Prince Liechtenstein hastened to occupy Perugia, but Mgr. Pecci, realizing that this foreign occupation would only increase the irritation of the inhabitants, set out for the Austrian camp and succeeded in saving the town from occupation. In 1859 a few outlaws set up in Perugia a provisional government; when the cardinal heard that, few as they were, they were preparing to resist the pontifical troops advancing under Colonel Schmidt he wrote a generous letter to try and dissuade them from their mad purpose and to avoid a useless shedding of blood. Unfortunately they spurned his advice, and the result was the so-called "Massacre of Perugia" (20 June). In February, 1860, he wrote a pastoral letter on the necessity of the temporal power of the Holy See; but on 14 September of that year Perugia and Umbria were annexed to Piedmont. In vain he besought General Fanti not to bombard the town; and during the first years that followed the annexation he wrote, either in his own name or in the name of the bishops of Umbria, eighteen protests against the various laws and regulations of the new Government on ecclesiastical matters: against civil marriage, the suppression of the religious orders and the inhuman cruelty of their oppressors, the "Placet" and "Exequatur" in ecclesiastical nominations, military service for ecclesiastics, and the confiscation of church property. But withal he was so cautious and prudent, in spite of his outspokenness, that he was never in serious difficulties with the civil power. Only once was he brought before the courts, and then he was acquitted.

In August, 1877, on the death of Cardinal de Angelis, Pius IX appointed him camerlengo, so that he was obliged to reside in Rome. Pope Pius died 7 February, 1878, and during his closing years the Liberal press had often insinuated that the Italian Government should take a hand in the conclave and occupy the Vatican. However the Russo-Turkish War and the sudden death of Victor Emmanuel II (9 January, 1878) distracted the attention of the Government, the conclave proceeded as usual, and after the three scrutinies Cardinal Pecci was elected by forty-four votes out of sixty-one.

Shortly before this he had written an inspiring pastoral to his flock on the Church and civilization. Ecclesiastical affairs were in a difficult and tangled state. Pius IX, it is true, had won for the papacy the love and veneration of Christendom, and even the admiration of its adversaries. But, though inwardly strengthened, its relations with the civil powers had either ceased or were far from cordial. But the fine diplomatic tact of Leo succeeded in staving off ruptures, in smoothing over difficulties, and in establishing good relations with almost all the powers.

Throughout his entire pontificate he was able to keep on good terms with France, and he pledged himself to its Government that he would call on all Catholics to accept the Republic. But in spite of his efforts very few monarchists listened to him, and towards the end of his life he beheld the coming failure of his French policy, though he was spared the pain of witnessing the final catastrophe which not even he could have averted. It was to Leo that France owed her alliance with Russia; in this way he offset the Triple Alliance, hoped to ward off impending conflicts, and expected friendly assistance for the solution of the Roman question. With Germany he was more fortunate. On the very day of his election, when notifying the emperor of the event, he expressed the hope of seeing relations with the German Government re-established, and, though the emperor's reply was coldly civil, the ice was broken. Soon Bismarck, unable to govern with the Liberals, to win whose favour he had started the Kulturkampf (q. v.), found he needed the Centre Party, or Catholics, and was willing to come to terms. As early as 1878 negotiations began at Kissingen between Bismarck and Aloisi-Masella, the nuncio to Munich; they were carried a step farther at Venice between the nuncio Jacobini and Prince von Reuss; soon after this some of the Prussian laws against the Church were relaxed. From about 1883 bishops began to be appointed to various sees, and some of the exiled bishops were allowed to return. By 1884 diplomatic relations were renewed, and in 1887 a *modus vivendi* between Church and State was brought about. In 1885 the question of the Caroline Islands arose, and Bismarck proposed that Pope Leo should arbitrate between Germany and Spain. The good feeling with Germany found expression in the three visits paid Leo by William II (1888, 1893, and 1903), whose father also, when crown prince (1883), had visited the Vatican. As a sort of *quid pro quo* Bismarck thought the pope ought to use his authority to prevent the Catholics from opposing some of his political schemes. Only once did Leo interfere in a parliamentary question, and then his advice was followed. In 1880 relations with the Belgian Government were again broken off à propos of the school question, on the pretext that the pope was lending himself to duplicity, encouraging the bishops to resist, and pretending to the Government that he was urging moderation. As a matter of fact,

LEO XIII

CHARTRAN (1891), VATICAN

the suppression of the Belgian embassy to the Vatican had been settled on before the school question arose. In 1885 the new Catholic Government restored it. During Pope Leo's pontificate the condition of the Church in Switzerland improved somewhat, especially in the Ticino, in Aargau, and in Basle. In Russia, Soloviev's attempt on Alexander II (14 April, 1879) and the silver jubilee of that czar's reign (1880) gave the pope an opportunity to attempt a *rapprochement*. But it was not until after Alexander III came to the throne (1883) that an agreement was reached, by which a few episcopal sees were tolerated and some of the more stringent laws against the Catholic clergy slightly relaxed. But when, in 1884, Leo consented to present to the czar a petition from the Ruthenian Catholics against the oppression they had to suffer, the persecution only increased in bitterness. In the last year of Alexander III (May, 1894) diplomatic relations were re-established. On the day of his election, Leo had expressed to this emperor the wish to see diplomatic relations restored; Alexander, like William, though more warmly, answered in a non-committal manner. In the meantime Leo was careful to exhort the Poles under Russian domination to be loyal subjects.

Among the acts of Leo XIII that affected in a particular way the English-speaking world may be mentioned: for England, the elevation of John Henry Newman to the cardinalate (1879), the "Romanos Pontifices" of 1881 concerning the relations of the hierarchy and the regular clergy, the beatification (1886) of fifty English martyrs, the celebration of the thirteenth centenary of St. Gregory the Great, Apostle of England (1891), the Encyclicals "Ad Anglos" of 1895, on the return to Catholic unity, and the "Apostolicæ Curæ" of 1896, on the non-validity of the Anglican orders. He restored the Scotch hierarchy in 1878, and in 1898 addressed to the Scotch a very touching letter. In English India Pope Leo established the hierarchy in 1886, and regulated there long-standing conflicts with the Portuguese authorities. In 1903 King Edward VII paid him a visit at the Vatican. The Irish Church experienced his pastoral solicitude on many occasions. His letter to Archbishop McCabe of Dublin (1881), the elevation of the same prelate to the cardinalate in 1882, the calling of the Irish bishops to Rome in 1885, the decree of the Holy Office (13 April, 1888) on the plan of campaign and boycotting, and the subsequent Encyclical of 24 June, 1888, to the Irish hierarchy represent in part his fatherly concern for the Irish people, however diverse the feelings they aroused at the height of the land agitation.

The United States at all times attracted the attention and admiration of Pope Leo. He confirmed the decrees of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore (1884), and raised to the cardinalate Archbishop Gibbons of that city (1886). His favourable action (1888), at the instance of Cardinal Gibbons, towards the Knights of Labour won him general approval. In 1889 he sent a papal delegate, Monsignor Satolli, to represent him at Washington on the occasion of the foundation of the Catholic University of America. The Apostolic Delegation at Washington was founded in 1892; in the same year appeared his Encyclical on Christopher Columbus. In 1893 he participated in the Chicago Exposition held to commemorate the fourth centenary of the discovery of America; this he did by the loan of valuable relics, and by sending Monsignor Satolli to represent him. In 1895 he addressed to the hierarchy of the United States his memorable Encyclical "Longinqua Oceani Spatia"; in 1898 appeared his letter "Testem Benevolentiæ" to Cardinal Gibbons on "Americanism"; and in 1902 his admirable letter to the American hierarchy in response to their congratulations on his pontifical jubilee. In Canada he confirmed the agreement made with the Province of Quebec (1889) for the settlement of the Jesuit Estates question, and in 1897 sent Monsignor Merry del Val to treat in his name with the Government concerning the obnoxious Manitoba School Law. His name will also long be held in benediction in South America for the First Plenary Council of Latin America held at Rome (1899), and for his noble Encyclical to the bishops of Brazil on the abolition of slavery (1888).

Monument of Leo XIII
Basilica of St. John Lateran, Rome

In Portugal the Government ceased to support the Goan schism, and in 1886 a concordat was drawn up. Concordats with Montenegro (1886) and Colombia (1887) followed. The Sultan of Turkey, the Shah of Persia, the Emperors of Japan and of China (1885), and the Negus of Abyssinia, Menelik, sent him royal gifts and received gifts from him in return. His charitable intervention with the negus in favour of the Italians taken prisoners at the unlucky battle of Adna (1898) failed owing to the attitude taken by those who ought to have been most grateful. He was not successful in establishing direct diplomatic relations with the Sublime Porte and with China, owing to the jealousy of France and her fear of losing the protectorate over Christians. During the negotiations concerning church property in the Philippines, Mr. Taft, later President of the United States, had an opportunity of admiring the pope's great qualities, as he himself declared on a memorable occasion.

With regard to the Kingdom of Italy, Leo XIII maintained Pius IX's attitude of protest, thus confirming the ideas he had expressed in his pastoral of 1860. He desired complete independence for the Holy See, and consequently its restoration as a real sovereignty. Repeatedly, when distressing incidents took place in Rome, he sent notes to the various governments pointing out the intolerable position in which the Holy See was placed through its subjection to a hostile power. For the same reason he upheld the "Non expedit", or prohibition against Italian Catholics taking part in political elections. His idea was that once the Catholics abstained from voting, the subversive elements in the country would get the upper hand and the Italian Government be obliged to come to terms with the Holy See. Events proved he was mistaken, and the idea was abandoned by Pius X. At one time, however, "officious" negotiations were kept up between the Holy See and the Italian Government through the agency of Monsignor Carini, Prefect of the Vatican Library and a great friend of

Crispi. But it is not known on what lines they were conducted. On Crispi's part there could have been no question of ceding any territory to the Holy See. France, moreover, then irritated against Italy because of the Triple Alliance, and fearing that any *rapprochement* between the Vatican and the Quirinal would serve to increase her rival's prestige, interfered and forced Leo to break off the aforesaid negotiations by threatening to renew hostilities against the Church in France. The death of Monsignor Carini shortly after this (25 June, 1895) gave rise to the senseless rumour that he had been poisoned. Pope Leo was no less active concerning the interior life of the Church. To increase the piety of the faithful, he recommended in 1882 the Third Order of St. Francis, whose rules in 1883 he wisely modified; he instituted the feast of the Holy Family, and desired societies in its honour to be founded everywhere (1892); many of his encyclicals preach the benefits of the Rosary; and he favoured greatly devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus.

Under Leo the Catholic Faith made great progress; during his pontificate two hundred and forty-eight episcopal or archiepiscopal sees were created, and forty-eight vicariates or prefectures Apostolic. Catholics of Oriental rites were objects of special attention; he had the good fortune to see the end of the schism which arose in 1870 between the Uniat Armenians and ended in 1879 by the conversion of Mgr. Kupelian and other schismatical bishops. He founded a college at Rome for Armenian ecclesiastical students (1884), and by dividing the college of S. Atanasio he was able to give the Ruthenians a college of their own; already in 1882 he had reformed the Ruthenian Order of St. Basil; for the Chaldeans he founded at Mossul a seminary of which the Dominicans have charge. In a memorable encyclical of 1897 he appealed to all the schismatics of the East, inviting them to return to the Universal Church, and laying down rules for governing the relations between the various rites in countries of mixed rites. Even among the Copts his efforts at reunion made headway.

The ecclesiastical sciences found a generous patron in Pope Leo. His Encyclical "Æterni Patris" (1880) recommended the study of Scholastic philosophy, especially that of St. Thomas Aquinas, but he did not advise a servile study. In Rome he established the Apollinare College, a higher institute for the Latin, Greek, and Italian classics. At his suggestion a Bohemian college was founded at Rome. At Anagni he founded and entrusted to the Jesuits a college for all the dioceses of the Roman Campagna, on which are modelled the provincial or "regional" seminaries desired by Pius X. Historical scholars are indebted to him for the opening of the Vatican Archives (1883), on which occasion he published a splendid encyclical on the importance of historical studies, in which he declares that the Church has nothing to fear from historical truth. For the administration of the Vatican Archives and Library he called on eminent scholars (Hergenröther, Denifle, Ehrle; repeatedly he tried to obtain Janssen, but the latter declined, as he was eager to finish his "History of the German People"). For the convenience of students of the archives and the library he established a consulting library. The Vatican Observatory is also one of the glories of Pope Leo XIII. To excite Catholic students to rival non-Catholics in the study of the Scriptures, and at the same time to guide their studies, he published the "Providentissums Deus" (1893), which won the admiration even of Protestants, and in 1902 he appointed a Biblical Commission. Also, to guard against the dangers of the new style of apologetics founded on Kantism and now known as Modernism (q. v.), he warned in 1899 the French clergy (Encycl. "Au Milieu"), and before that, in a Brief addressed to Cardinal Gibbons, he pointed out the dangers of certain doctrines to which had been given the name of "Americanism" (22 Jan., 1899). In the Brief "Apostolicæ Curæ" (1896) he definitively decided against the validity of Anglican Orders. In several other memorable encyclicals he treated of the most serious questions affecting modern society. They are models of classical style, clearness of statement, and convincing logic. The most important are: "Arcanum divinæ sapientiæ" (1880) on Christian marriage; "Diuturnum illud" (1881), and "Immortale Dei" (1885) on Christianity as the foundation of political life; "Sapientiæ christianæ" (1890) on the duties of a Christian citizen; "Libertas" (1888) on the real meaning of liberty; "Humanum genus" (1884) against Freemasonry (he also issued other documents bearing on this subject).

Civilization owes much to Leo for his stand on the social question. As early as 1878, in his encyclical on the equality of all men, he attacked the fundamental error of Socialism. The Encyclical "Rerum novarum" (18 May, 1891) set forth with profound erudition the Christian principles bearing on the relations between capital and labour, and it gave a vigorous impulse to the social movement along Christian lines. In Italy, especially, an intense, well-organized movement began; but gradually dissensions broke out, some leaning too much towards Socialism and giving to the words "Christian Democracy" a political meaning, while others erred by going to the opposite extreme. In 1901 appeared the Encyclical "Graves de Communi", destined to settle the controverted points. The "Catholic Action" movement in Italy was reorganized, and to the "Opera dei Congressi" was added a second group that took for its watchword economic-social action. Unfortunately this latter did not last long, and Pius X had to create a new party which has not yet overcome its internal difficulties.

Under Leo the religious orders developed wonderfully; new orders were founded, older ones increased, and in a short time made up for the losses occasioned by the unjust spoliation they had been subjected to. Along every line of religious and educational activity they have proved no small factor in the awakening and strengthening of the Christian life of the whole country. For their better guidance wise constitutions were issued; reforms were made; orders such as the Franciscans and Cistercians, which in times past had divided off into sections, were once more united; and the Benedictines were given an abbot-primate, who resides at St. Anselm's College, founded in Rome under the auspices of Pope Leo (1883). Rules were laid down concerning members of religious orders who became secularized.

In canon law Pope Leo made no radical change, yet no part of it escaped his vigilance, and opportune modifications were made as the needs of the times required. On the whole his pontificate of twenty-five years was certainly, in external success, one of the most brilliant. It is true the general peace between nations favoured it. The people were tired of that anticlericalism which had led governments to forget their real purpose, i. e. the well-being of the governed; and, on the other hand, prudent statesmen feared excessive catering to the elements subversive of society. Leo himself used every endeavour to avoid friction. His three jubilees (the golden jubilees of his priesthood and of his episcopate, and the silver jubilee of his pontificate) showed how wide was the popular sympathy for him. Moreover, his appearance either at Vatican receptions or in St. Peter's was always a signal for outbursts of enthusiasm. Leo was far from robust in health, but the methodical regularity of his life stood him in good stead. He was a tireless worker, and always exacted more than ordinary effort from those who worked with him. The conditions of the Holy See did not permit him to do much for art, but he renewed the apse of the Lateran Basilica, rebuilt its presbytery, and in the Vatican caused a few halls to be painted.

BACH, *Leonis XIII Carmina, Inscriptiones, Numismata* (1903), tr. HENRY (Philadelphia—); *Acta Leonis XIII*, 26 vols. (Rome, 1878–1903); *Scelta di atti apostolici del card. Pecci* (Rome, 1879); *Conventiones de rebus ecclesiasticis* (14 vols., Rome, 1878–93); biographies by O'REILLY (1886); T'SERCLAES (3 vols., Paris, 1894–1906); SCHNEIDER (1901); JUSTIN MCCARTHY (London, 1896); FUREY (New York, 1903); SPAHN (1905); JEAN D'ARRAS (Paris, 1902); GUILLERMIN (Paris, 1902): BOYER D'AGEN, *La Jeunesse de Léon XIII* (Tours, 1896); IDEM, *La Prélature de Léon XIII* (ibid., 1900); DE GERMINY, *La Politique de Léon XIII* (Paris, 1902); LEFEBVRE DE BÉHAINE, *Léon XIII et le prince Bismarck* (Paris, 1898); GEFFKEN, *Léon XIII devant l'Allemagne* (Paris, 1896); DE CESARE, *Il conclave di Leone XIII* (3rd ed., Città di Castello, 1887); BONACINA, *Continuazione della storia eccl. di Rohrbacher e di Balan* (Turin, 1899); DE MEESTER, *Leone XIII e la chiesa greca* (Rome, 1905); PROTZNER, *Die Entwickelung des kirchlichen Eherechts unter Leo XIII* (Salzburg, 1908). Cf. also *The Great Encyclicals of Leo XIII*, ed. WYNNE (New York, 1902).

U. BENIGNI.

Leo, BROTHER, Friar Minor, companion of St. Francis of Assisi, date of birth uncertain; d. at Assisi, 15 Nov., 1271. He appears to have been a native of Assisi and not of Viterbo, as some later writers have asserted. Although not one of the original twelve companions of St. Francis, Leo was one of the first to join him after the approbation of the first Rule of the Friars Minor (1209–1210) and perhaps was already a priest. In the course of time he became the confessor and secretary of the saint, and from about 1220 up to the time of Francis's death Leo was his constant companion. He was with the "Poverello" when the latter retired to Fonte Colombo near Rieti in 1223, to re-write the rule of the order and he accompanied him on his subsequent journey to Rome to seek its approval. The year following Leo was with the saint on Mount La Verna when Francis received the stigmata and he has left us a clear and simple account of that great miracle. This statement he wrote across the face of the autograph blessing which St. Francis had given him on La Verna, as a talisman against temptation, and which is still preserved at S. Francesco in Assisi. The text of a letter written by the saint to Leo some time before is also extant. It is a word of tender encouragement and counsel to the "Frate Pecorello di Dio" (little brother sheep of God) as the Saint had named his faithful disciple because of his simplicity and tenderness. And one of the most golden chapters in the "Fioretti" (ch. vii) tells how St. Francis showed to Brother Leo "which things were perfect joy". Leo nursed his master during his last illness and as the saint lay dying it was he, together with Angelo, another favourite companion, who consoled Francis by singing the "Canticle of the Sun".

Leo had entered deeply into the bitter disappointments experienced by the saint during the last few years of his life, and soon after Francis's death he came into conflict with those whom he considered traitors to the Poverello and his ideal of poverty. Having protested against the collection of money for the erection of the basilica of San Francesco and having actually smashed the vase which Brother Elias had set up for contributions (see ELIAS), Leo was whipped by order of Elias and expelled from Assisi. He thereupon retired to some hermitage of the order and from thenceforth we catch only occasional glimpses of him. Thus we find him present in 1253 at the death-bed of St. Clare of whom he was a life-long friend. Leo appears to have passed much of his latter years at the Porziuncola and to have employed himself in writing those works which exerted such a marked influence on Conrad d'Offida, Angelo Clareno, Ubertino da Casale, and other "Spirituals" of a later generation. These writings, in which Leo set forth what he considered to be the real intention of St. Francis regarding the observance of poverty, he is said to have confided to the nuns at S. Chiara in Assisi in order to save them to posterity. Leo died at the Porziuncola on 15 Nov., 1271, at an advanced age and was buried in the lower church of San Francesco near the tomb of his seraphic father. He is commemorated in the Franciscan Martyrology which gives him the title of Blessed, and the cause of his formal beatification is now (1910) pending with that of the other early companions of St. Francis.

Considerable doubt still exists as to how much Leo actually wrote. The famous "rotuli" and "cedulæ" which he deposited with the Poor Clares have not come down to us, but these documents are believed to have been the source from which the "Speculum Perfectionis" and some other compilations of "materia seraphica" were more or less directly derived. This "Speculum Perfectionis" was first published as a separate work in 1898 by Paul Sabatier, who called it the "Legenda Antiquissima S. Francisci" and claimed that it was written by Leo as early as 1227, as a manifesto against Elias and the other abettors of laxity among the friars. This claim gave rise to a large controversial literature. The majority of critics ascribe the "Speculum Perfectionis" to a later date and regard it as the work of different writers. However this may be, the "Speculum Perfectionis" remains of the utmost value and interest. In spite of its polemic tone—which reflects the controversy raging within the order between the *zelanti* and *mitigati* in Leo's day—and its shortcomings from a literary standpoint if compared with the "Legends" of Thomas of Celano and of St. Bonaventure, the portrait of St. Francis which the "Speculum" presents, and which all admit to be substantially due to Leo, affords an insight into the life of the Poverello such as no formal biography contains and such as none but an intimate could have given. Leo was moreover associated with Angelo and Rufino in the composition of the celebrated "Legend of the Three Companions", a work which has been the subject of scarcely less controversy than the "Speculum Perfectionis"; he is also credited with the authorship of a life of Blessed Giles or Ægidius of Assisi inserted in the "Chronicle of the XXIV Generals", and is thought to have collaborated in the biography of St. Clare written about 1257.

No modern biography of Leo exists, but Paul Sabatier has been at pains to gather all the contemporary references to him (see *Speculum Perfectionis* ed. SABATIER (Paris, 1898), pp. LXII–LXXXV], and there is a good sketch of his life by ANNE MACDONELL, *Sons of Francis* (London, 1902), pp. 95–112. The early life of Leo contained in the *Chron. XXIV Generalium* [*Anal. Francis.*, t. III (Quaracchi, 1897), 65 sq.] seems to be a compendium of an older legend; the one inserted by BARTHOL. PISANUS in his *De Conformitate* [*Anal. Francis*, IV (1906), 188 sq.] gives a list of miracles attributed to Leo not found elsewhere. On the writings of Leo see LEMMENS, *Scripta Fratris Leonis* in *Doc. Ant. Francis.*, I (Quaracchi, 1901). For a synopsis of the controversial literature to which the *Speculum Perfectionis* gave rise see DE KERVAL in *Bullettino Critico di cose Francescane* (Dec. 1905), 109, and ROBINSON, *Introduction to Franciscan Literature* (New York, 1907), 12 sq. See also CLARENUS, *Historia Tribulationum etc.* ed. EHRLE in *Archiv. für Litt. und Kirchen*, III, 553–623; WADDING, *Annales Minorum ad an 1210*, I, 91 n 32; *Actus B. Francisci et Sociorum ejus.* ed. SABATIER (Paris, 1902), vii–ix and *passim*; BALFOUR, *The Seraphic Keepsake* (London, 1905) *passim*; CARMICHAEL, *La Benedizione di San Francesco* (Leghorn, 1900); ROBINSON, *The Writings of St. Francis* (Philadelphia, 1906), 130 sq., and 146 sq.

PASCHAL ROBINSON.

Leocadia, SAINT, virgin and martyr, d. 9 December, probably 304, in the Diocletian persecution. The last great persecution gave the Church in Spain a succession of martyrs, who from 303 until 305 suffered death for the Christian Faith. In the historical martyrologies of the ninth century, St. Leocadia of Toledo is honoured among these martyrs on 9 December. Her name is not mentioned by Prudentius in his hymn on the Spanish Martyrs, but in very early times there was a church dedicated to her at Toledo. In the first half of the seventh century this church was mentioned as the meeting-place of the Fourth Synod of Toledo in 633, as well as of the fifth in 636, and the sixth in 638 (Concil. Toletanum IV, mentions the "basilica beatissimæ et sanctæ Confessoris Leocadiæ"; Mansi, "Concil. Coll.", X, 615). Long before that date, therefore, Leocadia must have been publicly honoured as a martyr. The basilica in question was

evidently erected over her grave. There is no doubt of the historical fact of her martyrdom, whilst the date of 9 December for her annual commemoration obviously rests on the tradition of the Church of Toledo. More recently compiled Acts relate that Leocadia was filled with a desire for martyrdom through the story of the martyrdom of St. Eulalia. By order of the governor, Decianus, who is described in the martyrology as the most furious persecutor of the Christians in Spain, she was seized and cruelly tortured in order to make her apostatize, but she remained steadfast and was sent back to prison, where she died from the effects of the torture. A church was built over her grave, besides which two others at Toledo are dedicated to her. She is the patroness of the diocese, and 9 December is still given as her feast in the Roman Martyrology. She is represented with a tower, to signify that she died in prison.

FLÓREZ, *España Sagrada*, VI, 315–17; LA FUENTE, *Historia eclesiástica de España*, 2nd ed., I (Madrid, 1873), 335–7; SURIUS, *Vita Sanctorum*, 9 December. XII, 199; BUTLER, *Lives of the Saints*, 9 December.

J. P. KIRSCH.

Leodegar (LEGER), SAINT, Bishop of Autun, b. about 615; d. a martyr in 678, at Sarcing, Somme. His mother was called Sigrada, and his father Bobilo. His parents being of high rank, his early childhood was passed at the court of Clotaire II. He went later to Poitiers, to study under the guidance of his uncle, the bishop of that town. Having given proof of his learning and virtue, and feeling a liking for the priestly life, his uncle ordained him deacon, and associated him with himself in the government of the diocese. Shortly afterwards he became a priest and with the bishop's approval withdrew to the monastery of St. Maxentius in 650. He was soon elected abbot and signalized himself by reforming the community and introducing the Rule of St. Benedict. In 656 he was called to the court by the widowed Queen Bathildis to assist in the government of the kingdom and in the education of her children. In reward for his services he was named to the Bishopric of Autun in 610. He again undertook the work of reform and held a council at Autun in 661. It dealt a crushing blow to Manichæism and was the first to adopt the Creed of St. Athanasius. He made reforms among the secular clergy and the religious communities, and he impressed on all pastors the importance of preaching and of administering the sacraments, especially baptism. For this purpose the bishop had three baptisteries erected in the town. The church of Saint-Nazaire was enlarged and embellished, and a refuge established for the indigent. Leodegar also caused the public buildings to be repaired and the old Roman walls to be restored. The latter still exist and are among the finest specimens preserved.

Serious trouble soon arose in the state. The Austrasians demanded a king and young Childeric II was sent to them through the influence of Ebroin, the mayor of the palace in Neustria. The latter was practically a ruler and desired to get rid of all who thwarted his plans. The queen withdrew from the court to an abbey she had founded at Chelles, near Paris. On the death of Clotaire III, in 670, Ebroin raised Thierry to the throne, but Leodegar and the other bishops supported the claims of his elder brother Childeric, who, by the help of the Austrasians and Burgundians, was eventually made king. Ebroin was exiled to Luxeuil and Thierry sent to St. Denis. Leodegar remained at court, guiding the young king. When the bishop protested against the marriage of Childeric and his first cousin, he also was sent to Luxeuil, his enemies representing him to the king as a conspirator. Childeric II was murdered at Bondi in 673, by a Frank whom he had maltreated. Thierry III now ascended the throne in Neustria, making Leudesius his mayor. Leodegar and Ebroin hastened from Luxeuil to the court. In a short time Ebroin caused Leudesius to be murdered, and became mayor. He vowed vengeance on the bishop, whom he looked on as the cause of his imprisonment. About 675 the Duke of Champagne and the Bishops of Chalons and Valence, stirred up by Ebroin, attacked Autun. To save the town, Leodegar surrendered to them. He was brutally treated and his eyes put out, the sockets being seared with red-hot irons. Ebroin's bloodthirsty instincts were not yet satiated; he caused the holy bishop's lips to be cut off and his tongue to be torn out. Some years later he persuaded the king that Childeric had been assassinated at the instigation of Leodegar. The bishop was seized again, and, after a mock trial, was degraded and condemned. He was led out into a forest by Ebroin's order and murdered. His testament drawn up at the time of the council, as well as the Acts of the council, are preserved. A letter which he caused to be sent to his mother after his mutilation is likewise extant. His relics, which had been at Sarcing in Artois, were translated to the Abbey of St. Maxentius at Poitiers in 782. Later they were removed to Rennes and thence to Ebreuil, which place took the name of Saint-Léger. Some of them are still kept in the cathedral of Autun and the Grand Séminaire of Soissons. In 1458 Cardinal Rolin caused his feast day to be observed as a holiday of obligation.

PITRA, *Histoire de Saint Léger* (Paris, 1846); BENNETT in *Dict. Christ. Biog.*, s. v. *Leodegarius;* FAURIEL, *Histoire de la Gaule méridionale*, II (Paris, 1836), 461–473; GUIZOT, *Collection des mémoires relatifs à l'histoire de France*, II (Paris, 1823), 325; GUÉRIN, *Vie des saints*, XI (Paris, 1880), 619–47; MABILLON, *Acta SS. O.S.B.*, II (Paris, 1669), 680–705; *P. L.*, XCVI, 377–84; CXIII, 373; CXXIV, 529; *Analecta Bollandiana*, XI (Brussels, 1892), 104–10; KAULEN in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.

A. A. MACERLEAN.

Leo Diaconus, Byzantine historian, b. at Kaloe, at the foot of Mount Tmolos, in Ionia, about the year 950; the year of his death is unknown. In his early youth he came to study at Constantinople and, as his name tells, was ordained deacon. In 986 he took part in the war against the Bulgars under the Emperor Basil II (976–1025), was present at the siege of Triaditza (Sofia), where the imperial army was defeated, and barely escaped with his life. After the year 992 he began to write a history of the empire, presumably at Constantinople. The work is incomplete. Apparently he died before he could finish it. The history, divided into ten books, covers the years from 959 to 975, that is, the reigns of Romanus II (959–963), Nicephorus Phocas (963–969) and John Zimisces (969–976). It describes the wars against the Arabs in which the fortresses of Cilicia and the Island of Cyprus were won back (964–965), the conquest of Antioch and Northern Syria from the Moslems (968–969), the Bulgarian War (969) and the defeat of the Southern Russians (971), one of the most brilliant periods of the later Empire. For the reigns of Nicephorus Phocas and John Zimisces, Leo the Deacon is the one source, the only contemporary historian, from whom all later writers have drawn their material. His authorities are his own observation and the account of eyewitnesses. He says: "The events as I saw them with my own eyes (for eyes are more trustworthy than ears, as Herodotus says) and as I gathered them from those who saw them, these things I write in my book" (Bonn edition, p. 5). Although Leo is so valuable an authority for his period, critics do not judge his manner of writing favourably. He is affected and dull, fond of foreign (Latin) words, and has a mania for unusual and extravagant forms; for simple words like "brother", or even the verb "to be" he prefers absurd artificial synonyms. Krumbacher sums up his style as "trivial and pedantic". Leo quotes Procopius, Homer, and especially the Bible (in the Septuagint). His loyalty to the emperor often prejudices his honesty. His history is con-

tinued by Michael Psellus. Leo's book was not very popular in the following centuries. Other writers who drew their information from him, were preferred, e. g. Nicephorus Bryennius. A result of this is that only one manuscript of his history is extant (cod. Paris, 1712).

First complete edition in the Paris *Corpus*, edited with a commentary by HASE (Paris, 1819), reprinted in the *Bonn Series* (1828), and in *P. G.*, CXVII, 635–926. HASE had already published Book VI with a Latin version and an analysis of the whole work in the *Notices et extraits de la bibliothèque nationale*, VIII (Paris, 1810), 2, 254–296; FISCHER, *Beiträge zur historischen Kritik des Leon Diakonos* in *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Oesterreichische Geschichtsforschung*, VII (1886), 353–377; SCHLUMBERGER, *Nicéphore Phocas* (Paris, 1890)

ADRIAN FORTESCUE.

Leon. See QUIMPER, DIOCESE OF.

Leon, DIOCESE AND CIVIL PROVINCE OF.—HISTORY. —Probably before the time of Trajan, the Romans founded in the Asturias, in the neighborhood of the ancient Lancia, a military colony to which they gave the name of *Legio Septima Gemina*. From *Legio* (acc. *legionem*) was formed, in accordance with the nature of the Romance-Castilian language, the name *León*, and the identity of this name with that of the king of beasts (*león*, from *leo*, acc. *leonem*) perhaps explains how, by what in German is called a *Volksetimologie*, the lion came to be considered the heraldic cognizance of the city and province of this name, and even of the whole Spanish people. Very soon the original military colony admitted civilian colonists, as the ancient epitaphs prove. Within a few years after its foundation the *Legatus Augustalis* who governed the Asturias was residing in this settlement.

Christianity must have been introduced very early, for it had its bishops at least as early as the third century, and the names of Basilides and Decentius are known before the time of the Germanic invasions. These invaders do not seem to have established themselves in Leon—a stronghold of the imperial power—until Euric (466–84), or at least Leovigild (572–86), drove out the imperial garrison. In the Roman persecutions Leon had numerous martyrs, among whom were Sts. Facundus, Primitivus, the husband and wife Marcellus and Nonia, with their sons Claudius, Victoricus, and Lupercus, Vincent, and Ramirus. The name of St. Facundus took, in the ancient dialect, the form *Sa-hagún*, which survives as a geographical name. A monastery was built, in the fourth century, on the spot where Claudius and his brothers suffered martyrdom. Leon fell into the power of the Mussulman invaders, but they did not long retain it; it was reconquered by Alfonso I, the Catholic. Destroyed a second time by the Mussulmans in the time of Abderrahman II (846), it was again rebuilt by Ordoño I (850–866), who erected there a royal residence which Ordoño II afterwards transformed into a cathedral. Among the bishops of Leon at this period figure Siuntila, Frunimius, Maurus, and Vincent, and the great St. Froilan (900–05), who was followed by Cixila and Frunimius II.

However, as the Court remained at Oviedo during all this period, Leon did not attain any great importance. When Alfonso III (the Great) was dethroned by his sons (910), the eldest of them, García, took for himself the city of Leon, which then began to be the capital of a kingdom. García died early (914), and Galicia, which had been Ordoño's share, was united to Leon. Ordoño II, who vanquished the Moors at S. Esteban de Gormaz, and was routed by them at Valdejunquera, reduced the Counts of Castile to submission and founded the cathedral of Leon (914–24). Leon now attained the chief place among the Christian States of Western Spain, but in the middle of the same century (the tenth) Castile began her efforts to achieve her liberation from Leonese vassalage. Meanwhile Leon succumbed for a brief period to the irresistible power of Almanzor (983). But Alfonso V rebuilt and repeopled the city, giving it its famous *fuero*, or charter, a collection of laws promulgated in the Council of Leon. This council which opened 1 August, 1020, had a politico-ecclesiastical character similar to that of the Toledan councils of the Visigothic period. Among other privileges, this *fuero* secured to the inhabitants of Leon inviolability of domicile, and it established the rights of *benefactoría* (whence the local term, *be-hetría*), by which a vassal might bind himself to any lord who would protect him.

In the spring of 1029 the city of Leon was the scene of a bloody event which was of transcendent importance in Spanish history. Don García, Count of Castile, who was about to be married to Doña Sancha, sister of Bermudo III, King of Leon, was assassinated as he was entering the church of S. Juan Bautista, by the Velas, a party of Castilian nobles, exiles from their own country, who had taken refuge in Leon. Leon and Navarre disputed the succession to the Countship of Castile thus left vacant. Ferdinand, son of Sancho the Elder (or the Great), of Navarre, married Sancha, sister of Bermudo III, of Leon, and received the title of King of Castile, and when, the war being renewed, Bermudo was slain at the battle of Tamarón, the united crowns of Leon and Castile became the possession of Ferdinand I. From that time the hegemony which Leon had enjoyed began to pass to Castile. The causes of this change, which left so deep an impression upon the history of Spain, may be summed up as follows: (1) Ferdinand, first King of Castile, had vanquished Bermudo; (2) Ferdinand I at his death, divided his kingdoms between his sons; Sancho, King of Castile, then wrested the Kingdom of Leon from Alfonso, but, Sancho being himself assassinated before the walls of Zamora by Vellido Dolfos, Alfonso in his turn obtained possession of both the kingdoms. (3) The Kingdoms of Castile and Leon being once more separated upon the death of Alfonso VII (the Emperor —see below) Alfonso VIII of Castile notably advanced the reconquest of Spain by gaining the victory of Las Navas de Tolosa (1212), while Alfonso IX of Leon pursued a dastardly policy of fomenting civil strife. (4) Ferdinand III, the Saint—who inherited Castile through his mother, Doña Berenguela, and then, on the death of his father, Alfonso IX, became King of Leon—transferred the centre of his activities to Castile. (5) Above all, Castile led the van of the reconquest beyond the Carpetan Mountains (Sierras de Gata, de Gredos, de Guadarrama), while Leon, by its separation from Portugal, found its expansion arrested at the boundaries of Estremadura.

The principal events which took place in Leon at this period were the following: The translation of the relics of St. Isidore to the ancient church of S. Juan Bautista, which was rebuilt and dedicated to the Sevillian Doctor, 21 December, 1063. Alvito, Bishop of Leon, went to Seville with an embassy to Ebn Abed, to bring the body of St. Justa, but, not finding it, brought that of St. Isidore. The Monk of Silos has preserved the history of this religious expedition. On 26 May, 1135, Alfonso VII was proclaimed, in the basilica of Sta. María, Emperor of Spain (*Ildephonsus pius . . . . . totius Hispaniæ imperator*). In 1176 the Military Order of Santiago was installed in the hospital of S. Marcos. In the minority of Ferdinand IV, the infante Don Juan was proclaimed King of Leon; and in the minority of Alfonso XI, the partisans of the infante brought his son Alfonso into the city of Leon and fortified themselves in the cathedral, which was almost destroyed by the attacking party who tried to dislodge them. The Leonese opposed Henry of Trastamare, who had killed his brother Pedro the Cruel (1368). After his triumph, nevertheless, Henry showed himself favourable to Leon, confirming its privileges, and John I reformed the municipal government which had been established by

Alfonso XI (1390). In the Cortes of 1406 and 1407 it was declared that the representatives of Leon had the second place in the order of voting (*segundo asiento*) after those of Burgos. In 1493, Ferdinand the Catholic, by his presence added solemnity to the translation of the relics of St. Marcellus.

Geography.—The Province of Leon as it actually exists, situated in the northern part of the ancient kingdom of the same name, is bounded on the north by the Asturias; on the east by the Provinces of Santander and Valladolid; on the south by that of Zamora; on the west by Galicia (Provinces of Orense and Lugo). Its natural boundaries are: the Cantabrian Mountains (which separate it from the Province of Oviedo on the north) from the peak of Guiña (6570 feet) to the Peña Vieja (8750 feet); its boundaries are continued on the east by the range which separates the basins of the Cea and the Carrión and are prolonged parallel to the course of both those rivers as far as Sahagún, turning thence to the south-east and following the course of the Cea, which bounds the Province of Valladolid. The southern boundaries are formed mostly by the range of the Peña Negra, while the western, beginning from Peña Trevinca, skirts Lake Baña, crosses the River Sil and follows northward the heights which mark on one side the basin of that river, towards the port of Piedrafita. Most of the province is within the great Castilian plateau, at an elevation of more than 1600 feet above the sea level, rising towards the Cantabrian Mountains on the north. From north to west it is drained by the Sil and its tributaries, which receive the waters flowing from the southern slope of the Cantabrian Mountains, from the Peña Rubia (6313 feet) onwards; from north to south by the Orbigo and the Bernesga, both affluents of the Esla (which, in turn, is an affluent of the Duero), and by the Cea, which forms the boundaries of the province on the east and south-east. Very mountainous in the north and north-west, it becomes more level towards the south-east, where it marches with the celebrated "Gothic Plains" (*Campi Gothici* or *Tierra de Campos*). From north to south-west it is traversed by the Mountains of Leon, which, joining the Cantabrian Chain, enclose the district of El Vierzo, leaving no other opening but that through which the Sil, a tributary of the Minho, passes.

The Province of Leon abounds in mineral resources. The carboniferous formation, which covers a wide area in the east, runs westward by the Valley of Ponjos, penetrates into El Vierzo, and, extending beyond Igueña, San Pedro de Mallo, and Villamartin, reaches as far as Fabero. The hollows on both banks of the Bernesga contain deposits of coal, with vast masses of carboniferous limestone, the exploitation of which undoubtedly promises great things for the future of Leonese industry. There are also iron, copper, and cobalt mines (e. g. the "Profunda", in the municipal district of Carmenes), and a great abundance of mineral waters—bicarbonate, sulphurous, etc. The climate varies considerably—cold in the mountains of the north, warm in the lowlands of the south-east. El Vierzo, sheltered by the mountains from the north winds, is one of the mildest and most humid regions; there the vine, the olive, and fruits of many kinds are cultivated. In the south great quantities of wheat and other cereals are grown, as well as pulse, beans, esculent herbs, and excellent silky flax. The forests are rich in beech, ilex, and oak. The livestock amounts to more than a million head of sheep, cattle, and swine. The mountainous character of the country, rendering communication difficult, is somewhat unfavourable to industry, which is confined to that of ironworks, mills, and the manufacture of flour. Leather and coarse cloth are produced; linseed oil is extracted, and chocolate and delicious cheeses are manufactured.

Statistics.—Lying between 42° 4′ 30″ and 42° 17′ north latitude, and between 1° 6′ and 3° 20′ longitude east of Madrid (2° 35′ 51″ and 21′ 51″ west of Greenwich), this province has an area of 15,377 square kilometers (5934 square miles). The land under cultivation amounts to 937,399 hectares (2,316,313 acres), of which 117,281 hectares (289,801 acres) are irrigated. The population, according to the census of 1900, was 401,172, whereas the census of 1887 gave a population of 388,830—an increase of 12,342 inhabitants in thirteen years, and a proportion of 26.7 inhabitants to the square kilometre (about 10.31 to the square mile). The Report of the Instituto Geographico y Estadistico on the movement of population for 1901 gives for the Province of Leon 14,784 births, 10,131 deaths, and 2987 marriages, showing that the increase of population continues.

Civil Division.—The province is divided into ten judicial districts and 234 subdivisions (*ayuntamientos*). The judicial districts are: Astorga (an episcopal see), La Bañeza, Murias de Paredes, Ponferrada, Riaño, Sahagún, Valencia de D. Juan, La Vecilla, Villafranca de Bierzo, and Leon. The capital has a population of 17,022 inhabitants.

Ecclesiastical Division.—The Diocese of Leon belongs to the ecclesiastical Province of Burgos, though that of Astorga, which is in the same civil province, belongs to the ecclesiastical Province of Valladolid. It (Leon) consists of 345 parishes, grouped in 37 archipresbyteries, and comprises part of the territory of the civil Provinces of Valladolid and Oviedo. The lists of its bishops was interrupted by the Arab conquest. It possesses two ecclesiastical seminaries: that of S. Froilan and that of S. Mateo de Valderas. The college of S. Isidoro at Leon, for poor scholars, is incorporated with the seminary of S. Froilan. There are two chapters in the diocese: that of the cathedral, and the collegiate chapter of San Isidoro, with an abbot and sixteen canons. The present incumbent of the see, the Right Reverend Juan Manuel Sanz y Saravía, b. at Puebla de los Infantes, 30 March, 1848, was preconized 27 March, 1905.

Religious Communities in the Diocese.—At the capital there is a convent of Capuchins and a house of Augustinians who have charge of the pupils of the Instituto Provincial. There are also the Benedictine nuns of Sta. María de Carvajal, Franciscan Conceptionists, Augustinian nuns, and Discalced nuns of Sta. Cruz, besides other uncloistered communities of women, viz., the Sisters of Charity in the Hospital Provincial and the Chapter Hospital and in the Asilo Municipal, an asylum of the Little Sisters of the Poor, a college of Carmelites of Charity, Servants of Jesus for the aid of the sick, and a convent of Carmelite Sisters. At Sahagún three are Benedictines of Sta. Cruz, and a hospital and college of Sisters of Charity; at Mayorga (Province of Valladolid), a convent of Franciscan Fathers occupied in teaching, Dominican nuns, and a hospital of Sisters of Charity; at Castroverde de Campos (Province of Zamora), Franciscan Fathers; at S. Pedro de Dueñas and in the monastery of La Vega, Benedictine nuns; at Villalpando, Villalobos, and Villafrechos there are Poor Clares; at Grajal de Campos, Discalced Carmelites; at Cuenca de Campos, Franciscan nuns; at Gradefes, Bernardine nuns; at Villalón, a hospital of Sisters of Charity; at Boadilla de Rioseco, a college of Tertiaries of the Sacred Heart of Jesus and Mary; at Saldaña, a college of Servants of Mary.

Education.—Besides the colleges of religious orders already mentioned, there are the Instituto Provincial at Leon and a local institute at Ponferrada. Leon is dependent upon the university district of Oviedo.

The City of Leon, capital of the civil province and also of the Diocese of León, is situated on the River Bernesga, at its junction with the Torio. It has a station on the Palencia, Coruña, and Oviedo railroad.



SIDE DOOR, CHURCH OF S. ISIDRO
FAÇADE OF THE CHURCH, CONVENT OF S. MARCO

LEÓN

TOMB IN THE TRANSEPT OF THE CATHEDRAL
CATHEDRAL CLOISTER

A part of the ancient city walls are still standing, some of them being Roman fortifications dating from the third century and decorated with tesseræ. The best preserved of these remains are in the "Carrera de los Cubos", on the north-west side of the city, between the cathedral and the Puerta del Castillo. The modern city extends beyond this enclosure towards the railroad. The most notable monuments are the cathedral, the collegiate church of S. Isidoro, and the convent of S. Marcos. The cathedral of Sta. María is one of the best examples of primitive Gothic in Spain. It is supposed to have been commenced in the middle of the thirteenth century, in the episcopates of Nuño Alvarez and Martin III (Fernández) (1245–80), and the façade was completed at the end of the sixteenth century. Its excessive weight caused the dilapidation which occasioned repairs under the direction of Madrazo (d. 1881), Demetrio de los Rios (d. 1892), and Lazaro. Its plan is a Latin cross, with three naves, a transept, a choir of five naves, and a chevet of chapels. Above the lateral arcade runs the triforium gallery, and above that again large ogival windows filled with stained glass of great value. The choir, in the middle of the largest nave, is magnificent Florid Gothic; the retro-choir, Renaissance. In the centre of the space behind the altar stands the mausoleum of Ordoño II. On the Gospel side of the main chapel is the tomb of St. Alvitus; on the Epistle side, that of Don Pelayo, the Bishop; in the chapel of the Saviour, that of the Countess Sancha; in the chapel of the Nativity, that of Bishop Rodrigo. The cloister is in the Renaissance-Transition ogival style. The exterior, uncovered in front and on one side, is dominated by the spires which crown the two lofty and massive towers; it is sustained by pinnacles and buttresses, strengthened with supports and abutments, and surrounded with cornices and pierced parapets. There are two orders of ogival windows and, opening to the west and south, a triple doorway which is profusely ornamented with magnificent carvings, and gives access to a spacious vestibule paved with marble and closed by an iron grille. The two towers, of unequal height, stand apart from the nave of the church from their bases up, but are connected with it by means of abutments. The northern tower, which is the less lofty, is crowned with a parapet and an octagonal spire. The southern is taller and more ornate; its octagonal spire is of exquisite pierced work. Here, in large Gothic characters, may be read: *María—Jesús Xps—Deus homo;* and higher up: *Ave María—Gratia plena—Dns tecum.* The porch consists of three arcades, corresponding to the three entrances; upon the pillar which bisects the middle portal stands the large and beautiful statue of the Blessed Virgin called *la Blanca* (the White). Towards the north of the city is the basilica of S. Isidoro, predominantly Byzantine in architecture, but with the addition of later constructions. The church has three lofty naves. In the north transept may be read the record of the consecration, performed by eleven bishops, 6 March, 1149. In the crypt of this church is the burial-place of the kings, which was desecrated by the French of Napoleon's army. The convent of S. Marco stands outside the city, to the west. It was once a residence of the Knights of Santiago. Its rebuilding was commenced by Ferdinand the Catholic and was completed in 1715. Its decoration is in the Plateresque style.

Fita, *Epigrafía romana de la ciudad de León* (Leon, 1866); Flórez-Risco, *España Sagrada*, XXXIV-VI, *Memorias de la Sta. Iglesia exenta de León* (Madrid, 1784–86); Quadrado, *España, sus monumentos y artes* (Barcelona, 1885); *Censo de 1900* and *Movimiento de la poblacion en 1901* in *Memorias del Instituto Geográfico y Estadístico;* Muños y Romero, *Fueros municipales de Castilla* (1847); Colmeiro, *Constitución y gobierno de los reinos de León y Castilla* (Madrid, 1855); Davila, *Teatro eclesiástico de España*, I (1618); Lavina, *La catedral de León* (Madrid, 1876); Belloso, *Anuario Eclesiástico de España* (Madrid, 1904).

Ramón Ruiz Amado.

León, Diocese of (Leonensis), suffragan of Michoacan in Mexico, erected in 1863. In the early days of the discovery of Mexico the whole country was divided into dioceses subject to the Archbishop of Seville in Spain as metropolitan. Among these was Michoacan, erected as a bishopric in 1536. On 31 January, 1545, at the request of Charles V, Paul III formed the Archdiocese of Mexico, and Michoacan became one of its suffragan sees, its bishop residing in what is now the town of Morelia. In the Secret Consistory of 16 March, 1863, Pius IX divided the Diocese of Michoacan into the Sees of Michoacan, Zamora, León, and Queretaro. The Diocese of León, which comprises the civil State of Guanajuato, about 8000 sq. miles in area, and having a population of 968,163, is in the heart of a rich agricultural country famous for its cotton and woollen weaving. The richest silver mines in Mexico are in the neighbourhood of Guanajuato. The town of Guanajuato, situated 6000 feet above the level of the sea, and 250 miles north-west of Mexico, is famous also for its churches and monasteries. It was founded by the Spaniards in 1554, and has a population of 53,000, though under Spanish rule the population exceeded 100,000. León, or León de los Aldamas, the chief town of the department of the same name, is the residence of the bishop, Mgr Emeterio Valverde Telles. The town is situated on the right bank of the Rio Torbio, at a height of 5000 feet above sea-level, and had a population of 63,263 in 1900. It was founded in 1576. Another important town in the same department is San Francisco del Rincón. As an episcopal see León dates from 1863, and its present bishop was elected on 7 August, 1909. The cathedral chapter consists of 12 canons and 6 chaplains. There is a diocesan seminary with 24 professors, and the spiritual wants of the diocese are looked after by 264 secular priests and 48 regulars (see Mexico). Among former bishops may be mentioned Mgr Tomas Baron y Morales, appointed 1882; Mgr Zambrano, appointed 1886; and Mgr Ruiz, appointed 1900.

Gerarchia Cattolica (1910); *Ann. pont. cath.* (1910); Herder, *Konversations-Lex.; Diccionario di Ciencias eclesiásticas.*

J. C. Grey.

León, Luis de, Spanish poet and theologian, b. at Belmonte, Aragon, in 1528; d. at Madrigal, 23 August, 1591. He came from an honourable bourgeois family, his father being "king's advocate" at Madrid. At fourteen the youth was sent to Salamanca to study law. Six months later he entered the Augustinian convent of that city. After completing his theological studies and obtaining his university degrees (1560) he was appointed to the chair of theology. The decree of the Council of Trent as to the authenticity of the Vulgate was then causing great dissension among the professors at Salamanca. Some of them, Grajal, Martínez, de León, and others continued to use in their courses or in their exegetical writings the Hebraic texts, the Septuagint, and even the version of Vatable. Some, like Medina and León de Castro, saw in this a defiance of the council's decree, and effectively denounced their adversaries, whom they called rabbinists. Early in 1572 Grajal and Martínez were arrested at Salamanca and accused of heresy. On 27 March, de León met the same fate, and was incarcerated at Valladolid by order of the Inquisition as being their abettor. After examining his writings and hearing the witnesses, the Inquisition summed up in seventeen propositions the accusations urged against him. In these propositions he was not charged with heresy, but with imprudence and rashness, particularly on account of his rather disrespectful appreciation of the Vulgate. The tribunal at Valladolid, after a trial extending over nearly five years, declared him guilty and asked that he be put to the rack and rebuked. This sentence, however, had to be ratified by the supreme council at Madrid. But nine days later

(7 December, 1576) this body reversed the sentence, acquitted de León, and ordered his chair to be given back to him, but warned him to be more cautious in his teaching. He renounced the chair, however, for the time being, in favour of the professor who had filled it during his absence, and was satisfied with pecuniary compensation and supplementary teaching.

In 1582 he got into fresh difficulties with the Inquisition, having in some points opposed the doctrine of St. Augustine on predestination. He was summoned before the high inquisitor at Toledo and warned to be more circumspect. He was appointed by the University of Salamanca a member of the committee on the reformation of the calendar, but in 1587 he refused to act on the commission for correction of the Vulgate, declaring that by comparing the present version with the original one would get further away from the Hebrew.

He was appointed provincial of his order a few days before his death. He left many works, published in six volumes (Madrid, 1806–1816). The first five contained his theological writings, of which the most important are Biblical commentaries superior to any of his time (on Abdias, Job, the Epistle to the Galatians, and the Canticle of Canticles). The sixth volume contains his vernacular writings: "La perfecta casada" (The Perfect Housewife); "De los nombres de Cristo", a metrical version of the Canticle of Canticles (employed against him on his trial), versions of the Eclogues and the Georgics of Virgil, versions of thirty odes of Horace, of forty psalms, and a few original odes, the most celebrated of which are: "The Prophecy of the Tagus", "The Life of the Fields", "The Serene Night", "Hymn on the Ascension". "La perfecta casada", one of the gems of sixteenth century pedagogical literature, has recently been edited by Elizabeth Wallace (Chicago University Decennial Publications, 1903); for a French version see Jane Dieulafoy "La Parfaite Epouse" (Paris, 1904). Despite a certain unevenness of style Luis de León is one of the greatest masters of Castilian lyric poetry. His virile national spirit, at once religious and patriotic, and his rare classical purity, magnanimity, and sure judgment conspire to save him from effeminacy, affectation, and pedantry.

Obras del M. Fr. Luis de León (Madrid, 1804–16); *Proceso original que la Inquisición hizo al M. Fr. Luiz de León* in *Colección de Documentos inéditos para la historia de España*, X, XI (Madrid, 1847); GONZALES DE TEJADA, *Vida de Fray Luis de León* (Madrid, 1863); GETINO, *Vida y processos del Maestro F. Luiz de Léon* (Salamanca, 1907); TICKNOR, *History of Spanish Literature* (Boston, 1864); FORD, *Luis de León, the Spanish Poet, Humanist, and Mystic* in *Public Mod. Lang. Assoc. of America*, XIV, no. 2; HURTER, *Nomenclator.*

ANTOINE DEGERT.

Leonardi, GIOVANNI, BLESSED. See CLERKS REGULAR OF THE MOTHER OF GOD OF LUCCA.

Leonardo da Vinci. See VINCI, LEONARDO DA.

Leonard of Chios, b. at an uncertain date on the Island of Chios, then under Genoese domination; d. in Chios or in Italy, 1482. He himself says he was of humble parents. He entered the Dominican Order in Chios, and after profession was sent to Padua for his philosophical and theological studies. After ordination he taught at both Padua and Genoa, then at the request of Maria Justiniani returned to his native island, and was made Bishop of Mytilene on the island of Lesbos by Eugene IV. Emperor Constantine Palæologus had sent a request to the pope, asking that efforts be made to effect a union between the Latin and Greek Churches: for this purpose Leonard was selected to accompany Isidore, Cardinal-Bishop of Sabina, to Constantinople. Some degree of success was attained through their efforts, and a treaty was ratified in December, 1452. However, the Greeks refused the aid of the Latin troops, and in the following year Leonard was a witness to the devastation of the city by Mohammed II. Leonard and the cardinal were miraculously spared from the slaughter which ensued, the latter returning to Rome and Leonard to his diocese. From Chios he wrote to the pope a detailed account of the fall of Constantinople in a letter, which is often reprinted by historians ("Historia captæ a Turcis Constantinopolis," Nuremberg, 1544; P. G., CLIX, 923 sq.; Lonicer, "Chronica Turcica", I, Frankfurt, 1578; "De capta a Mehemete II. Constantinopoli Leonardi Chiensis et Godefredi Langi narrationes," ed. L'Ecuy, Paris, 1823). He governed his diocese for the next three years, until Lesbos also fell and he was taken captive to Constantinople. He obtained his freedom the following year, and immediately wrote the pope a description of the sack of his diocese ("Leonardi Chiensis de Lesbo a Turcis capta epistola Pio Papæ II missa", ed. Hopf, Königsberg, 1866). His best-known writings are the two letters mentioned above and an apologetical tract in answer to the humanist Poggio. Both tracts with biographical sketches were edited by Michael Justinian (Avila, 1657). There is reason to believe that many of his letters remain unedited in the Vatican Library.

ECHARD AND QUÉTIF, *Scriptores O. P.*, II, 816; STREBER in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v. *Leonhard von Chios;* HOPF, op. cit.

IGNATIUS SMITH.

Leonard of Limousin, SAINT.—Nothing absolutely certain is known of his history, as his earliest "Life", written in the eleventh century, has no historical value whatever. According to this extraordinary legend, Leonard belonged to a noble Frankish family of the time of King Clovis, and St. Remy of Reims was his godfather. After having secured from the king the release of a great number of prisoners, and refused episcopal honours which Clovis offered him, he entered a monastery at Micy near Orléans. Later he went to Aquitaine and there preached the Gospel. Having obtained, through prayer, a safe delivery for the Queen of the Franks in her confinement, he received as a gift from the king a domain at Noblac, near Limoges, where he founded a monastery. The veneration paid this saint is as widely known as his history is obscure and uncertain. It is true that there is no trace of it before the eleventh century, but from that time it spread everywhere, and little by little churches were dedicated to him, not only in France, but in all Western Europe, especially in England, Belgium, Spain, Italy, Switzerland, Germany, more particularly in Bavaria, and also in Bohemia, Poland, and other countries. Pilgrims, among them kings, princes, and high dignitaries of the Church, flocked to Noblac (now St. Leonard). Numerous miracles are attributed to him, and in one small town alone, Inchenhofen, Bavaria, from the fourteenth to the eighteenth century, there are records of about 4000 favours granted through his intercession. The saint wrought the deliverance of captives, women in confinement, those possessed of an evil spirit, people and beasts afflicted with diseases. At the end of the eleventh century his name had already become renowned among the Crusaders captured by the Mussulmans. He is generally represented holding chains in his hands. His feast day is celebrated on 6 November.

PONCELET in *Acta SS.*, November, III, 139–209; see also CHEVALIER, *Bio-Bibl.*, s. v.

A. PONCELET.

Leonard of Port Maurice, SAINT, preacher and ascetic writer, b. 20 Dec., 1676, at Porto Maurizio on the Riviera di Ponente; d. at the monastery of S. Bonaventura, Rome, 26 Nov., 1751. The son of Domenico Casanova and Anna Maria Benza, he joined, after a brilliant course of study with the Jesuits in Rome (Collegio Romano), the so-called *Riformella*, an offshoot of the Reformati branch of the Franciscan Order [see FRIARS MINOR, II, B, (2)]. On 2 October, 1697, he received the habit, and, after making his novitiate at Ponticelli in the Sabine mountains, he completed his studies at the principal house of the

Riformella, S. Bonaventura on the Palatine at Rome. After his ordination he remained there as *lector* (professor), and expected to be sent on the Chinese missions. But he was soon afterwards seized with severe gastric hæmorrhage, and became so ill that he was sent to his native climate of Porto Maurizio, where there was a monastery of the Franciscan Observants (1704). After four years he was restored to health, and began to preach in Porto Maurizio and the vicinity. When Cosimo III de' Medici handed over the monastery del Monte (that on San Miniato near Florence, also called Monte alle Croci) to the members of the Riformella, St. Leonard was sent hither under the auspices and by desire of Cosimo III, and began shortly to give missions to the people in Tuscany, which were marked by many extraordinary conversions and great results. His colleagues and he always practised the greatest austerities and most severe penances during these missions. In 1710 he founded the monastery of Incontro, on a peak in the mountains about four and a quarter miles from Florence, whither he and his assistants could retire from time to time after missions, and devote themselves to spiritual renewal and fresh austerities.

In 1720 he crossed the borders of Tuscany and held his celebrated missions in Central and Southern Italy, enkindling with zeal the entire population. Clement XII and Benedict XIV called him to Rome; the latter especially held him in high esteem both as a preacher and as a propagandist, and exacted a promise that he would come to Rome to die. Everywhere the saint made abundant conversions, and was very often obliged both in cities and country districts to preach in the open, as the churches could not contain the thousands who came to listen. He founded many pious societies and confraternities, and exerted himself especially to spread the devotion of the Stations of the Cross—the propagation of which he greatly furthered with the assistance of his brethren—the devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus, the perpetual adoration of the Most Blessed Sacrament, and devotion to the Immaculate Conception. One of his most ardent desires was to see the last-named defined as a dogma of faith by the Holy See. Besides the celebrated stations in the Colosseum at Rome, St. Leonard erected 571 others in all parts of Italy, while on his different missions. From May to November, 1744, he preached in the Island of Corsica, which at that time belonged to the Republic of Genoa and which was frightfully torn by party strife. In November, 1751, when he was preaching to the Bolognese, Benedict XIV called him to Rome, as already there were indications of his rapidly approaching end. The strain of his missionary labours and his mortifications had completely exhausted his body. He arrived on the evening of 26 November, 1751, at his beloved monastery of S. Bonaventura on the Palatine, and expired on the same night at eleven o'clock at the age of seventy-five. In the church of this monastery (which must soon make way for the excavations of the ground occupied by the palace of the Cæsars) the partly incorrupt body of the saint is kept in the high altar. Pius VI pronounced his beatification on 19 June, 1796, and Pius IX his canonization on 29 June, 1867. The Franciscan Order celebrates his feast on 26 November, but outside this order it is often celebrated on 27 November.

The numerous writings of the saint consist of sermons, letters, ascetic treatises, and books of devotion for the use of the faithful and of priests, especially missionaries. The "Diary" (*Diario*) of his missions is written by Fra Diego da Firenze. A treasure for asceticism and homiletics, many of his writings have been translated into the most diverse languages and often republished: for example his "Via Sacra spianata ed illuminata" (the Way of the Cross simplified and explained), "Il Tesoro nascosto" (on the Holy Mass); his celebrated "Proponimenti", or resolutions for the attainment of higher Christian perfection. A complete edition of his works appeared first at Rome in thirteen octavo volumes (1853–84), "Collezione completa delle opere di B. Leonardo da Porto Maurizio". Then another in five octavo volumes, "Opere complete di S. Leonardo di Porto Maurizio" (Venice, 1868–9). In English, German etc., only single works have been issued, but a French translation of the entire set has appeared: "Œuvres complètes de S. Léonard de Port-Maurice" (8 vols., Paris and Tournai, 1858), and "Sermons de S. Léonard de Port Maurice" (3 vols., Paris).

Summarium processus beatificationis V. S. D. Leon. a P. M. (Rome, 1781); Rafaello da Roma, *Vita del P. Leonardo da P. M.* (Rome, 1754); Jos. de Masserano, *Vita del B. Leonardo da P. M.* (Rome, 1796), written by the postulator and dedicated to the Duke of York, son of James [III] of England; Salvatore di Ormea, *Vita del B. Leonardo da P. M.* (Rome, 1851); Heithausen and Gehlen, *Leben des sel. Leonhard von P. M.* (Innsbruck, 1869); L. de Cherancé, *S. Léonard de Port-Maurice* (Paris, 1903) in *Nouvelle Bibliothèque Franciscaine* (1st series), XIII. Chapter xx of this last-mentioned work had already appeared in *Études Franciscaines*, VIII (Paris, 1902), 501–10.

Michael Bihl.

Leonidas (or Leonides), Saint.—The Roman Martyrology records several feast days of martyrs of this name in different countries. Under date of 28 January there is a martyr called Leonides, a native of the Thebaïd, whose death with several companions is supposed to have occurred during the Diocletian persecution (Acta SS., January, II, 832). Another Leonides appears on 2 September, in a long list of martyrs headed by a St. Diomedes. Together with a St. Eleutherius, a Leonides is honoured on 8 August. From other sources we know of a St. Leonidas, Bishop of Athens, who lived about the sixth century, and whose feast is celebrated on 15 April ("Acta SS.", April, II, 378; "Bibliotheca hagiographica græca", 2 ed., 137). Still another martyr of the name is honoured on 16 April, with Callistus, Charysius, and other companions (Acta SS., April, II, 402). The best known of them all, however, is St. Leonides of Alexandria, father of the great Origen. From Eusebius (Hist. Eccles., VI, 1, 2) we learn that he died a martyr during the persecution under Septimius Severus in 202. He was condemned to death by the prefect of Egypt, Lactus, and beheaded. His property was confiscated. Leonides carefully cultivated the brilliant intellect of his son Origen from the latter's childhood, and imparted to him the knowledge of Holy Scripture. The feast of St. Leonidas of Alexandria is celebrated on 22 April.

J. P. Kirsch.

Leontius, Saint, Bishop of Fréjus, in Provence, France, b. probably at Nîmes, towards the end of the fourth century; d. in his episcopal town in 433, according to some authorities, though others say 445 or even 448. The date of his episcopal ordination is uncertain, but most likely it took place between the years 400 and 419; indeed the obscurity surrounding his life has not been entirely dissipated by the most conscientious labours of historians. It is however, indisputable that he was a man of eminent sanctity, and his episcopate was marked with important results, else he would not have been from an early date associated with the Blessed Virgin as patron of the cathedral church of Fréjus. A tenth-century document mentions him in this connexion. There is reason to believe that he was a brother of St. Castor, Bishop of Apt, and that consequently like him he was a native of Nîmes. At times he has been mistaken for other persons of the same name, especially for Leontius, Bishop of Arles, who lived at the end of the fifth century. But besides the difference in time, the important events associated with the name of the latter Leontius render the identification impossible. The principal occurrence during the episcopate of Leontius of Fréjus was the establishment of the monastery of Lerins at the beginning of the fifth century. The name

of this bishop is inseparably united to that of Honoratus, the founder of the monastery, and he seems to have played an important part in the development of the monastic life in the south-east of Gaul. Honoratus called him his superior and his father, whilst Cassian, who governed the numerous religious of the Abbey of St. Victor at Marseilles, dedicated most of his "Conferences" to him.

The relations of the monastery of Lérins to the diocesan bishop were most cordial and liberal. Some writers believe that this was due merely to the common custom of the age, but others hold, and not without reason it would seem, that it was the result of special privileges granted by Leontius to Honoratus, with whom he was intimately united in the bonds of friendship. Be that as it may, these regulations, which, while safeguarding the episcopal dignity, assured the independence of the monastery, and were confirmed by the Third Council of Arles, seem to have been the beginning of those immunities, which henceforward were enjoyed in an increasing degree by the religious communities. Moreover, the most cordial relations existed between the saint and the sovereign pontiffs. This is proved by the fact that St. Leo I, after his memorable quarrel with St. Honoratus, Bishop of Arles, deprived the latter of the prerogatives which gave him a kind of primacy over the district of Vienne, and bestowed them on Leontius. It is true that this important event took place only in 445, whilst Leontius had been succeeded in the episcopate by Theodore in 433. That is why some authorities have held that these prerogatives were granted to another Bishop of Fréjus, likewise named Leontius, who would have been a successor of Theodore. To this the supporters of a loved tradition reply that St. Leontius abandoned his see in 432 to go and preach the Gospel to the Teutonic tribes, and returned to his diocese in 442, dying only in 445 or even 448. Unfortunately no very solid proof of this apostolate can be adduced. Consequently it is still quite uncertain whether or not the Diocese of Fréjus had more than one bishop called Leontius. Another tradition, making St. Leontius a martyr, does not seem older than the beginning of the thirteenth century, and merits no credence. Earlier and better authenticated documents give him the title of confessor, which alone is accurate.

ANTELMI, *De initiis Ecclesiæ Forojuliensis* (Aix, 1680), 55–128; BOUCHE, *Description de la Provence*, I (Aix, 1664), 578–9; DISDIER, *Recherches historiques sur Saint Léonce, évêque de Fréjus et patron du diocèse* in *Bull. de la Soc. d'études scient. archéol. de Draguignan* (Draguignan, 1862-1865), IV, 294, 367; V, 71, 138; DU FOUR, *S. Leontius episcopus et martyr suis Forojuliensibus restitutus* (Avignon, 1638); GIRARDIN, *Histoire de la ville et de l'église de Fréjus*, II (Paris, 1729), 40–88, 131–152; TILLEMONT, *Mém. pour servir à l'histoire ecclés.*, XII (Paris, 1707), 468–70, 476–77, 676–79.

LÉON CLUGNET.

Leontius Byzantinus (Λεόντιος Βυζάντιος), an important theologian of the sixth century. In spite of his deserved fame there are few Christian writers whose lives have been so much discussed. Till quite lately even his period was not considered certain. Bellarmine and Labbe placed him before the fifth general council (Constantinople A. D. 553; cf. "Scriptores eccles.", Venice, 1728, VII, 204). He has been assigned to the time of Gregory the Great (590–604; Miræus, "Bibl. eccl.", Antwerp, 1639, 211); identified with Bishop Leontius of Salamis in Cyprus (in the VII cent.; Cave, "Script. eccles. hist. litt.", Geneva, 1720, 352); and with the Origenist Leontius mentioned in the "Life of St. Sabas" by Cyril of Scythopolis (Canisius-Basnage, "Thesaurus monum. eccles.", Antwerp, 1725, 529 and 533). There is, or was, the same uncertainty about his works; the authenticity of many books under his name has been discussed continually. In short, Fabricius said with some reason that (at his time) it was impossible to come to any clear conception of who Leontius really was, or what he really wrote (Fabricius-Harles, "Biblioth. Græca", Hamburg, 1802, VIII, 310). In his account of himself, in a work whose authenticity is undisputed (Contra Nest. et Eutych.), he says that in his youth he had belonged to the Nestorian sect, but was converted by "holy men who cleansed his heart by the works of true theologians" (P. G., LXXXVI, 1358 and 1360). Other works ("Adv. Nest.", and "Adv. Monoph.") describe him in their title as a monk of Jerusalem (P. G., LXXXVI, 1399 and 1769). Friedrich Loofs has made a special study of his life and works. As far as the Life is concerned, his conclusion is accepted in the main by Ehrhard and Krumbacher (Byzant. Litt., 55), Bardenhewer (Patrologie, 506–508), and to some extent Rügamer.

According to Loofs, Leontius was the monk of that name who came with others (Scythians) to Rome in 519, to try to persuade Pope Hormisdas (514–523) to authorize the formula (suspect of Monophysitism) "One of the Trinity suffered", and was also the Origenist Leontius of the "Vita S. Sabæ". He was born, probably at Constantinople, about 485, of a distinguished family related to the imperial general Vitalian. He then joined the Nestorians in Scythia, but was converted and became a stanch defender of Ephesus. Early in his life he became a monk. He came to Constantinople in 519, and then to Rome as part of the embassy of Scythian monks. After that he was for a time in Jerusalem. In 531 he took part in public disputes arranged by Justinian (527–565) between Catholics and the Monophysite followers of Severus of Antioch (538). He stayed at the capital till about 538, then went back to his monastery at Jerusalem. Later he was again at Constantinople, where he died, apparently before the first Edict against the "Three Chapters" (544). Loofs dates his death at "about 543". His change of residence accounts for the various descriptions of him as "a monk of Jerusalem" and "a monk of Constantinople". This theory, explained and defended at length by Loofs, supposes the identification of our author with the "Venerable monk Leontius and Legate of the Fathers (monks) of the holy city (Jerusalem)" who took part in Justinian's controversy (Mansi, VIII, 818; cf. 911 and 1019); with the Scythian monk Leontius who came to Rome in 519 (Mansi, VIII, 498 and 499); and with the Origenist Leontius of Byzantium, of whom Cyril of Scythopolis writes in his "Life of St. Sabas" (Cotelerius, "Ecclesiæ græcæ monumenta", Paris, 1686).

Rügamer admits the period of Leontius's life defended by Loofs (this may now be considered accepted), and the identification with the disputant at Constantinople (Leontius von Byzanz, 56–58). He thinks his identity with the Scythian monk to be doubtful. Leontius himself never mentions Scythia as a place where he has lived; he does not defend the famous sentence "One of the Trinity suffered" with the ardour one would expect in one of its chief patrons (ibid., pp. 54–56). Rügamer altogether denies the identification with the Origenist Leontius. Had he been an Origenist his name would not be so honoured in Byzantine tradition, where he appears as "blessed", "all-wise", and "a great monk" (ibid., pp. 58–63). According to Rügamer, Leontius spent his youth and became a Nestorian at Constantinople at the time of the Henoticon schism (482–519). He went after his conversion to Jerusalem and became a monk there. He had never been a public orator, as some authors (Nirschl, "Lehrbuch der Patrologie und Patristik", Mainz, 1885, p. 553) conclude from the title σχολαστικός (the common one for such persons; it is often given to him). On the contrary, he shows no special legal or forensic training, and never refers to such a career in his youth. So σχολαστικός in his case can only mean a learned man. He came to Constantinople for the disputation, went back to Jerusalem, was superior of a

monastery there, was an enemy of Theodore of Mopsuestia, but yet did not desire the condemnation of the "Three Chapters", and died after 553 (op. cit., pp. 49–72).

The works ascribed to Leontius Byzantinus are: (1) three books "Against the Nestorians and Eutychians" (commonly quoted as "Contra Nestorianos et Eutychianos", P. G., LXXXVI, 1267–1396). This is certainly authentic (in other words, the person about whom they dispute is the author of this work). It is his earliest composition. Book I refutes the opposite heresies of Nestorius and Eutyches, and establishes the Faith of Chalcedon. Book II, in dialogue form, refutes the heresy of the Aphthartodocetes (mitigated Monophysites who made our Lord's human nature incorruptible during His life on earth—therefore not a true human nature). Book III (the title of this book in Migne belongs really to Book II) accuses the Nestorians of dishonest practices to make converts, and vehemently attacks Theodore of Mopsuestia. The whole work is full of well-selected quotations from the Fathers, and shows great learning and controversial skill. All the other works have been disputed, at least in their present form. (2) "Against the Monophysites" ("Adv. Monophysitas", P. G., LXXXVI, 1769–1902), in two parts, but incomplete. Part I argues philosophically from the idea of nature; part II quotes the witness of the Fathers, and refutes texts alleged to favour Monophysitism. (3) "Against the Nestorians" ("Adv. Nestorianos", P. G., LXXXVI, 1399–1768), in eight books, of which the last is wanting. "A classical work" (Nirschl, op. cit., 555), explaining and defending all the issues against this heresy. Book IV defends the title *Theotokos;* book VII defends the formula: "One of the Trinity suffered". (4) "Scholia", or "Of Sects" ("De Sectis", P. G., LXXXVI, 1193–1268); ten chapters called "Acts" (*πράξεις*) against all the known heretics at that time, including Jews and Samaritans. (5) "Solution of the arguments proposed by Severus" (of Antioch; "Adv. Severum", P. G., LXXXVI, 1915–46). A refutation of Monophysitism in dialogue form. It supposes a Monophysite work (otherwise unknown) whose order it follows. (6) "Thirty chapters against Severus" ("Triginta capita", P. G., LXXXVI, 1901–16), a short work with many parallels to the preceding one. (7) "Against the frauds of the Apollinarists" ("Adv. fraudes Apollinaristarum", P. G., LXXXVI, 1947–76), a very important work, the beginning of the discovery of the works of Apollinaris of Laodicea which still occupies the minds of students. It is an examination of certain works attributed to Athanasius, Gregory Thaumaturgus, and Pope Julius, which are declared to be really by Apollinaris, and fraudulently attributed to these Fathers by his followers. (8) "Discussions of Sacred Things", by Leontius and John ("De rebus sacris", P. G., LXXXVI, 2017–2100). This is a recension of the second book of the "Sacra Parallela" (collections of texts of the Fathers) of which a version is also attributed to St. John Damascene (c. 760). (9) Two homilies by a priest Leontius of Constantinople (P. G., LXXXVI, 1975–2004), certainly another person. Of these works, (1) is certainly genuine, (8) and (9) are certainly not. The "De rebus sacris" was probably composed between 614 and 627. The Leontius of the title is a bishop of that name of Salamis in Cyprus. Of the others, Loofs thinks that (5) and (6) are fragments of a large work by Leontius Byzantinus, called "Scholia"; (2), (3), and (4) are later works founded on it. (7) is by another (unknown) author, written between 511 and 520. Rügamer, on the other hand, defends the authenticity in their present form of all these works, except (8) and (9).

Leontius of Byzantium is, in any case, a theologian of great importance. Apart from the merit of his controversial work against Nestorians and Monophysites, his Aristotelianism marks an epoch in the history of Christian philosophy. He has been described as the first of the Scholastics (Krumbacher-Ehrhard, "Byzantinische Litteratur", p. 54).

Works in *P. G.*, LXXXVI; Loofs, *Das Leben und die polemischen Werke des Leontius von Byzanz* (Leipzig, 1887); Rügamer, *Leontius von Byzanz* (Würzburg, 1894); Junglas, *Leontius von Byzanz* (Paderborn, 1909); Krumbacher, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur* (Munich, 1897), 54–56; Bardenhewer, *Patrology*, tr. Shahan (Freiburg, 1908), 544.

Adrian Fortescue.

Leontopolis, a titular archiepiscopal see of Augustamnica Secunda. Strabo (XVII, 1, 19, 20) places it near Mendete and Diospolis, and says (XVII, 1, 40) that the inhabitants worshipped a lion, whence the name of the town. In reality, the name comes from Horus, who according to Egyptian mythology changed himself into a lion (Naville, "Textes relatifs au mythe d'Horus", XVIII, 2). Ptolemy (IV, 5, 22) also mentions the nome and the metropolis of Leontopolis. The geographers Hierocles, George of Cyprus, and others call that locality *Λεοντῶ*, reserving the name of Leontopolis for a town in the province of Ægypta Prima; similarly in the signatures of bishops collected by Le Quien (Oriens Christianus, II, 553) Leonto is always found. Leonto is the modern Tell Mokdam on the right bank of the Nile (Damietta branch), near the railway from Cairo to Damietta which follows the left bank of the river. At Tell Mokdam may be seen the remains of a temple of Osorkon II. The other Leontopolis was situated near Heliopolis or Mataryeh. Here in the reign of Ptolemy Philometor, the Jewish high priest Onias built a temple to Jahveh, afterwards closed by Vespasian. Callinice in Syria was called Leontopolis, also a town in Isauria (Le Quien, "Oriens Christianus", II, 1021) not yet recognized.

S. Vailhé.

Lepanto, Italian name for Naupactos (Naupactus), a titular metropolitan see of ancient Epirus. The name Naupactus (dockyard) is said to have originated in the traditional building of a fleet there by the Heraclidæ (Strabo, IX, iv, 7). The site must have been chosen on account of the strong position of the hill, the fertile plains of the neighbourhood, and the many streams. Situated on the coast of Locris, it originally belonged to the Locri Ozolæ but was subsequently taken by the Athenians, who in 455 B. C., after the Third Messenian War, established there the Messenian helots, the bitter enemies of Sparta (Pausanias, IV, xxv, 7; X, xxxviii, 10). After the battle of Ægospotami (404 B. C.), the Spartans captured Naupactus, drove out the Messenians, and restored the town to the Locri Ozolæ. Subsequently, it passed in turn to the Achæans, the Thebans, and to Philip of Macedon, who gave it to the Ætolians; hence it was sometimes called the "City of the Ætolians" (Strabo, IX, iv, 7). For two months Naupactus fiercely resisted the Romans, who under M. Acilius Glabrio finally (191 B. C.) captured the town. Pausanias (X, xxxviii, 12–13) saw there near the sea a temple of Poseidon, another of Artemis, a cave dedicated to Aphrodite, and the ruins of a temple of Æsculapius. During Justinian's reign Naupactus was almost entirely destroyed by an earthquake (Procopius, "Bell. Goth.", IV, xxv).

Le Quien (Oriens Christianus, II, 197–200) mentions only ten of its Greek bishops, the first of whom took part in the Council of Ephesus (431), but our manuscript lists contain ninety-eight names. The metropolitan See of Naupactus depended on the pope, as Western Patriarch, until 733, when Leo III the Isaurian annexed it to the Patriarchate of Constantinople. In the early years of the tenth century it had eight suffragan sees (Gelzer, "Ungedruckte . . . Texte der Notitiæ episcopatuum", Munich, 1900, p. 557); nine about 1175 under Emperor Manuel Comnenus (Parthey, "Hieroclis Synecdemus", Berlin, 1866, p. 121), but only four at the close of the fifteenth century (Gel-

zer, op. cit., 635). Annexed to the Greek Orthodox Church in 1827, the see was suppressed in 1900, and replaced by the See of Acarnania and Naupactia, whose seat is at Missolonghi; the limits of this diocese are identical with those of the nome Ætolia and Acarnania. As to the Latin archbishops of Naupactus during the Frankish occupation, Le Quien (Oriens Christ., III, 995) and Eubel (Hierarchia catholica medii ævi, I, 379; II, 222) mention about twenty in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

Occupied by the Turks in 1498, Lepanto is chiefly celebrated for the victory which the combined papal, Spanish, Venetian, and Genoese fleets, under Don John of Austria, gained over the Turkish fleet on 7 Oct., 1571. The latter had 208 galleys and 66 small ships; the Christian fleet about the same number. The crusaders lost 17 ships and 7500 men; 15 Turkish ships were sunk and 177 taken, from 20,000 to 30,000 men disabled, and from 12,000 to 15,000 Christian rowers, slaves on the Turkish galleys, were delivered. Though this victory did not accomplish all that was hoped for, since the Turks appeared the very next year with a fleet of 250 ships before Modon and Cape Matapan, and in vain offered battle to the Christians, it was of great importance as being the first great defeat of the infidels on sea. Held by the Venetians from 1687 to 1689, and thence by the Turks until 1827, it became in the latter year part of the new Greek realm. Today Naupactus, chief town of a district in the province of Acarnania and Ætolia, has 4,500 inhabitants, all Orthodox Greeks. The roadstead is rather small and silted up; the strait connects the Bay of Patras with the Gulf of Corinth.

S. Vailhé.

Leprosy.—Leprosy proper, or *lepra tuberculosa*, in contradistinction to other skin diseases commonly designated by the Greek word λέπρα (psoriasis, etc.), is a chronic infectious disease caused by the *bacillus lepræ*, characterized by the formation of growths in the skin, mucous membranes, peripheral nerves, bones, and internal viscera, producing various deformities and mutilations of the human body, and usually terminating in death.

I. History of the Disease.—Leprosy was not uncommon in India as far back as the fifteenth century B. C. (Ctesias, Pers., xli; Herodian, I, i, 38), and in Japan during the tenth century B. C. Of its origin in these regions little is known, but Egypt has always been regarded as the place whence the disease was carried into the Western world. That it was well known in that country is evidenced by documents of the sixteenth century B. C. (Ebers Papyrus); ancient writers attribute the infection to the waters of the Nile (Lucretius, "De Nat. rer.", VI, 1112) and the unsanitary diet of the people (Galen). Various causes helped to spread the disease beyond Egypt. Foremost among these causes Manetho places the Hebrews, for, according to him, they were a mass of leprosy of which the Egyptians rid their land ("Hist. Græc. Fragm.", ed. Didot, II, pp. 578–81). Though this is romance, there is no doubt but at the Exodus the contamination had affected the Hebrews. From Egypt Phœnician sailors also brought leprosy into Syria and the countries with which they had commercial relations, hence the name "Phœnician disease" given it by Hippocrates (Prorrhetics, II); this seems to be borne out by the fact that we find traces of it along the Ionian coasts about the eighth century B. C. (Hesiod, quoted by Eustathius in "Comment. on Odyss.", p. 1746), and in Persia towards the fifth century B. C. (Herodotus). The dispersion of the Jews after the Restoration (fifth century) and the campaigns of the Roman armies (Pliny, "Hist. Nat.", XXVI) are held responsible for the propagation of the disease in Western Europe: thus were the Roman colonies of Spain, Gaul, and Britain soon infected.

In Christian times the canons of the early councils (Ancyra, 314), the regulations of the popes (e. g., the famous letter of Gregory II to St. Boniface), the laws enacted by the Lombard King Rothar (seventh century), by Pepin and Charlemagne (eighth century), the erection of leper-houses at Verdun, Metz, Maestricht (seventh century), St. Gall (eighth century), and Canterbury (1096) bear witness to the existence of the disease in Western Europe during the Middle Ages. The invasions of the Arabs and, later on, the Crusades greatly aggravated the scourge, which spared no station in life and attacked even royal families. Lepers were then subjected to most stringent regulations. They were excluded from the church by a funeral Mass and a symbolic burial (Martène, "De Rit. ant.," III, x). In every important community, asylums, mostly dedicated to St. Lazarus and attended by religious, were erected for the unfortunate victims. Matthew Paris (1197–1259) roughly estimated the number of these leper-houses in Europe at 19,000, France alone having about 2000, and England over a hundred. Such lepers as were not confined within these asylums had to wear a special garb, and carry "a wooden clapper to give warning of their approach. They were forbidden to enter inns, churches, mills, or bakehouses, to touch healthy persons or eat with them, to wash in the streams, or to walk in narrow footpaths" (Creighton). (See below: IV. Leprosy in the Middle Ages.) Owing to strict legislation, leprosy gradually disappeared, so that at the close of the seventeenth century it had become rare except in some few localities. At the same time it began to spread in the colonies of America and the islands of Oceanica. "It is endemic in Northern and Eastern Africa, Madagascar, Arabia, Persia, India, China and Japan, Russia, Norway and Sweden, Italy, Greece, France, Spain, in the islands of the Indian and Pacific Oceans. It is prevalent in central and South America, Mexico, in the West Indies, the Hawaiian and Philippine islands, Australia and New Zealand. It is also found in New Brunswick, Canada. In the United States, the majority of cases occur in Louisiana and California, while from many other States cases are occasionally reported, notably from New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Minnesota, Missouri, the Carolinas and Texas. In Louisiana leprosy has been gaining foothold since 1758, when it was introduced by the Acadians" (Dyer). According to the statistics furnished by delegates to the second international conference on leprosy (at Bergen, Norway, Sept., 1909), there are approximately 200,000 cases of the disease throughout the world: India, it is stated, coming first with 97,340 cases; the United States contributing 146 cases, and the Panama Canal Zone the minimum of 7 cases.

II. Pathology.—How leprosy originated is unknown: bad nutrition, bad hygiene, constitutional conditions (tuberculosis, alcoholism, probably heredity, etc.) seem to favour its production and propagation. The disease is immediately caused by the infection of the *bacillus lepræ*, a small rod bacillus from .003 mm. to .007 mm. in length and .0005 mm. in diameter, straight or slightly curved, with pointed, rounded, or club-shaped extremities, usually found in short chains or beads. This bacillus, discovered in 1868 by Hansen, has been described since 1880 by many specialists, particularly by Byron, who succeeded in cultivating it in agar-agar (Ceylon moss). It is present in all leprous tissues and the secretions (urine excepted; Köbner claims to have seen it in the blood), and has been repeatedly observed in the earth taken from the graves of lepers (Brit. Lepr. Commission of India). There is on record only one case—and this somewhat doubtful—of leprosy communicated by artificial inoculation. As to whether it is contagious from person to person, this was for years a much mooted question among specialists; although a scientific demonstration of contagiousness is so far

impossible—the mode of contamination being as yet unascertained, as well as the period of incubation of the germ—still there are unimpeachable practical proofs of contagion, such as the effect of isolation on the spread of the disease, and cases of healthy persons contracting the disease when exposed (Fathers Damien and Boglioli, nurses, and attendants), even accidentally, as in the instance of a medical student who cut himself while making a post-mortem on a leper. In the international conference at Bergen, these evidences were deemed convincing enough to call for a declaration that the disease be considered contagious.

The period of incubation is "estimated at from a few weeks to twenty and even forty years" (Dyer). Like most infections, leprosy has a preliminary stage, uncertain in its character: there are loss of appetite, dyspepsia, and nausea, neuralgia, rheumatic and articular pains, fever, intermittent or irregular, unaccountable lassitude and anxiety. These premonitory symptoms, which may last for months, are followed by periodical eruptions. Blotches, first reddish, then brown with a white border, appear and disappear in various parts of the body; sooner or later small tumours, filled with a yellowish substance fast turning to a darker hue, rise sometimes on the joints, but oftener on the articulations of the fingers and toes. These tumours, however, are not yet specifically leprous; at the end they may leave permanent spots, pale or brown, or nodules. Then the disease, manifested by the apparition of specifically leprous formations, diverges into different varieties, according as it affects the skin and mucous membranes (cutaneous leprosy), or the nerves (anæsthetic), or both (mixed, or complete); each of these varieties, however, merges frequently into the others, and it is sometimes difficult to draw the line between cases.

Cutaneous leprosy is either macular or tubercular. The former variety is characterized by dark (*L. maculosa nigra*), or whitish (*L. m. alba*) spots, usually forming on the place of the old blotches; the eruption, at first only intermittent, turns finally into an obstinate ulcer with constant destruction of tissue; the ulceration usually begins at the joints of the fingers and toes, which drop off joint by joint, leaving a well-healed stump (*L. mutilans*); it is sometimes preceded by, and ordinarily attended with, anæsthesia, which, starting at the extremities, extends up the limbs, rendering them insensible to heat and cold, pain, and even touch. In the tubercular type, nodosities of leprous tissue, which may reach the size of a walnut, are formed out of the blotches. They may occur on any part of the body, but usually affect the face (forehead, eyelids, nose, lips, chin, cheeks, and ears), thickening all the features and giving them a leonine appearance (*leontiasis, satyriasis*). Tubercular leprosy develops rapidly, and, when attacking the extremities, its destructive process has the same effect of ulceration, mutilation, and deformity as has been mentioned above. Scarcely different from the preceding in the period of invasion is the course of anæsthetic leprosy, one of the characteristic symptoms of which is the anæsthesia of the little finger, which may occur even before any lesions appear. The ulcer, at first usually localized on one finger, attacks one by one the other fingers, then the other hand; in some cases the feet are affected at the same time, in others their ulceration follows that of the hands. Neuralgic pains accompany the invasion, and a thickening of certain nerves may be observed; motor-paralysis gradually invades the face, the hands, and the feet. Consequent upon this, the muscles of the face become contracted and distorted by atrophy; ectropion of the lower lids prevents the patient from shutting his eyes; the lips become flabby, and the lower one drops. The sense of touch and muscle-control being lost, the hands are unable to grasp, and the contraction affecting the muscles of the forearm produces the claw-hand. In the lower extremities analogous effects are produced, resulting first in a shuffling gait and finally in complete incapacity of motion. Then the skin shrinks, the hair, teeth, and nails fall, and the lopping-off process of necrosis may extend to the loss of the entire hand or foot. The mixed variety of leprosy is the combination and complete development of the two types just described. In all cases a peculiar offensive smell, recalling that of the dissecting-room mixed with the odour of goose feathers—the authors of the Middle Ages compared it to that of the male-goat—is emitted by the leper, and renders him an object of repulsion to all who come near him. Add the torture of an unquenchable thirst in the last stages of the disease, and, as the patient usually preserves his mind unaffected to the end, the utter prostration resulting from his complete helplessness and the sight of the slow and unrelenting process of decomposition of his body, and it is easy to understand how truly, in the Book of Job (xviii, 13), leprosy is called "the firstborn of death".

The average course of leprosy is about eight years, the mixed type being more rapidly concluded. "Death is the ordinary conclusion of every case, which may come (in 38 per cent of cases) from the exhaustive effects of the disease, from an almost necessary septicæmia, or from some intercurrent disease, as nephritis (in 22.5 per cent); from pulmonary diseases including phthisis (in 17 per cent), diarrhœa (in 10 per cent), anæmia (in 5 per cent), remittent fever (in 5 per cent), peritonitis (in 2.5 per cent)" (Dyer).

So far leprosy has baffled all the efforts of medical science: almost every conceivable method of treatment has been attempted, yet with no appreciable success. Occasionally the treatment has been followed by such long periods of remission of the disease (fifteen or twenty years) as might lead one to believe the cure altogether complete; still, specialists continue to hold that in such instances the virulence of the bacillus is, through causes unknown, merely suspended, and may break forth again. It being admitted that the disease is both contagious and preventible, there seems to be no doubt that means of public protection should be provided. To answer this purpose, several countries (Norway and Sweden in particular) have by legislation ordered the isolation of lepers. In some other countries the Governments encourage, and, more or less generously, subsidize private establishments. Of all the states of the Union, Louisiana is the only one to have taken any definite steps: it partly supports the leper-home at Carville where some seventy patients are housed under the care of the Sisters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul (Emmitsburg). Some, not unwisely, think that if the federal authorities do not deem it right to interfere, individual states, especially those which, like California, are exposed to a constant danger of infection, should take means of preventing the spread of the disease.

III. Leprosy in the Bible.—The foregoing sketch of the pathology of leprosy may serve to illustrate some of the many passages of the Bible where the disease is mentioned. From the epoch of the sojourn of the people of God in the desert down to the times of Christ, leprosy seems to have been prevalent in Palestine: not only was it in some particular cases (Num., xii, 10; IV Kings, v, 27; Is., liii, 4) looked upon as a Divine punishment, but at all times the Hebrews believed it to be contagious and hereditary (II Kings, iii, 29); hence it was considered as a cause of defilement, and involved exclusion from the community. From this idea proceeded the minute regulations of Lev., xiii, xiv, concerning the diagnosis of the disease and the restoration to social and religious life of those who were cleansed. All decisions in this matter pertained to the priest, before whom should appear personally both those who were suspected of leprosy and those who claimed to be healed. If, at the first examination, the signs—coloured nodule, blister, shining

spot (xiii, 2), discoloration of the hair (3)—were manifest, isolation was pronounced at once; but if some of the signs were wanting, a seven-days quarantine was ordered, at the term of which a new inspection had to take place; should then the symptoms remain doubtful, another week's quarantine was imposed. The appearance of "the living flesh" in connexion with whitish blotches was deemed an evident sign of the infection (10). White formations covering the whole body are no sign of leprosy unless "live flesh" (ulceration) accompany them; in the latter case, the patient was isolated as suspect, and if the sores, which might be only temporary pustules, should heal up, he had to appear again before the priest, who would then declare him clean (12–17). A white or reddish nodule affecting the cicatrix of an ulcer or of a burn would be regarded a doubtful sign of leprosy, and condemned the patient to a seven-days quarantine, after which, according as clearer signs appeared or not, he would be declared clean or unclean (18–28). Another suspicious case, to be re-examined after a week's seclusion, is that of the leprosy of the scalp, in which, not leprosy proper, but ringworm should most likely be recognized. In all cases of acknowledged leprous infection, the patient was to "have his clothes hanging loose, his head bare, his mouth covered with a cloth" and he was commanded to cry out that he was defiled and unclean. As long as the disease lasted, he had to "dwell alone without the camp" (or the city). Like the presence of leprosy, so the recovery was the object of a sentence of the priest, and the reinstatement in the community was solemnly made according to an elaborate ritual given in Lev., xiv.

In connexion with leprosy proper, Leviticus speaks also of the "leprosy of the garments" (xiii, 47–59) and "leprosy of the house" (xiv, 34–53). These kinds of leprosy, probably due to fungous formations, have nothing to do with leprosy proper, which is a specifically human disease.

Bennett, *Diseases of the Bible* (London, 1887); Dyer, *Leprosy* (New York, 1897); Hansen and Looft, *Leprosy in its Clinical and Pathological Aspects* (London, 1895); *Report of the Leprosy Commission to India* (London, 1893); Thin, *Leprosy* (London, 1891); Bartholinus, *De morbis biblicis* (Copenhagen 1671); Pruner, *Die Krankheiten des Orients* (Erlangen, 1847); Trusen, *Die Sitten, Gebräuche und Krankheiten der alten Hebräer* (Breslau, 1833); Leloir, *Traité pratique et théorique de la lèpre* (Paris, 1886); Sauton, *La Léprose* (Paris, 1901).

Charles L. Souvay.

IV. Leprosy in the Middle Ages.—As a consequence of the dissemination of leprosy in Europe, legislation providing against the spread of the disease (which was considered to be contagious) and regulations concerning the marriage of leprous persons, as well as their segregation and detention in institutions—which were more charitable and philanthropic than medical, partaking of the character of asylums or almshouses—gradually came into operation. The historical researches of Virchow concerning leper-houses (*leprosoria*) have established the fact that such institutions existed in France as early as the seventh century at Verdun, Metz, Maestricht, etc., and that leprosy must even then have been widespread. In the eighth century St. Othmar in Germany and St. Nicholas of Corbis in France founded leper-houses, and many such existed in Italy. (See Virchow in "Archiv für pathologische Anatomie", XVIII-XX, Leipzig, 1860.) Legislative enactments against the marriage of lepers, and providing for their segregation, were made and enforced as early as the seventh century by Rothar, King of the Lombards, and by Pepin (757) and Charlemagne (789) for the Empire of the Franks. The earliest accounts of the founding of leper-houses in Germany is in the eighth and ninth century; in Ireland (Innisfallen), 869; England, 950; Spain, 1007 (Malaga) and 1008 (Valencia); Scotland, 1170 (Aldnestun); the Netherlands, 1147 (Ghent). The founding of these houses did not take place until the disease had spread considerably and had become a menace to the public health. It is said to have been most prevalent about the time of the Crusades, assuming epidemic proportions in some localities: in France alone, at the time of the death of Louis IX, it was computed that there were some two thousand such houses, and in all Christendom not less than nineteen thousand (Hirsch, "Handbook of Geographical and Historical Pathology", tr. Creighton, London, 1885, p. 7, note. Cf. Raymund, "Histoire de l'Eléphantiasis", Lausanne, 1767, p. 106). Mézeray (Hist. de France, II, 168) says: "Il y avait ni ville ni bourgade, que ne fust obligée de bâtir un hôpital pour les (lepreux) retirer". For Italy we have Muratori's statement (Antiq. Ital. Med. Ævi, III, 53), "Vix ulla civitas quæ non aliquem locum leprosis destinatum haberet."

There is, however, good reason to doubt the accuracy of the above figures (19,000) as estimated by our medieval informants. Besides, "it would be a mistake", writes Hirsch (op. cit., p. 7), "to infer from the multiplication of leper-houses, that there was a corresponding increase in the number of cases, or to take the number of the former as the measure of the extent to which leprosy was prevalent, or to conclude, as many have done, that the coincidence of the Crusades implies any intrinsic connexion between the two things; or that the rise in the number of cases was due to the importation of leprosy into Europe from the East. In judging of these matters we must not leave out of sight the fact that the notion of 'leprosy' was a very comprehensive one in the middle age, not only among the laity but also among physicians; that syphilis was frequently included therein, as well as a variety of chronic skin diseases, and that the diagnosis with a view to segregating lepers was not made by the practitioners of medicine but mostly by the laity."

Simpson, in his admirable essay on the leper-houses of Britain (Edin. Med. and Surg. Journal, 1841–42), writes: "I have already alluded to special Orders of Knighthood having been established at an early period for the care and superintendence of lepers. We know that the Knights of St. Lazarus separated from the general Order of the Knights Hospitallers about the end of the eleventh or beginning of the twelfth century (Index. Monast., p. 28). They were at first designated: Knights of St. Lazarus and St. Mary of Jerusalem. St. Louis brought twelve of the Knights of St. Lazarus to France and entrusted them with the superintendence of the 'Lazaries' (or leper hospitals) of the Kingdom. The first notice of their having obtained a footing in Great Britain is in the reign of Stephen (1135–54) at Burton Lazars (Leicestershire). I find that the hospitals of Tilton, of the Holy Innocents at Lincoln, of St. Giles (London), Closely in Norfolk, and various others are annexed to Burton Lazars as 'cells' containing 'fratres leprosos de Sancto Lazaro de Jerusalem'. Its [Burton's] privileges and possessions were confirmed by Henry II, King John and Henry VI. It was at last dissolved by Henry VIII." (See Lazarus, St., Order of.)

As has already been stated, these institutions were intended principally as houses to seclude the infected, and not so much as hospices for the curative treatment of the disease, which was considered then, as now, an incurable disorder. They were founded and endowed as religious establishments, and as such they were generally placed under the control and management of some abbey or monastery by a papal Bull, which appointed every leper-house to be provided with its own churchyard, chapel, and ecclesiastics—"cum cimuterio ecclesiam construere et propriis gaudere presbyteris" (Semler, "Hist. Eccles. Select."). The English and Scotch houses were under the full control of a custos, dean, prior, and, in some cases—as in the hospital of St. Lawrence, Canterbury, which contained lepers of both sexes—a prioress. The eccle-

siastical officers of the hospitals and the leper inmates were bound by the regulations laid down in the charters of the institution, which they had to observe strictly, especially as to offering up prayers for the repose of the souls of the founder and his family. The following extracts from the regulations of the leper-hospital at Illeford (Essex), in 1346, by Baldock, Bishop of London, illustrate this point: "We also command that the lepers omit not attendance at their church, to hear divine service unless prevented by previous bodily infirmity, and they are to preserve silence and hear matins and mass throughout if they are able; and whilst there to be intent on devotion and prayer as far as their infirmity permit them. We advise also and command that as it was ordained of old in the said hospital every leprous brother shall every day say for the morning duty, an Our Father and Hail Mary thirteen times and for the other hours of the day . . . respectively an Our Father and a Hail Mary seven times, etc. . . . If a leprous brother secretly [*occulte*] fails in the performance of these articles let him consult the priest of the said hospital in the tribunal of penance" (Dugdale, "Monasticon Anglicanum", II, 390). There was generally a chaplain under the prior and in some instances a free chapel was attached with resident canons. The hospital at St. Giles (Norwich), for instance, had a prior and eight canons (acting chaplains), two clerks, seven choristers, and two sisters (Monast., Index, 55).

Matthew Paris has left us a copy of the vow taken by the brothers of the leper-hospitals of St. Julian and St. Alban before admission: "I, brother B., promise and, taking my bodily oath by touching the most sacred Gospel, affirm before God and all the Saints in this church which is constructed in honour of St. Julian (the Confessor), in the presence of Dominus R. the archdeacon, that all the days of my life I will be subservient and obedient to the commands of the Lord Abbot of St. Albans for the time being and to his archdeacon, resisting in nothing, unless such things should be commanded as could militate against the Divine pleasure: I will never commit theft, or bring a false accusation against any one of the brethren, nor infringe the vow of chastity nor fail in my duty by appropriating anything, or leaving anything by will to others, unless by a dispensation granted by the brothers. I will make it my study wholly to avoid all kinds of usury as a monstrous thing and hateful to God. I will not be aiding or abetting in word or thought, directly or indirectly in any plan by which any one shall be appointed Custos or Dean of the lepers of St. Julians, except the persons appointed by the Lord Abbot of St. Albans. I will be content, without strife or complaint, with the food and drink and other things given and allowed to me by the Master; according to the usage and custom of the house. I will not transgress the bounds prescribed to me, without the special license of my superiors, and with their consent and will; and if I prove an offender against any article named above, it is my wish that the Lord Abbot or his substitute may punish me according to the nature and amount of the offence, as shall seem best to him, and even to cast me forth an apostate from the congregation of the brethren without hope of remission, except through special grace of the Lord Abbot." It is interesting to compare with the passage on usury in this formula the statement of Mézeray (Hist. de France), that during the twelfth century two very cruel evils (*deux maux très cruels*) reigned in France, viz., leprosy and usury, one of which, he adds, infected the body while the other ruined families.

The Church, therefore, from a remote period has taken a most active part in promoting the wellbeing and care of the leper, both spiritual and temporal. The Order of St. Lazarus was the outcome of her practical sympathy for the poor sufferers during the long centuries when the pestilence was endemic in Europe. Even in our own day we find the same Apostolic spirit alive. The saintly Father Damien, the martyr of Molokai, whose life-sacrifice for the betterment of the lepers of the Sandwich Islands is still fresh in public recollection, and his co-labourers and followers in that field of missionary work have strikingly manifested in recent times the same apostolic spirit which actuated the followers of St. Lazarus in the twelfth and two succeeding centuries.

See the works of Mézeray, Muratori, Virchow, and Semler, and the essay of Simpson in *Edinb. Med. and Surg. Journal* (1841–42), all quoted in the body of this article.

J. F. Donovan.

Leptis Magna, a titular see of Tripolitana. Founded by the Sidonians in a fine and fertile country, it was the most important of the three towns which formed the Tripoli Confederation. The remains of the ancient Phœnician town are still visible, with the harbour, quays, walls, and inland defence, which make it look like Carthage. This Semitic city subsequently became the centre of a Greek city, Neapolis, of which most of the monuments are buried under sand. Notwithstanding Pliny (Nat. Hist., V, xxviii), who distinguishes Neapolis from Leptis, there is no doubt, according to Ptolemy, Strabo, and Scyllax, that they should be identified. Leptis allied itself with the Romans in the war against Jugurtha. Having obtained under Augustus the title of *civitas* it seems at that time to have been administered by Carthaginian magistrates; it may have been a *municipium* during the first century of the Christian Era and erected by Trajan into a colony bearing the name of Colonia Ulpia Trajana, found on many of its coins. The birthplace of Septimius Severus, who embellished it and enriched it with several fine monuments, it was taken and sacked in the fourth century by the Libyan tribe of Aurusiani (Ammianus Marcellinus, XXVIII, vi) and has never since completely recovered. It was at that time the seat of the military government of Tripolitana.

When Justinian took it from the Vandals in the sixth century, Leptis Magna was largely in ruins and buried under sand. It was rebuilt, and its walls were raised, their extent being reduced in order more easily to protect the town against the attacks of the Berber tribes dwelling beyond its gates. The duke, or military governor, who again took up his residence there, built public baths and several magnificent buildings; the Septimius Severus palace was restored, and five churches were built (Procopius, "De ædif.", VI-IV). The massacre of all the Berber chiefs of the Levathes, treacherously ordered by Duke Sergius at Leptis Magna in 543, provoked a terrible insurrection, through which the Romans almost lost Africa. Taken in the seventh century by the Arabs, who allowed it to be invaded by the sands, Leptis Magna is now only a majestic ruin called Lebda, sixty-two miles east of Tripoli. Besides vague traces of several large buildings, the remains of a vast circus, 380 yards by sixty-six yards, are visible. Five bishops are recorded: Dioga in 255, Victorinus and Maximus in 393, Salvianus, a Donatist, in 411, Calipedes in 484. This town must not be confounded with Leptis Minor, to-day Lemta in Tunisia.

Gams, *Series episcoporum* (Ratisbon, 1873), 466, col. 3; Toulette, *Géog. de l'Afrique chrét.: Byzacène et Tripolitaine* (Montreuil, 1894), 252–255; Smith, *Dict. Greek and Roman Geog.*, s. v., which gives detailed sources.

S. Vailhé.

Le Puy, Diocese of (Aniciensis), comprises the whole Department of Haute Loire, and is a suffragan of Bourges. The territory of the ancient Diocese of Le Puy, suppressed by the Concordat of 1801, was united with the Diocese of Saint-Flour, and became a diocese again in 1823. The district of Brioude, which had belonged to the Diocese of Saint-Flour under the old regime, was thenceforward included in the new Diocese of Puy.

The Martyrology of Ado and the first legend of St. Front of Périgueux (written perhaps in the middle of the tenth century, by Gauzbert, chorepiscopus of Limoges) speak of a certain priest named George who was brought to life by the touch of St. Peter's staff, and who accompanied St. Front, St. Peter's missionary and first Bishop of Périgueux. A legend of St. George, the origin of which, according to Duchesne, is not earlier than the eleventh century, makes that saint one of the seventy-two disciples, and tells how he founded the Church of Civitas Vetula in the County of Le Velay, and how, at the request of St. Martial, he caused an altar to the Blessed Virgin to be erected on Mont Anis (Mons Anicius). After St. George, certain local traditions of very late origin point to Sts. Macarius, Marcellinus, Roricius, Eusebius, Paulianus, and Vosy (Evodius) as bishops of Le Puy. It must have been from St. Paulianus that the town of Ruessium, now St. Paulien, received its name; and it was probably St. Vosy who completed the church of Our Lady of Le Puy at Anicium and transferred the episcopal see from Ruessium to Anicium. St. Vosy was apprised in a vision that the angels themselves had dedicated the cathedral to the Blessed Virgin, whence the epithet *Angelic* given to the cathedral of Le Puy. It is impossible to say whether this St. Evodius is the same who signed the decrees of the Council of Valence in 374. Neither can it be affirmed that St. Benignus, who in the seventh century founded a hospital at the gates of the basilica, and St. Agrevius, the seventh-century martyr from whom the town of Saint-Agrève Chiniacum took its name, were really bishops. Duchesne thinks that the chronology of these early bishops rests on very little evidence and that very ill supported by documents; before the tenth century only six individuals appear of whom it can be said with certainty that they were bishops of Le Puy. The first of these, Scutarius, the legendary architect of the first cathedral, dates, if we may trust the inscription which bears his name, from the end of the fourth century.

Among the bishops of Le Puy are mentioned: Adhémar of Monteil (1087–1100), author of the ancient antiphon, "Salve Regina", whom Urban II, coming to Le Puy in 1095 to preach the Crusade, appointed his legate, and who died under the walls of Antioch; Bertrand of Chalencon (1200–13), who himself led the soldiers of his province against the Albigenses under the walls of Béziers; Guy III Foulques (1257–59), who became pope as Clement IV; the theologian Durandus of Saint-Pourçain (1318–26); Lefranc de Pompignan (1733–74), the great antagonist of the *philosophes;* De Bonald (1823–39), afterwards Archbishop of Lyons.

Legend traces the origin of the pilgrimage of Le Puy to an apparition of the Blessed Virgin to a sick widow whom St. Martial had converted. No French pilgrimage was more frequented in the Middle Ages. Charlemagne came twice, in 772 and 800; there is a legend that in 772 he established a foundation at the cathedral for ten poor canons (*chanoines de paupérie*), and he chose Le Puy, with Aachen and Saint-Gilles, as a centre for the collection of Peter's Pence. Charles the Bald visited Le Puy in 877, Eudes in 892, Robert in 1029, Philip Augustus in 1183. Louis IX met the King of Aragon there in 1245; and in 1254 passing through Le Puy on his return from the Holy Land, he gave to the cathedral an ebony image of the Blessed Virgin clothed in gold brocade. After him, Le Puy was visited by Philip the Bold in 1282, by Philip the Fair in 1285, by Charles VI in 1394, by Charles VII in 1420, and by the mother of Blessed Joan of Arc in 1429. Louis XI made the pilgrimage in 1436 and 1475, and in 1476 halted three leagues from the city and went to the cathedral barefooted. Charles VIII visited it in 1495, Francis I in 1533. Theodulph, Bishop of Orleans, brought to Our Lady of Le Puy, as an ex-voto for his deliverance, a magnificent Bible, the letters of which were made of plates of gold and silver, which he had himself put together, about 820, while in prison at Angers. St. Mayeul, St. Odilon, St. Robert, St. Hugh of Grenoble, St. Anthony of Padua, St. Dominic, St. Vincent Ferrer, St. John Francis Regis were pilgrims to Le Puy.

The Church of Le Puy received, on account of its great dignity and fame, innumerable temporal and spiritual favours. Concessions made in 919 by William the Young, Count of Auvergne and Le Velay, and in 923 by King Raoul, gave it sovereignty over the whole population of the town (*bourg*) of Anis, a population which soon amounted to 30,000 souls. In 999, Sylvester II consecrated his friend Théodard, a monk of Aurillac, Bishop of Le Puy, to replace Stephen of Gevaudan, whom his uncle Guy, Bishop of Le Puy, had in his lifetime, designated to be his successor, and whom a Roman council had excommunicated. Sylvester II exempted Théodard from all metropolitan jurisdiction, a privilege which Leo IX confirmed to the Bishops of Le Puy, also granting them the right, until then reserved to archbishops exclusively, of wearing the pallium. "Nowhere", he said in his Bull, "does the Blessed Virgin receive a more special and more filial worship." It was from Le Puy that Urban II dated (15 August, 1095) the Letters Apostolic convoking the Council of Clermont, and it was a canon of Le Puy, Raymond d'Aiguilles, chaplain to the Count of Toulouse, who wrote the history of the crusade. Gelasius II, Callistus II, Innocent II, and Alexander III visited Le Puy to pray, and with the visit of one of these popes must be connected the origin of the great jubilee which is granted to Our Lady of Le Puy whenever Good Friday falls on 25 March, the Feast of the Annunciation. It is supposed that this jubilee was instituted by Callistus II, who passed through Le Puy, in April, 1119, or by Alexander III, who was there in August, 1162, and June, 1165, or by Clement IV, who had been Bishop of Le Puy. The first jubilee historically known took place in 1407, and in 1418 the chroniclers mention a Bull of Martin V prolonging the duration of the jubilee. It took place three times in the nineteenth century—in 1842, 1853, and 1864—and will take place again in 1910. Lastly, during the Middle Ages, everyone who had made the pilgrimage to Le Puy had the privilege of making a will *in extremis* with only two witnesses instead of seven.

Honoured with such prerogatives as these, the Church of Le Puy assumed a sort of primacy in respect to most of the Churches of France, and even of Christendom. This primacy manifested itself practically in a right to beg, established with the authorization of the Holy See, in virtue of which the chapter of Le Puy levied a veritable tax upon almost all the Christian countries to support its hospital of Notre-Dame. In Catalonia this *droit de quête*, recognized by the Spanish Crown, was so thoroughly established that the chapter had its collectors permanently installed in that country. A famous "fraternity" existed between the chapter of Le Puy and that of Gerona in Catalonia. The efforts of M. Rochet to establish his contention, that this "fraternity" dated from the time of Charlemagne, have been fruitless; M. Coulet has proved that the earliest document in which it is mentioned dates only from 1470, and he supposes that at this date the chapter of Gerona, in order to escape the financial thraldom which bound it, like so many other Catalonian Churches, to the chapter of Le Puy, alleged its "fraternity" involving its equality—with the Church of Le Puy. In 1479 and in 1481 Pierre Bouvier, a canon of Le Puy, came to Gerona, when the canons invoked against him certain legends according to which Charlemagne had taken Gerona, rebuilt its cathedral, given it a canon of Le Puy for a bishop, and established a fraternity between the chapters of Gerona and Le Puy. In support of these

legends they appealed to the Office which they chanted for the feast of Charlemagne—an Office, dating from 1345, but in which they had recently inserted these tales of the Church of Le Puy. In 1484 Sixtus IV prohibited the use of this Office, whereupon there appeared at Gerona the "Tractatus de captione Gerunde", which reaffirmed the Gerona legends about the fraternity with Le Puy. Down to the last days of the old regime the two chapters frequently exchanged courtesies; canons of Le Puy passing through Gerona and canons of Gerona passing through Le Puy enjoyed special privileges. In 1883 the removal by the Bishop of Gerona of the statue of Charlemagne, which stood in that cathedral, marked the definitive collapse of the whole fabric of legends out of which the *hermandad* between Le Puy and Gerona had grown.

The statue of Our Lady of Le Puy and the other treasures escaped the pillage of the Middle Ages. The roving banditti were victoriously dispersed, in 1180, by the Confraternity of the *Chaperons* (Hooded Cloaks) founded at the suggestion of a canon of Le Puy. In 1562 and 1563 Le Puy was successfully defended against the Huguenots by priests and religious armed with cuirasses and arquebusses. But in 1793 the statue was torn from its shrine and burned in the public square. Père de Ravignan, in 1846, and the Abbé Combalot, in 1850, were inspired with the idea of a great monument to the Blessed Virgin on the Rocher Corneille. Napoleon III placed at the disposal of Bishop Morlhon 213 pieces of artillery taken by Pélissier at Sebastopol, and the colossal statue of "Notre-Dame de France" cast from the iron of these guns, amounting in weight to 150,000 kilogrammes, or more than 330,000 lbs. avoirdupois, was dedicated 12 September, 1860.

The saints specially venerated in the diocese are: St. Domninus, martyr, whose body is preserved in the cathedral; St. Julian of Brioude, martyr in 304, and his companion, St. Ferréol; St. Calminius (Carmery), Duke of Auvergne, who prompted the foundation of the Abbey of Le Monastier, and St. Eudes, first abbot (end of the sixth century); St. Theofredus (Chaffre), Abbot of Le Monastier and martyr under the Saracens (c. 735); St. Mayeul, Abbot of Cluny, who, in the second half of the tenth century, cured a blind man at the gates of Le Puy, and whose name was given, in the fourteenth century, to the university in which the clergy made their studies; St. Odilon, Abbot of Cluny (962–1049), who embraced the life of a regular canon in the monastery of St. Julien de Brioude; St. Robert d'Aurillac (d. 1067), who founded the monastery of Chaise Dieu in the Brioude district; St. Peter Chavanon (d. 1080), a canon regular, founder and first provost of the Abbey of Pébrac. At the age of eighteen M. Olier, afterwards the founder of Saint-Sulpice, was Abbot *in commendam* of Pébrac and, in 1626, was an "honorary count-canon of the chapter of St. Julien de Brioude". We may mention as natives of this diocese: the Benedictine, Hugues Lanthenas (1634–1701), who edited the works of St. Bernard and St. Anselm, and was the historian of the Abbey of Vendôme; the Benedictine, Jacques Boyer, joint author of "Gallia Christiana" (q. v.); Cardinal de Polignac (d. 1741), author of the "Antilucretius".

The cathedral of Le Puy, which forms the highest point of the city, rising from the foot of the Rocher Corneille, exhibits architecture of every period from the fifth century to the fifteenth. Formerly, the visitor passed through a porch standing well out from the building and, after descending beneath the pavement, emerged by a stairway in front of the high altar; the principal stairway is now covered by a bold vaulting which serves as base for one half of the church. The architectural effect is incredibly audacious and picturesque. The four galleries of the cloister were constructed during a period extending from the Carlovingian epoch to the twelfth century. The Benedictine monastery of the Chaise Dieu united in 1640 to the Congregation of St-Maur, still stands, with the fortifications which Abbot de Chanac caused to be built between 1378 and 1420, and the church, rebuilt in the fourteenth century by Clement VI, who had made his studies here, and by Gregory XI, his nephew. This church contains the tomb of Clement VI. The fine church of S. Julien de Brioude, in florid Byzantine style, dates from the eleventh or twelfth century. Besides the great pilgrimage of Le Puy, we may mention those of Notre-Dame de Pradelles, at Pradelles, a pilgrimage dating from 1512; of Notre-Dame d'Auteyrac, at Sorlhac, which was very popular before the Revolution; of Notre-Dame Trouvée, at Lavoute-Chilhac.

Before the passage of the Law of Associations (1901) there were at Le Puy, Jesuits, Franciscans, Religious of St. Mary of the Assumption, and Little Brothers of Mary. Two important congregations of men originated and had their mother-house, in the diocese. Of these the Brothers of the Sacred Heart, founded in 1821 with the object of giving commercial instruction, have their mother-house at Paradis and important boarding-schools at Lyons, as well as in the United States (chiefly Baie Saint-Louis) and in Canada (chiefly at Athabaskaville). The Labourer Brothers, or Farmer Brothers, of St. John Francis Régis were founded in 1850, by Père de Bussy, a Jesuit, and possess seven model farms for the education of poor children. A certain number of congregations of women originated in the diocese. The Dominicans of Mère Agnès, who taught and served as sick nurses and housekeepers, were founded in 1221; the teaching Sisters of Notre-Dame, in 1618; the religious of St. Charles, teachers and nurses, in 1624, by Just de Serres, Bishop of Le Puy; the hospital and teaching Sisters of St. Joseph, in 1650, by Père Médaille, who were the first congregation placed under the patronage of St. Joseph; the contemplative religious of the Visitation of St. Mary were founded in 1659; those of the Instruction of the Infant Jesus, for teaching, in 1667, by the celebrated Sulpician Tronson, parish priest of St. Georges, and his penitent, Mlle Martel; the Sisters of the Cross, for hospital service and teaching, in 1673.

At the end of the nineteenth century the religious congregations possessed in the Diocese of Le Puy: 69 infant schools (*écoles maternelles*), 2 schools for deaf mutes, 2 orphanages for boys, 6 orphanages for girls, 1 refuge for penitent women, 20 hospitals or hospices, 1 lunatic asylum, 3 old men's homes, 57 houses of religious women consecrated to the care of the sick at home. In 1905 (end of the Concordat period) the diocese had 314,058 inhabitants, 33 parishes, 243 auxiliary parishes (*succursales*), and 195 state-paid vicariates.

Gallia Christiana, Nova (1720), II, 685–752; 781–82; *instrum.*, 221–62; MANDET, *Histoire du Velay* (6 vols., Le Puy, 1860); FRUGÈRE, *Apostolicité de l'église du Velay* (Le Puy, 1869); DUCHESNE, *Fastes épiscopaux*, II, 55–58; 134–35; ROCHER, *Les rapports de l'église du Puy avec la ville de Girone en Espagne et le comte de Bigorre* (Le Puy, 1873); FITA, *Los Reyes de Aragon y la Sede de Girona* (Barcelona, 1872); COULET, *Etude sur l'office de Girone en l'honneur de Saint Charlemagne* (Montpellier, 1907); CHASSAING, *Cartulaire des hospitaliers du Velay* (Paris, 1888); IDEM, *Cartulaire des Templiers du Puy en Velay* (Paris, 1882); CHEVALIER, *Cartulaire de l'abbaye de S. Chaffre du Monastier, suivi de la chronique de S. Pierre du Puy* (Le Puy, 1882); LASCOMBE, *Répertoire général des hommages de l'évêché du Puy, 1154–1741* (Le Puy, 1882); SURREL DE SAINT-JULIEN, *Les évêques du Puy et la collation des bénéfices de ce diocèse* in *Annales de S. Louis des Français* (1897); ARNAUD, *Histoire des Protestants du Vivarais et du Velay* (2 vols., Paris, 1888); PAYRARD, *Mémoire sur le jubilé de N. D. du Puy* (Le Puy, 1875); CHEVALIER, *Topo-bibl.*, s. v. *Puy-en-Velay*; PEYRON, *Histoire du jubilé de Notre Dame du Puy* (Le Puy, 1910.)

GEORGES GOYAU.

Le Quien, MICHEL, French historian and theologian, b. at Boulogne-sur-Mer, department of Pas-de-Calais, 8 Oct., 1661; d. at Paris, 12 March, 1733. He studied at Plessis College, Paris, and at twenty entered

the Dominican convent of St-Germain, where he made his profession in 1682. Excepting occasional short absences he never left Paris. At the time of his death he was librarian of the convent in Rue St-Honoré, a position which he had filled almost all his life, lending kindly assistance to the learned men who sought information on theology and ecclesiastical antiquity. Under the supervision of the celebrated Père Marsollier he mastered the classical languages, Arab, and Hebrew, to the detriment, it seems, of his mother-tongue.

His chief works, in chronological order, are: (1) "Défense du texte hébreu et de la version vulgate" (Paris, 1690), reprinted in Migne, "Scripturæ Sacræ Cursus", III (Paris, 1861), 1525–84. It is an answer to "L'antiquité des temps rétablie" by the Cistercian Pezron, who took the text of the Septuagint as sole basis for his chronology. Pezron replied, and was again answered by Le Quien. (2) "Johannis Damasceni opera omnia", Greek text with Latin translation (2 vols. fol., Paris, 1712) in Migne, "Patrologia Græca", XCIV–VI. To this fundamental edition he added excellent dissertations; a third volume, which was to have contained other works of the great Damascene and various studies on him, was never completed. (3) "Panoplia contra schisma Græcorum", under the pseudonym of Stephanus de Altimura Ponticencis (Paris, 1718), a refutation of the Περὶ ἀρχῆς τοῦ Πάπα of Patriarch Nectarius of Jerusalem, Le Quien maintained, with historical proofs derived chiefly from the Orient, the primacy of the pope. (4) "La nullité des ordinations anglicanes" (2 vols., Paris, 1725), and "La nullité des ordinations anglicanes démontrée de nouveau" (2 vols., Paris, 1730), against Le Courayer's apology for Anglican Orders. (5) Various articles on archæology and ecclesiastical history, published by Desmolets (Paris, 1726–31). (6) "Oriens christianus in quatuor patriarchatus digestus, in quo exhibentur Ecclesiæ patriarchæ cæterique præsules totius Orientis", published posthumously (3 vols., Paris, 1740). Le Quien contemplated issuing this work as early as 1722, and had made a contract with the printer Simart (Revue de l'Orient latin, 1894, II, 190). In editing it, he used the notes of the Benedictine Sainte-Marthes, who had projected an "Orbis Christianus", and had obligingly handed him over their notes on the Orient and Africa. The "Oriens Christianus", as projected by Le Quien, was to comprise not only the hierarchy of the four Greek and Latin patriarchates of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, and that of the Jacobite, Melchite, Nestorian, Maronite, and Armenian patriarchates, but also the Greek and Latin texts of the various "Notitiæ episcopatuum", a catalogue of the Eastern and African monasteries, and also the hierarchy of the African Church. The last three parts of this gigantic project were set aside by Le Quien's literary heirs. As to the "Notitiæ episcopatuum", the loss is unimportant; the learned Dominican had not a very clear concept of the work called for by the editing of this text. His notes on Christian Africa and its monasteries have never been used, at least in their entirety. (7) "Abrégé de l'histoire de Boulogne-sur-Mer et de ses comtes" in Desmolets, "Mémoires de littérature", X (Paris, 1749), 36–112.

Quétif and Echard, *Script. ord. Præd.*, II, 808; *Journal des Savants*, ci; Michaud, *Biogr. universelle*, XXIV, 241; Hurter, *Nomenclator*, II, 1064–6; Streber in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.; Zöckler in *Realencykl. für prot. Theol.*, s. v.

S. Vailhé.

Leray, Joseph. See Gilbert Islands, Vicariate Apostolic of.

Lérida, Diocese of (Ilerdensis), suffragan of Tarragona. La Canal says it was erected in 600, but others maintain it goes back to the third century, and there is mention of a St. Lycerius, or Glycerius, as Bishop of Lérida in A. D. 269. The signatures of other bishops of Lérida are attached to various councils up to the year 716, when the Moors took possession of the town, and the see was removed to Roda; in 1101 it was transferred to Barbastro. An unbroken list of bishops of Lérida goes back to the year 887. Lérida, the Roman Ilerda, or Herda, the second city in Catalonia, is built on the right bank of the River Segra, about 100 miles from Barcelona. During the Punic wars it sided with the Carthaginians; near it Hanno was defeated by Scipio in 216 B. C., and Julius Cæsar defeated Pompey's forces in 49 B. C. The Moors took possession of it in 716, and in 1149 Berenger of Catalonia drove them out, and it became the residence of the kings of Aragon. During the Peninsular War the French held it (1810), and in 1823 Spain once more obtained possession of it. Owing to its natural position its strategic value has always been very great, and it is now strongly fortified. The town is oriental in appearance, and its streets are narrow and crooked. The population in 1900 was 23,683. The old Byzantine-Gothic Cathedral, of which the ruins are to be seen on the citadel, dates from 1203. During the Middle Ages the University of Lérida was famous; in 1717 it was suppressed, and united with Cervara.

In 514 or 524 a council attended by eight bishops passed decrees forbidding the taking up of arms or the shedding of blood by clerics. A council in 546 regulated ecclesiastical discipline. Another in 1173 was presided over by Cardinal Giacinto Bobone, who afterwards became Celestine III. A council in 1246 absolved James I of Aragon from the sacrilege of cutting out the tongue of the Bishop of Gerona. The cathedral chapter prior to the concordat consisted of 6 dignities, 24 canons, 22 benefices, but after the concordat the number was reduced to 16 canons and 12 beneficed clerics. The seminary, founded in 1722, accommodates 500 students. The Catholic population of the diocese is 185,000 souls scattered over 395 parishes and ministered to by 598 priests. Besides 395 churches for public worship, there are in the diocese five religious communities of men, six of women, and several hospitals in charge of nuns. Former bishops of Lérida include Cardinal de Rom, Cardinal Cerdan, and Inquisitor General Martínez de Villatoriel. The present bishop, Mgr J. A. Ruano y Martín, was born at Gijude del Barro, in the Diocese of Salamanca, 3 Nov., 1848, appointed titular bishop of Claudiopolis, and Administrator of Barbastro, 3 Nov., 1898, and transferred to Lérida, 14 Dec., 1905, when he succeeded Mgr José Meseguer y Costa.

Perujo in *Diccionario de Ciencias Eclesiásticas*, s. v.; Flórez, *España Sagrada* (Madrid, 1754); Belloso, *Anuario Eclesiástico de España* (Madrid, 1904).

J. C. Grey.

Lérins, Abbey of, situated on an island of the same name, now known as that of Saint-Honorat, about a league from the coast of Provence, in the Department of the Maritime Alps, now included in the Diocese of Nice, formerly in that of Grasse or of Antibes. It was founded in the beginning of the fifth

century by St. Honoratus. This saint lived there at first the life of a hermit, but followers soon gathered around him. They came from all parts of Roman Gaul and even from Brittany. During the fifth, sixth, and seventh centuries, the influence exerted by the abbey was considerable. The presence of the Saracens in Provence made the monastic life impossible or precarious for two centuries. The abbey was restored in the eleventh century, and a new era of prosperity began. It was given many estates and churches in the neighbouring Dioceses of Antibes, Aix, Arles, Fréjus, Digne, Senez, Vence, Nice, Ventimiglia, etc. The popes, the counts of Provence, and the kings of France bestowed on it many privileges. The monks were obliged during the Middle Ages to take an active part in defending the coasts against incursions of the Moors of Algeria. A monumental tower, built as a place of refuge, is still standing. The abbey was an important strategic position in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries during the Franco-Spanish wars. The *commendam* was introduced at Lérins in 1464. There was a crying need for reform. The monks were placed under the Italian Congregation of St. Justina of Padua (1515), which brought about for the monastery a long era of prosperity, both spiritual and material. The subsequent union with the French Congregation of St. Maur (1637) was of brief duration. A century later the monks were obliged to leave the Italian congregation to become a part of Cluny. The decline had already commenced; it steadily increased until the time of suppression (1791). The religious had followed the Benedictine Rule from the seventh century onwards.

During the first period of its history, Lérins gave to the Church celebrated bishops and writers. Through them the abbey played an important rôle. Such were St. Honoratus, his successor St. Hilary, and St. Cæsarius, Archbishops of Arles; St. Maximus and Faustus, Bishops of Riez; St. Eucherius, Bishop of Lyons; St. Lupus, Bishop of Troyes; St. Valerianus, Bishop of Cimiez; St. Salvianus, Bishop of Geneva; St. Veranus, Bishop of Vence; and the celebrated Vincent de Lérins. The presence of so many writers in one monastery has given rise to the belief that it was a theological school, which, however, it was not. Lérins had a reputation for learning, but it had no organized teaching body. The part given to the monks of Lérins in the editing of certain legends by M. Dufourcq is strongly contested. We find no writer of note from the seventh to the thirteenth century; after that came the troubadour Raymond Féraud; then Giovanni Andrea Gregorio Cortese, who died in 1548; Dionysius Faucher, who died in 1562; the historian of the abbey, Vincent Barralis, who died at the beginning of the seventeenth century.

Besides these writers and bishops, Lérins had also many monks of great sanctity; we must mention St. Antonius; the holy abbot and martyr Aigulf, who introduced the Benedictine Rule about 661; Abbot Porcharius II, who was massacred with his monks by the Saracens about 732. St. Patrick, the apostle of Ireland, lived some time in the monastery, as well as St. Cassian, founder of the monastery of St. Victor at Marseilles.

The abbey was restored by the Congregation of Sénanque in 1868. They preserved whatever remained of the ancient monastic buildings, that is to say the cloister, the refectory, and the chapter hall, which they enclosed in the new abbey. The fortress, of which the construction was begun in 1073 as a place of refuge in case of sudden attack, is fairly well preserved. The records, as well as the manuscripts of the old library, are in the archives of the Maritime Alps at Nice. Few monasteries have a history to which so much attention has been devoted as that of Lérins.

Moris, *L'Abbaye de Lérins. Histoire et Monuments* (Paris, 1909); Idem, *Inventaire Sommaire des archives départementales des Alpes-Maritimes. Série H.* (Nice, 1893); *Cartulaire de l'Abbaye de Lérins*, ed. Moris and Blanc, 2 vols. (Paris, 1883–1904); Barralis, *Chronologia sanctorum . . . abbatum sacræ insulæ Lerinensis* (Lyons, 1613); Goux, *Lérins au cinquième siècle* (Paris, 1854); Lahargou, *De Schola Lerinensi* (Paris, 1890).

J. M. Besse.

Leros, titular see of the Cyclades, suffragan of Rhodes. According to Strabo (XIV, i, 6), this island must have been a colony of Miletus; it next became independent before falling under the Roman domination. According to the poet Phocylides, the inhabitants of Leros had, without exception, an evil reputation (Strabo, X, v, 12). It was here that Aristagoras, the leader of the Ionian revolt against the Persians (499 B. C.), was advised to hide from the vengeance of Darius. The island possessed a famous sanctuary of Artemis the Virgin, on the site of which the present convent of Parthenia and the adjoining church are supposed to be built. Lequien (Oriens Christianus, I, 945) mentions four of its bishops: John, in 553; Sergius, in 787; Joseph, in 869; Callistus, in the sixteenth century. The list could be completed, for Leros has never ceased to be an episcopal see, and there is still a metropolitan of Leros and the neighbouring island Calymnos, dependent upon the Greek Patriarchate of Constantinople. Eubel ("Hierarchia catholica medii ævi", Münster, I, 315) also mentions two Latin bishops of the fourteenth century. A possession of the Knights of Rhodes, the island sustained a siege in 1505, and was taken by the Turks in 1523; it was recovered by the Venetians, who razed its fortifications, in 1648; and it once more fell into the possession of the Osmanli. Leros now forms a caza of the sanjak of Chio, in the vilayet of Rhodes. The island is about nine and a quarter miles long by seven and a half wide. It is barren, mountainous, and rich only in marble quarries; and has about eight thousand inhabitants, all Greeks. The Catholic inhabitants are under the jurisdiction of the Prefecture Apostolic of Rhodes.

Dapper, *Déscription des îles de l'Archipel* (Amsterdam, 1703), 183; Ross, *Reisen auf den griech. Inseln*, II, 119; Smith, *Dict. Greek and Roman Geog.*, II, 164; Lacroix, *Iles de la Grèce* (Paris, 1853), 208; Cuinet, *La Turquie d'Asie* (Paris, 1892), I, 429–432.

S. Vailhé.

Le Sage, Alain-René, writer, b. at Sarzeau (Morbihan), 1668; d. at Boulogne-sur-Mer, 1747. The son of a notary who died early in the youth's career, he left the Jesuit college of Vannes after the completion of his studies, and found himself penniless, his guardian having squandered his fortune. He married at the age of twenty-six and at first practised law, but he relinquished a profession which did not provide him with sufficient means for his needs, and devoted himself to literature. The Abbé de Lyonne settled a small pension upon him and encouraged him to study Spanish literature. Le Sage translated a number of plays from that language, without finding favour in the public eye. But a short original farce in prose, "Crispin rival de son maître", won marked success (1707). Its merits have kept it on the stage. Le Sage was both a dramatist and a novelist, and was a prolific writer of plays and romances. The enmity of the



Alain-René Le Sage

actors forced him, like Piron, to go to the minor theatre of the Foire, for which he collaborated in writing about a hundred plays. Amidst the sorrows and infirmities of age, he still wrote, hurriedly and incessantly, in order to make a living. He resided at the time with one of his sons, a canon at Boulogne-sur-Mer, at which place he died, aged eighty.

Besides the short farce of "Crispin", three works of Le Sage are worthy of special mention: "Turcaret", "Le Diable Boiteux", and "Gil Blas". "Turcaret ou le Financier" (1709) is a comedy in prose in which the principal character is a financier. This upstart, who has risen by theft and usury, is surrounded by people equally unscrupulous. It is an assemblage of rogues. A coquette shares her favours between Turcaret, who loves her and pays her, and a fashionable cavalier whom she loves. Frontin, the cavalier's valet, sums up the play fairly well when he says to his master: "We pluck a coquette; the coquette ruins a financier; the financier swindles others, which makes the most amusing ricochet of knavish tricks imaginable." The dialogue is spirited, the descriptions are true to life, and the action is full of animation. Perhaps no other play approaches so closely to Molière's great comedies. "Le Diable Boiteux" (1707) is based on a story from the Spanish writer Guevara (1641): The demon Asmodeus removes the roofs of the houses of Madrid, to show to a Castilian student the foibles and vices within the buildings. Aside from this Le Sage finds his inspiration in the Parisian himself; he describes Parisian society with truth and picturesqueness in a series of detached adventures and scenes. The success of the work was great. Le Sage's greatest work, however, was "Histoire de Gil Blas de Santillane" (4 vols., 1715–35). The Spaniard Gil Blas, hero of the romance, is in turn lackey, physician, major-domo of the great lord, secretary to an archbishop, favourite of the prime minister. He is finally given a title and an estate; he marries and peacefully writes his memoirs. The moral of the book is that one must constantly guard against the wiles of hypocrites and impostors. The writer correctly paints, with artful satire, French society as it was in the eighteenth century, and in fact society in general. In spite of assertion, "Gil Blas" is not plagiarized from a Spanish novel. It is an original work, and in France is considered one of the masterpieces of romance.

WALTER SCOTT, *Miscellaneous Prose Works*, III; TICKNOR, *History of Spanish Literature*, I; LINTILHAC, *Lesage* (Paris, 1893); LE BRETON, *Le Roman au XVIII siècle* (Paris, 1898).

GEORGES BERTRIN.

Lesbi, a titular see in Mauretania Sitifensis, suffragan of Sitifis, or Sétif, in Algeria. It is not, as is sometimes stated, the island of Lesbos, which never was a titular bishopric, and which, moreover, possesses two titular archbishoprics: Mytilene and Methymna. Of Lesbi we only know, from the "Itinerarium Antonini", that it was situated twenty-five miles from Tupusuctu or Tiklat, and eighteen miles from Horrea Aninici, now Ain-Roua, south of Bougie. The town, therefore, was on the Sava, i. e. the Oued-Bou-Sellam, but there are no remains to be seen. Two of its bishops are recorded: Romanus, a Donatist, present at the convention of Carthage, 411; Vadius, a Catholic, exiled by King Huneric, 484.

TOULETTE, *Géographie de l'Afrique chrétienne; Maurétanies* (Montreuil, 1894), 212.

S. VAILHÉ.

Lescarbot, MARC, French lawyer, writer, and historian, b. at Vervins, between 1565 and 1570; d. about 1629. Curiosity to see the New World and devotion to the public weal prompted him to follow Poutrincourt to Port-Royal, in Acadia, in 1606. His proficiency in Christian doctrine enabled him to instruct the Indians of the neighbourhood of Port-Royal. His material aid to the settlers was not less efficient: he built a grist-mill for their wheat, a still to produce tar, and ovens for making charcoal. After his return to France (1607), he published (1609), under the title of "Histoire de la Nouvelle-France", a narrative of his voyage which has made his name famous. Lescarbot gives in this work a summary of all the attempts at colonizing made by the French in America, notably in Florida, Brazil, and Acadia, where he himself played an important part. He was long considered an excellent authority, and is still often quoted as an exact, alert, and faithful witness. This work underwent six editions in the beginning of the seventeenth century from 1609 to 1618, and a seventh in 1866. It was first translated into English in 1609, and a translation, by L. W. Grant, was published in 1907. Lescarbot also wrote "Adieux à la France" (1606); "Les Muses de la Nouvelle-France" (1609); "La défaite des sauvages amouchiquois par le Sagamo Membertou" (1609). After a journey in Switzerland, he published (1613), in verse, "Tableau des treize Cantons".

Dictionnaire de Jal; MARCEL, *Une lettre inédite de Lescarbot* (Paris, 1885); GRANT, *The History of New France* (Toronto, 1907) (a tr. of Lescarbot's work).

LIONEL LINDSAY.

Lescot, PIERRE, one of the greatest architects of France in the pure Renaissance style, b. at Paris about 1510; d. there, 1571. The very improbable report that he was never in Italy has been sufficiently refuted. Moreover, he was descended from the Italian family of Alessi. Francis I took him into his service, and, by this king and his successors, Lescot was rewarded with many honours and with a benefice. At his death he was a commendatory abbot as well as Lord (sieur) of Clagny. With the active support of Francis I, the early Renaissance entered on a period of glorious prosperity, and in the later years of his reign displayed a distinctive character. From that time it rivalled the Italian Renaissance in its zenith, although, by meeting the demands of French taste, it became somewhat more ostentatious. Lescot proved its most brilliant exponent. For the decorations of his buildings he associated himself with the sculptor, Trebatti, a pupil of Michelangelo, and especially with the ablest plastic artist of the pure style, Jean Goujon. The perfection of their achievement depended to a great extent upon the harmonious combination of their mutual efforts. It has been thought that, even in architectural matters, Lescot was very dependent upon his friend, though the latter named him with Philibert de L'Orme as the most eminent architects of France, and the accounts for the building of the Louvre designate Lescot as the architect and Goujon as the sculptor. Francis I appointed him architect of the Louvre in 1546, and with this building his fame will always be connected. For remodelling the old bastions of the fortress into a residence, the celebrated Italian, Serlio, drew up a plan which he himself afterwards put aside in favour of Lescot's design. Three sides of a square court were to be enclosed by living apartments of royal splendour, while the fourth or east side was probably destined to open with an arcade. Corner pavilions, remarkable for commanding height and adorned by pillars and statues, replaced the medieval towers.

The master was destined to finish only the west side and part of the south side. The building was two stories high with a richly ornamented attic crowned by a tasteful roof. In the ground story the windows were rounded; the small round windows over the portals (*œils de bœuf*) afterwards became very popular. In the second story the windows are square and finished off with plain Renaissance pediments. Slightly projecting members and slabs of coloured marble give life to the massive masonry. A peculiar effect was obtained by the sparing use of rough-hewn stone in the corner decorations. Goujon's noble sculptures and the architectural ornaments, although numerous and splendid, were cleverly subordinated to the construction. The style corresponded to the "latest manner"

of Bramante, as it was imitated in Italy by Sangallo, Peruzzi, Giulio Romano, etc.; it was now by Lescot, Goujon, de L'Orme, and some others, successfully adapted to French taste. The building of the Louvre was carried on with greater or less ability by several masters, and was finally completed under Napoleon I. The oldest parts of the palace are considered one of the greatest architectural achievements in France. "If among all the works of the French Renaissance we were to seek for the creations which possess in the highest degree qualities which were, so to say, the aim of the Renaissance, i. e. perfect proportion of members and details, we would always be attracted finally to Lescot's court in the Louvre" (Geymüller). The rest of Lescot's works are few in number; he appears not to have sought much for opportunities to build. Although, according to a poem of Ronsard, he busied himself zealously in early youth with drawing and painting, and, after his twentieth year, with mathematics and architecture, his wealth and the duties of his offices appear subsequently to have interfered with his artistic activity. His first achievements (1540–45) were the rood-screen in St-Germain-l'Auxerrois and the Hôtel de Ligneris (now Carnavalet) in Paris. Here and in the design of the Fountain of Nymphs or Innocents (1547–9), he again owes a great part of his moderate success to Goujon's assistance. The classical simplicity of this work had the misfortune to be undervalued during the barocco and rococo period, and received properrecognition only from a later age.

Berty, *Les grands architectes* (Paris, 1860); Palustre, *Architecture de la Renaissance* (Paris, 1892); Geymüller in *Handbuch der Architektur von Durm etc.*, II (Stuttgart, 1898), vi, 1.

G. Gietmann.

Lesina, (Pharia: Hvar), Diocese of (Pharensis, Brachiensis, et Issensis), in Dalmatia; includes the three islands of Hvar (Lesina), the ancient Pharia colonized by the Greeks in 385 B. C.; Brać, formerly Brattia or Brachia, also colonized by the Greeks; and Lissa, formerly Issa. The residence is at Lesina, a small town on the island of that name, said to have been first evangelized by St. Doimus (Domnius), a disciple of St. Peter. The diocese was probably founded about 1145 by Lucius II; its first bishop was Martinus Manzavini, elected in 1147. Its present bishop, the fifty-first, is Jordanus Zaninović, O.P., consecrated 19 April, 1903, by Leo XIII. The diocese includes 6 deaneries, 2 vice-deaneries, 28 parishes, 14 chaplaincies, and 62,890 faithful. There are several religious orders: Dominicans, Franciscans, Benedictine nuns, Sisters of Charity, and Sisters of the Third Order of St. Francis. The cathedral (Lombard façade) was built in 1637, and contains a painting by the famous Giacomo Palma. In 1899 the head of St. Stephen, protomartyr, was given by Pius X, then Patriarch of Venice, to the Franciscan Fulgentius Carev, Bishop of Lesina and Archbishop of Uskup. Two bishops of this diocese were created cardinals: Giovanni Battista Pallavicini in 1524; and Zaccarias II e gente Delphina in 1553. During the episcopate of Pietro Cedulini (1581–1634) two diocesan synods were held.

Farlati-Coleti, *Illyricum sacrum* (Venice, 1751–1817); Petermann, *Guide en Dalmatie* (Paris, 1900); *Status personalis et localis diœcesis Pharensis, Brachiensis et Issensis* (Split, 1902, 1909); Boglić, *Studi storici sull' isola de Lesina*, I (Zadar, 1873).

Anthony Lawrence Gančević.

Leslie, John, Bishop of Ross, Scotland, b. 29 September, 1527; d. at Guirtenburg, near Brussels, 30 May, 1596. He was of the ancient House of Leslie of Balquhain, but apparently illegitimate, as in July, 1538, a dispensation was granted to him to take orders, notwithstanding this defect. He was educated first at Aberdeen University, and afterwards in France, studying at Poitiers, Toulouse, and Paris, and graduating as doctor of laws. Returning home, he became professor of canon law at Aberdeen, was ordained in 1558, presented to the parsonage of Oyne, and appointed official of the diocese. We find him in 1560 named by the Lords of the Congregation to discuss points of faith at Edinburgh against Knox and Willock. In the following year he went to France to bring to Scotland the young Queen Mary, with whom he was associated during the years which followed. In 1565 she made him a member of her privy council, and in the same year, on the death of Henry Sinclair, he was nominated Bishop of Ross. He also held the office of judge, or lord of session, and was co-editor of the "Actis and Constitutiounis of the Realme of Scotland from the Reigne of James I", the work of a commission appointed by the queen, at his suggestion, to revise and publish the laws of the kingdom. On Mary's escape from Lochleven in 1568, she was joined by Leslie, who never wavered in his fidelity to her cause; and he was her principal commissioner at the abortive conference with Queen Elizabeth's commissioners at York. For favouring the project of Mary's marriage with the Duke of Norfolk, he was imprisoned by Elizabeth, first at Ely, and then in the Tower of London. During his absence from Scotland he was deprived of the revenues of his bishopric and was reduced to great poverty. Theiner prints an interesting letter addressed by him to the pope in 1580, showing the efforts he made, though absent from his diocese, to confirm those wavering in the faith, and recover those who had fallen away. Liberated in 1573, but banished from the country, he visited various European courts to plead the cause of his queen, and finally went to Rome. The Archbishop of Rouen appointed him his vicar-general in 1579. James VI restored the bishop, his mother's lifelong friend and champion, to his former dignities, but he never returned to Scotland. In letters he is principally remembered as the author of a Latin account of the history of Scotland, "De origine, moribus, ac rebus gestis Scotiæ libri decem" (Rome, 1578), a Scottish version by Dom E. B. Cody, O.S.B. It comes down to 1571, and in its latter part presents a Catholic account of contemporary events.

LESLIE, *Historical Records of Family of Leslie*, III (Edinburgh, 1869), 402–407; KEITH, *Hist. Catalogue of Scottish Bishops* (Edinburgh, 1824), 194–200 (with extracts from original writs); TYTLER, *History of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1864), III, 140, and passim; CODY in *Introd. to Leslie's History of Scotland* (Scot. Text Soc., Edinburgh, 1888), with a full account of Leslie's historical writings. See also complete bibliography at end of article *Leslie* in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, XXXIII, 93–99. The article itself (by HENDERSON) is written with prejudice, and does much less than justice to an able, pious, and patriotic prelate.

D. O. HUNTER-BLAIR.

Lessius (LEYS), LEONARD, a Flemish Jesuit and a theologian of high reputation, b. at Brecht, in the province of Antwerp, 1 October, 1554; d. at Louvain, 15 January, 1623. His parents, honest people of the farming class, died when he was but six years old. In 1568 he entered the college of Arras in the University of Louvain, and there studied classics and philosophy. His brilliant talents enabled him to become doctor in philosophy at the age of seventeen years; and although he did not learn Greek till later, he mastered it so well that he could mentally translate into that language the reading he heard in the refectory, and sometimes wrote his private notes in Greek. Professors vied with one another in seeking to have him as their pupil. In 1572, and not, as the date is sometimes given, in 1573, he entered the Society of Jesus, and after two years' noviceship was sent to Douai to teach philosophy in the Jesuit College there till 1581. He studied theology in Rome, where he had Francis Suarez as his professor for two years. In 1585 he was back again at Louvain as professor of theology in the Jesuit College and held this chair for fifteen years. When he had given up teaching, he was urged by his superiors and companions to publish the lectures on theology which he had delivered with such great success; this he did, yielding at last to their wishes. He was twice sent to Rome by the members of the Gallo-Belgian province to the general congregations of his order in 1608 and 1615. Cardinal Bellarmine and other dignitaries of the Church endeavoured, though unsuccessfully, to retain him in Rome and to attach him to the Sacred Penitentiary. He was consulted from all quarters, and corresponded on theological matters with the most learned doctors of the day, such as Bellarmine, Suarez, Vasquez, Molina, etc. But he longed to have done with studying and writing books, that he might turn to prayer and contemplation towards the end of his career. His remains are in the choir of the Jesuit church in Louvain. Leonard Lessius was a man of great virtue and of great science; his modesty and humility were equal to his learning, nor did he ever hesitate to give up his own opinion when good arguments against it were presented to him; his charity, meekness, patience, and mortification were remarkable throughout his long life, in spite of the trying disease he contracted when fleeing from Douai to escape the Calvinists. Pope Urban VIII, who had known him personally, paid a special tribute to his sanctity; St. Francis of Sales also esteemed him highly for his virtue and his science. After his death, authentic information was taken about his life and virtues; he is now ranked among the venerable, and the process of his beatification has been introduced.

The literary activity of Lessius was not confined to dogmatic and moral matters; he wrote also on asceticism and controversy. We give here the most important of his works; the whole list may be seen in Sommervogel. The first printed lines which came from the pen of Lessius, i. e. "Theses theologicæ" (Louvain, 1586), provoked a fiery debate with the doctors of the University of Louvain; the theses of Lessius and Hamelius, both professors at the Jesuit College, were attacked as containing dangerous opinions on predestination, grace, inspiration in Holy Scripture, etc. As to the last point, Lessius had merely suggested an hypothesis on subsequent inspiration, i. e. that a book written without the help of the Holy Ghost might become Holy Scripture, if the Holy Ghost apparently declared that the said book did not contain anything false. The condemnations issued by the Vatican Council did not touch this view of Lessius. The doctrine of Lessius on grace and predestination, which was accused of Semipelagianism, taught predestination "post prævisa merita", the co-operation of free will with grace in such a way as to reject the "gratia per se efficax"; in fact, this doctrine was by no means peculiar to Lessius. Apologies, antitheses, anti-apologies, succeeded on both sides; the Universities of Louvain and Douai censured the theses; the faculties of theology of Ingolstadt, Mainz, and Trier approved them; the general of the Jesuits and at last the pope was appealed to. Finally Sixtus V, who in a letter called the incriminated articles "articuli sanæ doctrinæ", charged his nuncio at Cologne, Octavio Frangipani, to bring the discussions to an end till the pope should have decided the question; Frangipani (1588) forbade both sides, under threat of excommunication, to discuss the matter or to charge each other with heresy.

The great work of Lessius is "De justitia et jure", which was published in 1605 and was dedicated to the Archduke Albert. Many editions followed at Antwerp, Louvain, Lyons, Paris, and Venice. This work, composed with great accuracy, shows best the soundness of judgment, the common sense, and the clearness of mind which distinguishes Lessius. The chapters on interest and other commercial subjects are epoch-making in the treatment of those difficult questions; Lessius was especially consulted by the merchants of Antwerp on matters of justice. Archduke Albert had the book constantly on his desk and referred to it as a guide. A good compendium of the work was published at Douai in 1634. Four years later a work of quite a different nature was written by Lessius under the title, "Quæ fides et religio sit capessenda" (Antwerp, 1609). It is a short book of some 150 pages, on controversy and apologetics, which brought about a great many conversions, among them that of John of Nassau. The book was often reprinted and was translated into Flemish, German, Italian, Hungarian, Polish, and French. The work "De gratia efficaci", on grace, liberty, predestination, etc., appeared in 1610; with the "De justitia" it secures Lessius a place among the best theologians of the day in dogmatic as well as in moral questions. Some writings of a controversial character were published between 1611 and 1619; "De Antichristo et ejus præcursoribus"; "Defensio potestatis summi pontificis", against the theories put forward by James I, King of England, Barclay, Blackwell, etc. A work on Providence and the immortality of the soul was printed in 1613, "De Providentia Numinis", and translated into different languages, even into Chinese. His "Hygiasticon" or plea for sobriety, a treatise on how to preserve strength and to live long, was published in 1613, often reprinted and translated into nearly all the languages of Europe; it is a translation of a similar work by Cornaro (Luigi Cornaro, an Italian hygienist, 1467–1566), accompanied with the personal reflections of Lessius. Even now it is not without interest.

Among his ascetical works, which are noted for the science and piety they contain, must be mentioned his "De summo bono" (Antwerp, 1616); "De perfectionibus moribusque divinis libri XIV" (Antwerp, 1620); and especially his posthumous work, on the Divine names, "Quinquaginta nomina Dei" (Brussels, 1640), very often reprinted and translated. After his death was published his theological treatise on the sacraments, the Incarnation, etc. (De beatitudine, de actibus humanis, de incarnatione Verbi, de sacramentis et censuris, etc., Louvain, 1645). Not a few of his unprinted works are preserved at Brussels and elsewhere; they are made up especially of theo-

logical treatises, notes on morals, some letters and documents on the discussion mentioned above, answers to various consultations, etc. No complete edition of Lessius's works has ever appeared. The books "De perfectionibus divinis", "De gratia efficaci", "De summo bono", etc. were published in Paris (1878–81); "De divinis nominibus" and "De summo bono" at Freiburg (1862 and 1869); Bouix made a new French translation of the "De divinis nominibus" (Paris, 1882).

DE RAM, *Vie et Ecrits de L. Lessius* in *Revue Catholique*, XIX (1861), 189; DE BLOCK, *Le Père Lessius* in *Précis Historiques*, XII (1863), 133, 188, 210; HURTER, *Nomenclator;* SCHOOFS, *De Vita et Moribus L. Lessii* (Brussels, 1640); SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibl. de la Comp. de Jésus*, IV (Brussels, 1893), 1726. *Bibliographie Nationale*, XII, 79; IV, 774; WERNER, *Der hl. Thomas von Aquino*, III (Ratisbon, 1859), 382.

J. DE GHELLINCK.

Lessons in the Liturgy (exclusive of Gospel). I. HISTORY.—The reading of lessons from the Bible, Acts of Martyrs, or approved Fathers of the Church, forms an important element of Christian services in all rites since the beginning. The Jews had divided the Law into portions for reading in the synagogue. The first part of the Christian synaxis was an imitation or continuation of the service of the synagogue. Like its predecessor it consisted of lessons from the Sacred Books, psalm-singing, homilies, and prayers. The Christians, however, naturally read not only the Old Testament but their own Scriptures too. Among these Christian Scriptures the most important were the histories of Our Lord's life, that we call Gospels, and the letters of the Apostles to various Churches. So we find St. Paul demanding that his letter to the Thessalonians "be read to all the holy brethren" (I Thess., v, 27). Such a public reading could only take place at the synaxis. Again, at the end of the Epistle to the Colossians he tells the people to send the letter to Laodicea to be read there, and to demand and read his letter to the Laodiceans (Col., iv, 16). Here too he seems to imply a public reading ("when this epistle shall have been read with you"). That the public reading of lessons from the Holy Books was a well-known incident of Christian services in the first centuries appears also from the common idea that the "Gospel" to which St. Paul alludes as being "through all the churches" (II Cor., viii, 18) was the written Gospel of St. Luke read in the assemblies (Eusebius, "Hist. eccl.", III, iv, 8; Jerome, "De viris illustr.", vii). The famous text of St. Justin Martyr (I Apol., lxvii, quoted in GOSPEL IN THE LITURGY) shows that Biblical texts were read at the Sunday assemblies. So also Tertullian (d. about 240) says of the Roman Church, that she "combines the Law and the Prophets with the Gospels and Apostolic letters" in her public reading (De præscript. hær., 36). There is evidence that at first, not only the canonical Scriptures, but Acts of Martyrs, letters, homilies of prominent bishops, and other edifying documents were read publicly in the assemblies. St. Cyprian (d. 258) demands that his letters be read publicly in church (e. g., Ep. ix, in P. L., IV, 253, etc.). The first Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians was used for public reading; it is included (with II Clem. ad. Cor.) in the Codex Alexandrinus. The Epistle of Barnabas and the "Shepherd" of Hermas are in the Codex Sinaiticus. These manuscripts represent collections made for public reading. So also in the East, Acts of Martyrs were read on their anniversaries. Even as late as his time St. John Chrysostom (d. 407) seems to imply that letters from various Churches were still read in the Liturgy (Hom. 30 on II Cor., in P. G., LXI, 605). From the third and fourth centuries, however, the principle obtained that in the liturgy only the canonical Scriptures should be read. The Muratorian Canon (third century) expressly forbids the "Shepherd" to be read publicly. The ideas of public reading and canonicity become synonymous, so that the fact that a book is read at the Liturgy in any local Church is understood to be evidence that that Church accepts it as canonical. Readings during the Office (Matins, etc.) outside the Liturgy have always been more free in this regard.

Originally, as we see from Justin Martyr's account, the amount read was quite indeterminate; the reader went on "as long as time allowed". The presiding bishop would then stop him with some sign or formula, of which our clause, "Tu autem Domine, miserere nobis", at the end of lessons (once undoubtedly said by the celebrant) is still a remnant. The gradual fixing of the whole liturgical function into set forms naturally involved the fixing of the portions of the Bible read. There was an obvious convenience in arranging beforehand more or less equal sections to be read in turn. These sections were called "pericopes" (*περικοπή*), a fragment cut off, almost exactly the German *Abschnitt*); they were marked in the text of the Bible, as may be seen in most early manuscripts. An index (called *Συναξάριον* in Greek, *capitularium* in Latin), giving the first and last words of the pericopes for each Sunday and feast, made it easier to find them. There are many remnants of the practice of naming a pericope after its first words, as in the *capitularium*. The Fathers preach on Gospels which they so call, as if it were a proper name (so St. Bernard's "Homilies on the *Missus est*" is on Luke, i, 26–38, etc.). Eventually, for greater convenience the lessons are written out in their liturgical order in a *lectionarium*, and later still they are inserted in their place with the text of the whole service, in Breviaries and Missals (see GOSPEL IN THE LITURGY, I).

Meanwhile the number of lessons, at first undetermined, became fixed and reduced. The reading of the Gospel, as being the most important, the crown and fulfilment of the prophecies in the Old Law, was put in the place of honour, last. Every allusion to the lessons read in churches implies that the Gospel comes last. A further reason for this arrangement was that in some Churches the catechumens were not allowed to hear the Gospel, so it was read after their dismissal (see GOSPEL IN THE LITURGY, I). We are concerned here with the other lessons that preceded it. For a time their number was still vague. The liturgy of the Apostolic Constitutions refers to "the reading of the Law and the Prophets and of our Epistles and Acts and Gospels" (VIII, v, 11). The Syriac, Coptic, and Abyssinian Rites have several lessons before the Gospel (Brightman, "Eastern Liturgies", Oxford, 1896, pp. 76–8, 152–4, 212–5). In the Roman Rite we still have Masses with a number of lessons before the Gospel. Then gradually the custom obtains of reading two only, one from the Old Testament and one from the New. From the fact that the text read from the Old Testament is looked upon as a promise or type of what followed in Our Lord's life (very commonly taken from a Prophet) it is called the "prophecy". The lesson of the New Testament (exclusive of the Gospel) would naturally in most cases be part of an Epistle of St. Paul or another Apostle. So we have three lessons in the Liturgy—*prophetia, epistola* (or *apostolus*), *evangelium*. This was the older arrangement of the liturgies that now have only two. The Armenian Rite, derived at an early date (in the sixth century) from that of Constantinople, has these three lessons (Brightman, op. cit., 425–426). St. John Chrysostom also alludes to three lessons in the Byzantine Rite of his time (Hom. 29 on Acts, P. G., LX, 218; cf. Brightman, op. cit., 470). In the West, Germanus of Paris (d. 576), describing the Gallican Rite, mentions them: "The prophetic lesson of the Old Testament has its place. . . . The same God speaks in the prophecy who teaches in the Apostle and is glorious in the light of the Gospels", etc. (Duchesne, "Origines du Culte", 185). This Gallican use is still preserved in the Mozarabic

Liturgy, which has three lessons in the Mass. The Ambrosian Rite has a prophetic lesson on certain days only.

The Roman Rite also certainly once had these three lessons at every Mass. Besides the now exceptional cases in which there are two or more lessons before the Gospel, we have a trace of them in the arrangement of the Gradual which still shows the place where the other lesson has dropped out (see GRADUAL). The church of St. Clement at Rome (restored in the ninth century but still keeping the disposition of a much older basilica) has a third ambo for the prophetic lesson. A further modification reduced the lessons to two, one from any book of the Bible other than the Gospel, the second from the Gospel. In the Byzantine Rite this change took place between the time of St. John Chrysostom (d. 407) and the final development of the liturgy. The Barberini manuscript (ninth century, reproduced in Brightman, op. cit., 309–344) still supposes more than one lesson before the Gospel (ibid., 314). The Greek Liturgies of St. James and St. Mark also have only one lesson before the Gospel (ibid., 36, 118). This is one of the many examples of the influence of Constantinople, which from the seventh century gradually byzantinized the older Rites of Antioch and Alexandria, till it replaced them in about the thirteenth century. In St. Augustine's sermons we see that he refers sometimes to two lessons before the Gospel (e. g., Sermo xl), sometimes to only one (Sermo clxxvi, clxxx). At Rome, too, the lessons were reduced to two since the sixth century ("Liber Pontificalis", ed. Duchesne, Paris, 1884, I, 230), except on certain rare occasions. These two lessons, then, are our Epistle and Gospel.

II. THE EPISTLE.—In no rite is the first of these two lessons invariably taken from an Epistle. Nevertheless the preponderance of pericopes from one of the Epistles in the New Testament is so great that the first lesson, whatever it may be, is commonly called the "Epistle" (*Epistola*). An older name meaning the same thing is "Apostle" (*Apostolus*). The Gregorian Sacramentary calls this lesson *Apostolus;* e. g., P. L., LXXVIII, 25; "deinde sequitur Apostolus"; it was also often called simply *Lectio* (so the Saint-Amand Ordo, Duchesne, "Origines du Culte", 442). The Eastern rites (Antioch, Alexandria, Constantinople) in Greek still call the first lesson ὁ Ἀπόστολος. Originally it was read by a lector. The privileges of the deacon to sing the Gospel and (in the West) of the subdeacon to read the Epistle are a later development (see GOSPELS IN THE LITURGY). It seems that in the West lectors read the Epistle as well as the other lessons down to about the fifth century (Reuter, "Das Subdiakonat", Augsburg, 1890, pp. 177, 185). Gradually, then, the feeling grew that the Epistle belongs to the subdeacon. This is apparently an imitation of the deacon's right to the Gospel. When the custom had obtained of celebrating High Mass with two ministers only—a deacon and a subdeacon—in place of the number of concelebrating priests, regionary deacons, and assistant subdeacons whom we see around the celebrating bishop in the first centuries at Rome, when further the liturgical lessons were reduced to two, and one of them was sung by the deacon, it seemed natural that the subdeacon should read the other. The first Roman Ordo (sixth–eighth century) describes the Epistle as read by a subdeacon (I, 10). But not till the fourteenth century was the subdeacon's peculiar office of reading the Epistle expressed and acknowledged by his symbolic reception of the book of Epistles at his ordination. Even now the Roman Pontifical keeps unchanged the old form of the admonition in the ordination of subdeacons (Adepturi, filii dilectissimi, officium subdiaconatus . . . etc.), which, although it describes their duties at length, says nothing about reading the Epistle. In the corresponding admonition to deacons, on the other hand, there is a clear reference to their duty of singing the Gospel. In the time of Durandus (thirteenth century) the question was still not clear to every one. He insists that "no one may read the Epistle solemnly in church unless he be a subdeacon, or, if no subdeacon be present, it must be said by a deacon" (Rationale Div. Offic., iv. 16); but when he treats of the duties of a subdeacon he finds it still necessary to answer the question: "Why the subdeacon reads the lessons at Mass, since this does not seem to belong to him either from his name or the office given to him" (ii, 8). We have even now a relic of the older use in the rubric of the Missal which prescribes that in a sung Mass, where there are no deacon and subdeacon, a lector in a surplice should read the Epistle (Ritus cel. Missam, vi, 8); in case of necessity at high Mass, too, a clerk, not ordained subdeacon, may wear the tunicle (not the maniple) and perform nearly all the subdeacon's duties, including the reading of the Epistle (S. R. C., 15 July, 1698). In the Eastern rites there is no provision for a subdeacon in the liturgy, except in the one case of the Maronites, who here, too, have romanized their rite. In all the others the Epistle is still chanted by a reader (ἀναγνώστης.)

The Epistle is the last lesson before the Gospel, the first when there are only two lessons. In this case its place is immediately after the Collects. Originally it came between the two chants that we now call the Gradual (see GRADUAL). It was read from an ambo, the reader or subdeacon turning towards the people. Where there were two or more ambos, one was used only for the Gospel. The common arrangement was that of an ambo on either side of the church, between the choir and the nave, as may still be seen in many old basilicas (e. g., S. Maria in Cosmedin at Rome, etc.). In this case the ambo on the north side was reserved for the Gospel, from which the deacon faced the south, where the men stood (GOSPEL IN THE LITURGY). The north is also the right, and therefore the more honourable, side of the altar. The ambo on the south was used for the Epistle, and for other lessons if there were only two. In the case of three ambos, two were on the south, one for all other lessons, one for the Epistles. This arrangement still subsists, inasmuch as the Epistle is always read on the south side (supposing the church to be orientated). Where there was only one ambo it had two platforms, a lower one for the Epistle and other lessons, a higher one for the Gospel (Durandus, "Rationale", IV, 16). The ambo for the Epistle should still be used in the Roman Rite where the church has one; it is used regularly at Milan. In the Byzantine Rite the Apostle may be read from an ambo; if there is none the reader stands at the "high place", the solea (σωλέα), that is, the raised platform in front of the iconostasis. Ambos were still built in Western churches down to the twelfth and thirteenth centuries (see "Ambon" in Cabrol's "Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne"). Since then they have disappeared, except in some old churches. From that time the subdeacon as a rule stands in the choir on the south side of the altar (towards what the rubrics of the Missal call the *cornu epistolæ*), facing the altar, as he reads the Epistle. The Byzantine reader, however, faces the people. The Epistle has always been chanted to a simpler tone than the Gospel; generally it is simply read on one note. The answer "Deo gratias" after the Epistle is the common one after the reading of any lesson (e. g., in the Office too). It was originally a sign from the celebrant or presiding bishop that enough had been read. The medieval commentators (e. g., Durandus, IV, 17) note that the subdeacon, having finished his reading, goes to make a reverence to the celebrant and kisses his hand. During the Epistle in every rite the hearers sit. The First Roman Ordo notes this (10); they also cover their heads. This is the natural attitude for hearing a lesson read (so also at Matins, etc.); to

stand at the Gospel is a special mark of reverence for its special dignity.

III. Text of the Various Epistles.—The reason of the present order of Epistles in the Roman Rite throughout the year is even more difficult to find than the parallel case of the Gospels (see Gospel in the Liturgy, II). In the first period the question does not so much concern what we now call the Epistle as rather the whole group of Biblical lessons preceding the Gospel. We may deduce with some certainty that there was at first the principle of reading successive books of the Bible continuously. The second book of the Apostolic Constitutions (third century) says that "the reader standing on a height in the middle shall read the Books of Moses and Jesus son of Nave, and of the Judges and Kings, and of Paralipomenon and the Return [Esdras and Nehemias], after these those of Job and Solomon and the sixteen Prophets [these are the first lessons]. The lessons having been read by two [readers], another one shall sing the hymns of David and the people answer back the verses [this is the psalm between the lessons, our Gradual]. After this our Acts [the Apostles are supposed to be speaking] shall be read and the letters of Paul, our fellow-worker, which he sent to the Churches". ("Const. Apost.", II, lvii, ed. Funk, Paderborn, 1905, p. 161.) This then implies continuous readings in that order. For the rest the homilies of the Fathers that explain continuous books (and often explicitly refer to the fact that the passage explained has just been read) show us certain books read at certain seasons. Thus, for instance, in Lent Genesis was read in East and West. So St. John Chrysostom (d. 407), preaching in Lent, says: "To-day I will explain the passage you have heard read" and proceeds to preach on Genesis, i, 1 (Hom. vii, de statuis, 1). His homilies on Genesis were held during Lent (Hom. i, in Gen., i). It is also probable that St. Basil's sermons on the Hexaemeron were held in Lent. In the Roman Office still Genesis begins at Septuagesima (in Matins) and is read in part of Lent. The reason of this is apparently that the ecclesiastical year was counted as beginning then in the spring. Other books read in Lent were Job (e. g., St. Ambrose, "ad Marcell.", Ep. xx, 14; P. L., XVI, 998), as an example of patient suffering, and Jonas (ibid., 25; col. 1001), as a preparation for the Resurrection. During Eastertide the Acts of the Apostles were read (St. Augustine, Tract. vi in Joh. xviii, P. L., XXXV, 1433). For special feasts and on special occasions suitable lessons were chosen, thus breaking the continuous readings. In the Middle Ages it was believed that St. Jerome (d. 420), in obedience to an order of Pope Damasus, had arranged the lessons of the Roman Liturgy; a spurious letter of his to the Emperor Constantius was quoted as the first *comes*, or list of lessons, for each day. Dom G. Morin thinks that Victor, Bishop of Capua (541–554), was the author (Revue Bénédictine, 1890, p. 416 seq.). The letter is quoted in Beissel, "Entstehung der Perikopen des Römischen Messbuches" (Freiburg, 1907), 54–5.

From the fifth century various lists of lessons were drawn up. Gennadius of Marseilles (fifth century) says of one Muscus, priest of Marseilles: "Exhorted by the holy Bishop Venerius he selected lessons from Holy Scripture suitable for the feast days of all the year" (De viris illustr., lxxix). The "Lectionarium Gallicanum" published by Mabillon (in P. L., LXXII), written in Burgundy in the seventh century, is another scheme of the same kind. A codex at Fulda contains the Epistles for Sundays and feast days arranged by Victor of Capua in the sixth century. Probst ("Die ältesten römischen Sacramentarien und Ordines", Münster, 1892, p. 33) thinks that they are those read at Rome. All are taken from St. Paul (see the list, loc. cit., and in Beissel, "Entstehung der Perikopen", 57–8). From this time there are a number of *comites* arranged for use in different Churches. Of these one of the most famous is the *comes* arranged by Albinus (i. e., Alcuin) by command of the Emperor Charles. This contains only the Epistles; it is part of the Roman Rite introduced by Charles the Great in the Frankish Kingdom (published in "Thomasii Opera", ed. Vezzosi, V, 418, cf. Ranke: "Das kirchliche Perikopensystem", 1850, supplem. III; Beissel, op. cit., 141). The "Liber comicus" edited by Dom G. Morin ("Anecdota Maredsol.", I, 1893, cf. "Revue Bénéd.", 1892, 442) contains the full lessons of the old Mozarabic use. Paul the Deacon composed a collection of homilies between 786 and 797, from which one may deduce the lessons read on Sundays under Charles the Great (P. L., XCV, 1159 sq., cf. Wiegand, "Das Homilarium Karls des Grossen", Leipzig, 1897, and "Rev. Bénéd.", 1898, 400 seq.). Beissel (op. cit.) has collected a great number of such *comites*, lectionaries, and references in the early Middle Ages, from which the set of lessons in the present Roman Missal gradually emerges.

Of the arrangement one can only say that the special suitableness of certain Epistles for the various feasts and seasons soon quite disturbed the principle of continuous reading. Of continuous readings there is now hardly a trace in the Missal. On the other hand, Epistles obviously suitable for each occasion may be traced back through a long list of *comites*. Thus our Epistles from Romans at the beginning of Advent recur in many lists: they are chosen obviously because of their appropriateness to that season. In some cases a connexion of ideas with the Gospel seems to be the reason for the choice of the Epistle. In the Missal as reformed by Pius V in 1570 about two-thirds of the Epistles are taken from St. Paul; the others are from other Epistles, the Acts, Apocalypse, and various books of the Old Testament. A principle observed fairly regularly is that on fast days the Epistle is a lesson from the Old Testament. This applies to all week-days in Lent except Maundy Thursday, which has, of course, a festal Mass. The Mass on Holy Saturday is the first Easter Mass and has an Easter Epistle (Col., iii, 1–4). So also on most of the ember-days (which still have several lessons); but on the Whitsun ember Wednesday the sense of Pentecost predominates, so that it has two lessons from the New Testament (Acts, ii and v). It may be a remnant of the old system of reading Acts in Eastertide that, except Friday and Saturday, all the Masses of Easter Week have lessons from Acts, though, on the other hand, they are all in themselves appropriate. Practically all feasts and special occasions have Epistles chosen for their suitableness, as far as such could be found.

Occasionally, as on St. Stephen's feast and, to some extent, Ascension Day and Whitsunday, it is the Epistle rather than the Gospel that tells the story of the feast. The three Epistles for Christmas Day are sufficiently obvious: St. Stephen has of course the story of his martyrdom from Acts, vi and vii, Holy Innocents the lesson from Apocalypse, xiv, about the immaculate first-fruits of the saints. The Epiphany has a magnificent lesson about the Gentiles seeing the glory of the Lord in Jerusalem and the people who bring gold and incense, from Isaias, lx. Palm Sunday in its Epistle tells of the obedience of Our Lord to the death of the Cross and of His exaltation (Phil., ii), in the tone of the "Vexilla Regis". The Easter Epistle could be no other than the one appointed (I Cor., v): Ascension Day and Whitsunday have their stories from the Acts. The feast of the Holy Trinity has the passage in Romans, xi, about the inscrutable mystery of God. Corpus Christi brings, of course, St. Paul's account of the Holy Eucharist (I Cor., xi). St. John Baptist has a lesson from Isaias, xlix, about vocation and sanctification in the mother's womb. St. Peter and St. Paul have the story of St. Peter's imprisonment in Acts, xii. For All Saints we have the lesson

about the saints signed by God and the great crowd around his throne in Apoc., vii. Most of Our Lady's feasts have lessons from the Song of Solomon or Ecclesiasticus applied mystically to her, as in her Office. The commons of saints have fairly obvious Epistles too. It will be seen, then, that a great proportion of our pericopes are chosen because of their appropriateness to the occasion. With regard to the others, in the *Proprium de tempore*, notably those for the Sundays after Epiphany and Pentecost, it is not possible to find any definite scheme for their selection. We can only conjecture some underlying idea of reading the most important passages of St. Paul's Epistles. The fact that every Sunday except Whitsunday has a pericope from an Epistle, that in nearly all cases it is from St. Paul (the Sundays after Easter, 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 5th after Pentecost have Epistles of other Apostles) still shows that this is the normal text for the lesson before the Gospel; other lessons are exceptions admitted because of their special appropriateness. Of the old principle of continuous readings it is not now possible to find a trace. Our pericopes represent a combination of various *comites* and lectionaries, between which that principle has become completely overlaid.

The epistle is announced as *lectio*, "Lectio epistolæ beati Pauli ad Romanos", "Lectio libri Esther", and so on. No further reference is given; when there are several Epistles (e. g., those of St. Peter, St. John) the title read out does not say which it is: "Lectio epistolæ beati Petri apostoli". It should also be noted that all the five books attributed to Solomon and known as the "Libri Sapientiales" (namely, Prov., Eccl., Cant., Wis., Ecclus.) are announced as: "Lectio libri Sapientiæ".

The Epistles read in Eastern Churches are arranged in a way in which there is also no longer any trace of a system. Here, too, the present arrangement is the result of a long series of Lectionaries between which various compromises have been made. The Byzantine Church reads from the Epistles, Acts, and Apocalypse for the first lesson, called the Apostle (ὁ ἀπόστολος). These lessons are contained with their *Prokeimena* in a book also called Ἀπόστολος or Πραξαπόστολος. The last part of this book contains a selection of lessons from the Old Testament for use on special occasions (see the exact description in Leo Allatius, "De libris ecclesiasticis Græcorum", Paris, 1645, I, xv, 4). We have noted that the Armenians still have the older arrangement of three lessons in every liturgy, a Prophecy from the Old Testament, an Epistle, and a Gospel. The Copts have no Prophecy, but four New-Testament lessons, one of St. Paul read from the "Apostle", one from an Epistle by another Apostle, read from another book called the "Katholikon", then one from the Acts and finally the Gospel (Brightman, "Eastern Liturgies", 152–6); the Abyssinian Church follows the use of Egypt in this as in most liturgical matters (ibid., 212–219). The Syrian Jacobites read first several lessons from the Old Testament, then one from the Acts, an Epistle, and a Gospel (ibid., 77–80). The Nestorians have an Old-Testament lesson, one from the Acts, an Epistle and a Gospel (ibid., 256–60). Between the lessons in all these rites are various fragments of psalms, corresponding to our Gradual. The reading of the Apostle or other lessons before the Gospel is a very simple affair in the East. A reader, who is generally any layman, simply takes the book, stands in the middle of the choir, and sings the text in his usual nasal chant with a few enharmonic cadences which are handed down by tradition and, as a matter of fact, very considerably modified according to the taste and skill of the singer. Meanwhile the celebrant turns towards him and listens. He does not also read the text himself in any Eastern Rite. The Byzantine reader first chants the *Prokeimenon* (Προκείμενον τοῦ ἀποστόλου—"placed before", understand δίστιχον) facing the altar. This is a short verse of a psalm corresponding to our Gradual (which once preceded the Epistle: see GRADUAL). He then turns to the people and chants the *Apostolos*. Meanwhile the deacon is incensing the altar (Fortescue, "Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom", London, 1908, p. 75).

IV. RITUAL OF THE EPISTLE IN THE ROMAN RITE.—We have noted that for many centuries the reading of the Epistle is a privilege of the subdeacon. While the celebrant chants the last Collect, the master of ceremonies brings the book containing the Epistle (a *lectionarium* containing the Epistles and Gospels, very often simply another Missal) from the credence table to the subdeacon at his place behind the deacon. The subdeacon turns towards him and receives it, both making a slight inclination. He then goes to the middle and genuflects (even if the Blessed Sacrament is not on the altar) and comes back to a place *in plano* at some distance behind the celebrant. Standing there, facing the altar, and holding the book with both hands, he chants the title "Lectio . . .", etc., and goes on at once with the text, to the end. He bows at the Holy Name and genuflects, if the rubric directs it, at his place towards the altar in front. The normal tone for the Epistle is entirely on one note (*do*) without any inflection, except that where a question occurs it sinks half a tone (to *si*) four or five syllables before, and for the last three syllables has the inflection *la, si* and a *podatus si-do*. The revised Vatican Missal gives a rather more elaborate chant for use *ad libitum* in the appendix (no. III). While the Epistle is read the members of the choir sit with covered heads. Meanwhile the celebrant reads it (and the Gradual) in a low voice from the Missal at the altar; the deacon stands at his side, turns over the page, if necessary, and answers, "Deo gratias", when the celebrant has ended the Epistle. To the Epistle chanted by the subdeacon there is no answer. The last three or four syllables of the Epistle are chanted more slowly, *ritardando* at the end. The subdeacon, having finished, shuts the book, goes to the middle and genuflects; then, still holding the closed book in both hands, he goes round to where the celebrant stands; here he kneels facing sideways (north) on the step. The celebrant turns to him and rests the right hand on the book. The subdeacon kisses the hand and waits with bowed head while the celebrant makes the sign of the cross over him in silence. He hands the book back to the master of ceremonies and then carries the Missal round to the other side for the celebrant's Gospel.

At a sung Mass we have seen that the Epistle may be chanted by a lector in a surplice (Ritus celebr., vi, 8; the text even says that this should be done: "Epistolam cantet in loco consueto aliquis lector superpelliceo indutus"). In this case he does not go to kiss the celebrant's hand afterwards (ibid.). Generally, however, the celebrant chants the Epistle himself at the corner of the altar, using the same tone as would a subdeacon. "Deo gratias" should not be answered in this case either. At low Mass the Epistle is read by the celebrant in its place after the last Collect. The server answers, "Deo gratias".

V. OTHER LESSONS AT MASS.—There are a good many occasions in the year on which one or more lessons still precede the Epistle, according to the older custom. They are all days of a penitential nature, conspicuously the ember-days. The lessons are always separated by Graduals or Tracts, generally by Collects too. On the Advent ember Wednesday, after the first Collect a lesson from Isaias, ii, is read, then comes a Gradual, the Collect of the day followed by the other two that are said in Advent (or by commemorations), and a second lesson (the Epistle) from Is., vii, and lastly a second Gradual before the Gospel. The Advent ember Saturday has four lessons from Isaias, each preceded by a Collect and followed by a Gradual, then a lesson from Dan., iii (with its Collect

before it), which introduces the canticle "Benedictus es, Domine"; this is sung as a kind of Tract. Then come the usual Collects for the day and the Epistle. The Lent ember Wednesday has two, the Saturday five lessons before the Gospel. The Whitsun ember Wednesday has two lessons from Acts, Saturday five prophecies and an Epistle. The ember-days in September have on Wednesday two lessons, on Saturday four lessons and an Epistle before the Gospel. Wednesday in Holy Week also has two lessons from Isaias. In all these cases the arrangement is the same: a collect, the lesson, a gradual or tract. The lessons other than the last (technically the Epistle) are chanted by the celebrant to the Epistle tone; the deacon and subdeacon answer, "Deo gratias", except in the case of the lesson from Daniel that introduces the canticle (de Herdt, "S. liturgiæ praxis", I, 435). Palm Sunday, in the *missa sicca* in which the palms are blessed, has a lesson from Exodus, xv and xiv, sung by the subdeacon as if it were an Epistle, as well as a Gospel. On Maundy Thursday the Gospel of the Mass is sung again at the Maundy (washing of feet). The Mass of the Presanctified on Good Friday, as part of its archaic character, begins with three lessons. The first is the "Prophecy" from Osee, vi. This is sung by a lector—the only occasion on which such a person is mentioned in the text of the Missal (apart from the preface). A tract and collect follow. Then comes the Epistle (in this case, according to the rule for week-days in Lent, a lesson from the Old Testament, Ex., xii) chanted by the subdeacon in the usual way, another tract, and the Gospel (the Passion from St. John).

Holy Saturday and Whitsun eve keep a relic of very early times in the long series of lessons (called here too "Prophecies") before the Mass. It is often said that they represent the last instruction of the catechumens before baptism. Mgr Batiffol ("Histoire du Bréviaire Romain", Paris, 1895, pp. 114–115) and Father Thurston ("Lent and Holy Week", London, 1904) see in them rather a remnant of the old vigil-office of the type of the fourth-century vigil, but now despoiled of the psalms that once alternated with the lessons. The number of the Prophecies on Holy Saturday varied in different churches. Durandus, who explains them in the usual medieval way as instructions for the catechumens, says: "In some churches four lessons are read, in some six, in some twelve, and in some fourteen", and proceeds to give mystic reasons for these numbers (Rationale, vi, 81). The number at Rome seems to have been always, as it is now, twelve. A tradition ascribes the arrangement of these twelve to St. Gregory I. They were once chanted first in Latin and then in Greek. As they stand in the Missal they represent very well a general survey of the Old Testament as a preparation for Christ; the Collects which follow each emphasize this idea. The eighth and ninth only are followed by Tracts. They are chanted by readers (now practically anyone from the choir) before the altar, while the celebrant reads them in a low voice at the epistle side. They begin without any title. The celebrant, of course, sings the Collect that follows each. Their tone is given in the appendix of the Vatican Missal (no. 11). It agrees with that for lessons at Matins; namely, they are chanted on one note (*do*) with a fall of a perfect fifth (to *fa*) on the last syllable before each full stop, a fall of half a tone (*si*) before a colon, and the same cadence for questions as in the Epistle (see above). Only the last cadence is different, being formed of the four notes *re, do, si*♭, *si*♭, on the last four syllables. The lessons on Whitsun eve are (like the whole service) an imitation of Holy Saturday. It is supposed that the rites of the Easter vigil, including the baptisms, were transferred to Whitsun eve in the North because of the cold climate. They then reacted so as to produce a duplication, such as is not uncommon in the Roman Rite. The whole rite follows that of Easter eve exactly; but there are only six prophecies, being the 3rd, 4th, 11th, 8th, 6th, and 7th of the Easter series.

VI. Lessons in the Office.—Lessons of various kinds also form a very important part of the canonical hours in all rites. The essential and original elements of the Divine Office in East and West are the singing of psalms, the reading of lessons, and saying of prayers. The Canons of Hippolytus (second century) ordain that clerks are to come together at cockcrow and "occupy themselves with psalms and the reading of Scripture and with prayers" (can. xxi). The history of these lessons is bound up closely with that of the Office itself (see Bäumer, "Geschichte des Breviers", Freiburg, 1895, ch. ii, etc.; Batiffol, "Histoire du Bréviaire Romain", Paris, 1895, ch. i, etc.). We may note here that in the Office, as in the Liturgy, we see at first the principle of continuous readings from the Bible; to these are added the reading of Acts of Martyrs and then of homilies of approved Fathers. In the West this idea has been preserved more exactly in the Office than in the Mass. In the Roman and indeed in all Western Rites the most important lessons belong to the night Office, the nocturns that we now call Matins. The Rule of St. Benedict (d. 543) gives us exactly the arrangement still observed in the monastic rite (chap. xi). The development of the Roman Rite is described by Batiffol, op. cit. (chaps. ii and iii especially). Till the seventh century the ferial Nocturn had no lessons, that of Sunday had after the twelve psalms three lessons from Scripture; the lessons followed from the text of the Bible so that it was read through (except the Gospels and Psalms) in a year. The distribution of the books was much the same as now (Batiffol, op. cit., p. 93). In the seventh century lessons began to be read in the ferial Office too. The presiding priest or bishop gave a sign when enough had been read; the reader ended, as now, with the ejaculation, "Tu autem Domine miserere nobis"; and the choir answered, "Deo gratias".

A further development of the Sunday Office mentioned by St. Gregory I (d. 604) was that a second and third nocturn were added to the first. Each of these had three psalms and three lessons taken, not from the Bible, but from the works of the Fathers (Batiffol, p. 96). For these lessons a library of their works was required, till the homilies and treatises to be read began to be collected in books called *homiliaria*. Paul the Deacon made a famous collection of this kind. It was published by authority of Charles the Great, who himself wrote a preface to it; it was used throughout his kingdom. It became the chief source of our present Roman series of lessons from the Fathers (in P. L., XCV). Eventually then the arrangement of lessons in the Roman Rite has become this: The lessons from Scripture are arranged throughout the year in the *proprium temporis*. They form what is called the *scriptura occurrens*. The chief books of the Bible (except the Gospels and Psalms) are begun and read for a time. The shortening of the lessons, overlapping of seasons, and especially the number of feasts that have special lessons have produced the result that no book is ever finished. But the principle of at least beginning each book is maintained, so that if for any reason the *scriptura occurrens* of a day on which a book is begun falls out, the lessons of that day are read instead of the normal ones on the next free day.

Although the ecclesiastical year begins with Advent, the course of the *scriptura occurrens* is begun at Septuagesima with Genesis. This is a relic of an older calculation that began the year in the spring (see above, II). The course of the continuous reading is continually interrupted for special reasons. So the first Sunday of Lent has lessons from II Cor., vi and vii ("Now is the acceptable time"). The week-days in Lent have no *scriptura occurrens* but a Gospel and a homily, according to the rule for the feriæ that were

liturgical from the beginning and have a special Mass. Genesis goes on on the second and third Sundays of Lent; on the fourth comes a pericope from Exodus. Passion and Palm Sunday have lessons from Jeremias (beginning on Passion Sunday) for a special reason (the connexion of the Prophet of the destruction of the temple with Our Lord's Passion). Easter Day and its octave have only one nocturn, so no *scriptura occurrens*. Low Sunday has special lessons (Col., iii) about the Resurrection. The Acts of the Apostles begin on the day after Low Sunday and are read for a fortnight —according to the old tradition that connects them with Eastertide. The Apocalypse begins on the third Sunday after Easter and lasts for a week. On the fourth Sunday St. James's Epistle begins, on the fifth St. Peter's First Epistle. Ascension Day naturally has its own story from Acts, i; but on the next day II Peter begins. The Sunday following brings the First Epistle of St. John; the next Wednesday, II John; the Friday, III John; Saturday, the Epistle of St. Jude. Pentecost and its octave, like Easter, have no *scriptura occurrens*.

It will be noticed that, just as Lent has on its feriæ only lessons from the Old Testament, even in the Epistles at Mass, so Paschal time has only the New Testament, even in the Office. The feast of the Holy Trinity has special lessons (Is., vi—the Seraphim who cry: Holy, holy, holy); the next day we come back to the normal course and begin the First Book of Kings. II Kings begins on the fifth Sunday after Pentecost, III Kings on the seventh, IV Kings on the ninth. On the first Sunday of August (from which day till Advent we count by the months except for the Mass and the lessons of the third nocturn) the Books of Wisdom begin with Proverbs; Ecclesiastes comes on the second Sunday of August, Wisdom on the third, Ecclesiasticus on the fourth. Job comes on the first Sunday of September, Tobias on the third, Judith on the fourth, Esther on the fifth. October brings on its first Sunday I Machabees, on its fourth II Machabees. The Prophets begin in November: Ezekiel on the first Sunday, Daniel on the third, Osee on the fourth, and then the other minor Prophets in very short fragments, obviously in a hurry, till Advent. Advent has Isaias throughout. The first Sunday after Christmas begins St. Paul's Epistles with Romans; they continue to Septuagesima. I Corinthians comes on the first Sunday after Epiphany, II Corinthians on the second Sunday, Galatians on the third, Ephesians the following Wednesday, Philippians on the fourth Sunday, Colossians on the next Tuesday, I Thessalonians on Thursday, II Thessalonians on Saturday, I Timothy on the fifth Sunday, II Timothy on Tuesday, Titus on Thursday, Philemon on Saturday, Hebrews on the sixth Sunday. We have here again the same crowded changes as at the end of the season after Pentecost. The arrangement then is one of continuous readings from each book, though the books do not follow in order, but are distributed with regard to appropriateness. If we count the Pentateuch as one book (that seems to be the idea), we see that all the books of the Bible are read, in part at least, except Josue, Judges, Ruth, Paralipomenon, and the Canticle of Canticles. Cardinal Quiñones in his famous reformed Breviary (issued by Paul III in 1535, withdrawn by Paul IV in 1558) changed all this and arranged the reading of the whole Bible in a year (see Batiffol, op. cit., 222–231). His proposal, however, came to nothing and we still use the traditional Office, with the developments time has brought.

The arrangement of Matins is this: On feriæ and simple feasts there is only one nocturn with its three lessons. On feriæ all three are from the *scriptura occurrens:* on simples the third lesson is an account of the saint instead of the Scriptural one. The exception is when a feria has its own Mass. Such are the days that were originally liturgical days—week-days in Lent, ember-days, and vigils. In this case the lessons consist of the fragment of the Gospel with a homily as in the third nocturn of semi-doubles. On semi-doubles and all higher feasts (Sundays are semi-doubles) there are three nocturns, each with three lessons. Such days are the *festa novem lectionum*. The first nocturn has always Scriptural lessons—those of the *scriptura occurrens*, or on special feasts, a text chosen for its suitability. The second nocturn has lessons from a Father of the Church, here called *sermo*, a life of the saint on his feast, or a description of the event of the day. Thus, for instance, St. Peter's Chains (1 August) tells the story of their finding and how they came to Rome; S. Maria tit. Auxilium Christianorum (24 May) in the sixth lesson tells "ex publicis monumentis" the story of the battle of Lepanto. Sometimes papal Bulls are read in the second nocturn, as the Bull of Pius IX (Ineffabilis Deus) during the Octave of the Immaculate Conception (8 December). The second nocturn continually receives new lessons, written by various people and approved by the Sacred Congregation of Rites. Many of the older ones are taken from the "Liber Pontificalis". The third nocturn has for its lessons first a fragment (the first clause) of the Gospel read at Mass followed by the words, *et reliqua*, then a sermon (called Homilia) of a Father explaining it through the three lessons (the 7th, 8th, and 9th). In cases of concurrence of feasts, the feast commemorated (or the feria, if it be a liturgical day) has its own lesson (the life of the saint, or Gospel-fragment, and homily) read as the ninth lesson.

The monastic Office differs only in that it has four lessons in each nocturn (twelve altogether) and the whole Gospel of the day read after the Te Deum. This practice of reading the Gospel at the end of Matins was common in many medieval rites. Thus at Christmas in England the genealogy of Our Lord from St. Matthew was read at Christmas, and the one in St. Luke at the Epiphany at this place. So in the Byzantine Rite the Gospel of the day is read at the Orthros.

The other canonical hours have short lessons called *capitula*, originally *lectiunculæ*, sometimes *capitella*. The Ambrosian Breviary calls them *epistolellæ* and *collectiones*. These are very short passages from the Bible, generally continuous throughout the hours, connected with the feast or occasion. Very often they are from the same source as the Epistle. At Lauds and Vespers the *capitulum* is chanted by the officiating priest after the fifth psalm, before the hymn. At Terce, Sext, None he chants it after the psalm. Prime and Compline (originally private prayers of monks) are in many ways different from the other hours. They have always the same *capitula*. Prime has I Tim., i, 17 (omitting the word *autem*) chanted in the same place. Compline has Jer., xiv, 9^b (adding the word *sanctum* after *nomen* and the final clause, *Domine, Deus noster*). This is sung after the hymn by the celebrant. At Prime the officiating priest chants a second lesson (called *lectio brevis*) at the end, after the blessing that follows the *preces* and the prayer "Dirigere et sanctificare". For the *proprium temporis* this is given in the Breviary (in the *psalterium*); on feasts it is the *capitulum* of None, with the addition of "Tu autem Domine miserere nobis". Compline begins after the blessing with a *lectio brevis* from I Peter, v, 8, 9^a (with the additional word *Fratres* at the beginning and the clause, *Tu autem*, etc., at the end). All these short lessons are answered by the words *Deo gratias*, but the capitula do not have the clause "Tu autem", etc. The Roman Ritual has a few isolated lessons for special occasions. The Office of the "Visitation and care of the sick" has four Gospels from Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John (all about healing the sick), and the beginning of John. The "Order of commending a soul" has two

Gospels—the high-priestly prayer in John, xvii, and the Passion according to St. John. The exorcism has three Gospels (about driving out devils). In the Pontifical, a Gospel (Luke, ix) is appointed to be read at the opening of synods, before the *Veni Creator*, and another one (Luke, x) is given for the end of the blessing of bells. In some countries (Germany and Austria) it is the custom to sing the beginning of each Gospel during the Corpus Christi procession at the altars of repose, before the benediction.

All the Eastern rites in the same way have lessons of various kinds as part of the canonical hours. They constantly use psalms as lessons; that is to say, the whole text of a psalm is read straight through by a reader, as we read our lessons. The choral part of the Office consists chiefly of verses, responses, and exclamations of various kinds (the Byzantine *Stichera, Troparia, Kontakia,* etc., etc.,) that are not taken from the Bible, but are composed by various hymn-writers. In the Byzantine Office three lessons, generally from the Old Testament (called *παροιμίαι*), are read by a lector towards the end of the *hesperinos*, soon after the singing of the Φῶς ἱλαρόν. In the *Orthros* the priest reads the Gospel of the day shortly before the Canon is sung. In the Canon at the end of the sixth ode a lesson called *συναξάριον*, describing the life of the saint, or containing reflections on the feast or occasion, is read. If several feasts concur the various *synaxaria* follow each other (see Fortescue, "Canon dans le rite byzantin", in Cabrol, "Dictionnaire d'archéologie"). The day-hours have no lessons, except that many *troparia* throughout the Office describe the mystery that is celebrated and give information to the hearers in a way that makes them often very like what we should call short lessons. Lessons, Epistles, and Gospels are read at many special services; thus the "Blessing of the Waters" on the Epiphany has three lessons from Isaias, an Epistle (I Cor., x, 1–4), and a Gospel (Mark, i, 9–11). The Byzantine *synaxaria* and *menologia* are described by Leo Allatius (De libris eccl. Græc., I, xv).

DUCHESNE, *Origines du culte chrétien* (Paris, 1898); GIHR, *Das heilige Messopfer*, II (Freiburg, 1897), §40, pp. 400–08; BEISSEL, *Entstehung der Perikopen des römischen Messbuches* (Freiburg, 1907); BÄUMER, *Geschichte des Breviers* (Freiburg, 1895); BATIFFOL, *Histoire du Bréviaire Romain* (Paris, 1895); DANIEL, *Codex Liturgicus*, I (Leipzig, 1847); PROBST, *Liturgie des IV. Jahrhunderts* (Münster, 1893); IDEM, *Die ältesten römischen Sakramentarien und Ordines* (Münster, 1892); MALTZEW, *Die Nachtwache, oder Abend und Morgengottesdienst der Orth. Kath. Kirche des Morgenlandes* (Berlin, 1892).

ADRIAN FORTESCUE.

Lestrange, LOUIS-HENRI DE (in religion, DOM AUGUSTINE), b. in 1754, in the Château de Colombier-le-Vieux, Ardèche, France; d. at Lyons, 16 July, 1827. He was the fourteenth child of Louis-César de Lestrange, officer in the household of King Louis XV, and Jeanne-Perrette de Lalor, daughter of an Irish gentleman who had followed James II, King of England, to France in 1688. He was ordained priest in 1778, and was attached to the parish of Saint-Sulpice. In 1780, Mgr de Pompignan, Archbishop of Vienne, in Dauphiné, chose him for his vicar-general, with the ulterior determination of having him as his coadjutor with the right of future succession. This prospect of being made bishop alarmed the Abbé de Lestrange, and in the same year he severed all the ties that bound him to the world, and entered the celebrated monastery of La Trappe. He was master of the novices in that monastery, when a decree of the National Assembly, dated 4 December, 1790, suppressed the religious orders in France. Dom Augustine with twenty-four religious left for Switzerland, where the Senate of Fribourg authorized them to take up their residence in Val-Sainte, an ancient Carthusian monastery about fifteen miles from the city of Fribourg. From Val-Sainte, Dom Augustine established foundations at Santa Susana in Aragon, Spain, at Mont Brac in Piedmont, Italy, at Westmalle, Belgium, and at Lulworth, England. In 1798 the French troops invaded Switzerland, and the Trappists were obliged to leave the country. Some of them settled at Kenty, near Cracow; others at Zydichin, in the Diocese of Lusko, and in Podolia. In 1802 Switzerland recalled them, and Dom Augustine took possession once more of Val-Sainte, and in the following year he sent a colony to America under Dom Urbain Guillet.

In 1804 Dom Augustine founded the monastery of Cervara in the Republic of Genoa, and Napoleon not only authorized the establishment, but granted it a revenue of 10,000 francs. Moreover he desired that a similar institution be founded on the Alps, at Mont-Genèvre, to serve as a refuge for the soldiers who were to pass to and fro between Italy and France. To secure the success of this establishment he granted it an allowance of 24,000 francs. This protection was not, however, of long duration. The Republic of Genoa was united to the empire, and there, as in all the other states under the sway of Napoleon, an oath of fidelity to the empire was exacted from ecclesiastics and religious. The religious of Cervara, acting on the advice of some eminent personages, and of some influential members of the clergy who assured them that the pope had allowed the oath, took the oath of fidelity. Dom Augustine, who had received from Pius VII, then prisoner at Savona, knowledge of the Bull of excommunication issued against the spoliator of the States of the Holy See, commanded the Prior of Cervara to make immediate retractation. The emperor became furious. He caused Dom Augustine to be arrested at Bordeaux and thrown into prison. At the same time, by a sweeping decree of 28 July, he suppressed all the Trappist monasteries throughout the empire. The prefect of Bordeaux, upon the entreaties of several of Dom Augustine's friends, gave him the limits of the city for his prison. The abbot availed himself of the liberty thus accorded him to hasten the departure of his religious for America; he himself obtained from the police permission to go to Val-Sainte and Mont-Genèvre, where his presence was required. Pursued again by the emperor, he crossed Germany and arrived at Riga, whence he left for England and America.

Dom Augustine arrived in New York in December, 1813. The Jesuits had just abandoned a building which they had in that city, and which they had used for a classical school. The edifice occupied the place where now stands St. Patrick's Cathedral on Fifth Avenue. Dom Augustine purchased the site for the sum of $10,000, and in 1814, on the downfall of Napoleon, Dom Augustine returned to France and took possession once more of his former monastery of La Trappe. But his trials were not ended. He was accused of imposing extraordinary hardships on his religious; he was reproached with his frequent voyages and long absences. The Bishop of Séez, in whose diocese is the monastery of La Trappe, deceived by unjust insinuations, took the part of the detractors, and claimed over the monastery the authority of "direct superior". Dom Augustine, to put an end to these disputes with his bishop, abandoned La Trappe, and sought refuge at Bellefontaine, in the Diocese of Angers. The complaints were carried to Rome and submitted to the Sacred Congregation of Bishops and Regulars. Dom Augustine was summoned to Rome. He returned justified, and loaded with favours by the pope. Posterity has given Dom Augustine de Lestrange the title of "Saviour of La Trappe". His remains repose in the monastery of La Trappe in the Diocese of Séez alongside those of Abbot de Rancé.

Règlements de La Trappe et Usages de la Val-Sainte (2 vols., Fribourg, 1794); *Odyssée Monastique, Dom Augustin de Lestrange et les Trappistes pendant la Révolution* (La Grande-Trappe, 1898); VÉRITÉ, *Cîteaux, La Trappe et Bellefontaine* (Paris, 1883); GALLARDIN, *Les Trappistes et l'Ordre de Cîteaux au XIX^e siècle* (2 vols., Paris, 1844); *Vie du R. P. Dom Urbain Guillet* (Chapelle-Montligeon, 1899).

F. M. GILDAS.

Lesueur, François Eustache, Jesuit missionary and philologist, of the Abnaki mission in Canada; b. (according to notes given by Thwaites, apparently from official sources) near Coutances, Normandy, 22 July, 1685 or 1686, though Maurault gives his birthplace as Lunel, in Languedoc; d. at Montreal, 28 or 26 April, 1760, or (according to Maurault) at Quebec, in 1755. Although the principal facts of his work and writings are well known, there is remarkable uncertainty as to dates, places, and even his proper name. This uncertainty is probably largely due to the burning of the St. Francis mission, with all its records, by the English in 1759. He entered the Jesuit novitiate in 1704 or 1705, arrived in Canada in 1715 or 1716, studied the language for some months at the Abnaki mission of Sillery, and then began work at St. Francis, the principal Abnaki mission, remaining there until 1727 or later. He was at Montreal in 1730 and during 1749–54. According to Maurault, he arrived in Canada in June, 1715, and after a short stay at Sillery was sent to Bécancour, another Abnaki mission, on the St. Lawrence, where, with the exception of occasional parochial service, he remained until 1753, when he retired to Quebec. The name is variously given as François Eustache (Maurault), Jacques François (Thwaites), and Jacques (Calumet Dance MS.). In connexion with his study of Indian things, he wrote, besides prayers, sermons, etc., in the Abnaki language, a valuable account of the celebrated Calumet Dance, which gave so much trouble to the early missionaries. The original French manuscript is preserved at St. Francis mission, Pierreville, Canada, and was published in the "Soirées Canadiennes" of 1864. Manuscript copies are in St. Mary's College, Montreal, and with the Wisconsin Historical Society, Madison. According to Maurault, he compiled also a Dictionary of Abnaki, of 900 pages, still in existence, but we are not told where the manuscript is preserved.

Thwaites (ed.), *The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents*, LXIX (Cleveland, 1900); Maurault, *Histoire des Abenakis* (Sorel, 1866); Pilling, *Bibliography of the Algonquian Languages* (Washington, 1891).

James Mooney.

Lete, a titular see of Macedonia, known by its coins and inscriptions, mentioned in Ptolemy (III, xiii), the younger Pliny, IV, x, 17, Harpocration, Stephanus Byzantius, and Suidas, and in the Middle Ages in Nicephorus Bryennius (IV, xix). The spelling "Lite" is incorrect and comes from iotacism. Lete appears in some "Notitiæ episcopatuum" of a late period as suffragan of Thessalonica, later united to the See of Rentina. Lete and Rentina even had Greek bishops until the eighteenth century. Lete is to-day the small village of Aïvati (1000 inhabitants) situated a little north of Salonica.

Duchesne in *Revue archéologique* (1875); Idem, *Archives des Missions scientifiques*, 3rd series, III, 276 sq.; Demitsas, Ἀρχαία γεωγραφία τῆς Μακεδονίας (Athens, 1870), 250–52; Idem, Ἡ Μακεδονία, I (Athens, 1896), 566–74.

S. Pétridès.

Le Tellier, Charles-Maurice, Archbishop of Reims, b. at Turin, 1642; d. at Reims, 1710. The son of Michel Le Tellier and brother of Louvois (both ministers of Louis XIV), he studied for the Church, won the doctorate of theology at the Sorbonne, and was ordained priest in 1666. Provided, even before his ordination, with several royal abbeys, he rapidly rose to the coadjutorship of Langres, then to that of Reims, and became titular of that see at the age of twenty-nine. His administration was marked by zeal and success along the lines of popular education, training of clerics, parochial organization, restoration of ecclesiastical discipline, extirpation of Protestantism from the Sedan district, etc. The importance of his see together with the royal favour brought him to the front in the affairs of the Church in France. As secretary of the *Petite Assemblée* of 1681, he reported for the king and against the pope on all disputed points: the extension of the royal claim called *régale*, the forcible placing of a Cistercian abbess over the Augustinian nuns of Charonne, and the expulsion of the canonically elected vicars capitular of Pamiers. The famous Gallican Assembly of 1682 was convened at his suggestion. Elected president with Harlay, he caused the bishops to endorse the royal policy of encroachment upon church affairs, and even memorialized the pope with a view to make him accept the *régale*. His comparative moderation in the matter of the four Gallican propositions was due to Bossuet, who remarked that "the glory of the *régale* would only be obscured by those odious propositions." As president of the Assembly (1700) which undertook to deal with Jansenism and Laxism already judged by the pope, Le Tellier was unduly lenient with the Jansenists and severe with theologians of repute. The same holds true of the various controversies in which he took part: the "Version de Mons", the theory of philosophical sin, Molinism, etc. In spite of grave errors due less to lack of loyalty to the Holy See than to early education, royal fascination, and dislike for the Jesuits, Le Tellier is remembered as a successful administrator, an orator of some merit, a promoter of letters, a protector of Saint John Baptist de la Salle, Mabillon, Ruinart, etc., and a bosom friend of Bossuet, whom he consecrated, and visited on his deathbed, and whom he induced to write the "Oraison funèbre de Michel Le Tellier". His manuscripts, in sixty volumes, are at the Bibliothèque Nationale of Paris, and his library of 50,000 volumes at the Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève.

Gillet, *Charles-Maurice Le Tellier*, with an exhaustive bibliography (Paris, 1881), p. xii and passim; Ste-Beuve, *Port-Royal* (ed. 1900), index.

J. F. Sollier.

Le Tellier, Michel, b. 16 October, 1643, of a peasant family, not at Vire as has so often been said, but at Vast near Cherbourg; d. at La Flèche, 2 September, 1719. He was educated at the Jesuit College in Caen, and at 18 entered the order, and became professor, then rector of the College of Louis le Grand. He was one of the founders of the "Journal de Trévoux", and opposed Jansenism in three works: "Observations sur la nouvelle édition de la version françoise du Nouveau Testament" (1672); "Histoire des cinq Propositions de Jansenius" (1699); "Le père Quesnel séditieux et hérétique" (1705). In 1687 he took part in the discussion then going on about Chinese ceremonies, publishing a book entitled: "Défense des nouveaux chrétiens et des missionaires de la Chine, du Japon, et des Indes". The tone of this work was displeasing to Rome, but the General of the Jesuits defended it before the Congregation of the Holy Office. Greatly esteemed by the Jesuits, no matter what Saint-Simon may say about him, Le Tellier, after the death of Father Pétau, was entrusted with the task of finishing his work, "De theologicis dogmatibus". From August 1709 he belonged to the Academy of Inscriptions and Belles-Lettres. Le Tellier was provincial of his order in Paris when Father La Chaise, the confessor of Louis XIV, died, 20 January, 1709. Godet des Marais, Bishop of Chartres, and La Chétardie, rector of Saint-Sulpice, had a determining part in Louis's choice of Le Tellier as his new confessor. Saint-Simon, giving credence to a story told by a surgeon, Maréchal, attributed this choice to the king's fear of displeasing the Jesuits. For two centuries the greater number of historians have followed Saint-Simon's estimate of Le Tellier and denounced that "dark, false, and dread-inspiring countenance, which would have struck terror if met in a lonely forest", that "coarse, insolent, impudent confessor, knowing neither the world nor moderation, neither rank nor considerations, making no allowance for anything, covering up his purposes by a thousand

windings". Scientific history is revising this judgment. Saint-Simon makes Le Tellier responsible for the destruction of Port-Royal. Father Bliard points out that since 1695 Harlay de Champvallon, Archbishop of Paris, and Louis XIV had contemplated its destruction; that the seizure in 1703 of Quesnel's papers had drawn the king's attention to the political dangers of Jansenism; that as early as 25 March, 1708, Clement XI at the request of King Louis had united Port-Royal des Champs with Port-Royal de Paris and suppressed the title of the "Abbaye des Champs"; and that Cardinal de Noailles, who for a year past had interdicted the members of Port-Royal des Champs from receiving the sacraments, was preparing to use the power given him by the pope to send the nuns to other convents.

Saint-Simon claims that Le Tellier in advising episcopal nominations, relentlessly pursued all ecclesiastics suspected of Jansenism, recommending only "barefooted friars and men ready for anything". Such slurs indicate the attitude of the great nobleman against priests who lacked birth; but a letter from Fénelon to which Father Bliard draws attention proves that in reality it was Fénelon who, at the beginning of Le Tellier's influence, found him too lenient towards certain priests with Jansenist tendencies, and pointed out to him the danger he would incur by allowing the Jansenist faction to predominate in the episcopacy. Saint-Simon, following Maréchal's stories, accuses Le Tellier of having brought to Louis XIV an opinion of the doctors of the Sorbonne in order to prove that he could levy tithes upon his subjects with a clear conscience. Even admitting the accuracy of Maréchal's assertions, it must be borne in mind that the necessity of defending the kingdom was so urgent that Fénelon wrote on 4 August, 1710, "Money must be taken wherever it can be found", and Duclos in his "Mémoires secrets", declares that "the imposition of the tithes was perhaps the salvation of the State."

Le Tellier is accused by Saint-Simon of having in 1713 laboured jointly with Madame de Maintenon and Bissy, Bishop of Meaux, against Cardinal de Noailles, Archbishop of Paris, and used his influence with Clement XI, through the Jesuit Daubenton and Cardinal Fabroni, to obtain the condemnation of Quesnel. And again after the publication of the Bull "Unigenitus" he wished to have Cardinal de Noailles imprisoned, and he increased the number of "lettres de cachet", in order to fill the prisons with Jansenists. Father Bliard shows the capricious and exaggerated nature of these stories, and establishes from Jansenist sources that during the six years of Le Tellier's influence, only twenty-eight Jansenists were punished more or less severely. By the testimony of the Jansenist Roslet and Daubenton's report to Fénelon, he shows that the Bull "Unigenitus" was the outcome of three long years of doctrinal study, and that the alleged letters from Le Tellier to Chauvelin proving a plot for abducting Cardinal de Noailles were admitted to be apocryphal by Duclos, though he was hostile to the Jesuits. Finally, certain investigations made by Father Brucker lead to the conclusion, that a certain letter recommending the destruction of the Oratory is certainly not the work of Le Tellier, who has been frequently blamed for it, and that such an accusation may have originated in an intrigue of Abbé de Margon against the Jesuits. Louis XIV in a codicil to his will had selected Le Tellier as the confessor of the little Louis XV, then seven years of age; but a few days after the king's death the regent, under the influence of Saint-Simon and the Jansenists, informed the provincial of the Jesuits that Le Tellier must leave Paris. He was sent by his superiors to Amiens, and then to La Flèche, where he died. The menology of the Society of Jesus under the date of 2 September, repeats the following remarks addressed by Louis XIV to the Duc d'Harcourt about Le Tellier: "Do you see that man? His greatest happiness would be to shed his blood for the Church, and I do not believe there is a single soul in my entire kingdom who is more fearless and more saintly."

SAINT-SIMON, *Mémoires;* DUCLOS, *Mémoires secrets sur le règne de Louis XIV* (Paris, 1791); D'ORSANNE, *Journal* (Rome, 1753, 6 vols.); BLIARD, *Les mémoires de Saint-Simon et le père Le Tellier* (Paris, 1891); BRUCKER, *Un "Document assassin" faussement attribué au père Le Tellier* in *Etudes*, LXXXVIII (Paris, 1901); BROU, *Les Jésuites de la légende* (Paris, 1907).

GEORGES GOYAU.

Letourneux, NICOLAS, well-known French preacher and ascetical writer of Jansenistic tendencies, b. at Rouen, 30 April, 1640; d. at Paris, 28 November, 1686. His parents were poor, but the conspicuous talents and the gift of eloquence he displayed even at an early age attracted the attention of some wealthy benefactors, whose assistance enabled him to study the humanities at the Jesuit College in Paris, and later philosophy at the Collège des Grassins. To Dr. Hersant, his teacher at the latter institution, may be traced the Jansenistic views which mar his writings. Ordained priest at Rouen in 1662, he served for some years as curate there. About 1670 he removed to Paris, became closely associated with the Port-Royalists, and began to cultivate Jansenistic asceticism. He exchanged his soutane for a coarse grey robe and abstained from celebrating Mass, to expiate in this manner what he esteemed his guilt in having accepted ordination at so early an age (22). His intercourse with Lemaître restored him to more normal views; returning to pastoral duties, he acted as chaplain at the Collège des Grassins. His sermons at various Paris churches quickly placed him in the front rank of the preachers of his day, and in 1675 his work on the text "Martha, Martha, thou art careful" (Luke, x, 41) won the Balzac prize for eloquence awarded by the French Academy. In such esteem was he held by his spiritual superiors that Archbishop de Harlay appointed him, in 1679, temporary confessor of the nuns of Port-Royal, and also a member of the archiepiscopal commission for the emendation of the Breviary. His relations with the leading Jansenists, however, soon awakened distrust, and he found it necessary to retire, in 1682, to the Priory of Villiers-sur-Fère, a benefice granted him by his patron, Cardinal Colbert of Rouen.

In this retirement he devoted the remainder of his life to his ascetical compositions. His principal writings are: "Histoire de la vie de Jésus-Christ" (about 1673); "Le catéchisme de la pénitence" (1676); "L'Année chrétienne, ou les Messes des Dimanches, Féries et Fêtes de toute l'année, en latin et en français, avec l'explication des Epîtres et des Evangiles et un abrégé de la Vie des Saints, dont on fait l'Office". Of this last work Letourneux wrote nine volumes, and two were added by the Belgian Jansenist, Ruth d'Ans. Six volumes were published before 1686, when they were condemned for their Jansenistic views. The work was placed on the Index on 7 Sept., 1695. Among the other works of Letourneux may be mentioned:

"Principes et règles de la vie chrétienne" (Paris, 1688); "Explication littéraire et morale de l'épître de S. Paul aux Romains" (Paris, 1695); "Bréviaire Romain en latin et français" (4 vols., Paris, 1687), condemned by the archiepiscopal authorities because it was an innovation contrary to the spirit and practice of the Church, and because it contained much that was heretical and much that was conducive to heresy and error. Although the episcopal ban was subsequently removed, and the work was never placed on the Roman Index, the Jansenistic leanings of Letourneux stand conspicuous to-day in this as in the remainder of his writings.

Dict. des livres Jansénist., I, 63; II, 305; III, 307; SAINTE-BEUVE, *Port-Royal*, V, vi, 2; CHAUDON ET DELANDINE, *Dict. univ. Hist., Crit. et Bibliogr.*; MORÉRI, *Grand Dict. Histor.*; JUNGMANN in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.

THOMAS KENNEDY.

Letter, COMMENDATORY. See LETTERS, ECCLESIASTICAL.

Letterkenny. See RAPHOE, DIOCESE OF.

Letters, APOSTOLIC. See BULLS AND BRIEFS.

Letters, DIMISSORIAL. See DIMISSORIAL LETTERS.

Letters, ECCLESIASTICAL (LITTERÆ ECCLESIASTICÆ), are publications or announcements of the organs of ecclesiastical authority, e. g. the synods, more particularly, however, of popes and bishops, addressed to the faithful in the form of letters.

I. *Letters of the Popes in the Period of the Early Church.*—The popes began early, by virtue of the primacy, to issue laws as well for the entire Church as for individuals. This was done in the form of letters. Such letters were sent by the popes either of their own will or when application was made to them by synods, bishops, or individual Christians. Apart from the Epistles of the Apostle Peter the first example of this is the Letter of Pope Clement I (90–99?) to the Corinthians, in whose community there was grave dissension. Only a few papal letters of the first three Christian centuries have been preserved in whole or part, or are known from the works of ecclesiastical writers. As soon, however, as the Church was recognized by the State and could freely spread in all directions, the papal primacy of necessity began to develop, and from this time on the number of papal letters increased. No part of the Church and no question of faith or morals failed to attract the papal attention. The popes called these letters, with reference to their legal character, *decreta: statuta: decretalia constituta,* even when the letters, as was often the case, were hortatory in form. Thus Siricius, in his letter of the year 385 to Himerius of Tarragona [Jaffé, "Regesta Pontificum Romanorum" (2nd ed., Leipzig, 1885–88), I, no. 255]. Or the letters were called *sententiæ*, i. e. opinions (Syn. Tur., II, an. 567, c. ii); *præcepta* (Syn. Bracar., I, an. 561, præf.); *auctoritates* [Zosimus, an. 417; Jaffé, "Regesta", 2nd ed., I, no. 349]. On the other hand more general letters, especially those of dogmatic importance, were also called at times *tomi; indiculi; commonitoria; epistolæ tractoriæ*, or *tractatoriæ*. If the matter were important, the popes issued the letters not by their sole authority, but with the advice of the Roman presbytery or of a synod. Consequently such letters were also called *epistolæ synodicæ* (Syn. Tolet., III, an. 589, c. i). By *epistola synodica*, however, is also understood in Christian antiquity that letter of the newly elected bishop or pope by which he notified the other bishops of his elevation and of his agreement with them in the Faith. Thus an *epistola* of this kind had a certain relationship to the *litteræ formatæ* by which a bishop certified, for presentation to another bishop, to the orthodoxy and unblemished moral character of an ecclesiastic of his diocese. Closely related to the *litteræ formatæ* are the *litteræ dimissoriæ* (dimissorials) by which a bishop sends a candidate for ordination to another bishop to be ordained. While these names indicate sufficiently the legal character of the papal letters, it is to be noted that the popes repeatedly demanded in explicit terms the observance of their decrees; thus Siricius, in his letter of the year 385 to Himerius (Jaffé, "Regesta", 2nd ed., I, no. 255), and Innocent I in his letter of the year 416 addressed to Decentius of Gubbio (Jaffé, "Regesta", 2nd ed., I, no. 311). In the same manner they repeatedly required from the persons to whom they wrote that these should bring the letter in question to the notice of others. Thus again Siricius, in his letter to Himerius (Jaffé, "Regesta", 2nd ed., I, no. 255); and Pope Zosimus, in the year 418 to Hesychius of Salona (Jaffé, "Regesta", 2nd ed., I, no. 339). In order to secure such knowledge of the papal laws several copies of the papal letters were occasionally made and dispatched at the same time. In this way arose the letters *a pari: a paribus uniformes, τὰ ἴσα* (Jaffé, "Regesta", 2nd ed., I, nos. 331, 334, 373). Following the example of the Roman emperors the popes soon established archives (*scrinium*) in which copies of their letters were placed as memorials for further use, and as proofs of authenticity. The first mention of papal archives is found in the Acts of a synod held about 370 under Pope Damasus I (Coustant, "Epistolæ Romanorum Pontificum", Paris, 1721, 500). Pope Zosimus also makes mention in 419 of the archives (Jaffé, "Regesta", 2nd ed., I, no. 350). Nevertheless, forged papal letters appeared even earlier than this. By far the greater number of the papal letters of the first millennium, however, have been lost. Only the letters of Leo I, edited by the brothers Ballerini, the "Registrum Epistolarum" of Gregory I, edited by Ewald and Hartmann, and the "Registrum Epistolarum" of Gregory VII, edited by Jaffé, have been more or less completely preserved. As befitted their legal importance, the papal letters were also soon incorporated in the collections of canon law (Maassen, "Geschichte der Quellen und Literatur des kanonischen Rechts im Abendlande bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters", Graz, 1870, 231 sqq.). The first to collect the epistles of the popes in a systematic and comprehensive manner was the monk Dionysius Exiguus, at the beginning of the sixth century (Maassen, "Geschichte der Quellen", 422 sqq.). In this way the papal letters took rank with the canons of the synods as of equal value and of equal obligation. The example of Dionysius was followed afterwards by almost all compilers of the canons, Pseudo-Isidore and the Gregorian canonists, e. g. Anselm of Lucca, Deusdedit, etc.

II. *Letters of the Popes in the Medieval Period.*—With the development of the primacy in the Middle Ages the papal letters grew enormously in number. The popes, following the earlier custom, insisted that their rescripts, issued for individual cases, should be observed in all analogous ones. According to the teaching of the canonists, above all of Gratian, every papal letter of general character was authoritative for the entire Church without further notification. The names of the letters of general authority were very varied: *constitutio* (c. vi, X, De elect., I, vi); *edictum* (c. unic., in VIto, De postul., I, v); *statutum* (c. xv, X, De sent. excomm., V, xxxix); *decretum* (c. i, in VIto, De præb., III, iv); *decretalis* (c. xxix, in VIto, De elect., I, vi); *sanctio* (c. unic., in VIto, De cler. ægrot., III, v). Decrees (*decreta*) was the name given especially to general ordinances issued with the advice of the cardinals (Schulte, "Geschichte der Quellen und Literatur des kanonischen Rechtes", Stuttgart, 1876, I, 252 sq.). On the other hand ordinances issued for individual cases were called: *rescripta, responsa, mandata.* Thus a constitution was always understood to be a papal ordinance which regulated ecclesiastical conditions of a general character judi-

cially, in a durable manner and form, for all time; but by a rescript was understood a papal ordinance issued at the petition of an individual that decided a lawsuit or granted a favour. Compare the Bulls of promulgation prefixed to the "Decretals" of Gregory IX, the "Liber Sextus" of Boniface VIII, and the "Clementinæ"; also the titles, "De constitutionibus" and "De rescriptis" in the "Corpus Juris Canonici". Notwithstanding all this, usage remained uncertain (c. xiv, in VIto, De præb., III, iv). The above-mentioned distinctions between papal documents were based on the extent of their authority. Other names again had their origin in the form of the papal documents. It is true they all had more or less evidently the form of letters. But essential differences appeared, especially in regard to the literary form (*stylus*) of the document and the method of sealing, these depending in each case on the importance of the contents of the respective document. It was merely the difference in the manner of sealing that led to the distinction between Bulls and Briefs. For Bulls, legal instruments almost entirely for important matters, the seal was stamped in wax or lead, seldom in gold, enclosed in a case, and fastened to the document by a cord. For Briefs, instruments used, as a rule, in matters of less importance, the seal was stamped upon the document in wax. Curial letters (*litteræ curiales* or *de curia*) denoted particularly letters of the popes in political affairs. During the Middle Ages, just as in the early Church, the letters of the popes were deposited in the papal archives either in the original or by copy. They are still in existence, and almost complete in number, from the time of Innocent III (1198-1216). Many papal letters were also incorporated, as their legal nature required, in the "Corpus Juris Canonici". Others are to be found in the formularies, many of which appeared unofficially in the Middle Ages, similar in kind to the ancient official "Liber Diurnus" of the papal chancery in use as late as the time of Gregory VII. The papal letters were forwarded by the papal officials, above all by the chancery, for whose use the chancery rules, *regulæ cancellariæ Apostolicæ*, were drawn up; these rules had regard to the execution and dispatch of the papal letters, and date back to the twelfth century. Nevertheless, the forging of papal letters was even more frequent in the Middle Ages than in the early Church. Innocent III (in c. v, X, De crimine falsi, V, xx) refers to no less than nine methods of falsification. From the thirteenth century on to a few years ago it sufficed, in order to give a papal document legal force, to post it up at Rome on the doors of St. Peter's, of the Lateran, the Apostolic Chancery, and in the Piazza del Campo di Fiori. Since 1 January, 1909, they acquire force by publication in the "Acta Apostolicæ Sedis".

III. *Letters of the Popes in Modern Times.*—In the modern period also, papal letters have been and still are constantly issued. Now, however, they proceed from the popes themselves less frequently than in the Middle Ages and Christian antiquity; most of them are issued by the papal officials, of whom there is a greater number than in the Middle Ages, and to whom have been granted large delegated powers, which include the issuing of letters. Following the example of Paul III, Pius IV, and Pius V, Sixtus V by the Bull "Immensa æterni" of 22 January, 1587, added to the already existing bodies of papal officials a number of congregations of cardinals with clearly defined powers of administration and jurisdiction. Succeeding popes added other congregations. Pius X, however, in the Constitution "Sapienti consilio" of 29 June, 1908, reorganized the papal Curia. Papal writings are yet divided into Constitutions, Rescripts, Bulls, Briefs, and Apostolic Letters (*Litteræ Apostolicæ*). The *Litteræ Apostolicæ* are further divided into *Litteræ Apostolicæ simplices* or *Brevetti, Chirographa, Encyclicæ* (Encyclicals), and *Motus Proprii*. By *Litteræ Apostolicæ simplices* are understood all documents drawn up by virtue of papal authorization, and signed with the pope's name but not by the pope personally. Documents signed by the pope personally are called *Chirographa*. Encyclicals are letters of a more hortatory nature, addressed to all or to a majority of the higher officials of the Church. A *Motu Proprio* is a document prepared at the personal initiative of the pope, without previous petition to him, and issued with a partial avoidance of the otherwise customary forms of the chancery. By *Constitution* is understood, as in the Middle Ages, a papal document of general authority; by *Rescript*, a similar document applicable to an individual case. Bulls and Briefs are distinguished from each other by characteristics of form which have always remained essentially the same. The papal documents are still deposited in the Roman archives. There are no official collections of them corresponding to the medieval "Corpus Juris Canonici". The last official collection is that of the Constitutions of Benedict XIV (1740–1758). From the sixteenth century, on the other hand, private collections have appeared, some of which are called *bullaria*, from the more important part of their contents. Many papal letters are also found in the collections of the Acts of the Councils. The documents issued by the officials of the Curia and the Congregations of Cardinals contain either resolutions (decisions) for individual cases, or declarations (*extensivæ* or *comprehensivæ*) interpreting laws, or decrees, which are entirely new laws. Some congregations of cardinals have issued official collections of their decisions.

IV. *Collections of the Letters of the Popes and of the Roman Officials.*—Coustant, "Epistolæ Romanorum Pontificum et quæ ad eos scriptæ sunt a S. Clemente I usque ad Innocentium III" (Paris, 1721), goes to only 440; Schönemann, "Pontificum Romanorum a Clemente I usque ad Leonem M. genuinæ . . . epistolæ" (Göttingen, 1796); Thiel, "Epistolæ Romanorum Pontificum genuinæ . . . a S. Hilaro usque ad Pelagium II" (Brunsberg, 1868). From 1881 the Ecole Française of Rome has published, with particular reference to France, the "Registra" of Gregory IX, Innocent IV, Alexander IV, Urban IV, Clement IV, Gregory X, John XXI, Nicholas III, Martin IV, Honorius IV, Nicholas IV, Boniface VIII, and Benedict XI. The "Registra" of the Avignon popes are also in course of publication. Cf. "Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire", XXV, 443 sqq.; Hergenröther, "Leonis X Pontificis Maximi Regesta" (Freiburg, 1884—); "Regesta Clementis Papæ V cura et studio monachorum ordinis S. Benedicti" (Rome, 1885—); Pressuti, "Registrum Honorii III" (Rome, 1888—). There are innumerable collections of papal letters issued from a partisan point of view. All known papal letters up to 1198 are enumerated by Jaffé in the "Regesta Rom. Pont." The papal letters of 1198–1304 are found in Potthast, "Regesta Pontificum Romanorum ab anno 1198 ad annum 1304" (Berlin, 1874). Professor Paul Kehr is preparing a critical edition of all papal letters up to Innocent III. See the "Nachrichten", of the Göttingen Academy of Sciences, 1896, 72 sqq.; "Pii IX acta" (Rome, 1854—); "Leonis XIII acta" (Rome, 1881); "Pii X acta" (Rome, 1907). For the Bullaria, see Tomasetti, "Bullarum, diplomatum et privilegiorum s. Romanorum Pontificum Taurinensis editio locupletissima" (Turin, 1857—); for collections of the Acts of the Councils, Mansi, "Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio" (Florence and Venice, 1759), goes to 1439. It is continued by "Collectio conciliorum recentioris ecclesiæ universæ", ed. Martin and Petit (Paris, 1905); "Decreta authentica S. Congregationis Indulgentiarum edita jussu et auctoritate Leonis XIII" (Ratisbon, 1883); "Jus Pontificium de Propaganda Fide Leonis XIII jussu recognitum" (Rome, 1888); "Decreta

authentica Congregationis S. Rituum . . . promulgata sub auspiciis Leonis XIII" (Rome, 1898).

V. *Letters of Bishops.*—Just as the popes rule the Church largely by means of letters, so also the bishops make use of letters for the administration of their dioceses. The documents issued by a bishop are divided according to their form into pastoral letters, synodal and diocesan statutes, mandates, or ordinances, or decrees, the classification depending upon whether they have been drawn up more as letters, or have been issued by a synod or the chancery. The pastoral letters are addressed either to all the members of the diocese (*litteræ pastorales*) or only to the clergy, in this case generally in Latin (*litteræ encyclicæ*). The mandates, decrees, or ordinances are issued either by the bishop himself or by one of his officials. The synodal statutes are ordinances issued by the bishop at the diocesan synod, with the advice, but in no way with the legislative co-operation, of the diocesan clergy. The diocesan statutes, regularly speaking, are those episcopal ordinances which, because they refer to more weighty matters, are prepared with the obligatory or facultative co-operation of the cathedral chapter. In order to have legal force the episcopal documents must be published in a suitable manner and according to usage. Civil laws by which episcopal and also papal documents have to receive the approval of the State before they can be published are irrational and out of date (Vatican Council, Sess. III, De eccl., c. iii). (See EXEQUATUR.)

For the extensive literature on papal letters see works on papal diplomatics; GRISAR in *Kirchenlex.*, s.v. *Bullen und Breven* (to 1884); PITRA, *Analecta novissima Spicilegii Solesmensis. Altera continuatio. Tom. I: De epistolis et registris Romanorum Pontificum* (Paris, 1885); BRESSLAU, *Handbuch der Urkundenlehre für Deutschland und Italien* (Leipzig, 1889), 65 sqq.; GIRY, *Manuel de diplomatique* (Paris, 1894), 661 sqq.; SCHMITZ-KALLENBERG, *Die Lehre von den Papsturkunden in Meister, Grundriss der Geschichtswissenschaft* (Leipzig, 1906—), I, pt. I, 172 sqq.; cf. also, PFLUGK-HARTTUNG, *Die Bullen der Päpste bis zum Ende des 12. Jahrhunderts* (Gotha, 1901); STEINACKER, *Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung*, XXIII, 1 sqq.; KEHR, *Ergänzungsband d. Mitteilungen*, VI, 70 sqq.; WERNZ, *Jus decretalium*, I (2nd ed., Rome, 1905—), 159 sqq., 311 sqq., 350 sqq., 379 sqq.; LAURENTIUS, *Institutiones juris ecclesiastici* (2nd ed., Freiburg im Br., 1908), no. 11 sqq., 23 sqq., 28 sqq.; SÄGMÜLLER, *Lehrbuch des katholischen Kirchenrechts* (2nd ed., Freiburg, 1909), 85 sqq., 129 sqq., 153 sqq., 164 sqq.

JOHANNES BAPTIST SÄGMÜLLER.

Leubus, a celebrated ancient Cistercian abbey, situated on the Oder, northwest of Breslau, in the Prussian Province of Silesia. The year of foundation is not quite certain, the deed of foundation of 1175, formerly considered genuine, having been proved a forgery, but the statement of the old Cistercian chronicles and Polish annalists, that Leubus was founded 16 August, 1163, by Duke Boleslaus the Tall, is the most probable one. Formerly the Benedictines were there. The Cistercians of Leubus have done a great deal for the cultivation and Germanization of Silesia, which was formerly wilderness, primeval forest, morass and moorland, although their activity has been overrated. The mother-house of Leubus was Pforta. From Leubus itself there sprang the houses of Mogila and Klara Tumba at Cracow, Heinrichau at Münsterberg, and Kamenz at Glatz. Leubus had extensive possessions. In the Hussite wars the monastery with all the buildings was burned to the ground (1432). When it had recovered from these misfortunes, it was severely oppressed by the Dukes of Sagan and Münsterberg, and was in their possession for seven years (1492–98), the inmates of the convent having fled. The abbot Andreas Hoffmann (1498–1534) infused new life into the monastery. During the Thirty Years' War it was occupied by the Swedes in 1632 and pillaged. All the treasures of the church fell into their hands. A few years later they returned once more and carried off the valuable library, which had taken centuries to collect, to Stettin, where it was afterwards destroyed by lightning. As long as the war lasted, Leubus was practically a ruin, but after the peace Abbot Arnold (1636–72) restored it in a comparatively short time and embellished the church and buildings. He called in the skilful painter Michael Willmann, who was employed forty years at Leubus (until his death, 1706). Under Arnold and Johann IX (1672–91) theological and philosophical studies also flourished. The monastery reached its zenith under Ludwig Bauch (1696–1729), under whose rule the enormous and imposing building was erected, which is considered the largest building in Germany and one of the largest in Europe. The principal façade is 225 metres long, the wings are 118 metres long. Under Constantine (1733–47) the interior was decorated, the hall of princes and the library being adorned with extravagant magnificence. In the first Silesian War, and in the Seven Years' War (1740–42 and 1756–63), Leubus was terribly impoverished by the Prussians and Austrians, so that it had a debt of 200,000 Reichsthaler. On 21 Nov., 1810, it was suppressed by the Prussian Government and confiscated with its 59 villages and 10 domains. Part of the buildings are now used as a lunatic asylum, in connexion with which the large and beautiful church is utilized for Catholic worship.

BUSCHING, *Die Urkunden des Klosters Leubus* (Breslau, 1821); WATTENBACH, *Monumenta Lubensia* (Breslau, 1861); THOMA, *Die Kolonisatorische Tätigkeit des Klosters Leubus* (Leipzig, 1894); SCHULTE, *Die Anfänge der deutschen Kolonisation in Schlesien* in *Silesiaca* (Breslau, 1898;) WINTERA, *Leubus* in *Studien und Mitteilungen aus dem Benedictiner- und Zisterzienserorden* (1904), XXV, 502–514; 676–697; WELS, *Kloster Leubus* in *Schlesien* (Breslau, 1908).

KLEMENS LÖFFLER.

Leuce, a titular see of Thrace, not mentioned by any ancient historian or geographer. However, its bishop, Symeon, attended the Council of Constantinople (Lequien, "Oriens Christ.", I, 1167). The "Notitiæ episcopatuum" of the tenth to the twelfth and thirteenth centuries mention Leuce among the suffragans of Philippopolis. It is probably the modern village of Copolovo, south of Philippopolis, or Plovdiv, Bulgaria.

S. PÉTRIDÈS.

Levadoux, MICHAEL, one of the first band of Sulpicians who, owing to the distressed state of religion in France, went to the United States and founded St. Mary's Seminary in Baltimore; b. at Clermont-Ferrand, in Auvergne, France, 1 April, 1746; d. at Le-Puy-en-Velay, 13 Jan., 1815. He entered the Sulpician Seminary at Clermont, 30 Oct., 1769, where he studied theology, then went to the "Solitude", or Sulpician novitiate, for one year. He was appointed, in 1774, director of the seminary at Limoges, where he remained till 1791. In consequence of the threatening aspect of affairs in France, Rev. J. A. Emery, Superior-General of the Sulpicians, deemed it prudent to found a house of their institute in some foreign country, and at the suggestion of Cardinal Dugnani, nuncio at Paris, the United States was chosen. Negotiations were opened with Bishop Carroll, but lately consecrated, and after some delay Rev. Francis C. Nagot, S.S., was named first director of the projected seminary at Baltimore. With him were associated MM. Levadoux, Tessier, Garnier, and Montdésir, together with several seminarians. Rev. M. Delavau, Canon of St. Martin of Tours, and Chateaubriand joined the party, which sailed from St. Malo, 8 April, 1791, and after a tempestuous and roundabout voyage reached Baltimore 10 July. For one year M. Levadoux, as treasurer, assisted M. Nagot in organizing the Seminary of St. Mary's, and was then sent by the latter to the Illinois mission, for which M. Emery had at first destined M. Chicosneau, deeming M. Levadoux a better administrator of temporal affairs. Empowered as vicar-general by Bishop Carroll, he took his departure for the West on 15 Jan., 1792.

His missionary labours centred around Cahokia and Kaskaskia. The registers of the latter place bear his sig-

nature from Dec., 1792, and he seems to have spent most of his time from 1793 to 1796 at Cahokia, though after M. Flaget left Vincennes in 1795 he visited that post also. Meanwhile as the health of M. Nagot, superior of the Sulpicians in the United States, was failing fast, he was desirous of having M. Levadoux near him at Baltimore, that he might be ready to succeed him in office; but Bishop Carroll was no less anxious to secure the services of the zealous missionary for Detroit. The bishop's wishes prevailed, and M. Levadoux became parish priest of St. Anne's in 1796. It was he who performed the obsequies of Rev. F. X. Dufaux, S.S., missionary to the Hurons at the parish of the Assumption opposite Detroit, who died at his post 10 September, 1796. After the demise of the latter, M. Levadoux had frequent occasion to minister to the spiritual wants of the Indians and of other scattered Catholics from Sandusky and Mackinaw to Fort Wayne. In 1801 M. Nagot recalled M. Levadoux to Baltimore, and in 1803 he received orders from M. Emery to return to France, where he was soon appointed superior of the Seminary of St. Flour in Auvergne, and remained there until the dispersion of the Sulpicians by Napoleon I, in 1811. When their institute was revived, in 1814, the Rev. M. Duclaux, successor of M. Emery, placed M. Levadoux at the head of the Seminary of Le-Puy-en-Velay. For years he had been suffering from the stone, which disease was the cause of his death in the following year. He bore the intense pains of his last illness with exemplary fortitude and resignation.

SHEA, *Hist. of Cath. Ch. in the U. S.*, II, 379, 407, 483, 485, 489–490, 606; PHÉPIN DE RIVIÈRE, *Vie de M. Richard, S.S., MS. in St. Mary's Seminary Archives*, Baltimore, 369, note; DILHET, *Etat de l'église Catholique ou du diocèse des Etats Unis; Manuscript registers of the Immaculate Conception Church*, Kaskaskia, and of Mackinaw. A. E. JONES.

Levau (LE VAU), LOUIS, a contemporary of Jacques Lemercier and the two Mansarts, and the chief architect of the first decade of Louis XIV's independent reign, b. 1612; d. at Paris, 10 Oct., 1670. Although posterity has refused to consider him a genius, he developed a distinctive style which aimed at classic simplicity of construction and elegance in decoration. It is true, however, that he more often depended on Mansart's or Lenôtre's plans. Of his life, we have few particulars except as regards his works. He had two sons who shared his labours; of these Louis died in 1661, and of Francis we know nothing except that in 1656, in the capacity of royal architect, he received a salary of 600 livres. In 1653 the father became first royal inspector of buildings, and in 1656 received a salary of 3000 livres. In his death certificate, he is called "king's councillor, general inspector, and director of the royal building enterprises, His Majesty's secretary, and the pride of France." Levau won renown by the erection of many handsome buildings in Paris and elsewhere. The oldest are the Hôtel Lambert and the château of Vaux-le-Vicomte. After 1654 he completed the south and north wings of the Louvre as successor to Lescot and Lemercier, and then built the east wing, thereby concluding the square up to the colonnade on the east side. His design for the latter was rejected as being not sufficiently ornate, and that of Claude Perrault substituted. In this work Levau had a faithful assistant in his son-in-law, Dorbay. He next directed some changes in the Tuileries. Another considerable achievement was the Collège des Quatres Nations (now Palais de l'Institut), especially the old church. The latter consisted of a domical structure: a cupola carried out without massive effect over a cylinder which was not perfectly round, and four surrounding spaces, in one of which was the monument of the founder, Mazarin. During the entire course of the next century, Levau's influence was felt in palace-building on account of his work on the extension of Versailles. Begun in 1624 by Lemercier (q. v.), it was finished by Hardouin-Mansart and later architects. But the first rough sketch and the substantial form are due to Levau. Versailles became a standard, not only because of the imposing splendour of the interior and the exterior simplicity, but above all through the fact that the court, instead of being enclosed, lay in front of the façade. Levau extended the so-called marble court of the old palace by the addition of side wings, and, by pushing these back laterally, he gave to the court a greater breadth. He proceeded in the same way with the widely extended wings, which were also pushed back sideways and enclose the present so-called King's Court. Louis XIV caused the long side wings to be extended still further, thereby giving an immense width to the front. Levau seems to be responsible for the monotonous garden façade, while the chapel, among other things, constitutes Mansart's claim to renown. The epoch-making church of St-Sulpice, a counterpart of St-Eustache, was begun on Gamard's design in 1646, but it was really carried on by Levau in his own style until 1660, when Gittard took his place. The church is planned on a large scale, but the effect does not correspond to the vast design.

LANCE, *Dict. des architectes* (Paris, 1873); GURLITT, *Gesch. des Barockstils* (Stuttgart, 1887); GEYMÜLLER in *Handbuch der Architektur von Durm*, etc., II (Stuttgart, 1898), vi, 1. For further particulars consult *Archives de l'art français* and *Nouvelles archives de l'art français*. G. GIETMANN.

Le Verrier, URBAIN-JEAN-JOSEPH, astronomer and director of the observatory at Paris, b. at Saint Lô, the ancient Briodurum later called Saint-Laudifanum, in northwestern France, 11 May, 1811; d. at Paris, 25 September, 1877. From 1831 the talented youth studied at the Ecole Polytechnique with such success that at the end of his course he was appointed an instructor there. While connected with the school he showed a strong predilection for mathematical studies, above all for such problems as Laplace had so skilfully treated in the "Mécanique céleste". Le Verrier soon received an appointment in the government administration of tobaccos; later he became a professor at the Collège Stanislas at Paris, and finally, in 1646, he was appointed professor of celestial mechanics in the faculty of sciences at the University of Paris. As early as 1839 he published a calculation of the variations of the planetary orbits for the period of time from the year 100,000 B. C. to the year 100,000 A. D., in which he proved by figures the stability of the solar system, which Laplace had only indicated. His calculation of the transit of Mercury of 1845 and of the orbit of Faye's comet demonstrated his ability in that province in which he was soon to gain an almost undreamed-of triumph from the discovery, by means of theoretical calculations, of the planet Neptune. The variations observed in Uranus, up to then the most distant planet known, led him to look for the cause of the disturbance outside of its orbit. His calculations enabled him to specify the very spot in the heavens where the body causing the perturbations in question

URBAIN-JEAN-JOSEPH LE VERRIER

was to be sought, so that the astronomer Galle of Berlin was able by the aid of his specifications to find the new planet at once upon looking for it, 23 September, 1846. In this way Le Verrier gave the most striking confirmation of the theory of gravitation propounded by Newton. He now became a member of the Academy of Sciences, in 1852 was made a senator, and after Arago's death (1853) was appointed director of the Paris Observatory, a position he held with a short interruption (1870–73) until his death. Under his skilful and prudent administration the observatory made important progress both as to equipment in instruments and, more particularly, as regards pre-eminent scientific achievements of which Le Verrier was the inspiration. He was the founder of the International Meteorological Institute and of the Association Scientifique de France, being the permanent president of the latter. He also gave careful attention to the geodetic work which was intended to give the most complete presentation possible of the configuration of the earth. The instruments of precision with which, in order to attain this end, he equipped the observers were remarkably complete.

His most important work, however, was the construction of tables representing the movements of the sun, moon, and planets: "Tables du Soleil" (1858); "Tables de Mercure" (1859); "Tables de Vénus" (1861); "Tables de Mars" (1861); "Tables de Jupiter" (1876); "Tables de Saturne" (1876); "Théorie d'Uranus" (1876); "Théorie de Neptune" (1876); "Tables d'Uranus" (1877). All these publications were preceded by theoretical investigations: "Théorie du mouvement apparent du Soleil" (1858); "Théorie de Mercure" (1859); "Théorie de Vénus" (1861); "Théorie de Mars" (1861), etc. Considerations similar to those which led to the discovery of the planet Neptune caused Le Verrier to infer the existence of a planet between Mercury and the sun. But far greater difficulties both were and are here connected with actual discovery than was the case with Neptune. However, Le Verrier on this occasion also showed his masterly skill in handling the various problems of the reciprocal perturbations of the planets and other heavenly bodies, as is shown in his writings on the subject: "Formules propres à simplifier le calcul des perturbations" (1876); "Variations séculaires des orbites" (1876), etc.

With all his erudition Le Verrier was a zealous adherent and true son of the Catholic Church; even as deputy of the Assembly he openly acknowledged and defended his Catholic faith before all the world. He was also a ready speaker, one in no way discomposed by the attacks of opponents, for he knew how by profound and logical statements to convince his hearers quickly. When dying he said in the words of the aged Simeon: "Nunc dimittis servum tuum, Domine, in pace". Those who spoke at the funeral of this remarkable man could truthfully assert that the study of the star-worlds stimulated in him the living belief of the Christian to new fervour. Even in the sessions of the Academy he made no concealment of his faith nor of his childlike dependence on the Catholic Church. When, on 5 June, 1876, he presented to the Academy his completed tables for Jupiter, the result of thirty-five years of toil, he emphasized particularly the fact that only the thought of the great Creator of the universe had kept him from flagging, and had maintained his enthusiasm for his task. He also on this occasion spoke strongly, like his colleague Dumas, against the materialistic and sceptical tendencies of so many scholars. To Le Verrier is due the organization of the meteorological service for France, especially the weather warnings for seaports, by which to-day the weather for the following twenty-four hours can be announced with much probability, a matter of especial importance for agriculture and shipping. The "Annales de l'Observatoire de Paris", published during the administration of Le Verrier, consist of thirteen volumes of theoretical treatises and forty-seven volumes of observations (1800–1876). At the time of his death he was making plans for equipping the observatory with a large new telescope, and it may be that the stimulating influence exerted in this direction contributed not a little to the result that everywhere, particularly in North America, generous-minded patrons appeared who, each in his own land, gave the money necessary to obtain larger instruments. On 27 June, 1889, a statue of the distinguished savant which cost nearly 32,000 francs ($6400), was erected by subscription in front of the observatory where he had laboured for so many years.

FIGUIER, *L'année scientifique et industrielle*, XXI (Paris, 1877); DENZA, *Commemorazione di alcuni uomini illustri nella scienza* (Turin, 1877); HEUZEAU, *Vade-mecum de l'astronomie* (Brussels, 1882); *Annuaire* (for 1890) published by the Bureau des Longitudes; KNELLER, *Das Christentum und die Vertreter der Naturwissenschaft* (2nd ed., Freiburg im Br., 1904).

ADOLPH MÜLLER.

Levites (לְוִיִּם, from לֵוִי, Levi, name of the ancestral patriarch, generally interpreted "joined" or "attached to"—see Gen., xxix, 34, also Num., xviii, 2, 4, Hebrew text),—the subordinate ministers appointed in the Mosaic Law for the service of the Tabernacle and of the Temple. Levi was the third son borne to Jacob by Lia, and full brother of Ruben, Simeon, and Juda. Together with Simeon he avenged the humiliation of their sister Dina by the slaughter of Sichem and his people (Gen., xxxiv), for which deed of violence the two brothers were reproved both in Gen., xxxiv, 30, and in the prophecy attributed to the patriarch in Gen., xlix, 5–7. Waiving all critical discussion connected with this incident as also with the other events connected with the history of the tribe, the next point to be noticed is the connexion of Levi with the priesthood. According to the received Biblical account, all the male descendants of the patriarch were set apart by Moses, acting under Divine command, for the service of the sanctuary, a distinction which may have been due to the religious zeal manifested by the tribe on the occasion of the idolatrous worship of the golden calf (Ex., xxxii, 25–29). As it was also the tribe to which Moses himself belonged, it could probably be relied upon more than the others to sustain the legislator in the establishment and promotion of his religious institutions among the people. The sacred calling of the Levites is mentioned in various passages of the Pentateuch. For instance, the author of the first chapters of Numbers (P), after recalling (iii; cf. Ex., xxviii, xxix; Lev., viii, ix) the names and sacred functions of the sons of Aaron, adds the designation of the entire tribe of Levi who were to "stand in the sight of Aaron the priest to minister to him. And let them watch, and observe whatsoever appertaineth to the service of the multitude before the tabernacle of the testimony, and let them keep the vessels of the tabernacle, serving in the ministry thereof." Though in Num., xviii, 23, the special mission of the tribe is described broadly as a mediation between the Lord and his people, and though the Levite mentioned in the interesting and very ancient passage of Judges (xvii, xviii) is represented as exercising without qualification the functions of the priesthood, it is held by many commentators that at an early date a distinction was made between the priests of the family of Aaron and the simple Levites—a distinction which became very pronounced in the later religious history of the Chosen People. The ceremonies with which the simple Levites were consecrated to the service of the Lord are described in Num., viii, 5–22. Besides their general function of assisting the priests, the Levites were assigned to carry the Tabernacle and its utensils, to keep watch about the sanctuary, etc. As most of their duties required a man's full strength, the Levites did not enter upon their functions before the age of

thirty. In the distribution of the Land of Chanaan after the conquest, Josue, acting according to instructions received from Moses, excluded the tribe of Levi from sharing like the others in the territory. "But to the tribe of Levi he gave no possession: because the Lord the God of Israel himself is their possession" (Jos., xiii, 33.) It may be noted that a very different reason for this exception is mentioned in Gen., xlix, 5–7. In lieu of a specified territory, the members of the tribe of Levi received permission to dwell scattered among the other tribes, special provision being made for their maintenance. Besides the tithes of the produce of land and cattle, and other sacerdotal dues already granted by Moses, the Levites now received from each of the other tribes four cities with suburban pasture lands, or forty-eight in all (Jos., xxi). Among these were included the six cities of refuge, three on each side of the Jordan, which were set aside to check the barbarous custom of blood revenge, still existing among the Arab tribes, and in virtue of which the kinsmen of a man put to death consider it a duty to avenge him by the killing of his intentional or even unintentional slayer. It is probable, however, that these administrative dispositions concerning the Levites were not fully carried out until some time after the conquest, for, during the long period of transition between the wandering life of the desert and the fully organized civilization of later times, the priests and Levites seem to have had a rather precarious mode of existence. Taking the story of Michas (Judges, xvii) as illustrative of the condition of the Levitical order during that early period, it would appear that the priestly functionaries were inadequately provided for and had to wander about to secure a livelihood.

The elaborate and highly differentiated organization of the priestly or Levitical system, described with such abundance of detail in the priestly writings of the Old Testament, was doubtless the result of a long process of religious and ritualistic development which attained its fullness in the post-Exilic period. As elsewhere in the history of ancient religions, there appears in the beginnings of Hebrew history a period when no priestly class existed. The functions of the priesthood were performed generally by the head of the family or clan without need of a special sanctuary, and there is abundant evidence to show that for a long time after the death of Moses the priestly office was exercised, not only occasionally, but even permanently, by men of non-Levitical descent. The Deuteronomic legislation insists on the unity of sanctuary, and recognizes the descendants of Levi as the sole legitimate members of the priesthood, but it ignores the sharply defined distinction between priests and simple Levites which appears in the later writings and legislation, for the whole class is constantly referred to as the "levite priests". This category excludes the purely lay priest who is no longer tolerated, but if any Levite be willing to leave his residence in any part of the land and come to Jerusalem, "He shall minister in the name of the Lord his God, as all his brethren the Levites do, that shall stand at that time before the Lord. He shall receive the same portion of food that the rest do; besides that which is due him in his own city, by succession from his fathers" (Deut. xviii, 6–8). In the post-Exilic writings the detailed organization and workings of the levitical system then in its full vigour are adequately described, and a certain number of the regulations pertaining thereto are ascribed to King David. Thus, it is to the period of his reign that I Par. refers the introduction of the system of courses whereby the whole sacerdotal body was divided into classes, named after their respective chiefs and presided over by them. They carried out their various functions week by week, their particular duties being determined by lot (cf. Luke, i, 5–9). We read also that during the reign of David the rest of the Levites, to the number of thirty-eight thousand, ranging from the age of thirty years and upwards receive a special organization (I Par., xxiii–xxvi). Levites are mentioned only three times in the New Testament (Luke, x, 32; John, i, 19; Acts, iv, 36), and these references throw no light on their status in the time of Christ.

LEGENDRE in VIG., *Dict. de la Bible*, s. v. *Lévi, Tribu de* (III); BAUDISSIN in HAST., *Dict. of the Bible*, s. v. *Priests and Levites;* GIGOT, *Outlines of Jewish History*, viii, § 2, etc.

JAMES F. DRISCOLL.

Leviticus, the third book of the Pentateuch, so called because it treats of the offices, ministries, rites, and ceremonies of the priests and Levites (see PENTATEUCH).

Lewis, DAVID. See BAKER, CHARLES, VENERABLE.

Lex (LAW).—The etymology of the Latin word *lex* is a subject of controversy. Some authorities derive it from the Old Norse *lög*, neuter plural of *lag*, which would be the root of the English *law*, signifying "to put in order", "put in place". Others derive it from the Latin *legere*, "to read", thus giving it an exclusively Latin origin (Bréal, "Sur l'origine des mots désignant le droit et la loi en latin" in "Nouvelle Revue historique de droit français et étranger", VII, Paris, 1883, 610–11). We shall not examine here the divers meanings of the word *law*, but merely treat of certain expressions beginning with the word *lex* or *leges*.

(1) *Roman Use.*—The word *lex* followed by a personal name in the feminine gender (Lex Julia, Lex Papia Poppæa) signified, in Roman Law, a *lex rogata*, i. e. a legislative enactment that was the outcome of an interrogation (from *rogare*) by the magistrate of the Roman people: the magistrate proposed the law to the citizens, and they declared their acceptance. The law was called by the family name of the author or authors of the proposal.

(2) *Leges Romanæ of Teutonic Peoples.*—While official or private collections of Roman Law made under the Empire are called *codices*, e. g. "Codex Theodosianus", probably because they were written on parchment sheets bound together in book form, the title *lex* was given to collections of Roman Law made by order of the barbarian kings for such of their subjects as followed that legislation. When the Teutonic tribes occupied territories that had once belonged to the empire, the natives of these territories continued to follow the Roman Law. It was for them that Alaric II, King of the Visigoths, published, probably in 506, the "Lex Romana Wisigothorum" (Roman Law of the Visigoths); according to the most probable opinion, he wished to reduce the number of sources that the lawyers of those days had to consult for the Roman Law, and which were too numerous for them to understand thoroughly. This code was only one year in force in Gaul, but it lasted in Spain till the middle of the seventh century. So long as it continued to be applied as the personal law of Romans under the Gothic regime, it was the accepted form of Roman Law in the West. It is also called "Breviarium Alarici" (Résumé of Alaric), or "Breviarium Aniani", from the name of the referendary by whom the copies of the "Lex Romana Wisigothorum" were signed; even the name "Lex Romana" was sometimes given to it. The "Lex Romana Burgundionum" is due to the initiative of Gundobad, King of the Burgundians (d. 516). It was enacted for the Gallo-Roman subjects of his kingdom, and was not, like the preceding collection, a résumé of the Roman Law, but rather a kind of official instruction drawn up for the use of judges, calling their attention to the more important points of Roman legislation. This collection is known also as "Papianus", or "Liber Papiani". The "Lex Romana Rætica Curiensis" is of a later date (middle of the eighth or beginning of the ninth century), and differs very much in character from the preceding "leges"; it is a collection containing extracts from the "Lex Romana Wisigothorum"

and enactments from German law, drawn up for Rhætia and the Grisons. With these might be mentioned the "Lex Dei quam precepit Dominus ad Moysen" (Law which God gave to Moses), now commonly known as "Collatio legum Mosaicarum et Romanarum", a comparison of Mosaic and Roman laws made by a Christian between 390 and 438, to show the extent to which they agreed. The "Lex Romana canonice compta" (i. e. *concepta* or *composita*) is a collection of Roman laws made in Italy in the ninth century (after 825). It comprises those enactments of the Roman Law, and especially of the Justinian Code, which were of special import to the Church.

(3) *Leges Barbarorum.*—This title denotes the collections of laws drawn up by the barbarian kings for their Teutonic subjects. It is difficult to assign a precise date to each of these collections; several of them were reissued at a later period, and the earliest form has not always been preserved. The most ancient of these compilations is the "Lex Salica", the earliest redaction of which does not indicate clearly a Christian or a pagan origin; it is believed to date from the reign of Clovis, between the years 486 and 496. The most important new redaction is the "Lex Salica emendata" (a Carolo magno emendata), a product of the Carlovingian age, though apparently it cannot be attributed to Charlemagne. In the fourteenth century the Salic Law was invoked to exclude women from the succession to the French throne. The "Lex Ribuaria", or "Ripuaria", reproduces in part the Salic Law, but it is manifestly influenced by Christianity and the Roman Law. It was drawn up by the authority of a Frankish king, and in its primitive form dates apparently from the sixth century. The "Lex Barbara Burgundionum" belongs to the fifth century and is attributed to King Gundobad, who promulgated the "Lex Romana Burgundionum"; under the Carlovingians it was ordinarily called the "Lex Gundeboda", law of Gondebaud, whence its French name, "Loi Gombette". It is a collection of the ordinances of that prince and his predecessors. The first redaction of the "Lex Barbara Wisigothorum" belongs to the reign of King Euric (466–84), but it was revised by several of his successors. In the complete form in which it has reached us, it cannot be older than the end of the seventh century. It was modified by the Justinian Code and especially by the influence of Christianity. The "Lex Allamanorum" (Law of the Allamani) was drawn up in its definitive form probably between the years 717 and 719 by Duke Lanfridus; the "Lex Bajuwariorum" (Law of the Bavarians) about 748–52; the "Lex Frisionum" (Law of the Frisians) dates back to the second half of the eighth century. Authorities attribute to the Synod of Aachen (802 or 803) the "Lex Saxonum" (Law of the Saxons), and the "Lex Angliorum et Werinorum, hoc est Thuringorum" promulgated for the inhabitants of northeastern Thuringia. The "Lex Chamavorum" (Law of the Chamavi, identified with the inhabitants of the Lower Rhine and the Yssel and the Netherlands territory of Drenthe) was composed about the end of the eighth or beginning of the ninth century (about 802?). The first version of the "Edictus", or "Lex Longobardorum", enacted for the Lombards of Italy, belongs to the year 643. It was revised by King Grimoald in 668 and by King Liutprand between 713 and 735, while additions to it were made by King Ratchis in 745–46 and King Aistulf in 755. A critical edition of the "Leges Barbarorum" and of certain "Leges Romanorum" is published in "Mon. Germ. Hist.: Leges", III–V (Hanover, 1863–89), and "Legum Sectio I", I–II (Hanover, 1902).



THE BEGINNING OF THE PROLOGUE OF THE LEX SALICA
From an VIII-century MS. in the Stiftsbibliothek, St-Gall

(4) *In the Middle Ages.*—In this period *lex* was employed to denote a body of rights. The name *lex metropolitana* signified all the rights of a metropolitan over the suffragan bishops of his province (c. xi, "De officio judicis ordinarii", X, I, xxxi); by the name *lex diœcesana* (c. ix, "De majoritate et obedientia", X, I, xxxiii), or *lex diœcesanæ jurisdictionis* (c. ix, "De hæreticis", X, V, vii), was meant all the rights of a bishop in his diocese. However, a distinction was drawn later both by law and by the doctors between the *lex diœcesana* and the *lex jurisdictionis* (c. xviii, "De officio judicis ordinarii", X, I, xxxi), the former dealing with the profitable rights of the bishop to certain fixed incomes like the *procuratio*, the *cathedraticum*, etc., and the latter treating of the other rights of the bishop, e. g. the exercise of jurisdiction in contentious matters, the ministry of souls, the power and

right of ordaining. This distinction was made in view of the exemptions which the religious orders enjoyed in their relations with the bishops. The definition given of these two *leges* by Benedict XIV does not seem accurate; according to that learned canonist (De synodo diœcesana, I, iv, n. 3), the *lex jurisdictionis* is the complexus of rights which a bishop has over exempted regulars; the *lex diœcesana*, the complexus of episcopal rights from which the regular orders are exempt (Scherer, "Handbuch des Kirchenrechtes", I, Graz, 1886, 560). This distinction is no longer of any practical importance.

MOMMSEN, *Manuel des antiquités romaines*, French tr. GIRARD, VI (Paris, 1888), i, 351 sqq.; KRUGER, *Histoire des sources du droit romain*, French tr. BRISSAUD (Paris, 1894); ESMEIN, *Cours élémentaire d'histoire du droit français* (4th ed., Paris, 1908); VIOLLET, *Histoire du droit civil français* (Paris, 1893); BRUNNER, *Deutsche Rechtsgeschichte* (Leipzig, 1887).

A. VAN HOVE.

Lezana, JUAN BAUTISTA DE, theologian, b. at Madrid, 23 Nov., 1586; d. in Rome, 29 March, 1659. He took the habit at Alberca, in Old Castile, 18 Oct., 1600, and made his profession at the house of the Carmelites of the Old Observance, at Madrid, in 1602; studied philosophy at Toledo, theology at Salamanca, partly at the college of the order, partly at the university under Juan Marquez, and finally at Alcalá under Luis de Montesion. For some years he was employed as lecturer at Toledo and Alcalá, but having been sent to the general chapter of 1625 as delegate of his province, he remained in Rome as professor of theology. At the following chapter (1645), at which he assisted in the quality of titular provincial of the Holy Land, he obtained some votes for the generalship, but remaining in the minority he was nominated assistant general; for some years he also filled the office of procurator general. In addition to these dignities within the order, he filled for sixteen years the chair of metaphysics at the Sapienza, and became consultor to the Congregation of the Index under Urban VIII, and to that of Rites under Innocent X. Appointed to a bishopric, he requested a saintly nun to recommend an important matter (the nature of which he did not disclose) to Our Lord in prayer, and received through her the answer, which he acted upon, that it would be more perfect for him to refuse the dignity.

Lezana was a great authority on canon law, dogmatic theology, and philosophy, and his writings on these subjects still carry weight. His historical works, however, are not of the same high standard. A notice on his "Annals of the Carmelite Order" (four folio vols. were published between 1645 and 1656, and there remains another vol. in MS.) will be found in the bibliography accompanying the article CARMELITE ORDER. The following are the principal products of his indefatigable pen: (1) "Liber apologeticus pro Immaculata Conceptione" (Madrid, 1616). (2) "De regularium reformatione" (Rome, 1627), four times reprinted and translated into French, although it is doubtful whether the translation appeared in print. (3) "Summa quæstionum regularium", five vols., the first of which appeared in Rome (1637), the last in 1647, most of them were repeatedly reprinted. (4) and (5) Two works, "Columna immobilis", and "Turris Davidica", on the Blessed Virgin del Pilar, at Saragossa (1655 and 1656). (6) "Maria patrona" (Rome, 1648). (7) Life of St. Mary Magdalene de Pazzi, in Spanish (Rome, 1648). (8) "Summa theologiæ sacræ" (3 vols., Rome, 1651 sqq.). (9) "Consulta varia theologica" (Venice, 1656). Also some less important works.

B. ZIMMERMAN.

L'Hospital, MICHEL DE, b. at Aigueperse, about 1504; d. at Courdimanche, 13 March, 1573. While very young he went to Italy to join his father, who had been a follower of the traitor, the Constable of Bourbon, in the camp of Charles V. He acquired his juridical training first as a student at Padua and then as auditor of the Rota at Rome, and in 1537 became a councillor of the Parliament of Paris. In 1547 he was charged by Henry II with a mission to the œcumenical council, which had been transferred from Trent to Bologna, returning after sixteen months to take his seat in the Parliament. He was next appointed chancellor of Berry by Marguerite of France, the daughter of Francis I, in 1554 became first president of the court of exchequer (*chambre des comptes*), and, upon the accession of Francis II (1559), entered the privy council through the patronage of the Guises. Catharine de' Medici appointed him chancellor in 1560. On the one hand, L'Hospital had written a eulogy in Latin verse on the Duke of Guise and the Cardinal of Lorraine; on the other hand, he was the husband of a Protestant wife, and had had his children brought up Protestants. At the opening of his career as chancellor his complex personality is thus described by Brantôme: "He was held to be a Huguenot, though he went to Mass; but at court they said, 'God save us from L'Hospital's Mass!'" Théodore de Bèze had had a portrait of L'Hospital made, in which he was represented with a lighted torch behind his back, a way of indicating that the chancellor had known the "light" of the Reformation, but would not look at it. As a matter of fact, the policy of tolerance, of which he was the apostle in France, was, perhaps, inspired by a certain scepticism; the differences of religious belief seemed to him less serious and less profound than they really were; he would have readily classed in the same category the Council of Trent and certain Calvinistic manifestations, as equally embarrassing to the State; and the state of mind of which he was a representative was much nearer to that of the eighteenth-century philosophers than it was to that of men living in his own day, whether Protestants or Catholics.



MICHEL DE L'HOSPITAL

The Edict of Romorantin (May, 1560) gave to the bishops criminal jurisdiction in cases of heresy, and to the secular courts the function of punishing the offence of holding Protestant meetings. This was L'Hospital's first efforts to draw the line between spiritual and temporal—between the religion of the kingdom and its police regulation. His address at the opening of the States General of Orléans (13 December, 1560) is summed up in these words: "The knife is worth little against the spirit. We must garnish ourselves with virtues and good morals, and then assail the Protestants with weapons of charity, prayers, persuasion, the word of God. Away with those diabolical names, Lutheran, Huguenot, Papist—names of factions and seditions. Let us keep to the name of Christian." To this programme of tolerance he added some extremely severe threats against Protestants who should stir up seditions, while, on the other hand, the religious articles of the Ordinance of Orléans (31 January, 1561) essayed to bring back the Church of France to the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges, to restore to it certain elective franchises, and thus to do away with the exclusive rights which the pope and the king had exercised over it since the concordat of Francis I. On 19 April, 1561, L'Hospital sent to the governors, without

previously submitting it to the Parliament, an edict granting to all subjects the right of worshipping as they pleased in their own homes. In July, 1561, he caused all prosecutions for religious opinions to be suspended until a "council" should be assembled. This "council", which was the Colloquy of Poissy, resulted in nothing. By another edict (15 January, 1562) he granted to the Protestants liberty of worship outside of cities, and recognized their right to hold meetings in private houses, even within the limits of cities. This edict the Protestants always regarded as a kind of charter of enfranchisement, and during the religious wars they constantly demanded its restoration.

But other measures touching the Church, taken by L'Hospital at the same time, gave the Holy See good reason for uneasiness. He caused a thesis on the pope to be denounced before the Parliament, because it seemed to him too ultramontane; he opposed the monitorium by which Pius IV had invited Jeanne d'Albret to appear in France before the Inquisition. At last Pius IV in 1562 requested of the French Court that the chancellor be dismissed. L'Hospital, in fact, was not present at the conclusion of the council which decided on war against Condé and the Protestants; he returned to court only after this first war of religion, when the Edict of Amboise (19 March, 1563) restored religious peace by guaranteeing certain liberties to the Protestants. He agreed with Catharine de' Medici that the cause of peace would be served by having Charles IX declared of age, and by letting him make a progress through the country. The declaration of the king's majority took place in 1563, and from 1564 to 1566 L'Hospital caused him to make an extensive journey through France. During this tour the Ordinance of Moulins (February, 1566) was promulgated by the chancellor, to reform the administration of justice. But L'Hospital's plans failed; party violence continued, and the Catholics blamed him for his indulgence towards the Protestants, all the more bitterly because he refused to let the Council of Trent be published in France. In February, 1564, he had declared himself so strongly against the acceptance of the Tridentine decrees that the Cardinal of Lorraine exclaimed: "You should take off your mask and embrace Protestantism." The same cardinal also, when he appeared before L'Hospital at Moulins (February, 1566) to demand the abrogation of the Edict of Amboise, treated him as a worthless fellow (*bélître*).

Meanwhile, suspicion of him continued to increase in the Catholic camp, and after the Protestants had made an attempt at Meaux (26–28 September, 1567) to get possession of the king's person, thus precipitating the second war of religion, Catharine de' Medici turned against the chancellor with the brutal words: "It is you who have brought us to this pass with your counsels of moderation". From that day the policy of moderation, which had been L'Hospital's dream, was exploded; his repeated assurances of Huguenot loyalty were belied by the conspiracy of Meaux, and he retired, disheartened, to his estate at Vignay. Irremovable as chancellor, he had to give up the seals on 24 May, 1568. He followed from a distance the events which little by little brought Catharine de' Medici to the Massacre of St. Bartholomew. His daughter, who was in Paris at the time of the massacre, was saved through the protection of François de Guise's widow. L'Hospital himself and his wife were threatened by the peasantry of Vignay, and a report was spread that they had been killed; Catharine sent some soldiers to protect him. On 1 February, 1573, the Court compelled L'Hospital to resign the chancellorship, and he died six weeks later. His Latin poems, which in the seventeenth century had passed into the hands of Jan de Witt, grand pensionary of Holland, were published in 1732, in a more complete edition than that of his grandson (1585). His complete works, edited by Dufey, appeared at Paris, in 1824, in five volumes.

VILLEMAIN, *Etudes d'Histoire moderne* (2nd ed., Paris, 1856); AMPHOUX, *Michel de L'Hôpital et la liberté de conscience au XVI^e siècle* (Paris, 1900); ATKINSON, *Michel de L'Hospital* (London, 1900); DUPRÉ-LASALE, *Michel de L'Hospital avant son élévation au poste de chancelier de France* (2 vols., Paris, 1875–1899); SHAW, *Michel de L'Hospital and His Policy* (London, 1905).

GEORGES GOYAU.

Liafwin (LIEFWIN), SAINT. See LEBWIN, SAINT.

Liao-tung. See MANCHURIA.

Libel (Lat. *libellus*, a little book), a malicious publication by writing, printing, picture, effigy, sign, or otherwise than by mere speech, which exposes any living person, or the memory of any person deceased, to hatred, contempt, ridicule, or obloquy, or which causes or tends to cause any person to be ashamed or avoided, or which has a tendency to injure any person, corporation, or association of persons, in his, her, or its business or occupation. The use of the word *libel*, as relating to defamatory writings, seems to have originated early in the sixteenth century. Such a writing then became known as a *libellus famosus*, i. e., a scurrilous or defamatory pamphlet. Since the earliest ages every civilized community has provided for the protection of the citizen from defamation of character, and practically the same theories of redress and penalties as exist to-day were held under the very ancient laws. The Mosaic law provided penalties for the offence (Ex., xxiii), and under the laws of Solon it was punished by a severe fine. A libel may be either a civil injury or a criminal offence. The theory upon which it is made the subject of criminal law is that it is calculated to cause a breach of the public peace. Libel differs essentially from slander, in that it may be the subject of both criminal and civil litigation, whereas slander is not a criminal offence.

Many statements may be actionable *per se* when written, or printed, and published, which would not be actionable if merely spoken, without claiming and proving special damage. Thus, unwritten words imputing immoral conduct are not actionable *per se* unless the misconduct imputed amounts to a criminal offence, for which the person slandered may be indicted. If the published matter holds a person up to public scorn, contempt, and ridicule, it is libellous *per se*. Libel *per se* embraces all cases which would be actionable if made orally, and also embraces all other cases where the additional gravity imparted to the charge by the publication can fairly be supposed to make it damaging. The nature of the charge must be such that the court can legally presume that the plaintiff has been degraded in the estimation of his acquaintances or of the public, or has suffered some loss, either to his property, character, or business, or in his domestic or social relations, in consequence of the publication of such charges. Compensation for mental suffering caused by the libel may be included in the damages recovered. In cases of libels upon the dead, although no private injury in the ordinary sense results to anyone, they are properly the subject of criminal prosecution, as being likely to cause a breach of the peace, on account of the resentment of the surviving relatives.

In criminal prosecution in Great Britain, and in many jurisdictions in America, for many years the jury have been made judges of both the law and the fact (Fox's Criminal Libel Act, 32 George III, c. 60). In such cases it is still the duty of the presiding judge to inform and instruct the jury as to the law of evidence, and to decide all questions arising in that regard.

The law of libel is not limited to injuries done to personal reputation, but also includes the protection of the reputation of property; and this form of libel is commonly called slander of title. Slander of title was actionable at common law upon proof of special damage. A claim of title made in good faith, however,

and upon probable cause cannot be considered as furnishing grounds for a cause of action, but the principle sustaining this form of actionable libel is well-established. A corporation can maintain an action for libel *per se* when the libel necessarily and directly occasions pecuniary injury. A distinction between criticism and defamation is, that criticism deals only with such things as invite public attention or call for public comment, and does not follow a man into his private life, or pry into his domestic concerns. It never attacks the individual, but only his work. A criticism of a public man, consisting of imputations upon his motives, which arise fairly and legitimately out of his conduct, is generally regarded as justifiable.

Publication.—To constitute a libel there must be a publication, as well as a writing. While a defamatory writing is not libel if it remains with the writer undelivered, yet if it goes to other hands, even inadvertently, there has been a publication. The writing must go into the hands of persons who by a knowledge of the language or of reading are able to become acquainted with its contents. In relation to criminal libel, it has been adjudged that, even if the defamatory communication has been seen by no one but the person to whom it is addressed, a case has been made out, as in such an event it is likely to cause a breach of the public peace. [Barrow v. Lewellen, Hobart's (K. B.) Reports, 62 a (152); Lyle v. Clason, 1 Cairnes (N. Y.), 581.]

Malice.—It is an essential ingredient in both libel and slander that the defamation be malicious. A distinction is made between malice in fact and malice in law. In a legal sense, any act done wilfully to the prejudice and injury of another, which is unlawful, is, as against that person, malicious. The falsity of the charge establishes a presumption of malice. It is not necessary to render an act in law malicious that the party be actuated by a feeling of hatred or ill-will toward the individual, but if in pursuing a design, even if actuated by a general good purpose, he wilfully inflicts a wrong on others which is not warranted by law, such act is malicious.

Privileged Communications. — A communication made to a person entitled to, or interested in, the communication, by one who is also interested in or entitled to make it, or who stood in such a relation to the former as to afford a reasonable ground for supposing his motive innocent, is presumed not to be malicious, and is called a privileged communication. To support the claim of privilege there must be something more than a social or moral duty, for, no matter how praiseworthy the motive may be, unless the circumstances are such, in the opinion of the court, as to come within the above definition, privilege cannot be successfully pleaded. Two elements must exist: not only must the occasion create the privilege, but the occasion must be made use of *bona fide* and without malice. Reports of proceedings in legislative assemblies and in judicial tribunals (where the published matter is pertinent to any cause of which the court has jurisdiction) are absolutely privileged.

Justification.—The truth of a charge is always a justification and a complete answer to a civil proceeding for libel. In criminal proceedings it is the general rule that it must be shown in addition that the publication was for the public benefit and for justifiable ends. This has been the law in almost all of the United States for many years, and in Great Britain since 1843 (6 and 7 Victoria, c. 96). Formerly in criminal cases the truth of the charges constituting the alleged libel was no defence, the rule being embodied in the maxim, "The greater the truth the greater the libel". There was substantial reason for this theory, as it was deemed that a truthful defamatory statement was more apt to cause a breach of the public peace than one that was untrue. It is a well-established and universal fact that courts will never assume that there has been wrongdoing, and the burden in both civil and criminal litigation is upon the person making the charge to sustain it. Moreover, if the defamatory matter consists of charges involving moral turpitude, and subject to criminal prosecution, the requirements as to the proof of the truth of the same are substantially as strict as if the person claiming to have been defamed was on trial for the alleged offences.

A striking and interesting illustration of the application of this rule is to be found in the record of the case of the Queen against Newman, the defendant being Dr. (afterwards Cardinal) Newman. This was a proceeding for criminal libel instituted by Giovanni G. Achilli, who had formerly been a priest of the Catholic Church, but had been disciplined and suspended by the ecclesiastical authorities. The complainant, prior to the publication, had been delivering public addresses, attacking the Church and its institutions, and giving a wrong impression as to the circumstances connected with his suspension. Dr. Newman published a statement setting forth the facts in relation to the complainant's suspension, and making specific charges of a number of instances of sexual immorality, in one case a young girl of about fifteen years being involved. The acts charged took place on the Continent of Europe, and the persons who could have supported the statement by their testimony were beyond the jurisdiction of the English court in which the proceeding was conducted. Dr. Newman was, therefore, unable to prove the truth of the twenty-one charges made, except the one in relation to the proceedings conducted by the Church, and which was supported by documentary evidence. He had pleaded the truth of the alleged libel under the statute of Victoria. The court found him guilty and he was fined one hundred pounds.

It may be generally stated that any circumstances that would appeal to a reasonable person as being mitigating may be introduced in evidence in either criminal or civil litigation under a plea of mitigation, even including a belief in the truth of the matter, or an attempt subsequently to repair the alleged wrong by a retraction or apology.

Munroe, *English Dictionary of Historical Principles* (Oxford, 1903); Cooley, *Wrongs and their Remedies*, I: *Torts* (Chicago, 1888); *New York Penal Code; Blackstone's Commentaries;* Wendell, *Starkie on Slander and Libel* (West Brookfield, Massachusetts, 1852).

Eugene A. Philbin.

Libellatici, Libelli.—The *libelli* were certificates issued to Christians of the third century. They were of two kinds: (1) certificates of conformity, to attest that the holders had conformed to the religious tests required by the edict of Decius; (2) certificates of indulgence, in which the confessors or martyrs interceded for the *lapsi* (i. e. those who had apostatized). The opprobrious term *libellatici* is applied only to holders of the former kind. The edict of Decius (Dec., 249, or Jan., 250), coming as it did after a comparatively long period of peace, frightened many Christians into submission. But the methods and extent of submission were of several kinds: the *lapsi* might be: (a) *apostates*, who had entirely abandoned their religion, or (b) *sacrificati, thurificati*, who had taken part in the pagan rites, or (c) *libellatici*, who had secured certificates (*libelli*) of conformity from the proper civil authorities. Three such *libelli* are extant, all of them of Egyptian origin ("Oxyrhynchus Papyri", IV, 658; Gebhardt, "Acta Martyrum Selecta"). Therein the petitioner declares that he was ever constant in sacrificing to the gods, and has actually performed the test of conformity, in attestation of which he begs the pagan commissioners to sign this certificate. However, it seems that the declaration was sometimes accepted for the deed, or the deed itself performed by proxy; and no doubt the docu-

ment might be bought from amenable commissioners without any declaration of paganism.

It was in connexion with the reconciliation of these *libellatici* as well as other *lapsi* that the *libelli pacis*, or letters of indulgence, were introduced. The *lapsi* were in the habit of seeking the intercession of the confessors, who were suffering for the Faith; and the latter would address to the bishop *libelli pacis* petitioning for the reconciliation of the apostates. The *libelli* were, however, more than mere recommendations to mercy; the confessors were understood to be petitioning that their own merits should be applied to the excommunicated, and procure them a remission of the temporal punishment due to their defection. And this indulgence was not simply a remission of the canonical penance; it was believed that it availed before God and remitted the temporal punishment that would otherwise be required after death (Cyprian, "De Lapsis", ad fin.). This custom does not seem to have been established in Rome, but it was particularly prevalent in Carthage, and was not unknown in Egypt and Asia Minor. Even in the time of Tertullian, the *lapsi* of Carthage were in the habit of thus appealing to the intercession of the confessors ("Ad Mart.", i; "De Pudicitia", xxii). In the letters that Saint Cyprian wrote from his place of exile he has frequent occasion to complain of the abuse of the *libelli*. There was a party of laxists who ignored the necessity of the bishop's sanction, and their leader actually promulgated a general indulgence to all the *lapsi* (Cyprian, "Epp.", xxxiv, 23). The confessors themselves seem to have lacked discretion in the petitions they presented. Cyprian's letter to them (ep. xv), couched though it is in the tenderest of terms, begs them to be more judicious, to avoid vague petitions, such as "Let him and his people be received into communion", and not to lend their services to the schemes of the seditious or the avarice of traffickers. The bishop's own method of treating the petitions for indulgence varied according to circumstances. Ep. xviii contains instructions that the *lapsi* who held such letters should be reconciled in case of sickness. Subsequently, however, owing no doubt to the abovementioned abuses and the need for wider methods, the *libelli* were not given any special mention in the general conditions of reconciliation (African Councils, I, 38).

See the *Letters* of St. Cyprian, e. g. in *P. L.*, IV and V; and notably his treatise *De Lapsis; Vita S. Cypriani per Pontium diaconum ejus scripta;* Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, IV, xlii; Benson, *Cyprian* (London, 1897); Allard, *Histoire des Persécutions*, II (2nd ed., Paris, 1896), viii.

James Bridge.

Liberalism, a free way of thinking and acting in private and public life. I.—Definition.—The word *liberal* is derived from the Latin *liber*, free, and up to the end of the eighteenth century signified only "worthy of a free man", so that people spoke of "liberal arts", "liberal occupations". Later the term was applied also to those qualities of intellect and of character, which were considered an ornament becoming those who occupied a higher social position on account of their wealth and education. Thus *liberal* got the meaning of intellectually independent, broad-minded, magnanimous, frank, open, and genial. Again Liberalism may also mean a political system or tendency opposed to centralization and absolutism. In this sense Liberalism is not at variance with the spirit and teaching of the Catholic Church. Since the end of the eighteenth century, however, the word has been applied more and more to certain tendencies in the intellectual, religious, political, and economical life, which implied a partial or total emancipation of man from the supernatural, moral, and Divine order. Usually, the principles of 1789, that is of the French Revolution, are considered as the Magna Charta of this new form of Liberalism. The most fundamental principle asserts an absolute and unrestrained freedom of thought, religion, conscience, creed, speech, press, and politics. The necessary consequences of this are, on the one hand, the abolition of the Divine right and of every kind of authority derived from God; the relegation of religion from the public life into the private domain of one's individual conscience; the absolute ignoring of Christianity and the Church as public, legal, and social institutions; on the other hand, the putting into practice of the absolute autonomy of every man and citizen, along all lines of human activity, and the concentration of all public authority in one "sovereignty of the people". This sovereignty of the people in all branches of public life as legislation, administration, and jurisdiction, is to be exercised in the name and by order of all the citizens, in such a way, that all should have share in and a control over it. A fundamental principle of Liberalism is the proposition: "It is contrary to the natural, innate, and inalienable right and liberty and dignity of man, to subject himself to an authority, the root, rule, measure, and sanction of which is not in himself". This principle implies the denial of all true authority; for authority necessarily presupposes a power outside and above man to bind him morally.

These tendencies, however, were more or less active long before 1789; indeed, they are coeval with the human race. Modern Liberalism adopts and propagates them under the deceiving mask of Liberalism in the true sense. As a direct offspring of Humanism and the Reformation in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, modern Liberalism was further developed by the philosophers and *literati* of England especially Locke and Hume, by Rousseau and the Encyclopedists in France, and by Lessing and Kant in Germany. Its real cradle, however, was the drawing-rooms of the moderately free-thinking French nobility (1730–1789), especially those of Mme Necker and her daughter, Mme de Staël. The latter was more than anybody else the connecting link between the free-thinking elements before and after the Revolution and the centre of the modern Liberal movement both in France and Switzerland. In her politico-religious views she is intimately connected with Mirabeau and the Constitutional party of the Revolution. These views find their clearest exposition in her work "Considérations sur les principaux événements de la Révolution française". She pleads for the greatest possible individual liberty, and denounces as absurd the derivation of human authority from God. The legal position of the Church, according to her, both as a public institution and as a property-owner is a national arrangement and therefore entirely subject to the will of the nation; ecclesiastical property belongs not to the church but to the nation; the abolition of ecclesiastical privileges is entirely justified, since the clergy is the natural enemy of the principles of Revolution. The ideal form of government is in smaller states the republic, in larger ones the constitutional monarchy after the model of England. The entire art of government in modern times, consists, according to Mme de Staël, in the art of directing public opinion and of yielding to it at the right moment.

II.—Development and Principal Types of Modern Liberalism in non-English-speaking Countries.—Since the so-called Liberal principles of 1789 are based upon a wrong notion of human liberty, and are and must forever be contradictory and indefinite in themselves, it is an impossibility in practical life to carry them into effect with much consistency. Consequently the most varying kinds and shades of Liberalism have been developed, all of which remained in fact more conservative than a logical application of Liberal principles would warrant. Liberalism was first formulated by the Protestant Genevese (Rousseau, Necker, Mme de Staël, Constant, Guizot);

nevertheless it was from France, that it spread over the rest of the world, as did its different representative types. These developed in closest connexion with the different Revolutions in Europe since 1789. The principal types are:—

(A)—*Anti-ecclesiastical Liberalism.*—(1) The old Liberalism, first advocated by Mme de Staël and Constant. It may be described as the drawing-room Liberalism of the free-thinking educated classes, who, however, did not condescend to become practical politicians or statesmen; they were superior observers, infallible critics, standing above all parties. In later days some few of these old Liberals, animated by a truly liberal chivalry, stood up for the rights of suppressed minorities against Jacobin majorities, for instance, Littré and Laboulaye in France (1879–1880). (2) Closely connected with this old Liberalism of Mme de Staël is doctrinaire Liberalism which originated in the lecture-hall of Royer-Collard and in the salon of the Duc de Broglie (1814–1830). It was the Liberalism of the practical politicians and statesmen, who intended to re-establish, maintain, and develop, in the different states, the constitutional form of government based upon the principles of 1789. The most prominent representatives of this body were, besides de Broglie, Royer-Collard, Guizot in France, Cavour in Italy, von Rotteck and his partisans in Germany.

(3) Bourgeois Liberalism, was the natural outgrowth of doctrinaire Liberalism. It adapted itself more to the interests of the propertied and moneyed classes; for the clergy and nobility having been dispossessed of their political power, these were the only classes which could make use of the new institutions, the people not being sufficiently instructed and organized to do so. The rich industrial classes, therefore, were from the very beginning and in all countries the mainstay of Liberalism, and Liberalism for its part was forced to further their interests. This kind of bourgeois Liberalism enjoyed its highest favour in France during the time of the citizen-king, Louis-Philippe (1830–40), who openly avowed his dependence upon it. It flourished in Germany, as "national Liberalism", in Austria, as "political Liberalism in general", in France, as the Liberalism of Gambetta's Opportunist party. Its characteristic traits are materialistic, sordid ideals, which care only for unrestrained enjoyment of life, egoism in exploiting the economically weak by means of tariffs which are for the interests of the classes, a systematic persecution of Christianity and especially of the Catholic Church and her institutions, a frivolous disregard and even a mocking contempt of the Divine moral order, a cynical indifference in the choice and use of means—slander, corruption, fraud, etc.—in fighting one's opponents and in acquiring an absolute mastery and control of everything.

(4) The Liberal "parties of progress" are in opposition to the Conservatives and the Liberals of the bourgeois classes, in so far as these, when once in power, usually care little or nothing for further improvements according to their Liberal principles, whereas the former lay more stress on the fundamental tenets of Liberalism themselves and fight against a cynical one-sided policy of self-interest; for this reason they appear to an outsider more fair-minded. (5) Liberal Radicals are adherents of progressive modern ideas, which they try to realize without consideration for the existing order or for other people's rights, ideas, and feelings. Such was the first Liberal political party, the Spanish Jacobinos in 1810. This is the Radicalism, which under the mask of liberty is now annihilating the rights of Catholics in France. (6) The Liberal Democrats want to make the masses of the common people the deciding factor in public affairs. They rely especially on the middle classes, whose interests they pretend to have at heart. (7) Socialism is the Liberalism of self-interest nurtured by all classes of Liberals described above, and espoused by the members of the fourth estate and the proletariat. It is at the same time nothing but the natural reaction against a one-sided policy of self-interest. Its main branches are: (a) Communism, which tries to reorganize the social conditions by abolishing all private ownership; (b) Radical Social Democracy of Marx (founded 1848), common in Germany and Austria; (c) Moderate Socialism (Democratic Socialistic Federation in England, Possibilists in France, etc.); (d) Anarchist parties founded by Bakunin, Most, and Krapotkin, after 1868, for some periods allied to Social Democracy. Anarchism as a system is relatively the most logical and radical development of the Liberal principles.

(B)—*Ecclesiastical Liberalism* (*Liberal Catholicism*). —(1) The prevailing political form of modern Liberal Catholicism, is that which would regulate the relations of the Church to the State and modern society in accordance with the Liberal principles as expounded by Benjamin Constant. It had its predecessors and patterns in Gallicanism, Febronianism, and Josephinism. Founded 1828 by Lamennais, the system was later defended in some respects by Lacordaire, Montalembert, Parisis, Dupanloup, and Falloux. (2) The more theological and religious form of Liberal Catholicism had its predecessors in Jansenism and Josephinism; it aims at certain reforms in ecclesiastical doctrine and discipline in accordance with the anti-ecclesiastical liberal Protestant theory and atheistical "science and enlightenment" prevailing at the time. The newest phases of this Liberalism were condemned by Pius X as Modernism. In general it advocates latitude in interpreting dogma, oversight or disregard of the disciplinary and doctrinal decrees of the Roman Congregations, sympathy with the State even in its enactments against the liberty of the Church, in the action of her bishops, clergy, religious orders and congregations, and a disposition to regard as clericalism the efforts of the Church to protect the rights of the family and of individuals to the free exercise of religion.

III. Condemnation of Liberalism by the Church.—By proclaiming man's absolute autonomy in the intellectual, moral and social order, Liberalism denies, at least practically, God and supernatural religion. If carried out logically, it leads even to a theoretical denial of God, by putting deified mankind in place of God. It has been censured in the condemnations of Rationalism and Naturalism. The most solemn condemnation of Naturalism and Rationalism was contained in the Constitution "De Fide" of the Vatican Council (1870); the most explicit and detailed condemnation, however, was administered to modern Liberalism by Pius IX in the Encyclical "Quanta cura" of 8 December, 1864 and the attached Syllabus. Pius X condemned it again in his allocution of 17 April, 1907, and in the Decree of the Congregation of the Inquisition of 3 July, 1907, in which the principal errors of Modernism were rejected and censured in sixty-five propositions. The older and principally political form of false Liberal Catholicism had been condemned by the Encyclical of Gregory XVI, "Mirari Vos", of 15 August, 1832 and by many briefs of Pius IX (see Ségur, "Hommage aux Catholiques Libéraux", Paris, 1875). The definition of the papal infallibility by the Vatican council was virtually a condemnation of Liberalism. Besides this many recent decisions concern the principal errors of Liberalism. Of great importance in this respect are the allocutions and encyclicals of Pius IX, Leo XIII, and Pius X. (Cf., "Recueil des allocutions consistorales encycliques . . . citées dans le Syllabus", Paris, 1865) and the encyclicals of Leo XIII of 20 January, 1888, "On Human Liberty"; of 21 April, 1878, "On the Evils of Modern Society"; of 28 December, 1878, "On the Sects of the Socialists, Communists, and Nihilists"; of 4 August,

1879, "On Christian Philosophy"; of 10 February, 1880, "On Matrimony"; of 29 July, 1881, "On the Origin of Civil Power"; of 20 April, 1884, "On Freemasonry"; of 1 November, 1885, "On the Christian State"; of 25 December, 1888, "On the Christian Life"; of 10 January, 1890, "On the Chief Duties of a Christian Citizen"; of 15 May, 1891, "On the Social Question"; of 20 January, 1894, "On the Importance of Unity in Faith and Union with the Church for the Preservation of the Moral Foundations of the State"; of 19 March, 1902, "On the Persecution of the Church all over the World". Full information about the relation of the Church towards Liberalism in the different countries may be gathered from the transactions and decisions of the various provincial councils. These can be found in the "Collectio Lacensis" under the headings of the index: Fides, Ecclesia, Educatio, Francomuratores.

FERRAZ, *Spiritualisme et libéralisme* (Paris, 1887); IDEM, *Traditionalisme et ultramontanisme* (Paris, 1880); D'HAUSSONVILLE, *Le salon de Mme Necker* (Paris, 1882); LADY BLENNERHASSET, *Frau von Staël* (1887–89); LABOULAYE, *Le parti libéral* (Paris, 1864); IDEM in the Introduction to his edition of *Cours de politique constitutionelle de Benj. Constant* (Paris, 1872); CONSTANT, *De la religion* (Paris, 1824–31); BLUNTSCHLI, *Allgemeine Staatslehre* (Stuttgart, 1875), 472; SAMUEL, *Liberalism* (1902); DEVAS, *Political Economy* (London, 1901), 122, 531, 650 seq.; VILLIERS, *Opportunity of Liberalism* (1904); RUDEL, *Geschichte des Liberalismus und der deutschen Reichsverfassung* (1891); DEBIDOUR, *Histoire des rapports de l'église et de l'état* 1789–1905 (Paris, 1898–1906); BRÜCK, *Die Geheimen Gesellschaften in Spanien* (1881); *Handworterbuch der Staatswissenschaften*, I, 296–327, s. v. *Anarchismus; Ferrer im Lichte der Wahrheit in Germania* (Berlin, 1909); MEFFERT, *Die Ferrer-Bewegung als Selbstentlarvung des Freidenkertums* (1909).

Works concerning ecclesiastical Liberalism:—(A) Protestant Churches:—GOYAU, *L'Allemagne religieuse, le protestantisme* (Paris, 1898); SABATIER, *Religions of Authority and the Religion of the Spirit;* POLLOCK, *Religious Equality* (London, 1890); REVILLE, *Liberal Christianity* (London, 1903); IDEM, *Anglican Liberalism* (London, 1908). (B) Concerning Catholic Liberalism:—WEILL, *Histoire du Catholicisme libéral en France, 1828–1908* (Paris, 1909). (C) Concerning Modernism: SCHELL, *Katholizismus als Prinzip des Fortschritts* (1897); IDEM, *Die neue Zeit und der neue Glaube* (1898); MÜLLER, *Reformkatholizismus* (these three works are on the Index); STUFLER, *Die Heiligkeit Gottes* in *Zeit. für kath. Theol.* (Innsbruck, 1908), 100–114; 364–368.

Critique and condemnation of Liberalism:—FAGUET, *Le Libéralisme* (Paris, 1906); FRANTZ, *Die Religion des Nationalliberalismus* (1872). From the Catholic standpoint:—DONAT, *Die Freiheit der Wissenschaft* (1910); VON KETTELER, *Freiheit, Autorität und Kirche* (Mainz, 1862); IDEM, *Die Arbeiterfrage und das Christenthum* (Mainz, 1864); DECHAMPS, *Le libéralisme* (1878); DONOSO CORTÉS, *Catholicism, Liberalism and Socialism* (tr. Philadelphia, 1862); H. PESCH, *Liberalismus, Sozialismus und christliche Gesellschaftsordnung* (Freiburg, 1893–99); CATHREIN, *Der Sozialismus* (Freiburg, 1906); PALLEN, *What is Liberalism?* (St. Louis, 1889); MOREL, *Somme contre le catholicisme libéral* (Paris, 1876); *Die Encyklika Pius IX. vom 8 Dez. 1864* in *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach;* CHR. PESCH, *Theologische Zeitfragen*, IV (1908); HEINER, *Der Syllabus* (*Pius IX.*) (1905); *Der Syllabus Pius X. und das Dekret des hl. Offiziums "Lamentabili" vom* 3 *Juli*, 1907 (1908); BROWNSON, *Conversations on Liberalism and the Church* (New York, 1869), reprinted in his *Works*, VII (Detroit, 1883–87), 305; MING, *Data of Modern Ethics Examined* (New York, 1897), x, xi; MANNING, *Liberty of the Press* in *Essays*, third series (London, 1892); BALMES, *European Civilization* (London, 1855), XXXIV, XXXV, lxvii; IDEM, *Letters to a Sceptic* (tr. Dublin, 1875), letter 7; GIBBONS, *Faith of Our Fathers* (Baltimore, 1871), xvii, xviii; *The Church and Liberal Catholicism*, pastoral letter of the English bishops, reprinted in *Messenger of the Sacred Heart XXXVI* (New York, 1901), 180–93; cf. also *Dublin Review*, new series, *XVIII*, 1,285; *XXV*, 202; *XXVI*, 204, 487; third series *XV*, 58.

HERM. GRUBER.

Libera Me (Domine, de morte aeterna, etc.), the responsory sung at funerals. It is a responsory of redundant form, having two versicles ("Tremens factus sum" and "Dies illa"). As in all the Office for the Dead, the verse "Requiem æternam" takes the place of "Gloria Patri"; then all the first part, down to the first versicle, is repeated. Its form therefore is exceptional, considerably longer than the normal responsory. It is a prayer in the first person singular for mercy at the Last Day. This should no doubt be understood as a dramatic substitution; the choir speaks for the dead person. A great part of our Office for the Dead is made up of such prayers about the Last Day, the meaning of which appears to refer rather to the people who say them than to the dead (the sequence "Dies iræ", most of the Vespers, Matins, and Lauds).

Another dramatic substitution is involved in the prayers of this responsory (and throughout the Office for the Dead) that the person for whom we pray may be saved from hell. That question was settled irrevocably as soon as he died. This is one instance of the dramatic displacement or rearrangement of the objective order of things that occurs continually in all rites (compare for instance in the baptism service the white robe and shining light given after the essential form, in the ordination of priests the power to forgive sins given after the man has been ordained and has concelebrated, the Epiclesis in Eastern liturgies, etc.). The explanation of all these cases is the same. Since we cannot express everything at one instant, we are forced to act and speak as if things really simultaneous followed each other in order. And in the eternity of God all things (including our consecutive prayers) are present at once—*nunc stans æternitas*. The responsory "Libera me" is begun by a cantor and continued by the choir in the usual way (the cantor alone singing the versicles) at the beginning of the "Absolution", that is the service of prayers for the dead person said and sung by the bier immediately after the Mass for the Dead. As soon as Mass is over the celebrant exchanges his chasuble for a (black) cope (all the sacred ministers of course take off their maniples) and chants the prayer "Non intres in judicium". Then "Libera me" is sung. Meanwhile the celebrant puts incense into the thurible, assisted by the deacon. During the whole Absolution the subdeacon stands at the head of the bier, facing the altar, with the processional cross.

The ninth responsory of Matins for the Dead also begins with "Libera me", but continues a different text (Domine, de viis inferni, etc.). This is built up according to the usual arrangement (with "Requiem æternam" instead of "Gloria Patri"). But on All Souls' Day (2 November), and whenever the whole Office of nine lessons is said, the "Libera me" of the Absolution is substituted for it. The Vatican Gradual gives the new chant for the "Libera me" after the Mass for the Dead.

ADRIAN FORTESCUE.

Libera Nos, the first words of the Embolism of the Lord's Prayer in the Roman Rite. Most liturgies contain a prayer developing the idea of the last clause of the Our Father (But deliver us from evil), and specifying various evils from which we pray to be delivered. This prayer, which always follows the Our Father immediately, is called its Embolism (*ἐμβολισμός*, insertion). In many rites (Antiochene, Alexandrine, Nestorian) it is rather of the nature of an insertion into the Our Father, repeating again and enlarging on its last clauses (e. g. the Antiochene Embolism: "And lead us not into temptation, O Lord, Lord of Hosts Who knowest our weakness, but deliver us from the evil one, and from his works and all his might and art, for the sake of Thy Holy Name invoked upon our lowliness"). The Roman Embolism is said secretly by the celebrant as soon as he has added Amen to the last clause of the "Pater noster" sung by the choir (or said by the server). In the middle (after *omnibus sanctis*) he makes the sign of the cross with the paten and kisses it. During the last clause (*Per eundem Dominum nostrum . . .*) he puts the paten under the Host, he (at high Mass the deacon) uncovers the chalice, genuflects, breaks the Host over the chalice, puts a small fraction into the chalice and the rest on the paten. This rite is the Fraction common to all liturgies. The last words (*Per omnia sæcula sæculorum*) are sung (or said) aloud, forming the Ephonesis before the Pax). Only on Good Friday does he sing it aloud, to the tone of a ferial Collect, and the choir

answers Amen. In this case the Fraction does not take place till the Embolism is finished. In the Milanese and Mozarabic Rites he sings it, and the choir answers Amen. For the Gallican Embolism (of Germanus of Paris, d. 576) see Duchesne, "Origines du Culte chrétien" (Paris, 1898), 211. The present Milanese form is very similar to that of Rome. It will be found with its chant in any edition of the Ambrosian Missal. The Mozarabic Embolism with its chant is in the "Missale Mistum" (P. L., LXXXV, 559–60). In both rites the Fraction has preceded the Lord's Prayer. The Embolisms of the Eastern rites are given in Brightman, "Eastern Liturgies" (Oxford, 1896), namely: Antiochene, 60, 100; Alexandrian, 136, 182; Nestorian, 296; Armenian, 446. In all these the Embolism is said secretly, with the last words aloud (Ecphonesis); the people answer Amen. The Byzantine Rite has no Embolism of the Lord's Prayer, but only the final clause: "For Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory, of the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost, now and for ever and for ages of ages. R. Amen" (ibid., 392 and 410). That it once had this prayer, like the parent Rite of Antioch, seems certain from the fact that there is an Embolism in the Nestorian and Armenian Liturgies, both derived at an early date from Constantinople.

ADRIAN FORTESCUE.

Liberatore, MATTEO, philosopher, theologian, and writer, b. at Salerno, Italy, 14 August, 1810; d. at Rome, 18 October, 1892. He studied at the College of the Jesuits at Naples in 1825, and a year later applied for admission into the Society of Jesus. His remarkable innocence, brilliant talents, and strength of character made him a most acceptable candidate, and he entered the novitiate on 9 October, 1826. The long course of studies was completed by him with unusual success, and resulted in his teaching philosophy for the space of eleven years, from 1837 until the Revolution of 1848 drove him to Malta. On returning to Italy he was appointed to teach theology, but gave up his professorship to found and assume charge in 1850 of the "Civiltà Cattolica", a periodical founded by the Jesuits to defend the cause of the Church and the papacy, and to spread the knowledge of the doctrine of St. Thomas Aquinas. Indeed it is Liberatore's chief glory to have brought about the revival of the Scholastic philosophy of St. Thomas. This movement he inaugurated by publishing his course of philosophy in 1840, at a time when the prevailing methods of teaching that science, even among certain Catholics, were, to say the least, little calculated to provide solid foundation for Catholic doctrine. This movement he supported to his dying day by his teaching in the class-room, by textbooks on philosophy, by able articles in the "Civiltà Cattolica" and other periodicals, by larger and more extensive works, and also by his work as member of the Accademia Romana by appointment of Leo XIII.

For more than half a century he was the tireless champion of truth in the fields of philosophy and theology, and of the rights of the Church. His pen was constantly at work, analysing the vexed problems of Christian life, both theoretical and practical, marking out the relations between Church and State, and the moral and social aspects of life. His watchfulness over the foundations of the faith is attested by his successful struggles with Rationalism, Ontologism, and Rosminianism. His literary activity may be estimated from the fact that Sommervogel records more than forty of his published works, and gives the titles of more than nine hundred of his articles (including reviews) which appeared in the "Civiltà" alone. The most prominent characteristics of his writings are keenness of judgment, strength of argument, breadth of learning, logical sequence of thought, close observation of facts, knowledge of men and of the world, and simplicity and elegance of style. He has been regarded by many as the greatest philosopher of his day. It is a tribute to his holiness of life and deep religious spirit that his brethren of the Society of Jesus were less impressed by his varied talents and immense learning than by the many virtues displayed during his long and fruitful life as scholar, professor, writer, academician, director of souls, and rector. His name will long be in blessed memory among all those who love the Church. The following are the best known, perhaps, of his works: "Institutiones Philosophicæ"; "Instructiones Ethicæ"; various compendiums of logic, metaphysics, ethics, and natural law; "Della Conoscenza intellettuale"; "Del Composto umano"; "Dell' Anima umana"; "Degli Universali"; "Chiesa e Stato"; "Dialoghi filosofici"; "Il Matrimonio"; "Roma e il mondo"; "Il Matrimonio e lo Stato"; "Le Commedie filosofiche"; and "Spicilegio".

Civiltà Cattolica, series XV, t. IV, 352–360; *American Ecclesiastical Review* (December, 1892); SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibl. de la C. de J.*, t. IV, c. 1774.

J. H. FISHER.

Liberatore, NICCOLÒ DI. See ALUNNO, NICCOLÒ.

Liberatus of Carthage (sixth century), archdeacon, author of an important history of the Nestorian and Monophysite troubles. In 535 he was sent to Rome, as legate of a great African national synod of two hundred and seventeen bishops, to consult Pope Agapetus I (535–6) about a number of questions (Harduin, II, 1154; Mansi, VIII, 808). Like most Africans he was vehemently opposed to Justinian's edict against the "Three Chapters" (544). He was frequently employed by the African bishops as their ambassador in the disputes that arose from that question. "Tired with the fatigue of traveling, and resting the mind a little from temporal cares" (introduction to his book), he used his leisure to compose a summary history of the two great heresies of the preceding century. His object in writing it was avowedly to show how misjudged the emperor's condemnation of the Three Chapters was. The work is called "A Short Account of the Affair of the Nestorians and Eutychians" (Breviarium causæ Nestorianorum et Eutychianorum). It begins with the ordination of Nestorius (428) and ends with the Fifth General Council (Constantinople II, 553). From the fact that the author mentions Theodosius of Alexandria as being still alive (xx), it is evident that it was written before 567, in which year Theodosius died. On the other hand, Liberatus records the death of Pope Vigilius (June, 555). His authorities are the "Historia tripartita" of Cassiodorus, acts of synods, and letters of contemporary Fathers. In spite of Liberatus's controversial purpose and his indignation against Monophysites and all aiders and abettors of the condemnation of the Three Chapters, his short history is well and fairly written. It forms an important document for the history of the two heresies.

LIBERATUS, *Breviarium causæ Nestorianorum et Eutychianorum* in *P. L.*, LXVIII, 963–1052; also in MANSI, *Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, IX (Florence, 1759), 659–700; FABRICIUS-HARLES, *Bibliotheca Græca*, XII (Hamburg, 1809), 685–92, a list of Liberatus's sources; KRÜGER, *Monophysitische Streitigkeiten* (Jena, 1884); FESSLER-JUNGMANN, *Institutiones Patrologiæ* (2nd ed., Innsbruck, 1896, 542); BARDENHEWER, *Patrologie* (Freiburg, 1894), 596.

ADRIAN FORTESCUE.

Liber Diurnus Romanorum Pontificum, a miscellaneous collection of ecclesiastical formularies used in the papal chancery until the eleventh century. It contains models of the important official documents usually prepared by the chancery; particularly of letters and official documents in connexion with the death, the election, and the consecration of the pope; the installation of newly elected bishops, especially of the suburbicarian bishops; also models for the profession of faith, the conferring of the pallium on archbishops, for the granting of privileges and dispensations, the founding of monasteries, the confirmation of

acts by which the Church acquired property, the establishment of private chapels, and in general for all the many decrees called for by the extensive papal administration. The collection opens with the superscriptions and closing formulæ used in writing to the emperor and empress at Constantinople, the Patricius, the Exarch and the Bishop of Ravenna, a king, a consul; to patriarchs, metropolitans, priests, and other clerics. The collection is important both for the history of law and for church history, particularly for the history of the Roman Church. The formularies and models set down are taken from earlier papal documents, especially those of Gelasius I (492–6) and Gregory I (590–604).

This collection was certainly compiled in the chancery of the Roman Church, but probably a comparatively small number of the formularies contained in the extant manuscripts were included at first, the remainder being added from time to time. There is no systematic arrangement of the formularies in the manuscripts. In its final form, as seen in the two existing manuscripts (one codex in the Vatican Archives, and another, originally from Bobbio, in the Ambrosian Library at Milan), the Liber Diurnus dates back to the eighth century. Concerning the more exact determination of the date of its compilation, there is even a still great diversity of opinion. Garnier gives in his edition the year 715. Zaccaria, in his "Dissertationes" (P. L., CV, 119 sqq.), attributes the compilation to the ninth century; Rozière, to whom we owe the first good edition (see below), decides for the period 685 to 751—the former date, because Emperor Constantine Pogonatus (d. 685) is mentioned as dead, and the latter, because in 751 Northern Italy was conquered by the Lombards and the Byzantine administration at Ravenna came to an end (see Introduction, pp. 25 sqq.). Sickel, however, in his "Prolegomena" and in his researches on the Liber Diurnus (see below), has shown that the work possesses by no means a uniform character. He recognizes in it three divisions, the first of which he ascribes to the time of Honorius I (625–38), the second to the end of the seventh century, and the third to the time of Hadrian I (772–95). Duchesne (Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes, LII, 1891, pp. 7 sqq.) differs from Sickel, and maintains that the original version of most of the formularies, and among them the most important, must be referred to the years after 682, and that only the last formularies (nn. lxxxvi–xcix) were added in the time of Hadrian I, though some few of these may have existed at an earlier date. Hartmann defends the views of Sickel (Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreich. Gesch., XIII, 1892, pp. 239 sqq.). Friederich (Sitzungsberichte der bayer. Akademie der Wiss. zu München, Phil.-hist. Kl., I, 1890, pp. 58 sqq.) investigated more closely the case of some of the formularies attributed by Sickel to one of the aforesaid periods, and attempted to indicate more nearly the occasions and pontificates to which they belonged. These investigations have established beyond doubt that the collection had already attained its present form towards the end of the eighth century, though no insignificant portion had been compiled during the seventh century. The Liber Diurnus was used officially in the papal chancery until the eleventh century, after which time, as it no longer corresponded to the needs of papal administration, it gave way to other collections. Twelfth century canonists, like Ivo of Chartres and Gratian, continued to use the Liber Diurnus, but subsequently it ceased to be consulted, and was finally completely forgotten.

Lucas Holstenius (q. v.) was the first who undertook to edit the Liber Diurnus. He had found one manuscript of it in the monastery of Santa Croce in Gerusalemme at Rome, and obtained another from the Jesuit Collège de Clermont at Paris; but as Holstenius died in the meantime and his notes could not be found, this edition printed at Rome in 1650 was withheld from publication, by advice of the ecclesiastical censors, and the copies put away in a room at the Vatican. The reason for so doing was apparently formula lxxxiv, which contained the profession of faith of the newly elected pope, in which the latter recognized the Sixth General Council and its anathemas against Pope Honorius for his (alleged) Monothelism. The edition of Holstenius was reprinted at Rome in 1658; but was again withdrawn in 1662 by papal authority, though in 1725 Benedict XIII permitted the issue of some copies. From the Clermont manuscript, which has since disappeared, Garnier prepared a new edition of the Liber Diurnus (Paris, 1680), but it is very inaccurate, and contains arbitrary alterations of the text. In his "Museum Italicum" (I, II, 32 sqq.) Mabillon issued a supplement to this edition of Garnier. From these materials, the Liber Diurnus was reprinted at Basle (1741), at Vienna (1762), and by Migne (P. L., CV, Paris, 1851). The first good edition, as stated above, we owe to Eug. de Rozière (Liber Diurnus ou Recueil des formules usitées par la Chancellerie pontificale du V^{e} au XI^{e} siècle, Paris, 1869). In the interest of this edition Daremberg and Renan compared Garnier's text with the Vatican manuscript, then regarded as the only authentic one. From this manuscript Th. von Sickel prepared a critical edition of the text: "Liber Diurnus Rom. Pont. ex unico codice Vaticano denuo ed." (Vienna, 1889). Just after the appearance of this work, however, Ceriani announced the discovery of a new manuscript, originally from Bobbio, in the Ambrosian Library at Milan; towards the end this was more complete than the Vatican manuscript. This text was published by Achille Ratti (Milan, 1891).

Potthast, *Bibl. hist. medii ævi*, I, 734–5; Rozière, *Recherches sur le Liber Diurnus des Pontifes romains* (Paris, 1868); Sickel, *Prolegomena zum Liber Diurnus*, I and II, in *Sitzungsberichte der k. k. Akad. der Wiss. in Wien, Phil.-hist. Kl.*, CXVII (1888–9), nn. 7, 13, also edited separately; Idem, *Die Vita Hadriani Nonantulana und die Diurnushandschriften* in *Neues Archiv*, XVIII (1893), 107 sqq.; cf. *ibid.*, XV (1890), 22 sq.; Idem, *Nouveaux éclaircissements sur la premiȅre édition du Diurnus* in *Mélanges Julien Havet* (Paris, 1895), 14–38; Giorgi, *Storia esterna del codice Vaticano del Liber Diurnus Rom. Pont.* in *Archivio della Società Romana di storia patria*, XI (1889), 641 sqq.; Ceriani, *Notizia di un antico manuscritto Ambrosiano del Liber Diurnus* in *Rendiconti del Istituto Lombardo di scienze*, 2nd series, XXVI, 376 sqq.; Duchesne, *Le Liber Diurnus et les élections pontificales au VII^{e} siècle* in *Bibl. de l'Ecole des Chartes*, LII (1891), 5–30; Hartmann, *Die Entstehungszeit des Liber Diurnus* in *Mitteilungen des Instituts für österr. Gesch.*, XIII (1892), 239–64; Friedrich, *Zur Entstehung des Liber Diurnus* in *Sitzungsber. der k. bayer. Akademie der Wiss., Phil.-hist. Kl.*, I (1890), 58–141.

J. P. Kirsch.

Liberia, a republic on the west coast of Africa, between 4° 20′ and 7° 20′ N. lat., extending from the Sherbro river on the north-west, near the south boundary of the British colony of Sierra Leone, to the Pedro river on the south-east, a distance along the coast of nearly six hundred miles. It has enjoyed the status of a sovereign State since 1874, when its independence was formally recognized by England, France, and Germany. The habitable region of the country is a strip from ten to twelve miles wide along a slightly indented shore line of 350 miles. The area over which the political jurisdiction of the republic extends is estimated at 9700 square miles. The interior is one of the wildest and least visited sections of Africa.

Liberia had its origin in the scheme of the American Colonization Society to found in Africa a place to which free blacks and persons of African descent might return from the United States. Charles Carroll, of Carrollton, was at one time president of this society, which sent out its first colony to Africa on 6 Feb., 1820. They settled first on Sherbro Island, but in April, 1822, abandoned this site for the more promising location at Cape Mesurado, between Sierra Leone and the Ivory Coast. Here the colony became permanently established, and continued under the management of the

Colonization Society until the political exigencies of commercial intercourse with other countries, especially with England, forced Liberia, 26 July, 1847, to make a declaration of independence as a sovereign State. It is divided into four counties, Mesurado, Grand Bassa, Sinou, and Maryland. The capital and largest town is Monrovia, a seaport on Cape Mesurado, called after James Monroe, President of the United States, under whose administration the colonizing scheme was begun. There are no harbours, and access to the most important rivers is prevented for vessels of deep draught by a sand-bar. The temperature varies from 56 to 105 degrees Fahrenheit, with an average of 80 degrees and a rainfall of about 100 inches a year. The rainy season begins in May and ends in November, the hottest month being December and the coolest August. The climate is deadly to white men, African fever being prevalent.

Some 12,000 quasi-American negroes constitute the governing class. With these are affiliated about 30,000 who are civilized, native born, and native bred. The wilder tribes of the interior, estimated as numbering about 2,000,000, are the descendants of the aborigines. The Americo-Liberian settlers are to be found on the sea-coast and at the mouths of the two most important rivers. Of the native tribes the principal are the Veys, the Pessehs, the Barlines, the Bassas, the Kroos, the Frebos, and the Mandingos. Outside of the negroes of American origin not many Liberians are Christians. The converts have been made chiefly among the Kroos and the Frebos. Methodist, Baptist, Presbyterians, and Episcopalian missions have been established for many years with scant results. As a number of the first American colonists were Catholic negroes from Maryland and the adjoining states, the attention of Propaganda was called to their spiritual needs and the second Provincial Council of Baltimore in 1833 undertook to meet the difficulty. In accordance with the measures taken, the Very Rev. Edward Barron, Vicar-General of Philadelphia, the Rev. John Kelly of New York, and Denis Pindar, a lay catechist from Baltimore, volunteered for the mission and sailed for Africa from Baltimore on 2 December, 1841. They arrived there safe and Father Barron said the first Mass at Cape Palmas on 10 Feb., 1842. After a time, finding that he did not receive missionaries enough to accomplish anything practical, Father Barron returned to the United States, and thence went to Rome where he was made on 22 Jan., 1842, Vicar Apostolic of the Two Guineas, and titular Bishop of Constantia. With seven priests of the Congregation of the Holy Ghost he returned to Liberia, arriving at Cape Palmas on 30 Nov., 1843. Five of these priests died on the mission of fever, to which Denis Pindar, the lay catechist, also fell a victim, 1 Jan., 1844. Bishop Barron and Father Kelly held out for two years, and then, wasted by fever, they determined to return to the United States, feeling that it was impossible to withstand the climate any longer. Bishop Barron died of yellow fever during an epidemic at Savannah, Georgia, 12 Sept., 1854, and after a long pastorate Father Kelly died at Jersey City, New Jersey, 28 April, 1866.

The Fathers of the Holy Ghost, who took up the work, were also forced by the climate to abandon it in a couple of years, and the permanent mission lapsed until 25 Feb., 1884. The Fathers of Montfort (Company of Mary), under Fathers Blanchet and Lorber, then laid the foundation of another mission at Monrovia. The president of the republic, Mr. Johnson, and the people generally gave them a cordial welcome, but the sectarian ministers organized a cabal against them, and endeavoured to thwart all their efforts to spread the Faith. They made some progress in spite of this, and in the following year, having received reinforcements from France, opened a school for boys and extended their operations into other places. Father Bourzeix learned the native language, in which he compiled a catechism and translated a number of hymns. Later, when he returned to France, he wrote a history of Liberia. He died in 1886. Deaths among the missionaries and the health of the others shattered by fever forced these priests also to abandon the Liberia mission. After this it was visited occasionally by missionaries from Sierra Leone until 1906, when Propaganda handed its care over to the Priests of the African Missions (Lyons), and three Irish priests, Fathers Stephen Kyne, Joseph Butler, and Dennis O'Sullivan, with two French assistants, went to work with much energy, and continue (1910) to make much progress among the 2800 Catholics the vicariate is estimated to contain (see AFRICA, subtitle *The Catholic Church*). The British Colony of Sierra Leone on the west, and the French colonies of the Ivory Coast to the east, and French Guinea to the north have gradually been encroaching on its territory, and internal troubles over deficits adding other complications, Liberia sent in 1908 an urgent appeal to the United States Government for help to preserve its integrity. To learn the conditions there, and find out what assistance could best be given, a commission of three was appointed by the president; it sailed from New York 24 April, 1909, and returned in the following August. The diary kept by Father John Kelly during his stay in Liberia was published in the United States Catholic Historical Society's "Records" (New York, 1910).

STOCKWELL, *The Republic of Liberia* (New York, 1868); *Annual Report Smithsonian Inst.* (Washington, 1905); PIOLET, *Miss. Cath.*, V (Paris, 1902), 172; CLARK, *Lives of Deceased Bishops U. S.*, II (New York, 1872), appendix; *Catholic Almanac* (Baltimore, 1855); SHEA, *Hist. Cath. Ch. in U. S.* (New York, 1856); KIRLIN, *Catholicity in Philadelphia* (Philadelphia, 1909); FLYNN, *The Cath. Church in New Jersey* (Morristown, 1904), 92 sqq.

THOMAS F. MEEHAN.

Liberius, POPE (352–66).—Pope Julius died on 12 April, according to the "Liberian Catalogue", and Liberius was consecrated on 22 May. As this was not a Sunday, 17 May was probably the day. Of his previous life nothing is known save that he was a Roman deacon. An epitaph preserved in a copy by a seventh-century pilgrim is attributed to Liberius by De Rossi, followed by many critics, including Duchesne. The principal points in it are that the pope confirmed the Nicene Faith in a council, and died in exile for the Faith, unless we render "a martyr by exile". The epitaph is attributed by Funk to St. Martin I. De Rossi, however, declared that no epigraphist could doubt that the verses are of the fourth and not of the seventh century; still it is not easy to fit the lines to Liberius. The text is in De Rossi, "Inscr. Christ. Urbis Romæ", etc., II, 83, 85, and Duchesne, "Lib. Pont.", I, 209. See De Rossi in "Bull. Archeol. Crist." (1883), 5–62; and Von Funk in "Kirchengesch. Abhandl.", I (Paderborn, 1897), 391; Grisar in "Kirchenlex.", s. v.; Suvio, "Nuovi Studi", etc.

FIRST YEARS OF PONTIFICATE.—By the death of Constans (Jan., 350), Constantius had become master of the whole empire, and was bent on uniting all Christians in a modified form of Arianism. Liberius, like his predecessor Julius, upheld the acquittal of Athanasius at Sardica, and made the decisions of Nicæa the test of orthodoxy. After the final defeat of the usurper Magnentius and his death in 353, Liberius, in accordance with the wishes of a large number of Italian bishops, sent legates to the emperor in Gaul begging him to hold a council. Constantius was pressing the bishops of Gaul to condemn Athanasius, and assembled a number of them at Arles where he had wintered. The court bishops, who constantly accompanied the emperor, were the rulers of the council. The pope's legates (of whom one was Vincent of Capua, who had been one of the papal legates at the Council of Nicæa) were so weak as to consent to renounce the

cause of Athanasius, on condition that all would condemn Arianism. The court party accepted the compact, but did not carry out their part; and the legates were forced by violence to condemn Athanasius, without gaining any concession for themselves. Liberius, on receiving the news, wrote to Hosius of Cordova of his deep grief at the fall of Vincent; he himself desired to die, lest he should incur the imputation of having agreed to injustice and heterodoxy. Another letter in the same strain was addressed by the pope to St. Eusebius, Bishop of Vercelli, who had formerly been one of the Roman clergy.

Earlier than this, a letter against Athanasius signed by many Eastern bishops had arrived at Rome. The emperor sent a special envoy named Montanus to Alexandria, where he arrived 22 May, 353, to inform the patriarch that the emperor was willing to grant him a personal interview; but Athanasius had never asked for this; he recognized that a trap had been set for him, and did not move. He quitted Alexandria only in the following February, when George, an Arian, was set up as bishop in his place, amid disgraceful scenes of violence. But Athanasius had already held a council in his own defence, and a letter in his favour, signed by seventy-five (or eighty) Egyptian bishops, had arrived at Rome at the end of May, 353. Constantius publicly accused the pope of preventing peace and of suppressing the letter of the Easterns against Athanasius. Liberius replied with a dignified and touching letter (Obsecro, tranquillissime imperator), in which he declares that he read the letter of the Easterns to a council at Rome (probably an anniversary council, 17 May, 353), but, as the letter which arrived simultaneously from Egypt was signed by a greater number of bishops, it was impossible to condemn Athanasius; he himself had never wished to be pope, but he had followed his predecessors in all things; he could not make peace with the Easterns, for some of them refused to condemn Arius, and they were in communion with George of Alexandria, who accepted the Arian priests whom Alexander had long ago excommunicated. He complains of the Council of Arles, and begs for the assembling of another council, by means of which the exposition of faith to which all had agreed at Nicæa may be enforced for the future. The letter was carried by Lucifer, Bishop of Calaris (Cagliari), the priest Pancratius, and the deacon Hilary, to the emperor at Milan. The pope asked St. Eusebius to assist the legates with his influence, and wrote again to thank him for having done so. A council was in fact convened at Milan, and met there about the spring of 355. St. Eusebius was persuaded to be present, and he insisted that all should begin by signing the Nicene decree. The court bishops declined. The military were called in. Constantius ordered the bishops to take his word for the guilt of Athanasius, and condemn him. Eusebius was banished, together with Lucifer and Dionysius of Milan. Liberius sent another letter to the emperor; and his envoys, the priest Eutropius and the deacon Hilary, were also exiled, the deacon being besides cruelly beaten. The Arian Auxentius was made Bishop of Milan. The pope wrote a letter, generally known as "Quamuis sub imagine", to the exiled bishops, addressing them as martyrs, and expressing his regret that he had not been the first to suffer so as to set an example to others; he asks for their prayers that he may yet be worthy to share their exile.

That these were not mere words was proved, not only by Liberius's noble attitude of protest during the preceding years, but by his subsequent conduct. Constantius was not satisfied by the renewed condemnation of Athanasius by the Italian bishops who had lapsed at Milan under pressure. He knew that the pope was the only ecclesiastical superior of the Bishop of Alexandria, and he "strove with burning desire", says the pagan Ammianus, "that the sentence should be confirmed by the higher authority of the bishop of the eternal city". St. Athanasius assures us that from the beginning the Arians did not spare Liberius, for they calculated that, if they could but persuade him, they would soon get hold of all the rest. Constantius sent to Rome his prefect of the bed-chamber, the eunuch Eusebius, a very powerful personage, with a letter and gifts. "Obey the emperor and take this" was in fact his message, says St. Athanasius, who proceeds to give the pope's reply at length: He could not decide against Athanasius, who had been acquitted by two general synods, and had been dismissed in peace by the Roman Church, nor could he condemn the absent; such was not the tradition he had received from his predecessors and from St. Peter; if the emperor desired peace, he must annul what he had decreed against Athanasius and have a council celebrated without emperor or counts or judges present, so that the Nicene Faith might be preserved; the followers of Arius must be cast out and their heresy anathematized; the unorthodox must not sit in a synod; the Faith must first be settled, and then only could other matters be treated; let Ursacius and Valens, the court bishops from Pannonia, be disregarded, for they had already once disowned their bad actions, and were no longer worthy of credit.

The eunuch was enraged, and went off with his bribes, which he laid before the confession of St. Peter. Liberius severely rebuked the guardians of the holy place for not having prevented this unheard-of sacrilege. He cast the gifts away, which angered the eunuch yet more, so that he wrote to the emperor that it was no longer a question of simply getting Liberius to condemn Athanasius, for he went so far as formally to anathematize the Arians. Constantius was persuaded by his eunuchs to send Palatine officers, notaries, and counts, with letters to the Prefect of Rome. Leontius, ordering that Liberius should be seized either secretly or by violence, and despatched to the court.

There followed a kind of persecution at Rome. Bishops, says St. Athanasius, and pious ladies were obliged to hide, monks were not safe, foreigners were expelled, the gates and the port were watched. "The Ethiopian eunuch", continues the saint, "when he understood not what he read, believed St. Philip; whereas the eunuchs of Constantius do not believe Peter when he confesses Christ, nor the Father indeed, when He reveals His Son"—an allusion to the declarations of the popes that in condemning Arianism they spoke with the voice of Peter and repeated his confession, "Thou art [the] Christ, the Son of the living God", which the Father Himself had revealed to the Apostle. Liberius was dragged before the emperor at Milan. He spoke boldly, bidding Constantius cease fighting against God, and declaring his readiness to go at once into exile before his enemies had time to trump up charges against him. Theodoret has preserved the minutes of an interview between "the glorious Liberius" and Constantius, which were taken down by good people, he says, at the time. Liberius refuses to acknowledge the decision of the Council of Tyre and to renounce Athanasius; the Mareotic acts against him were false witness, and Ursacius and Valens had confessed as much, and had asked pardon from the Synod of Sardica. Epictetus, the young intruded Bishop of Centumcellæ, interposes, saying that Liberius only wanted to be able to boast to the Roman senators that he had beaten the emperor in argument. "Who are you", adds Constantius, "to stand up for Athanasius against the world?" Liberius replies: "Of old there were found but three to resist the mandate of the king." The eunuch Eusebius cried: "You compare the emperor to Nabuchodonosor." Liberius: "No, but you condemn the innocent." He demands that all shall subscribe the Nicene formula, then the exiles must be restored, and all the bishops must assemble at Alexandria to give Athanasius a fair trial on the spot.

Epictetus: "But the public conveyances will not be enough to carry so many." Liberius: "They will not be needed; the ecclesiastics are rich enough to send their bishops as far as the sea." Constantius: "General synods must not be too numerous; you alone hold out against the judgment of the whole world. He has injured all, and me above all; not content with the murder of my eldest brother, he set Constans also against me. I should prize a victory over him more than one over Silvanus or Magnentius." Liberius: "Do not employ bishops, whose hands are meant to bless, to revenge your own enmity. Have the bishops restored and, if they agree with the Nicene Faith, let them consult as to the peace of the world, that an innocent man be not condemned." Constantius: "I am willing to send you back to Rome, if you will join the communion of the Church. Make peace, and sign the condemnation." Liberius: "I have already bidden farewell at Rome to the brethren. The laws of the Church are more important than residence in Rome." The emperor gave the pope three days for consideration, and then banished him to Berœa in Thrace, sending him five hundred gold pieces for his expenses; but he refused them, saying Constantius needed them to pay his soldiers. The empress sent him the same amount, but he sent it to the emperor, saying: "If he does not need it, let him give it to Auxentius or Epictetus, who want such things." Eusebius the eunuch brought him yet more money: "You have laid waste the Churches of the world", the pope broke out, "and do you bring me alms as to a condemned man? Go and first become a Christian."

LIBERIUS TRACING THE PLAN OF ST. MARY MAJOR'S IN THE SNOW
Mino da Fiesole, St. Mary Major's, Rome

EXILE.—On the departure of Liberius from Rome, all the clergy had sworn that they would receive no other bishop. But soon many of them accepted as pope the Archdeacon Felix, whose consecration by the Arian Bishop Acacius of Cæsarea had been arranged by Epictetus at the emperor's order. The people of Rome ignored the antipope. Constantius paid his first visit to Rome on 1 April, 357, and was able to see for himself the failure of his nominee. He was aware that there was no canonical justification for the exile of Liberius and the intrusion of Felix; in other cases he had always acted in accordance with the decision of a council. He was also greatly moved by the grandeur of the Eternal City—so Ammianus assures us. He was impressed by the prayers for the return of the pope boldly addressed to him by the noblest of the Roman ladies, whose husbands had insufficient courage for the venture. There is no reason to suppose that Felix was recognized by any bishops outside Rome, unless by the court party and a few extreme Arians, and the uncompromising attitude of Liberius through at least the greater part of his banishment must have done more harm to the cause the emperor had at heart than his constancy had done when left at Rome in peace. It is not surprising to find that Liberius returned to Rome before the end of 357, and that it was noised abroad that he must have signed the condemnation of Athanasius and perhaps some Arian Creed. His restoration is placed by some critics in 358, but this is impossible, for St. Athanasius tells us that he endured the rigours of exile for two years, and the "Gesta inter Liberium et Felicem episcopos", which forms the preface to the "Liber Precum" of Faustinus and Marcellinus, tells us that he returned "in the third year". The cause of his return is variously related. Theodoret says that Constantius was moved by the Roman matrons to restore him, but when his letter to Rome, saying that Liberius and Felix were to be bishops side by side, was read in the circus, the Romans jeered at it, and filled the air with cries of "One God, one Christ,

one bishop". The Arian historian Philostorgius also speaks of the Romans having eagerly demanded the return of their pope, and so does Rufinus. St. Sulpicius Severus, on the other hand, gives the cause as seditions at Rome, and Sozomen agrees. Socrates is more precise, and declares that the Romans rose against Felix and drove him out, and that the emperor was obliged to acquiesce. The reading in St. Jerome's "Chronicle" is doubtful. He says that a year after the Roman clergy had perjured themselves they were driven out together with Felix, until (or because) Liberius had re-entered the city in triumph. If we read "until", we shall understand that after Liberius's return the forsworn clergy returned to their allegiance. If we read "because", with the oldest MS., it will seem rather that the expulsion of Felix was subsequent to and consequent on the return of Liberius. St. Prosper seems to have understood Jerome in the latter sense. The preface to the "Liber Precum" mentions two expulsions of Felix, but does not say that either of them was previous to the return of Liberius.

On the other hand, the Arian Philostorgius related that Liberius was restored only when he had consented to sign the second formula of Sirmium, which was drawn up after the summer of 357 by the court bishops, Germinius, Ursacius, Valens; it rejected the terms *homoousios* and *homoiousios;* and was sometimes called the "formula of Hosius", who was forced to accept it in this same year, though St. Hilary is surely wrong in calling him its author. The same story of the pope's fall is supported by three letters attributed to him in the so-called "Historical Fragments" ("Fragmenta ex Opere Historico" in P. L., X, 678 sqq.) of St. Hilary, but Sozomen tells us it was a lie, propagated by the Arian Eudoxius, who had just invaded the See of Antioch. St. Jerome seems to have believed it, as in his "Chronicle" he says that Liberius "conquered by the tedium of exile and subscribing to heretical wickedness entered Rome in triumph". The preface to the "Liber Precum" also speaks of his yielding to heresy. St. Athanasius, writing apparently at the end of 357, says: "Liberius, having been exiled, gave in after two years, and, in fear of the death with which he was threatened, signed", i. e. the condemnation of Athanasius himself (Hist. Ar., xli); and again: "If he did not endure the tribulation to the end yet he remained in his exile for two years knowing the conspiracy against me." St. Hilary, writing at Constantinople in 360, addresses Constantius thus: "I know not whether it was with greater impiety that you exiled him than that you restored him" (Contra Const., II).

Sozomen tells a story which finds no echo in any other writer. He makes Constantius, after his return from Rome, summon Liberius to Sirmium (357), and there the pope is forced by the Semi-Arian leaders, Basil of Ancyra, Eustathius, and Eleusius, to condemn the "Homoousion"; he is induced to sign a combination of three formulæ: that of the Catholic Council of Antioch of 267 against Paul of Samosata (in which *homoousios* was said to have been rejected as Sabellian in tendency), that of the Sirmian assembly which condemned Photinus in 351, and the Creed of the Dedication Council of Antioch of 341. These formulæ were not precisely heretical, and Liberius is said to have exacted from Ursacius and Valens a confession that the Son is "in all things similar to the Father". Hence Sozomen's story has been very generally accepted as giving a moderate account of Liberius's fall, admitting it to be a fact, yet explaining why so many writers implicitly deny it. But the date soon after Constantius was at Rome is impossible, as the Semi-Arians only united at the beginning of 358, and their short-lived influence over the emperor began in the middle of that year; hence Duchesne and many others hold (in spite of the clear witness of St. Athanasius) that Liberius returned only in 358. Yet Sozomen mentions the presence of Western bishops, and this suits 357; he says that Eudoxius spread the rumour that Liberius had signed the second Sirmian formula, and this suits 357 and not the time of Semi-Arian ascendancy. Further, the formula "in all things like" was not the Semi-Arian badge in 358, but was forced upon them in 359, after which they adopted it, declaring that it included their special formula "like in substance". Now Sozomen is certainly following here the lost compilation of the Macedonian (i. e. Semi-Arian) Sabinus, whom we know to have been untrustworthy wherever his sect was concerned. Sabinus seems simply to have had the Arian story before him, but regarded it, probably rightly, as an invention of the party of Eudoxius; he thinks the truth must have been that, if Liberius signed a Sirmian formula, it was the harmless one of 351; if he condemned the "Homoousion", it was only in the sense in which it had been condemned at Antioch; he makes him accept the Dedication Creed (which was that of the Semi-Arians and all the moderates of the East), and force upon the court bishops the Semi-Arian formula of 359 and after. He adds that the bishops at Sirmium wrote to Felix and to the Roman clergy, asking that Liberius and Felix should both be accepted as bishops. It is quite incredible that men like Basil and his party should have done this.

Later Years of Liberius.—At the time of his return, the Romans cannot have known that Liberius had fallen, for St. Jerome (who is so fond of telling us of the simplicity of their faith and the delicacy of their pious ears) says he entered Rome as a conqueror. It was clearly not supposed that he had been conquered by Constantius. There is no sign of his ever having admitted that he had fallen. In 359 were held the simultaneous Councils of Seleucia and Rimini. At the latter, where most of the bishops were orthodox, the pressure and delay, and the underhand machinations of the court party entrapped the bishops into error. The pope was not there, nor did he send legates. After the council his disapproval was soon known, and after the death of Constantius at the end of 361 he was able publicly to annul it, and to decide, much as a council under Athanasius at Alexandria decided, that the bishops who had fallen could be restored on condition of their proving the sincerity of their repentance by their zeal against the Arians. About 366 he received a deputation of the Semi-Arians led by Eustathius; he treated them first as Arians (which he could not have done had he ever joined them), and insisted on their accepting the Nicene formula before he would receive them to communion; he was unaware that many of them were to turn out later to be unsound on the question of the Divinity of the Holy Ghost. We learn also from St. Siricius that, after annulling the Council of Rimini, Liberius issued a decree forbidding the rebaptism of those baptized by Arians, which was being practised by the Luciferian schismatics.

Forged Letters.—In the fragments of St. Hilary are embedded a number of letters of Liberius. Fragment IV contains a letter, "Studens paci", together with a very corrupt comment upon it by St. Hilary. The letter has usually been considered a forgery since Baronius (2nd ed.), and Duchesne expressed the common view when he said in his "Histoire ancienne de l'Eglise" (1907) that St. Hilary meant us to understand that it is spurious. But its authenticity was defended by Tillemont, and has been recently upheld by Schiktanz and Duchesne (1908), all Catholic writers. Hermant (cited by Coustant), followed by Savio, believed that the letter was inserted by a forger in the place of a genuine letter, and he took the first words of St. Hilary's comment to be serious and not ironical: "What in this letter does not proceed from piety and from the fear of God?" In this document Liberius is made to address the Arian bishops of the East, and to declare that on receiving an epistle against St. Atha-

nasius from the Oriental bishops, which had been sent to his predecessor Julius, he had hesitated to condemn that saint, since his predecessor had absolved him, but he had sent legates to Alexandria to summon him to Rome. Athanasius had refused to come, and Liberius on receiving new letters from the East had at once excommunicated him, and was now anxious to communicate with the Arian party. Duchesne thinks this letter was written in exile at the beginning of 357, and that Liberius had really sent an embassy (in 352–3), suggesting that Athanasius should come to Rome; now in his exile he remembers that Athanasius had excused himself, and alleges this as a pretext for condemning him. It seems inconceivable, however, that after heroically supporting Athanasius for years, and, having suffered exile for more than a year rather than condemn him, Liberius should motive his present weakness by a disobedience on the saint's part at which he had testified no resentment during all this stretch of time. On the contrary, St. Hilary's comment seems plainly to imply that the letter was forged by Fortunatian, Metropolitan of Aquileia, one of the bishops who condemned Athanasius and joined the court party at the Council of Milan in 355. Fortunatian must have tried to excuse his own fall, by pretending that the pope (who was then still in Rome) had entrusted this letter to him to give to the emperor, "but Potamius and Epictetus did not believe it to be genuine when they condemned the pope with glee (as the Council of Rimini said of them)", else they would not have condemned him to exile, "and Fortunatian sent it also to many bishops without getting any gain by it". And St. Hilary goes on to declare that Fortunatian had further condemned himself by omitting to mention how Athanasius had been acquitted at Sardica after the letter of the Easterns against him to Pope Julius, and how a letter had come from a council at Alexandria and all Egypt in his favour to Liberius, as earlier to Julius. Hilary appeals to documents which follow, evidently the letter "Obsecro" to the emperor (already mentioned), in which Liberius attests that he received the defence by the Egyptians at the same time with the accusation by the Arians. The letter "Obsecro" forms fragment V, and it seems to have been immediately followed in the original work by fragment VI, which opens with the letter of Liberius to the confessors, "Quamuis sub imagine" (proving how steadfast he was in his support of the faith), followed by quotations from letters to a bishop of Spoleto and to Hosius, in which the pope deplores the fall of Vincent at Arles. These letters are incontestably genuine.

There follows in the same fragment a paragraph which declares that Liberius, when in exile, reversed all these promises and actions, writing to the wicked, prevaricating Arians the three letters which complete the fragment. These correspond to the authentic letters which have preceded, each to each: the first, "Pro deifico timore" is a parody of "Obsecro"; the second, "Quia scio uos", is a reversal of everything said in "Quamuis"; the third "Non doceo", is a palinode, painful to read, of the letter to Hosius. The three are clearly forgeries, composed for their present position. They defend the authenticity of "Studens paci", which they represent as having been sent to the emperor from Rome by the hands of Fortunatian; the genuine letters are not contested, but it is shown that Liberius changed his mind and wrote the "Studens paci"; that in spite of this he was exiled, through the machinations of his enemies, so he wrote "Pro deifico timore" to the Easterns, assuring them not only that he had condemned Athanasius in "Studens paci", but that Demophilus, the Bishop of Berœa (reprobated as a heretic in "Obsecro"), had explained to him the Sirmian formula of 357, and he had willingly accepted it. This formula disapproved of the words *homoousios* and *homoiousios* alike; it had been drawn up by Germinius, Ursacius, and Valens. "Quia scio nos" is addressed precisely to these three court bishops and Liberius begs them to pray the emperor for his restoration, just as in "Quamuis" he had begged the three confessors to pray to God that he too might be exiled. "Non doceo" parodies the grief of Liberius at the fall of Vincent; it is addressed to Vincent himself and begs him to get the Campanian bishops to meet and write to the emperor for the restoration of Liberius. Interspersed in the first and second letters are anathemas "to the prevaricator Liberius", attributed by the forger to St. Hilary. The forger is clearly one of the Luciferians, whose heresy consisted in denying all validity to the acts of those bishops who had fallen at the Council of Rimini in 359; whereas Pope Liberius had issued a decree admitting their restoration on their sincere repentance, and also condemned the Luciferian practice of rebaptizing those whom the fallen bishops had baptized.

The aforesaid "Fragments" of St. Hilary have recently been scrutinized by Wilmart, and it appears that they belonged to two different books, the one written in 356 as an apology when the saint was sent into exile by the Synod of Béziers, and the other written soon after the Council of Rimini for the instruction (says Rufinus) of the fallen bishops; it was entitled "Liber adversus Valentem et Ursacium". The letters of Liberius belonged to the latter work. Rufinus tells us that it was interpolated—he implies this of the whole edition—and that Hilary was accused at a council on the score of these corruptions; he denied them, but, on the book being fetched from his own lodging, they were found in it, and St. Hilary was expelled excommunicate from the council. St. Jerome denied all knowledge of the incident, but Rufinus certainly spoke with good evidence, and his story fits in exactly with St. Hilary's own account of a council of ten bishops which sat at his urgent request at Milan about 364 to try Auxentius whom he accused of Arianism. The latter defended himself by equivocal expressions, and the bishops as well as the orthodox Emperor Valentinian were satisfied; St. Hilary, on the contrary, was accused by Auxentius of heresy, and of joining with St. Eusebius of Vercelli in disturbing the peace, and he was banished from the city. He does not mention of what heresy he was accused, nor on what grounds; but it must have been Luciferianism, and Rufinus has informed us of the proofs which were offered. It is interesting that the fragments of the book against Valens and Ursacius should still contain in the forged letters of Liberius (and perhaps, also in one attributed to St. Eusebius) a part of the false evidence on which a Doctor of the Church was turned out of Milan and apparently excommunicated.

It would seem that when St. Hilary wrote his book "Adversus Constantium" in 360, just before his return from exile in the East, he believed that Liberius had fallen and had renounced St. Athanasius; but his words are not quite clear. At all events, when he wrote his "Adversus Valentem et Ursacium" after his return, he showed the letter "Studens paci" to be a forgery, by appending to it some noble letters of the pope. Now this seems to prove that the Luciferians were making use of "Studens paci" after Rimini, in order to show that the pope, who was now in their opinion too indulgent to the fallen bishops, had himself been guilty of an even worse betrayal of the Catholic cause before his exile. In their view, such a fall would unpope him and invalidate all his subsequent acts. That St. Hilary should have taken some trouble to prove that the "Studens paci" was spurious makes it evident that he did not believe Liberius had fallen subsequently in his exile; else his trouble was useless. Consequently, St. Hilary becomes a strong witness to the innocence of Liberius. If St. Athanasius believed in his fall, this was when he was in hiding, and immediately after the supposed event; he was apparently de-

ceived for the moment by the rumours spread by the Arians. The author of the preface to the "Liber Precum" of Faustinus and Marcellinus is an Ursinian masquerading as a Luciferian in order to get the advantage of the toleration accorded to the latter sect, and he takes the Luciferian view of Liberius; possibly he followed Jerome's "Chronicle", which seems to be following the forged letters; for Jerome knew St. Hilary's book "Against Valens and Ursacius", and he refused to accept the assertion of Rufinus that it had been interpolated. In his account of Fortunatian (De Viris Illust., xcvii) he says this bishop "was infamous for having been the first to break the courage of Liberius and induce him to give his signature to heresy, and this on his way into exile". This is incredible, for St. Athanasius twice tells us that the pope held out two whole years. Evidently St. Jerome (who was very careless about history) had got hold of the story that Fortunatian had a letter of Liberius in his hands after the Council of Milan, and he concludes that he must have met Liberius as the latter passed through Aquileia on his way to Thrace; that is to say, Jerome has read the forged letters and has not quite understood them.

Rufinus, who was himself of Aquileia, says he could not find out whether Liberius fell or not. This seems to be as much as to say that, knowing necessarily the assertions of St. Jerome, he was unable to discover on what they were based. He himself was not deceived by the forgeries, and there was indeed no other basis.

Positive evidence in favour of Liberius is not wanting. About 432 St. Prosper re-edited and continued St. Jerome's "Chronicle", but he was careful to omit the words *tædio victus exilii* in relating the return of Liberius. St. Sulpicius Severus (403) says Liberius was restored *ob seditiones Romanas*. A letter of Pope St. Anastasius I (401) mentions him with Dionysius, Hilary, and Eusebius as one of those who would have died rather than blaspheme Christ with the Arians. St. Ambrose remembered him as an exceedingly holy man. Socrates has placed the exile of Liberius after the Council of Milan, through too carelessly following the order of Rufinus; unlike Rufinus, however, he is not doubtful about the fall of Liberius, but gives as sufficient reason for his return the revolt of the Romans against Felix, and he has expressly omitted the story which Sozomen took from Sabinus, a writer of whose good faith Socrates had a low opinion. To Theodoret Liberius is a glorious athlete of the faith; he tells us more of him than any other writer has done, and he tells it with enthusiasm.

But the strongest arguments for the innocence of Liberius are a priori. Had he really given in to the emperor during his exile, the emperor would have published his victory far and wide; there would have been no possible doubt about it; it would have been more notorious than even that gained over Hosius. But if he was released because the Romans demanded him back, because his deposition had been too uncanonical, because his resistance was too heroic, and because Felix was not generally recognized as pope, then we might be sure he would be suspected of having given some pledge to the emperor; the Arians and the Felicians alike, and soon the Luciferians, would have no difficulty in spreading a report of his fall and in winning credence for it. It is hard to see how Hilary in banishment and Athanasius in hiding could disbelieve such a story, when they heard that Liberius had returned, though the other exiled bishops were still unrelieved.

Further, the pope's decree after Rimini, that the fallen bishops could not be restored unless they showed their sincerity by vigour against the Arians, would have been laughable, if he himself had fallen yet earlier, and had not publicly atoned for his sin. Yet, we can be quite certain that he made no public confession of having fallen, no recantation, no atonement.

The forged letters and, still more, the strong words of St. Jerome have perpetuated the belief in his guilt. The "Liber Pontificalis" makes him return from exile to persecute the followers of Felix, who becomes a martyr and a saint. St. Eusebius, martyr, is represented in his Acts as a Roman priest, put to death by the Arianizing Liberius. But the curious "Gesta Liberii", apparently of the time of Pope Symmachus, do not make any clear allusion to a fall. The Hieronymian Martyrology gives his deposition both on 23 Sept. and 17 May; on the former date he is commemorated by Wandalbert and by some of the enlarged MSS. of Usuard. But he is not in the Roman Martyrology.

MODERN JUDGMENTS ON POPE LIBERIUS.—Historians and critics have been much divided as to the guilt of Liberius. Stilting and Zaccaria are the best known among the earlier defenders; in the nineteenth century, Palma, Reinerding, Hergenröther, Jungmann, Grisar, Feis, and recently Savio. These have been inclined to doubt the authenticity of the testimonies of St. Athanasius and St. Jerome to the fall of Liberius, but their arguments, though serious, hardly amount to a real probability against these texts. On the other hand, Protestant and Gallican writers have been severe on Liberius (e. g. Moeller, Barmby, the Old-Catholic Langen, and Döllinger), but they have not pretended to decide with certainty what Arian formula he signed. With these Renouf may be grouped, and lately Schiktanz. A more moderate view is represented by Hefele, who denied the authenticity of the letters, but admitted the truth of Sozomen's story, looking upon the union of the pope with the Semi-Arians as a deplorable mistake, but not as a lapse into heresy. He is followed by Funk and Duchesne (1907), while the Protestant Krüger is altogether undecided. The newest view, brilliantly exposed by Duchesne in 1908, is that Liberius early in 357 (because the preface to the "Liber Precum" makes Constantius speak at Rome in April-May as though Liberius had already fallen) wrote the letter "Studens paci", and, finding it did not satisfy the emperor, signed the indefinite and insufficient formula of 351, and wrote the three other contested letters; the Arian leaders were still not satisfied, and Liberius was only restored to Rome when the Semi-Arians were able to influence the emperor in 358, after Liberius had agreed with them as Sozomen relates. The weak points of this theory are as follows: There is no other authority for a fall so early as the beginning of 357 but a casual word in the document referred to above; the "Studens paci" is senseless at so late a date; the letter "Pro deifico timore" plainly means that Liberius had accepted the formula of 357 (not that of 351), and had he done so, he would certainly have been restored at once; the story of Sozomen is untrustworthy, and Liberius must have returned in 357.

It should be carefully noted that the question of the fall of Liberius is one that has been and can be freely debated among Catholics. No one pretends that, if Liberius signed the most Arian formulæ in exile, he did so freely; so that no question of his infallibility is involved. It is admitted on all sides that his noble attitude of resistance before his exile and during his exile was not belied by any act of his after his return, that he was in no way sullied when so many failed at the Council of Rimini, and that he acted vigorously for the healing of orthodoxy throughout the West from the grievous wound. If he really consorted with heretics, condemned Athanasius, or even denied the Son of God, it was a momentary human weakness which no more compromises the papacy than does that of St. Peter.

The letters of Liberius, together with his sermon on the occasion of the consecration of St. Ambrose's sister to virginity (preserved by that Father, "De Virg." I, ii, iii), and the dialogue with the emperor (Theodoret, "Hist. Eccl.", II, xvi) are collected in Coustant,

"Epistolæ Rom. Pont." (reprint in P. L., VIII). A critical edition from MSS. of the three spurious epistles of St. Hilary, 'Frag.' VI, in "Revue Bénéd." (Jan., 1910).

STILTING in *Acta SS.*, Sept., VI (1757), 572; TILLEMONT, *Mémoires*, VI; ZACCARIA, *Dissertatio de commentitio Liberii lapsu* in PETAVIUS, *Theol. dog.*, II, ii (1757); PALMA, *Prælectiones Hist. Eccl.*, I (Rome, 1838); REINERDING, *Beiträge zur Honorius und Liberiusfrage* (1865); LE PAGE RENOUF, *The Condemnation of Pope Honorius* (London, 1868); HEFELE, *Conciliengeschichte*, I (2nd ed. and later ones; Eng. tr. vol. II, 1876); JUNGMANN, *Dissertationes selectæ*, II (Ratisbon and New York, 1881); BARMBY in *Dict. Christ. Biog.*, s. v.; HERGENRÖTHER, *Kirchengesch.*, I (1884) 374; GRISAR in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.; FEIS, *Storia di Liberio Papa e dello scisma dei Semiariani* (Rome, 1894); MŒLLER-SCHUBERT, *Lehrbuch der Kirchengesch.*, I (Leipzig, 1902); LOOFS in *Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, s. v. *Hilarius*; KRUGER, ibid., s. v. *Liberius*; SCHIKTANZ, *Die Hilariusfragmente* (Breslau, 1905); SALTET, *La formation de la légende des papes Libère et Félix* in *Bulletin de litt. eccl.* (July, 1905); IDEM, *Fraudes littéraires des Lucifériens, ibid.* (Oct., 1906); IDEM, *Les lettres du pape Libère de 357, ibid.* (Dec., 1907); WILMART, *L'Ad Constantium liber I de S. Hilaire* in *Revue Bénéd.* (April and July, 1907); IDEM, *Les Fragments historiques et le synode de Béziers, ibid.* (April, 1908); IDEM, *La question du pape Libère, ibid.* (July, 1908); DUCHESNE, *Libère et Fortunatien in Mélanges de l'école française de Rome*, XXVIII, i–ii (Jan.–April, 1908); SAVIO, *La questione di papa Liberio* (Rome, 1907; an answer to SCHIKTANZ); IDEM, *Nuovi studi sulla questione di papa Liberio* (Rome, 1909; in reply to DUCHESNE); CHAPMAN, *The contested letters of Pope Liberius* in *Revue Bénéd.* (Jan., April, July, 1910; in reply to DUCHESNE); FEDER, *Studien zu Hilarius von Poitiers*, I, in *Sitzungsber. der K. Akad. Wiss. von Wien* (Vienna, 1910), follows DUCHESNE.

JOHN CHAPMAN.

Libermann, FRANCIS MARY PAUL, VENERABLE, founder of the Congregation of the Immaculate Heart of Mary, which was afterwards merged in the Congregation of the Holy Ghost (q. v.). The son of a Jewish rabbi, he was born at Saverne in Alsace, 12 April, 1804; and he died at Paris, 2 February, 1852. He received the name of Jacob at his circumcision, and was the third youngest of seven children whom his mother Lia Suzanna Haller, bore to his father, Lazarus Libermann. He was brought up according to the sternly strict tenets of the Talmud, and his mind was early imbued with a special horror of the "Goim", or Christians. He lost his mother when he was nine years old; and this, together with the harsh treatment he received from his schoolmaster, caused his boyhood to pass in much bitterness. The learned and universally esteemed rabbi of Saverne fixed his mind on his son, Jacob, as his successor in the rabbinical office. With this in view, he sent him to Metz to perfect his studies in the Talmud, and in Hebrew and Chaldaic. But God had other designs on the young man, who was then in his twentieth year. During his stay at Metz, the Gospels, translated into Hebrew came accidentally into his hands, and impressed him deeply. Moreover, his eldest brother first, and afterwards two other brothers, embraced Catholicity. And, although Jacob deeply resented their change of religion, he gradually came to recognize their happiness and peace of soul, which was in strong contrast with his own distracted frame of mind. Finally, he obtained from his father permission to go to Paris; and there he came under the influence of M. Drach, a convert from Judaism, who had him received into the Collège Stanislas, where he was instructed in the truths of Faith, which he embraced with eagerness. He was baptized on Christmas Eve, 1826, in the twenty-third year of his age. At baptism he took the three-fold name of Francis Mary Paul, the first two in gratitude to his godfather, Baron François de Mallet, and to his godmother, Comtesse Marie d'Heuse, and the last as a mark of his admiration of the great Apostle of the Gentiles, whom he was so closely to imitate in many respects.

Immediately after his conversion, M. Libermann displayed marked signs of a vocation for the ecclesiastical state. His protectors and friends found a place for him, first, in the college of the Missions de France, where he received tonsure five months after his baptism, and later in the seminary of St. Sulpice, which he entered in October, 1827. On the very eve of his promotion to subdeaconship, he was stricken down by an attack of epilepsy which was to be his companion for the next five years. During that time he was kept by his charitable superiors at the seminary of Issy. It was there that he was brought into close apostolic relationship with two Creole seminarians, M. Le Vavasseur, from Bourbon, and M. Tisserand, from Santo Domingo, both of whom were filled with zeal for the evangelization of the poor ex-slaves of those islands. This acquaintanceship evoked the first concept of a religious society for the conversion of those abandoned souls. It took five years more of prayer and patience to accomplish the foundation of the Congregation of the Immaculate Heart of Mary, for that purpose. Meanwhile, M. Libermann was called away to become, though yet only in minor orders, master of novices for the Eudist Fathers at Rennes. After two years of devotion to that work (1838–39), he felt a very positive call from God to unite with MM. Le Vavasseur and Tisserand in furthering the apostolate to the negroes. At their suggestion, he proceeded to Rome and laid his plans before the Holy See. The year of his sojourn at Rome (1840–41) was passed in great obscurity and poverty. He profited by the time he was kept waiting for a decision to write the provisional rules of the proposed institute, as well as a remarkable "Commentary on St. John's Gospel". At last, after a year's waiting, the obscure and friendless ecclesiastic received the warm encouragement of the Cardinal Prefect of Propaganda, to pursue his project for the evangelization of the negroes. He repaired to the seminary of Strasburg to prepare for his ordination, which took place at Amiens, 18 September, 1841. On the twenty-seventh of the same month the novitiate of the Congregation of the Immaculate Heart of Mary was opened in the neighbouring village of La Neuville.

The first occupants of the novitiate were the founder himself, his first associate, Father Le Vavasseur, and a sub-deacon, M. Collin. Others filled with apostolic zeal quickly joined them, among the number being Rev. Ignatius Schwindemhammer, who was destined to be the founder's immediate successor. Missions were soon offered to the infant society in Mauritius, where Father Laval wrought wonders which continue to the present day; in Bourbon and Hayti; and, especially in Africa. Father Libermann's sons were, practically, the first since the downfall of the African Church to penetrate the Dark Continent. Most of the first missioners paid for their heroism with their lives; but others filled their places; and the widespread prosperity of the Church in Africa, at the present day is, in large measure, due to the initiative and self-sacrifice of the first members of the Congregation of the Immaculate Heart of Mary. The Venerable Libermann was the heart and soul, the father and model of the nascent community during the seven years of its independent existence, 1841–1848. By that time it had become numerous and flourishing; and Divine Providence ordained that it should be engrafted on the Congregation of the Holy Ghost, which had a similar object, but which had become almost extinct during the Revolution (see HOLY GHOST, RELIGIOUS CONGREGATIONS OF THE, I). This difficult and delicate task of uniting two congregations was successfully accomplished, at the request of the Holy See, by Father Libermann; and he was chosen superior general of the united societies, a post he occupied till his death. By the time of his death, the Venerable Libermann enjoyed the reputation of the highest sanctity in the minds of all who knew him; and shortly after his death there was a widespread desire to have the cause of his beatification introduced. The usual ecclesiastical tribunal was erected in Paris, in 1867; its labours were continued till 1872, when the depositions of the witnesses and the other documents bearing on the case

were forwarded to Rome. After mature examination and deliberation, the Sacred Congregation of Rites unanimously decreed the introduction of his cause. This decree was ratified a few days afterwards, 1 June, 1876, by Pius IX, who thus declared the holy convert from Judaism Venerable. Since that time, the cause of his beatification has progressed through the usual forms; and his spiritual sons throughout the world expect to see him ere long declared Blessed.

Several thousand of his letters have been preserved; and these, together with all his other writings, have been examined and approved by the Holy See. His method of spiritual direction, was, like his life, a mingling of sweetness and self-denial, breathing peace and courage, in the midst of all manner of trials. His published writings are, "Lettres Spirituelles", 2 vols. (Paris, 1880); "Ecrits Spirituels" (Paris, 1891); "Commentaire sur l'Evangile de St. Jean" (Paris, n. d.).

PITRA, *Vie du R. P. Libermann*, (Paris, 1872); *Vie du R. P. Libermann par un père de la Cong. du S. Esprit* (Paris, 1878); GOEPFERT, *Life of Ven. F. M. P. Libermann*, (Dublin, 1880).

JOHN T. MURPHY.

Liber Pontificalis (BOOK OF THE POPES), a history of the popes, beginning with St. Peter and continued down to the fifteenth century, in the form of biographies. The first complete collection of the papal biographies in the original form of the Liber Pontificalis reached to Stephen V (885–91). They were afterwards continued in a different style as far as Eugene IV (d. 1447) and Pius II (d. 1464). The individual biographies are very unequal in extent and importance. In most cases they exhibit a definite symmetrical form, which in the old Liber Pontificalis is quite uniform. These brief sketches give the origin and birthplace of the pope, the length of his pontificate, the decrees issued by him on questions of ecclesiastical discipline and liturgy, civil and ecclesiastical events, the building and renovation of Roman churches, donations to churches of land, liturgical furniture, reliquaries, valuable tapestries and the like, transfer of relics to churches, the number of the principal ordinations (bishops, priests, deacons), the burial-place of the pope, and the time during which the see was vacant.

Historical criticism has for a long time dealt with this ancient text in an exhaustive way, especially in recent decades after Duchesne had begun the publication of his classic edition. In most of its manuscript copies there is found at the beginning a spurious correspondence between Pope Damasus and Saint Jerome. These letters were considered genuine in the Middle Ages; consequently, in those times St. Jerome was considered the author of the biographies as far as Damasus, at whose request it was believed Jerome had written the work, the subsequent lives having been added at the command of each individual pope. When the above-mentioned correspondence was proved entirely apocryphal, this view was abandoned. In the sixteenth century Onofrio Panvinio on quite insufficient grounds attributed to Anastasius Bibliothecarius in the ninth century the continuation of the biographies as far as Nicholas I. Although Baronius in great measure corrected this false impression, the earlier editions, which appeared in the seventeenth century, bear the name of Anastasius as the author of our book of the popes. The investigations of Ciampini ("Examen Libri Pontificalis seu Vitarum Rom. Pont. quæ sub nomine Anastasii circumferuntur", Rome, 1688), Schelstrate ("Dissertatio de antiquis Romanorum Pontificum catalogis", Rome, 1692), and other scholars, disprove any possible claim of Anastasius to the authorship of this work. The conclusive researches of Duchesne have established beyond a doubt that in its earlier part, as far as the ninth century, the Liber Pontificalis was gradually compiled, and that the later continuations were added unsystematically. In only a few cases is it possible to ascertain the authors.

Modern criticism deals chiefly with two points, the period in which the Liber Pontificalis, in its earliest part, was compiled, and the sources then available to the author of this oldest division of the Liber Pontificalis. Duchesne has proved exhaustively and convincingly that the first series of biographies, from St. Peter to Felix III [IV (d. 530)], were compiled at the latest under Felix's successor, Boniface II (530–2), and that their author was a contemporary of Anastasius II (496–8) and of Symmachus (498–514). His principal arguments are the following. A great many biographies of the predecessors of Anastasius II are full of errors and historically untenable, but from Anastasius II on the information on the ecclesiastico-political history of the popes is valuable and historically certain. In addition, some manuscripts offer a summary of the earlier part of the Liber Pontificalis as far as Felix III (IV), whence the name "catalogus Felicianus"; consequently, the Liber Pontificalis must have been accessible to the author of this summary in a recension that reached to the above-mentioned Felix III (IV). This observation tallies well with the aforesaid fact that the biographies from Anastasius II on exhibit accurate historical information. Duchesne defended successfully this opinion against Waitz and Mommsen, who placed the first edition of the Liber Pontificalis in the beginning of the seventh century. To bear out this view they suppose that from the time of Anastasius II to that of the author a genuine and reliable historical source, since lost, was at his disposal. Since, moreover, they cannot explain the summary ending with Felix III (IV), as easily is done by the hypothesis of Duchesne, the latter's opinion meets with the general approval of historians, and has recently been perfected by investigators like Grisar. The first part, therefore, to the death of Felix III (IV), i. e. to 530, should be considered a complete work, the compilation of some author who wrote shortly after the death of Pope Felix; later biographies were added at different times in groups or separately by various authors.

The compiler of the first part made use of two ancient catalogues or lists of the popes, taking from them the order of succession, the chronological data, and also certain historical notes; these lists were: (a) the so-called "Catalogus Liberianus", and (b) a list of the popes that varies in length in the manuscripts, and perhaps depends on the "Catalogus Liberianus" for the period before the middle of the sixth century. The "Catalogus Liberianus" is so called because it terminates with Pope Liberius (352–66). It has reached us in the so-called "Chronographus anni 354", an ancient manuscript that contains the valuable lists of the "Depositio martyrum" and the "Depositio episcoporum". In the "Catalogus Liberianus" there are already short historical notices of some popes (Peter, Pius, Pontianus, Fabianus, Cornelius, Lucius, Xystus, Marcellinus, Julius), which were taken over by the author of the Liber Pontificalis. For its list of the earliest popes the "Catalogus Liberianus" was able to draw on the papal catalogue given by Hippolytus of Rome in his "Liber generationis", though even this list is not the oldest list of popes. It is probable that from the beginning of the second century there was already a list of popes, which contained short historical notices and was afterwards continued. Eusebius and later chroniclers used such lists in their works [Lightfoot, "The Apostolic Fathers", Part I; "St. Clement of Rome", I (2nd ed., London, 1890), 201 sqq.; Harnack, "Gesch. der altchristl. Litt.", Part II: "Die Chronologie", I (Leipzig, 1897), 70 sqq.; Segna, "De Successione Romanorum Pontificum" (Rome, 1897)]. Such a catalogue of popes has reached us, as above stated, in the "Catalogus Liberianus", and forms a basis for the earliest recension of the work.

The compiler of the Liber Pontificalis utilized also some historical writings (e. g. St. Jerome, "De Viris

Illustribus"), a number of apocryphal fragments (e. g. the Pseudo-Clementine Recognitions), the "Constitutum Silvestri", the spurious Acts of the alleged Synod of 275 bishops under Silvester etc., and fifth century Roman Acts of martyrs. Finally, the compiler distributed arbitrarily along his list of popes a number of papal decrees taken from unauthentic sources; he likewise attributed to earlier popes liturgical and disciplinary regulations of the sixth century. The building of churches, the donations of land, of church plate and furniture, and many kinds of precious ornaments are specified in great detail. These latter items are of great value, since they are based on the records of the papal treasury (*vestiarium*), and the conclusion has been drawn that the compiler of the Liber Pontificalis in its earliest form must have been a clerk of the treasury. It is to be noted that the actual Liber Pontificalis that we have was not the only work of this kind. There existed a similar collection of papal biographies, executed under Pope Hormisdas (d. 523), of which a lengthy fragment has reached us (Fragmentum Laurentianum); it gives the end of the life of Anastasius II (d. 498) and the life of his successor Symmachus. The text of the early Liber Pontificalis (first half of the sixth century), as found in the manuscripts that exhibit the later continuations, is not the original text. Duchesne gives a reconstruction of the earliest text of the work. After Felix III (IV) the Liber Pontificalis was continued by various authors at intervals, each writer treating a group of papal lives. Duchesne recognizes a first continuation as far as Pope Silverius (536–7), whose life is attributed to a contemporary. The limits of the next continuation are more difficult to determine; moreover in its earliest biographies several inaccuracies are met with. It is certain that one continuation ended with Pope Conon (d. 687); the aforesaid summary ending with this pope (Catalogus Cononianus) and certain lists of popes are proof of this.

After Conon the lives down to Stephen V (885–91) were regularly added, and from the end of the seventh century usually by contemporaries of the popes in question. While many of the biographies are very circumstantial, their historical value varies much; from a literary point of view both style and diction are, as a rule, of a low grade. Nevertheless they are a very important historical source for the period covered. Some of these biographies were begun in the lifetime of the pope, the incidents being set down as they occurred. The authors were Roman ecclesiastics, and some of them were attached to the papal court. In only two cases can the author's name be discovered with any probability. The life of Stephen II (752–7) was probably written by the papal "Primicerius" Christopher. Anastasius Bibliothecarius perhaps wrote the life of Nicholas I (858–67), a genuine, though brief, history of this pope; this author may also have worked at the life of the following pope, Adrian II (867–72), with whose pontificate the text of this Liber Pontificalis, as exhibited in the extant manuscripts, comes to an end. The biographies of the three following popes are missing and that of Stephen V (885–91) is incomplete. In its original form the Liber Pontificalis reached as far as the latter pope. From the end of the ninth century the series of the papal lives was long interrupted. For the whole of the tenth and eleventh centuries there are only lists of the popes with a few short historical notices, that usually give only the pope's origin and the duration of his reign.

After Leo IX (1049–54) detailed biographies of the popes were again written; at first, however, not as continuations of the Liber Pontificalis, but as occasion offered, notably during the Investitures conflict. In this way Bonizo of Sutri, in his "Liber ad amicum" or "De persecutione ecclesiæ", wrote lives of the popes from Leo IX to Gregory VII; he also wrote, as an introduction to the fourth book of his "Decretals", a "Chronicon Romanorum Pontificum" as far as Urban II (1088–99). Cardinal Beno wrote a history of the Roman Church in opposition to Gregory VII, "Gesta Romanæ ecclesiæ contra Hildebrandum" (Mon. Germ. Hist., Libelli de lite, II, 368 sqq.). Important information concerning the popes is contained in the "Annales Romani", from 1044 to 1187, and is utilized, in part, by Duchesne in his edition of the Liber Pontificalis (below). Only in the first half of the twelfth century was a systematic continuation again undertaken. This is the Liber Pontificalis of Petrus Guillermi (son of William), so called by Duchesne after the manuscript written in 1142 by this Petrus in the monastery of St. Gilles (Diocese of Reims). But Petrus Guillermi merely copied, with certain additions and abbreviations, the biographies of the popes written by Pandulf, nephew of Hugo of Alatri. Following the lines of the old Liber Pontificalis, Pandulf had made a collection of the lives of the popes from St. Peter down; only from Leo IX does he add any original matter. Down to Urban II (1088–99) his information is drawn from written sources; from Paschal II (1099–1118) to Honorius II (1124–30), after whose pontificate this recension of the Liber Pontificalis was written, we have a contemporary's own information. Duchesne holds that all biographies from Gregory VII on were written by Pandulf, while earlier historians like Giesebrecht ("Allgemeine Monatsschrift", Halle, 1852, 260 sqq.) and Watterich (Romanorum Pontificum vitæ, I, LXVIII sqq.) had considered Cardinal Petrus Pisanus as author of the lives of Gregory VII, Victor III, and Urban II, and had attributed to Pandulf only the subsequent lives—i. e. those of Gelasius II, Callistus II, and Honorius II. This series of papal biographies, extant only in the recension of Petrus Guillermi, is continued in the same manuscripts of the monastery of St. Gilles as far as Martin II (1281–5); however, the statements of this manuscript have no special value, being all taken from the Chronicle of Martinus Polonus.

On the other hand the series of papal lives written by the cardinal priest Boso (d. about 1178), has independent value; it was his intention to continue the old Liber Pontificalis from the death of Stephen V, with which life, as above said, the work ends. For the popes from John XII to Gregory VII Boso drew on Bonizo of Sutri; for the lives from Gelasius II (1118–19), to Alexander III (1179–81) under whom Boso filled an important office, the work has independent value. This collection, nevertheless, was not completed as a continuation of the Liber Pontificalis and it remained unnoticed for a long time. Cencius Camerarius, afterwards Honorius III, was the first to publish, together with his "Liber censuum", the "Gesta Romanorum Pontificum" of Boso. Biographies of individual popes of the thirteenth century were written by various authors, but were not brought together in a continuation of the Liber Pontificalis. Early in the fourteenth century an unknown author carried farther the above-mentioned continuation of Petrus Guillermi, and added biographies of the popes from Martin IV (d. 1281) to John XXII (1316–34); but the information is taken from the "Chronicon Pontificum" of Bernardus Guidonis, and the narrative reaches only to 1328. An independent continuation appeared in the reign of Eugene IV (1431–47).

From Urban V (1362–70) to Martin V (1417–31), with whom this continuation ended, the biographies have special historical value; the epoch treated is broadly the time of the Great Western Schism. A later recension of this continuation, accomplished under Eugene IV, offers several additions. Finally, to the fifteenth century belong two collections of papal biographies, which were thought to be a continuation of the Liber Pontificalis, but nevertheless have remained separate and independent collections. The first comprises the popes from Benedict XII (1334–

42) to Martin V (1417–31), and in another manuscript to Eugene IV (1431–47); the second reaches from Urban VI (1378–89) to Pius II (1458–64). For the last popes in each case they exhibit valuable historical material. In consequence of the peculiar development of the Liber Pontificalis as a whole, it follows that, in order to obtain the full value of the historical sources used in the Liber Pontificalis, each particular life, each larger or smaller group of lives, needs separate critical treatment. The Liber Pontificalis was first edited by J. Busæus under the title "Anastasii bibliothecarii Vitæ seu Gesta Romanorum Pontificum" (Mainz, 1602). A new edition, with the "Historia ecclesiastica" of Anastasius, was edited by Fabrotti (Paris, 1647). The best of the older editions of the primitive Liber Pontificalis (down to Hadrian II), with edition of the life of Stephen VI, was done by Fr. Bianchini (4 vols., Rome, 1718–35; a projected fifth volume did not appear). Muratori added to his reprint of this edition the lives of later popes down to John XXII (Scriptores rerum Italicarum, III). The edition of Bianchini with several appendixes is found also in Migne (P. L., CXXVII–VIII). For a classic edition of the early Liber Pontificalis, with all the abovementioned continuations, we are indebted to the tireless industry of Louis Duchesne, "Liber Pontificalis. Texte, introduction et commentaire" (2 vols., Paris, 1886–92). Mommsen began a new critical edition of the same work under the title "Gestorum Pontificum Romanorum pars I: Liber Pontificalis" (Mon. Germ. hist.); the first volume extends to 715 (Berlin, 1898).

On the plan of the Roman Liber Pontificalis, and in obvious imitation, Agnellus, a priest of Ravenna, wrote the history of the bishops of that city, and called it "Liber Pontificalis Ecclesiæ Ravennatis". It began with St. Apollinaris and reached to about 485 (see AGNELLUS OF RAVENNA). This history of the bishops of Ravenna was continued, first by the unknown author to the end of the thirteenth century (1296), and afterwards to 1410 by Petrus Scordilli, provost of Ravenna. Other medieval chroniclers have also left collections of biographies of the bishops of particular sees, arranged on the lines of the Liber Pontificalis. Thus in 1071–2, at the order of Bishop Gundecharus of Eichstätt, the "Liber Pontificalis Eichstettensis" (ed. Bethmann in "Mon. Germ. hist., Script.", VII, 242–50). Many medieval archiepiscopal and episcopal sees possess, under the title of "Gesta", histories of the occupants of these sees. Most of them offer very important original material for local diocesan history (for a list of them consult Potthast, "Bibliotheca historica medii ævi", 2nd ed., I, 511, 514–6).

Besides the learned *Prolegomena* to the editions of DUCHESNE and MOMMSEN, see DUCHESNE, *Etude sur le Liber Pontificalis* in *Bibl. des Ecoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome* (1st series, Paris, 1877); IDEM, *La date et les récensions du Liber Pont.* in *Revue de quest. hist.*, XXVI (1879), 493–530; IDEM, *Le premier Liber Pont., Ibid.*, XXIX (1881), 246–62; IDEM, *La nouvelle édition du Liber Pont.* in *Mélanges d'archéol. et d'hist.*, XVIII (1898), 381–417; GRISAR, *Der Liber Pontif.* in *Zeitschr. fur kath. Theol.*, XI (1887), 417–46; IDEM, *Analecta Romana*, I (Rome, 1899), 1 sqq.; WAITZ, *Ueber die italienischen Handschriften des Liber Pont.* in *Neues Archiv*, X (1885), 455–65 IDEM, *Ueber den sogennanten Catalogus Felicianus der Päpste, ibid.*, XI (1886), 217–99: IDEM, *Ueber die verschiedenen Texte des Liber Pont., ibid.*, IV (1879), 216–73; BRACKMANN, *Reise nach Italien, ibid.*, XXVI (1901), 299–347; GIORGI, *Appunti intorno ad alcuni manoscritti del Liber Pont.* in *Archivio della Soc. romana di storia patria*, XX (1897), 247 sqq.; WATTERICH, *Vitæ Pontif. Roman.* (2 vols., Leipzig, 1862); LIGHTFOOT, *The Apostolic Fathers*, Part I: *S. Clement of Rome*, I (London, 1890), 303–25; FABRE, *Etude sur le Liber Censuum de l'Eglise romaine* in *Bibl. des Ecoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome*, n. lxii (1st series, Paris, 1899); GLASSCHRÖDER, *Des Lucas Holstenius Sammlung von Papstleben* in *Römische Quartalschr.*, IV (1890), 125 sqq.; IDEM, *Vitæ aliquot Pontificum sæc.* XV, *ibid.*, V (1891), 178 sqq.; IDEM, *Zur Quellenkunde der Papstgesch. des XIV. Jahrhunderts* in *Historiches Jahrbuch*, XI (1890), 240 sqq.; HARNACK, *Ueber die Ordinationes im Papstbuch* in *Sitzungsber. der Akad. der Wiss. zu Berlin* (1897), 761 sqq.; MOMMSEN, *Ordo et spatia episcoporum Romanorum in Libro Pontificali* in *Neues Archiv*, XXI (1894), 333 sqq.; SÄGMÜLLER, *Dietrich von Niem und der Liber Pontificalis* in *Hist. Jahrbuch*, XV (1894), 802 sqq.; ROSENFELD, *Ueber die Komposition des Liber Pontificalis bis zu Konstantin. Dissert.* (Marburg, 1896); SCHNÜRER, *Der Verfasser der Vita Stephani II* 752–757) *im Liber Pontificalis* in *Histor. Jahrbuch*, XI (1890), 425 sqq.; POTTHAST, *Bibl. hist. medii ævi*, I, 737–9; DE SMEDT, *Introductio generalis ad historiam eccl. critice tractandam* (Ghent, 1876), 220 sqq.

J. P. KIRSCH.

Liber Sententiarum. See PETER LOMBARD.

Liber Septimus.—Three canonical collections of quite different value from a legal standpoint are known by this title. (1) The "Constitutiones Clementis V" or "Clementinæ", not officially known as "Liber Septimus", but so designated by historians and canonists of the Middle Ages, and even on one occasion by John XXII, in a letter to the Bishop of Strasburg, in 1321. This collection was not even considered a "Liber". It was officially promulgated by Clement V in a consistory held at Monteaux near Carpentras (France) on 21 March, 1314, and sent to the Universities of Orléans and Paris. The death of Clement V, occurring on 20 April following, gave rise to certain doubts as to the legal force of the compilation. Consequently, John XXII by his Bull, "Quoniam nulla", of 25 October, 1317, promulgated it again as obligatory, without making any changes in it. Johannes Andreæ compiled its commentary, or *glossa ordinaria*. It was not an exclusive collection, and did not abrogate the previously existing laws not incorporated in it (see CORPUS JURIS CANONICI; DECRETALS, PAPAL). (2) A canonist of the sixteenth century, Pierre Mathieu (Petrus Matthæus), published in 1690, under the title of "Septimus Liber Decretalium", a collection of canons arranged according to the order of the Decretals of Gregory IX, containing some Decretals of preceding popes, especially of those who reigned from the time of Sixtus IV (1464–71) to that of Sixtus V, in 1590. It was an entirely private collection and devoid of scientific value. Some editions of the "Corpus Juris Canonici" (Frankfort, 1590; Lyons 1621 and 1671; Böhmer's edition, Halle, 1747), contain the text of this "Liber septimus" as an appendix.

(3) The name has been given also to a canonical collection officially known as "Decretales Clementis Papæ VIII". It owes the name of "Liber Septimus" to Cardinal Pinelli, prefect of the special congregation appointed by Sixtus V to draw up a new ecclesiastical code, who, in his manuscript notes, applied this title to it. Fagnanus and Benedict XIV imitated him in this, and it has retained the name. It was to supply the defect of an official codification of the canon law from the date of the publication of the "Clementinæ" (1317), that Gregory XIII, about the year 1580 appointed a body of cardinals to undertake the work. In 1587 Sixtus V established the congregation mentioned above. The printed work was submitted to Clement VIII, in 1598, for his approbation, which was refused. A new revision undertaken in 1607–08 had a similar fate, the reigning pope, Paul V, declining to approve the "Liber Septimus" as the obligatory legal code of the Church. It is divided into five books, subdivided into titles and chapters, and contains disciplinary and dogmatic canons of the Councils of Florence, Lateran, and Trent, and constitutions of twenty-eight popes from Gregory IX to Clement VIII. The refusals of approbation by Clement VIII and Paul V are to be attributed, not to the fear of seeing the canons of the Council of Trent glossed by canonists (which was forbidden by the Bull of Paul IV, "Benedictus Deus", confirming the Council of Trent), but to the political situation of the day, several states having refused to admit some of the constitutions inserted in the new collection, and also to the fact that the Council of Trent had not yet been accepted by the French Government; it was therefore feared that the Governments would refuse to recognize the new code. It seems a mistake, too, to have included in the work decisions that were purely and exclusively dogmatic and as such entirely foreign to the domain of canon

law. This collection, which appeared about the end of the sixteenth century, was edited by François Sentis ("Clementis PapæVIII Decretales", Freiburg, 1870).

PHILLIPS, *Kirchenrecht*, IV (Ratisbon, 1851), 378 sqq.; LAURIN, *Introductio in Corpus juris canonici* (Freiburg, 1889), 196 sqq., 277; SCHERER, *Handbuch des Kirchenrechts*, I (Graz, 1886), 253; SCHNEIDER, *Die Lehre v. d. Kirchenrechtsquellen* (Ratisbon, 1902), 156 sqq., 177; text-books of WERNZ, SÄGMÜLLER, etc.

A. VAN HOVE.

Liber Sextus Decretalium, the title of the canonical collection compiled under order of Boniface VIII by Guillaume de Mandagot, Bishop of Embrun, Berenger Fredoli, Bishop of Beziers, and Ricardo Petroni, of Siena, vice-chancellor of the pope, by whom it was approved as an authentic and official collection in the Bull "Sacrosanctæ" of 3 March, 1298. Like the "Decretals of Gregory IX", the "Liber Sextus" comprises five books, subdivided into titles and chapters. It contains in addition eighty-eight rules of law (*regulæ juris*) borrowed from the Roman law, and compiled probably by Dino de' Rossoni, professor of civil law at the University of Bologna. It is an obligatory code of laws, abrogating all previous general laws enacted from the time of the publication of the "Decretals of Gregory IX" till the accession of Boniface VIII (5 September, 1234, to 24 December, 1294), with the exception of those that were reserved (*reservatæ*) — that is to say, maintained in vigour — either by decretals inserted in the "Sextus", declaring that these laws were to remain in force, or by their *Incipit* being included in the collection. The "Decretals of Gregory IX" were revoked, in so far as they were inconsistent with the new statutes. Although Laurin holds the contrary, we believe that the eighty-eight rules of law are also real ecclesiastical laws, because they form part of the collection as approved by Boniface VIII. The glossators of the "Sextus" were Johannes Andreæ, author of the ordinary gloss, to which he made some additions later (Additiones ad apparatum super Sexto); Johannes Monachus (d. 1313), and Guido de Baysio (d. 1313). As to the manner of citing the "Sextus", the revision of its text by the *Correctores Romani* of 1582, and the best editions, see CORPUS JURIS CANONICI.

This canonical collection was called by Boniface VIII himself the "Liber Sextus", firstly, because it is a continuation of the five books of the "Decretals of Gregory IX", and secondly, because six is a perfect number. This title will indicate, he says in the Bull of approbation ("Sacrosanctæ"), that the complete body of canon law, henceforth collected into six books (i. e. a perfect number of books), will furnish a perfect rule of action and be a safe guide in morals. According to Euclid, the number six is perfect, because it is equal to the sum of all its factors (1+2+3=6). According to Boethius, a number is to be compared to an organized body, all the parts of which (factors, quotients, or aliquot parts) represent the members. A perfect number thus denotes a body, the members of which are in perfect harmony with that body. So also in the moral order, the perfect number is the emblem of virtue (*virtutis æmulator*), and, calling this new compilation the "Liber Sextus", the pope wished to signify the happy effects which this collection of canonical legislation would produce.

NILLES, *Ueber den Titel der Dekretalensammlung Bonifaz VIII.; Lib. Sext. Decretal. Bonif. PP. VIII.* in *Archiv für kath. Kirchenrecht*, LXXXII (Mainz, 1902), pp. 425 sqq.; LAURIN, *Introductio in Corp. Jur. Can.* (Fribourg, 1889), 176 sqq.; SCHNEIDER, *Die Lehre von den Kirchenrechtsquellen* (2nd ed., Ratisbon, 1892), 151 sq.; WERNZ, *Jus Decretalium*, I (Rome, 1898), 328 sqq.; SCHERER, *Handbuch des Kirchenrechts*, I (Graz, 1886), 252.

A. VAN HOVE.

Liberties, GALLICAN. See GALLICANISM.

Libraries, that is to say, collections of books accumulated and made accessible for public or private use, were known to the ancients before the coming of Christ. Probably the most ancient library of which we have any precise knowledge is that of Tello in Mesopotamia, discovered through the excavations of M. de Sarzec and now in great part removed to the Louvre. It seems to have consisted of more than 20,000 tablets inscribed with cuneiform writing and belonging to the time of Gudea, ruler of Lagash, about 2500 B. C. Still more extensive was the royal library of Nineveh, formed by Sargon, King of Assyria from 722 to 705 B. C., and by his great-grandson Ashurbanipal (668 to 628 B. C.). The latter monarch sent scribes to the ancient cities of Babylonia and Assyria, where libraries existed, to make copies for him of rare and important works, and it seems certain that the collection comprised texts, impressed of course upon clay tablets, dealing with every branch of learning and science known to the wise men of his day. More than twenty thousand of these tablets have been brought to Europe and are now preserved in the British Museum. All the more important texts are marked with a formula attesting that they belong to the palace of Ashurbanipal, and the formula concludes with an imprecation interesting to compare with those so often found in the manuscripts of mediæval libraries: "Whosoever shall carry off this tablet, or shall inscribe his name upon it side by side with mine own, may Ashur and Belit overthrow him in wrath and anger, and may they destroy his name and posterity in the land" (Wallis, Budge, and King, "Guide to Babylonian and Assyrian Antiquities", 1908, p. 41). In Egypt collections of papyrus rolls must undoubtedly have been made, though the more perishable nature of the material has not permitted any considerable remains to be preserved from the earlier ages of Egyptian history. Of collections of books among the Jews little is known, though certain passages in the historical books of the Old Testament (e. g., II Kings, i, 18; III Kings, xi, 41; xiv, 19; xv, 23, etc.) suggest that there must have been repositories where books might be consulted. Moreover, we find in II Mach., ii, 13, a distinct statement that Nehemias founded a library and "gathered together out of the countries, the books both of the prophets, and of David, and the epistles of the kings, and concerning the holy gifts."

With regard to pagan Rome and Greece we have more precise evidence. Pisistratus is said to have formed a library which was carried off to Persia by Xerxes and afterwards restored. Aristotle, the philosopher, as his writings prove, must certainly have had some sort of library at his command, and this collection, after coming to Athens, is said to have been ultimately taken by Sulla to Rome. But by far the most famous libraries of the Greek world were those of Pergamum and Alexandria. The former, which had been formed by the kings of the family of Attalus from about the year 200 B. C., must have been a very remarkable collection. Modern archæological exploration has identified the site of this library with certain rooms in the precincts of the temple of Athene (see Conze in the "Sitzungsberichte" of the Berlin Academy, 1884, 1259–70). As for the books themselves, we learn from Plutarch that two hundred thousand volumes, or rather rolls, were removed by Mark Anthony to Alexandria and given to Cleopatra to replace the library which had been accidentally destroyed by fire in Julius Cæsar's Egyptian campaign. The library so destroyed, which was known as that of the Musæum, was formed by Ptolemy Philadelphus about 260 B. C. It is to this library that the legend attaches of the origin of the Septuagint (q. v.), as recorded in the apocryphal, but very ancient, "Letter of Aristeas". According to this legend, Demetrius Phalereus, the keeper of the library, advised his master, King Ptolemy, to endeavour to obtain for it a translation of the Law of the Jews. Envoys were accordingly despatched to the High Priest Eleazar of Jerusalem, who sent seventy (or, more exactly,

seventy-two) scholars to Alexandria to make the Greek version required. The work was completed in seventy days, and the translation was read aloud by Demetrius and approved as final.

The "Musæum" (i. e., building consecrated to the Muses), which contained this, the older of the two libraries, seems to have been located within the precincts of the palace, but the other, of later date, was formed in connexion with the temple of Serapis, hence called the Serapeum. Much havoc was wrought among its treasures when Bishop Theophilus made his attack upon pagan worship at Alexandria in A. D. 390, and whatever remained of the library must have perished after the incursion of the Arabs in 641. Although Polybius, writing in the second century before Christ, speaks (xii, 27) as though libraries would naturally be found in any large town, it is only in the last years of the Roman Republic that we hear much of libraries in Rome itself. At first these collections were in private hands—Cicero, for example, seems to have taken much pains in acquiring books—but, after an unfulfilled project of Julius Cæsar to form a library for public use, C. Asinius Pollio carried this idea into execution a little later by means of the spoils he had obtained in his Illyrian campaign 39 B. C. The Emperor Augustus himself soon followed the same example, and we hear of the collections both of Greek and Latin books formed by him, first in the Porticus Octaviæ, which he restored about the year 33 B. C., and, secondly, within the precincts of the temple of Apollo on the Palatine, dedicated in 28 B. C. From this time forth public libraries multiplied in Rome under the imperial patronage of Tiberius and his successors, until they numbered, it is said, as many as twenty-six in all. From allusions in such writers as Ovid, Horace, and Aulus Gellius, it seems probable that these libraries, for example that of the Palatine Apollo, were furnished with copies of books on all subjects, and that as soon as a new work of any well-known writer was given to the world the Roman libraries acquired it as a matter of course. We also know that they were administered by special officials, and that they served as places of resort for literary men, while one or more of them — notably the Bibliotheca Ulpia in the forum of Trajan — were used as depositories for the public archives.

At the time that Christianity appeared upon the scene in Rome, it is interesting to learn from Seneca how firm a hold the fashion of maintaining libraries, either public or private, had taken of Roman society. "What", asks Seneca, "is the use of books and libraries innumerable, if scarce in a lifetime the master reads the titles? . . . Forty thousand books were burnt at Alexandria. I leave to others to praise this splendid monument of royal opulence. . . . Procure as many books as will suffice for use, but not one for show. . . . Why should you excuse a man who wishes to possess book-presses inlaid with arbor-vitæ wood or ivory, who gathers together masses of authors either unknown or discredited, and who derives his chief delight from their edges and their tickets? You will find, then, in the libraries of the most arrant idlers all that orators or historians have written—book-cases built up as high as the ceiling. Nowadays a library takes rank with a bathroom as a necessary ornament of a house. I could forgive such ideas, if they were due to extravagant desire for learning. As it is, these productions of men whose genius we revere, paid for at a high price, with their portraits ranged in line above them, are got together to adorn and beautify a wall" (De Tranquil. Animi, ix).

These were the fashions that prevailed in the more cultured circles of the Roman Empire at the time when Christianity began its life-and-death struggle with paganism. The use of books, even if attended with a certain amount of shallow affectation, was not a weapon which the Church could afford to neglect. In itself the accumulated learning of past ages was a good influence, and the teachers of the new faith were not slow in striving to enlist it on their side. In any case some small collection of books was needed for the church services which seem from the very beginning to have consisted in part—as does the Divine Office of the present day—of readings from the Old and New Testaments, and from works of Christian instruction and edification. In this way every church that was founded became the nucleus of a library, and we need not be surprised to find St. Jerome counselling Pammachius (Ep. xlix, 3) to make use of these collections (*ecclesiarum bibliothecis fruere*), and apparently assuming that wherever there was a congregation of the faithful suitable books would be available. But there must, of course, have been certain centres where, on account of their position, antiquity, or the exceptional generosity of benefactors, more important accumulations existed. Of these the earliest known to us is the library formed at Jerusalem, principally by Bishop Alexander, about the year 250, and containing, as Eusebius attests, a number of letters and historical documents (Hist. Eccles., VI, xx). Still more important was the library of Cæsarea in Palestine. This was collected by the martyr Pamphilus, who suffered in the year 308, and it contained a number of the manuscripts which had been used by Origen (Jerome, In Titum, III, ix). At about the same period again we hear that, in the persecution which devastated Africa (303–304), "the officers went to the church at Cirta, in which the Christians used to assemble, and despoiled it of chalices, lamps, etc., but when they came to the library [*bibliothecam*], the presses [*armaria*] were found empty" (see appendix to Optatus).

Julian the Apostate, in 362, demanded that the books formerly belonging to George, the Arian Bishop of Alexandria, including "many philosophical and rhetorical works and many of the doctrines of the impious Galileans", should be sent him for a library formerly established by Constantius in the imperial palace (Julian, Epist. ix). On the other hand, when St. Augustine was dying, "he directed that the library of the church and all the books should be carefully kept for posterity forever", and "he bequeathed libraries to the church containing books and treatises by himself or other holy persons" (Possidius, "Vita Aug.", n. 31). In Rome it would seem that Pope Damasus (366–384) built a record-office (*archivum*) which, besides being the depository of official documents, served also as library and chancery. It was connected with the Basilica of St. Lawrence, on the façade of which was an inscription which ended with the three following lines:—

> Archivis fateor volui nova condere tecta.
> Addere præterea dextra laevaque columnas.
> Quae Damasi teneant proprium per sæcula nomen.

(I confess that I have wished to build a new abode for archives and to add columns on the right and left to preserve the name of Damasus forever.) It is no doubt this building which St. Jerome refers to as "chartarium ecclesiæ Romanæ". De Rossi and Lanciani conjecture that Damasus, following the model of one of the great libraries of Rome, which in its turn had imitated the arrangement of the famous library of Pergamum, had first built a basilica dedicated to St. Lawrence and then added on the north and south sides a colonnade from which the rooms containing the records would be readily accessible (Lanciani, Ancient Rome, pp. 187–190). Whether this building did or did not ever strictly deserve the name of a library, we have evidence that Pope Agapetus (535–36) set about the erection of another building on the Cœlian Hill intended for the keeping of books and afterwards known as the Library of St. Gregory. There, at any rate, an inscription was to be read in the ninth century speaking of the long array

of portraits which adorned the walls and, amongst the rest, of that of Pope Agapetus:—

Hos inter residens Agapetus jure sacerdos
Codicibus pulchrum condidit arte locum.

(Mid these by right takes Agapetus place, who built to guard his books this fair abode.) The celebrated Cassiodorus, who had been the friend of Agapetus, withdrew from the world in his declining years and gathered round him a religious community at Vivarium, in Southern Italy. There he formed a library as an adjunct of primary necessity for such an institute. Further, he enjoined upon the brethren that if they met with any book which he wanted they should make a copy of it, "that by the help of God and their labour the library of the monastery might be benefited" (De Inst. Div. Litt., viii). Cassiodorus also tells us a good deal about his library contrivances.

But at the break-up of the civilization of the Roman Empire the great influence which contributed more than anything else to preserve in the West some scattered remnants of the learning of the classical period was undoubtedly monasticism, and in particular that form of monasticism which was identified with the Rule of St. Benedict. Even in Africa, as the Rule of St. Pachomius and the writings of Cassian clearly show, the maintenance of the ideal of cœnobitical life was in some measure dependent upon the use of books. St. Pachomius, for example, enjoined that the books of the house were to be kept in a cupboard in the thickness of the wall. Any brother who wanted a book might have one for a week, at the end of which he was bound to return it. No brother might leave a book open when he went to church or to meals. In the evening the officer called the "second"—that is the second in command—was to take charge of the books, count them, and lock them up (see P. L., XXIII, 68, and cf. Butler, "Palladius", I, 236). We know from a letter of St. Augustine's that at Hippo even the nuns had a library, and that it was the duty of one of the sisters to distribute and then to collect the books at the hours set apart for reading. Nor could the large place that study—but more particularly the study of the Scriptures—played in the lives of ascetic women at the close of the fourth century, be more clearly illustrated than in the story of St. Melania the younger, the friend of St. Augustine and St. Jerome, who made it a rule to spend daily a prescribed time in reading, and whose labours as a scribe were long renowned. But of all the written documents which have influenced the preservation of books, the text of the Rule of St. Benedict is the most important. Upon this is chiefly based that love of learning distinctive of the great monastic orders: "Idleness", says the Rule, "is an enemy to the soul, and hence at certain times the brethren ought to occupy themselves with manual labour and at others with holy reading . . ." And, after specifying the hours to be devoted to reading at various seasons, the Rule further lays down: "During Lent let them apply themselves to reading from morning until the end of the third hour . . . And in these days of Lent let each one receive a book from the library and read it all through in order. These books are to be given out at the beginning of Lent. Above all, let one or two seniors be appointed to go round the monastery at the hours when the brethren are engaged in reading and see that there be no slothful brother giving himself to idleness or to foolish talk and not applying himself to his reading, so that he is thus not only useless to himself but a distraction to others. If such a one be found (which God forbid) let him be corrected once and a second time", and the Rule adds that if all this be ineffectual, the delinquent is to be chastised in such a way as to strike terror into others.

That these principles were fully taken to heart, and bore fruit in the respect shown for books and in the zeal displayed to acquire them, was nowhere more clearly proved than in England. The whole life of the Venerable Bede might serve to illustrate this theme. But it is Bede who tells us from first hand knowledge of Benedict Biscop, Abbot of Wearmouth, who, having visited Rome in 671, "brought home not a few books of all-divine erudition, either bought for a fixed price or given him by the kindness of friends; and when on his return he came to Vienne he received those which he had bought and entrusted to his friends there" (Hist. Abbat., iv). In 678 he paid another visit to Rome and "brought home a multitude [*innumerabilem copiam*] of books of every kind". In his last illness Benedict Biscop gave directions that the very noble and complete library which he had brought from Rome as necessary for the instruction of the Church, should be scrupulously preserved entire and neither suffer injury through want of care nor be dispersed (Hist. Abb., xi). Further we learn that this collection, which was divided between Wearmouth and Jarrow, was doubled by the energy of Ceolfrid his successor (Hist. Abb., xv). It was from this collection, which Ceolfrid enriched with three new copies of the Vulgate and with one of the Itala, that the famous Codex Amiatinus (q. v.) was taken, which Ceolfrid on a later occasion carried with him to Italy as a present for the pope. This manuscript, now in the Laurentian Library in Florence, has been described as "perhaps the finest book in the world" (White in "Studia Biblica," II, 273), but it seems not to have been the work of native scribes but of Italians brought over to England.

Although Jarrow had not itself a great scriptorium with a staff of trained copyists—such as, for example, belonged to Lindisfarne, which followed Irish traditions, and to Canterbury, where the dominant influence was Italian—still, through Archbishop Egbert, whom Bede loved and visited at York, Ceolfrid's library must have exercised a profound influence upon Alcuin (q. v.), and through him again upon the scholarship of all Western Christendom. Alcuin was the librarian of the fine collection of books which Egbert had formed in the monastery at York, and in one of his poems he gives a rather florid account of its contents (Migne, P. L., CI, 843) which has been described as the earliest catalogue of any English library. If we could trust this list, the collection was really one of extraordinary range, including, not merely the best-known of the Latin Fathers, but Athanasius, Basil, and Chrysostom, among the Greeks, and besides these a certain number of historians, with philosophers like Aristotle and Boethius, with the most representative of the Latin classics and a fair sprinkling of grammarians. When Alcuin became the trusted adviser of Charlemagne, that great monarch's influence was everywhere exerted to foster the spread of learning and the accumulation of books. In an ordinance of 789, Charlemagne made provision for the setting-up of schools for boys in which he directed that "in every monastery and cathedral [episcopium]" they were to learn "the psalms and canticles, plain chant, the computus [or regulation of the calendar] and grammar". And he adds, "Let them also have Catholic books well corrected".

All this, directly or indirectly, must have given an immense stimulus towards the formation of libraries in Western Europe. Neither can we leave out of account the great influence which had been exerted at a somewhat earlier period by St. Columban and the Irish missionaries who settled at Luxeuil in France, at St. Gall in Switzerland, at Bobbio in Italy, at Würzburg in Germany, and in many other places. Still, as at St. Gall, for example, the Benedictine Rule often supplanted the Columban, and it was in its Benedictine days that the Swiss abbey attained its greatest renown as a centre of learning, and formed the library which still exists. Many, however, of its most precious volumes were at one time removed to Reich-

enau as a measure of safety, and they seem not to have been all returned to their owners when quiet was restored. At the same time there is abundant evidence for the existence of a system of lending manuscripts by one house to another among friendly monasteries, for the purpose of transcription and collation. This latter process may often be traced in the copies which still survive: for example, two of our oldest manuscripts of Bede's "Ecclesiastical History" have evidently been collated, and the readings of one transferred to the other.

The most famous libraries of the Carlovingian period were those of Fulda, Reichenau, Corvey, and Sponheim in Germany, and those of Fleury, St-Riquier, Cluny, and Corbie in France. The library of Fulda, under the great scholar Rhabanus Maurus, was regarded as the best equipped in Christendom, and a contemporary speaks of the books he saw there as "almost countless". Even at the beginning of the sixteenth century the abbey still possessed nine hundred volumes of manuscripts, most of which seem to have been destroyed or scattered in the Thirty Years' War. In the case of Reichenau we still possess the catalogue made by the librarian, Reginbert, before A. D. 831, which enumerates over 500 works contained in 256 volumes. All the libraries just mentioned owed directly or indirectly a good deal to the support of Charlemagne. In southern Italy the abbey of Monte Cassino, the cradle of Benedictine monasticism, well illustrates the perils to which books were exposed owing to the wildness of the times. After it had been demolished by the Lombards in the sixth century, the monastery was rebuilt, and a new library painfully brought together. But in the ninth century came the Saracens, and when the abbey was despoiled the library perished in the flames. None the less, the monks set to work once more to acquire books and to make new copies, and this collection of manuscripts, which still survives, is among the most remarkable in Italy.

In Spain, at an earlier date, we gain some insight into the ornamentation of a well-appointed library from certain verses written by St. Isidore of Seville (600–636) to inscribe upon the portraits which hung over his book-presses. Upon the door of the room were also displayed another set of verses as a warning to talkative intruders, the last couplet of which runs:

Non patitur quenquam coram se scriba loquentem;
Non est hic quod agas, garrule, perge foras.

Which may be rendered:—

A writer and a talker can't agree;
Hence, idle chatterer; 'tis no place for thee.

Speaking of Western Europe as a whole, we may regard it as an undisputed principle throughout the Middle Ages that a library of some sort was an essential part of every monastic establishment. "Claustrum sine armario, castrum sine armamentario", ran the adage; that is to say, a monastery without a library is a fort without an armoury. In all the developments of the Benedictine Rule, regulations of some kind are laid down for the use of books. We may quote, for example, the directions given by Lanfranc for the annual calling-in of library books on the first Sunday of Lent. The monks are bidden to bring back all books to the chapter house, and thereupon, "let the librarian read a document [*breve*] setting forth the names of the brethren who have had books during the past year; and let each brother when he hears his own name pronounced, return the book which has been entrusted to him for reading, and let him who is conscious of not having read the book through which he has received, fall down on his face, confess his fault, and pray for forgiveness. And let the aforesaid librarian hand to each brother another book for reading; and when the books have been distributed in order, let the aforesaid librarian in the same chapter put on record the names of the books and of those who receive them."

J. W. Clark gives a summary of the arrangements peculiar to the different orders. Both the Cluniacs and Benedictines, he says, put the books in charge of the precentor, often also styled *armarius*, and there is to be an annual audit and registration similar to that just described. Among the later Benedictines we also find a further regulation that the precentor is to keep all in repair and personally to supervise the daily use of the manuscripts, restoring each to its proper place when done with. Among these later Benedictine rules, as found, for example, at Abingdon at the end of the twelfth century, first appears the important permission to lend books to others outside the monastery on receipt of an adequate pledge. The Carthusians also maintained the principle of lending. As for the monks themselves, each brother might have two books, and he is to be specially careful to keep them clean. Among the Cistercians a particular official has charge of the books, about the safety of which great care is to be taken, and at certain times of the day he is to lock the press. This last regulation is also observed by the Premonstratensians, who further require their librarian to take note of books borrowed as well as books lent. Finally, the Augustinians, who are very full in their directions regarding the use of the library, also permit books to be lent outside, but insist much on the need of proper security (see Clark, "Care of Books", 58–73).

The importance of the permission to lend consists, of course, in this: that the monasteries thus became the public libraries of the surrounding district and diffused much more widely the benefit afforded by their own command of books. The practice no doubt involved much risk of loss, and there was a disposition sometimes manifested to forbid the lending of books altogether. On the other hand, it is clear that there were those who looked upon this means of helping their neighbours as a duty prescribed by the laws of charity. Thus, in 1212, a synod held in Paris passed the following decree: "We forbid those who belong to a religious order to formulate any vow against lending their books to those who are in need of them; seeing that to lend is enumerated among the principal works of mercy. After due consideration let some books be retained in the house for the use of the brethren; but let others according to the decision of the abbot be lent to those who are in need of them, the rights of the house being safeguarded. In future no penalty of anathema is to be attached to the removal of any book, and we annul and grant absolution from all anathemas of the sort" (Delisle in "Bib. de l'Ecole des Chartes", Ser. 3, I, 225). It is noteworthy, also, that in this same thirteenth century many volumes were bequeathed to the Augustinian house of St. Victor, Paris, on the express condition that they should be so lent. No doubt most of the lending was for the benefit of other monasteries, either for reading or, still more often, for the purpose of making a copy. Against the dangers thus incurred it would seem that some protection was sought by invoking anathemas upon the head of the faithless borrower. How far excommunications were seriously and validly enacted against the unlawful detainers of such volumes is a matter of some uncertainty, but, as in the case of Ashur-ban-i-pal's cuneiform tablets, the manuscripts of medieval monasteries frequently contain on the fly-leaf some brief form of malediction against unjust possessors or detainers. For example, in a Jumièges book we find: "Should anyone by craft or any device whatever abstract this book from this place [Jumièges] may his soul suffer in retribution for what he has done, and may his name be erased from the book of the living and not be recorded among the Blessed." But in general such formulæ were more compendious, as, for example, the following found in many St.

Alban's books: "This book belongs to St. Alban. May whoever steals it from him or erases his inscription of ownership [*titulum deleverit*] be anathema. Amen."

The high value set on books is also emphasized by the many decrees enjoining care in their use. "When the religious are engaged in reading", says an order of the General Benedictine Chapter, "they shall, if possible, hold the books in their left hands, wrapped in the sleeve of their tunics and resting on their knees, their right hands shall be uncovered, with which to hold and turn the leaves of the aforesaid books" (Gasquet, "Old English Bible", 29). Numberless other appeals recommending care, tenderness, and even reverence, in the treatment of books might be quoted from medieval sources. In the "Philobiblon" of Bishop Richard of Bury we have a whole treatise upon the subject, written with an enthusiasm which could not have been exceeded by a nineteenth-century bibliophile. He says, for example (chap. xvii): "And surely next to the vestments and vessels dedicated to our Lord's Body, holy books deserve to be rightly treated by the clergy, to which great injury is done so often as they are touched by unclean hands." This care naturally extended to the presses in which the books were permanently lodged. The Augustinians, in particular, had a formal rule that "the press in which the books are kept ought to be lined inside with wood, that the damp of the walls may not moisten or stain the books", and devices were further suggested to prevent the books from being "packed so close as to injure each other, or delay those who want to consult them" (Clark, "Care of Books", 71).

Still, the monastic system did not until much later make provision for any separate room to be used as a library. It was in the cloister, in which little alcoves called "carrels" were fitted up, securing a certain amount of privacy for each student, that the literary work of the house, whether in reading or transcribing, was mainly done. The result of this system was that the books were not kept all together but preserved in presses in different parts of the building. At Durham, for example, "some were kept in the church, others in the 'spendiment' or treasury, and others again in the refectory, and in more than one place in the cloister" (Gasquet, "Old Eng. Bible", 10). This scattering of the books was the more likely to happen because, from the very nature of the case, a collection of volumes written by hand and kept up only by limited monastic resources could never be very vast. Until the art of printing had lent its aid to multiply books and to cheapen them, a comparatively small number of cupboards were sufficient to contain the literary treasures of the very largest monastery. At Christ Church, Canterbury, Henry de Estria's Catalogue of about the year 1300 enumerates 3000 titles in some 1850 volumes. At Glastonbury in 1247 there were 500 works in 340 volumes. The Benedictines at Dover in 1389 possessed 449, while the largest English monastic library, so far as is known to us, viz., that at Bury St. Edmunds, at the beginning of the fifteenth century, contained 2000 volumes.

The practice just referred to, of scattering books in different presses and collections, was probably also much influenced by the custom of lending, or allowing outsiders to consult, books, upon which something has previously been said. Naturally, there will always have been volumes which any community, monastic or collegiate, reserved for the exclusive use of its members. Liturgical books and some ascetical treatises, particular copies of the Scripture, etc., will have belonged to this class, while there will have been divisions even among the books to which the outside world had access. The following passage, for example, is very suggestive. Thomas Gascoigne says of the Franciscans at Oxford about the year 1445: "They had two libraries in the same house; the one called the convent library, and the other the library of the schools; whereof the former was open only to graduates; the latter to the scholars they called seculars, who lived among those friars for the sake of learning". All this must have been very inconvenient, and it is not surprising that in the course of the fifteenth century the desirability of gathering their library treasures into one large apartment where study might be carried on occurred to the authorities of many monastic and collegiate institutions. During the whole of this period, therefore, libraries of some pretensions began to be built. Thus, to take a few examples, at Christ Church, Canterbury, a library, 60 feet long by 22 broad, was built by Archbishop Chichele, between 1414 and 1443, over the Prior's Chapel. The library at Durham was constructed between 1416 and 1446, by Prior Wessyngton, over the old sacristy; that at Cîteaux, in 1480, over the *scriptorium*, or writing-room, forming part of the cloister; that at Clairvaux, between 1495 and 1503, in the same position; that at the Augustinian monastery of St-Victor in Paris, between 1501 and 1508; and that at St-Germain des Prés in the same city, about 1513, over the south cloister.

The transformation of Clairvaux is easy to understand on account of two descriptions left us at a later date. A visitor in 1517 tells us: "On the same side of the cloister are fourteen studies [the carrels] where the monks write and study; and over the said studies is the new library, to which one mounts by a broad and lofty spiral staircase from the aforesaid cloister." The description goes on to extol the beauty of this new construction, which, adapting itself, of course, to the shape of the cloister below, was 189 feet long by 17 wide. In it, we are told, "there were 48 seats [*bancs*] and in each seat four shelves [*poulpitres*] furnished with books on all subjects". These books, although the writer does not say so, were probably chained to the shelves after the custom of that period. At any rate this is what the authors of the "Voyage littéraire", two hundred years later, say of the same library: "From the great cloister you pass into the cloister of conversation, so called because the brethren are allowed to converse there. In this cloister there are twelve or fifteen little cells [the carrels], all of a row, where the brethren formerly used to write books; for this reason they are still called at the present day the writing rooms. Over these cells is the Library, the building for which is large, vaulted, well lighted, and stocked with a large number of manuscripts fastened by chains to desks, but there are not many printed books."

This, then, is a type of the transformation which was going on in the last century of the Middle Ages, a process immensely accelerated, no doubt, by the multiplication of books consequent upon the invention of printing. The newly constructed libraries, whether connected with universities, or cathedrals, or religious houses, were rooms of considerable size, generally broken up into compartments or stalls, such as may still be seen in Duke Humphrey's Library in the Bodleian at Oxford. Here the books were chained to the shelves, but they could be taken down and laid upon the desk at which the student sat, and at which he could also use his writing materials without inconvenience. Some few survivals of this old arrangement, for example at Hereford Cathedral, and at Zutphen (where, however, the chained books can only be consulted standing), still exist. But it was not for very many years that this system lasted, except as a perpetuation of old tradition.

Modern Libraries.—Foremost among the agencies which have contributed to the collection and preservation of books in later times is the papacy. The popes, as munificent patrons of learning, have founded a number of libraries and enriched them with manuscripts and documents of the greatest value. The most important of these papal foundations is the

Vatican Library, which will be described in another article (see VATICAN LIBRARY). Indirectly, also, the popes have furthered the establishment of libraries by founding and encouraging universities. Each of these naturally regarded the library as the indispensable means of research; and in modern times especially these university collections have been enriched by the ever-growing mass of scientific literature. It is interesting to note that the nucleus of the library was often obtained by taking over the books and manuscripts which had been preserved in monasteries and other ecclesiastical establishments. A glance at the history of the universities will show how much they are indebted in this respect to the care and industry of the monks (see, e. g., the brief accounts in "Minerva", II, Strasburg, 1893). From the same sources came, in many instances, the books which served as the beginnings of the libraries founded by sovereigns, princes, churchmen, national governments, municipalities, and private individuals. In recent times, moreover, numerous and successful attempts have been made to provide the people at large with the facilities which were once the privilege of the student. Among the efficient means for the diffusion of knowledge must be reckoned the public library which is found in nearly every town of importance. While this multiplication of libraries is due chiefly to the advance in popular education, it has led, on the other hand, to the creation of what might be called a special art or science. Much attention is now given to the proper housing and care of books, and systematic instruction is provided for those who are to engage in library work. It is not surprising, then, that, along with the growing realization of the value and importance of libraries, there should gradually have come about a fairer appreciation of what was done by the Church for the preservation of books.

The following list gives the founders and dates of some famous libraries:—

Ambrosian (q. v.), Milan; Cardinal Federigo Borromeo, 1603–09.

Angelica, Rome; Angelo Rocca, O.S.A., 1614.

Bodleian, Oxford; Sir Thomas Bodley, c. 1611.

British Museum, London; George III and George IV (largely with MSS. taken from monasteries by Henry VIII), c. 1759.

Casanatense, Rome; Cardinal Girolamo Casanata (q. v.), 1698.

Congressional, Washington; U. S. Government, 1800.

Mazarine, Paris; Cardinal Mazarin, 1643; public 1688.

Mediceo-Laurenziana, Florence; Clement VII, 1571.

Nationale, Paris; Charles V of France, 1367.

Royal, Berlin; Elector Fred. William, c. 1650.

Royal, Munich; Duke Albert V, c. 1560.

Valliceliana, Rome; Achille Stazio, 1581.

Vatican, Rome (see VATICAN LIBRARY).

CLARK, *The Care of Books* (Cambridge, 1902), a work of the very highest value and indispensable to any fuller study of the subject; POHLE AND STAHL in *Kirchenlex.* s. v. *Bibliotheken;* SCUDAMORE in *Dict. of Christ. Antiq.;* GASQUET, *Mediæval Monastic Libraries* in *The Old English Bible and other Essays* (London, 1897), 1–62; EHRLE, JAMES, and others in *Fasciculus; Joanni Willis Clark Dicatus* (Cambridge, 1909); GOTTLIEB, *Ueber mittelalterliche Bibliotheken* (Leipzig, 1890); EDWARDS, *Memoirs of Libraries*, 2 vols., (London, 1895); PAULY-WINOWA, *Realencyklopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* (1893–); BECKER, *Catalogi Bibliothecarum antiqui* (Bonn, 1885); JAMES, *The Ancient Libraries of Canterbury and Dover* (Cambridge, 1903); MACRAY, *Annals of the Bodleian Library* (Oxford, 1890); ROBINSON AND JAMES, *The Manuscripts of Westminster Abbey* (Cambridge, 1909); BATESON, *Catalogue of the Library of Lyon Monastery* (Cambridge, 1898); BASS-MULLINGER in *The Cambridge Hist. of English Literature*, IV (Cambridge, 1909), 415–34; DELISLE, in *Bib. de l'Ecole des Chartes* (1849), 216–31; ID., *Cabinet des MSS. de la Bib. Nationale* (3 vols., Paris, 1874–76); THOMAS, *The Philobiblon of Richard of Bury* (London, 1888).

HERBERT THURSTON.

Licentiate. See ARTS, MASTER OF; UNIVERSITY.

Lichfield, ANCIENT DIOCESE OF (LICHFELDENSIS). This diocese took its rise in the conversion of Mercia by St. Cedd [q. v.] and his three companions in 652 and subsequent years. One of these was Diuma who was made Bishop of Mercia about 656. Among the successors of Diuma was St. Chad, who fixed his seat at Lichfield, where he built a monastery. As time went on other dioceses were carved out of the Mercian territory—the sees afterwards known as Hereford, Worcester, and Dorchester. But Lichfield, though lessened in territory, grew in political importance until the time of the ascendancy of Mercia under Offa, when that king determined to raise Lichfield as a rival to Canterbury. At the Council of Chelsea in 785 legates from the pope invested Bishop Higbert of Lichfield with the archiepiscopal pallium, giving him metropolitan authority over Worcester, Leicester, Lincoln, Hereford, and the East Anglian dioceses of Elmham and Dunwich. On the death of Offa the pope restored the full power of Canterbury, and in 803 the Council of Clovesho accepted the decision of the Holy See. During the ninth century the diocese suffered much from the Danes, and the great Abbey of Repton was sacked. The next step was the gradual conversion of the invaders. In the anarchy that ensued in the Midlands after the Conquest, the estates of the see were devastated, and Lichfield itself was so poor a place that after the Synod of 1075, which directed the removal of all sees to walled towns, Bishop Peter fixed on Chester as his cathedral city, and his successor, Robert de Limesey, transferred his seat to Coventry.

The chapter at Lichfield was nevertheless maintained, and one of the early Norman bishops, Roger de Clinton, rebuilt its cathedral there, re-dedicating it to St. Chad, whose relics he there enshrined. Enmity and jealousy, however, marked for many years the relations between the Lichfield secular canons and the Coventry monks, and successive episcopal elections were the occasions for fresh quarrels. Gregory IX (1227–41) settled the dispute by arranging that the elections should be made alternately by each chapter. During the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries the building of the cathedral continued. Though not one of the larger cathedrals, it has many beauties, including the west front and the Lady Chapel, and is altogether exceptional in having three spires. When the Reformation swept away all abbeys and monasteries, the great monastic cathedral church of Coventry was destroyed, and the diocese was robbed by the king of many manors. The churches were plundered and the shrine of St. Chad in Lichfield cathedral was violated and stripped. The schismatical bishops, Roland Lee and Richard Sampson, wasted the diocesan property. The last Catholic bishop was Ralph Bayne, who was deprived of the temporalities of his see by Elizabeth and imprisoned in the house of the Protestant bishop, Grindal. There he died in November, 1559. The following is the list of the bishops of Lichfield, the dates of the Saxon bishops being very doubtful:—

Bishops of Mercia: Diuma, 656; Ceollach, 658; Thumere, 659; Jaruman, 663. *Bishops of Lichfield:* St. Chad, 669; Winfred, 673; St. Sexwulf, 675; Headdi, 691; Aldwini (Wor.), 721; Witta, 737; Hemele, 752; Cuthred, 765; Berhthun, 768; Higbert, 785; Aldulf, 801; Humbert, —; Herewin, 816; Higbert II, —; Aethelwald, 818; Hunberght, 828; Tunberht, —; Cineferth, 870; St. Cumbert, —; Tunbriht, 890; Wigmund, 901 (?); Ella, 920; Alfgar, 944 (al. 935); Kynsy, 960 (al. 949); Wynsy, 974 (al. 961 or 964); Elphege, 992 (al. 973); Godwin, 1002; Leofgar, 1020; Brihtmar, 1026; Wulsy, 1039; Leofwin, 1053; vacancy, 1066; Peter, 1072; Robert de Limesey, 1086; vacancy, 1117. *Bishops of Coventry and Lichfield:* Robert Peche, 1121; Roger de Clinton, 1129; Walter Durdent, 1149; Richard Peche, 1161; vacancy, 1181; Gerard la Pucelle, 1183; vacancy, 1184; Hugh Nonant, 1188 (al. 1184); Geofrey de Muschamp, 1198; vacancy, 1208; William de Cornhill, 1215; Alexander de Stavenby, 1224; Hugh Pateshull, 1240; vacancy, 1242; Roger Weseham, 1245; Roger de Meyland (Longespée), 1258; Walter de Langton, 1296; Roger de Northburgh, 1322;

LICHFIELD CATHEDRAL

Robert Stretton, 1360; Walter Skirlaw, 1386; Richard Scroope, 1386; John de Burghill, 1398; John Catterick, 1415; William Heyworth, 1419; William Booth, 1447; Nicholas Cloose, 1452; Reginald Bolars (Butler), 1453; John Hales, 1459; William Smith, 1492; John Arundel, 1496; Godfrey Blyth, 1503; Roland Lee, 1524; Richard Sampson, (elected schismatically), 1543; Ralph Bayne, 1554.

In Catholic days the Diocese of Lichfield included the counties of Derby, Salop, Stafford, and most of Warwickshire. It was divided into four archdeaconries: Derby, Shrewsbury, Stafford, and Coventry. The arms of the see were: party per pale, gules and argent, a cross potent and quadrate in the centre between four crosslets patee of the second and or.

THOMAS OF CHESTERFIELD, *Additamenta ad historiam veterem Lichfeldensem*, printed in WHARTON, *Anglia Sacra* (London, 1691); JACKSON, *History of Lichfield* (Lichfield, 1795); IDEM, *Short account of the City and Close of Lichfield* (Lichfield, 1819); SHAW, *History and Antiquities of Staffordshire* (London, 1798–1801); HARWOOD, *History of Lichfield* (Gloucester, 1806); BRITTON, *History and Antiquities of Lichfield Cathedral* (London, 1820); DUGDALE, *Monasticon Anglicanum*, VI, pt. III (London, 1846); WINKLE, *Cathedral Churches of England and Wales* (London, 1860); STONE, *Lichfield Cathedral* (Birmingham, 1870); BOLTON, *Statutes of the Cathedral Church of Lichfield* (Stafford, 1871); BERESFORD, *Lichfield* (written with strong anti-Catholic bias) in *Diocesan Histories Series* (London, 1883); CLIFTON, *Lichfield; the Cathedral and See* (London, 1896); FAIRBAIRNS, *Cathedrals of England and Wales* (London, 1907); SAMUEL PEGGE, *Memoirs of Roger de Weseham* (London, 1761); IDEM, *Life of Robert Grosseteste* (London, 1793).

EDWIN BURTON.

Lichtenau, CONRAD OF. See KONRAD OF LICHTENAU.

Licinius, ROMAN EMPEROR. See CONSTANTINE THE GREAT.

Lidwina, SAINT, b. at Schiedam, Holland, 18 April, 1380; d. 14 April, 1433. Her father, Peter by name, came of a noble family while her mother Petronella, born at Kethel, Holland, was a poor country girl. Both were poor. Very early in her life St. Lidwina was drawn towards the Mother of God and prayed a great deal before the miraculous image of Our Lady of Schiedam. During the winter of the year of 1395, Lidwina went skating with her friends, one of whom caused her to fall upon some ice with such violence that she broke a rib in her right side. This was the beginning of her martyrdom. No medical skill availed to cure her. Gangrene appeared in the wound caused by the fall and spread over her entire body. For years she lay in pain which seemed to increase constantly. Some looked on her with suspicion, as under the influence of the evil spirit. Her pastor, Andries, brought her an unconsecrated host, but the saint distinguished it at once. But God rewarded her with a wonderful gift of prayer and also with visions. Numerous miracles took place at her bed-side. The celebrated preacher and seer, Wermbold of Roskoop, visited her after previously beholding her in spirit. The pious Arnold of Schoonhoven treated her as a friend. Hendrik Mande wrote for her consolation a pious tract in Dutch. When Joannes Busch brought this to her, he asked her what she thought of Hendrik Mande's visions, and she answered that they came from God. In a vision she was shown a rose-bush with the words, "When this shall be in bloom, your suffering will be at an end." In the spring of the year 1433, she exclaimed, "I see the rose-bush in full bloom!" From her fifteenth to her fifty-third year, she suffered every imaginable pain; she was one sore from head to foot and was greatly emaciated. On the morning of Easter-day, 1433, she was in deep contemplation and beheld, in a vision, Christ coming towards her to administer the Sacrament of Extreme Unction. She died in the odour of great sanctity. At once her grave became a place of pilgrimage, and as early as 1434 a chapel was built over it. Joannes Brugmann and Thomas à Kempis related the history of her life, and veneration of her on the part of the people increased unceasingly. In 1615 her relics were conveyed to Brussels, but in 1871 they were returned to Schiedam. On 14 March, 1890, Leo XIII put the official sanction of the Church upon that veneration which had existed for centuries.

COUDURIER, *Vie de la bienheureuse Lidwine* (Paris, 1862); RIBADENEIRA, *La vie de s. Lidwine, vierge* (Valenciennes, 1615); THOMAS À KEMPIS, *Vita Lidewigis virginis* in *Opera Omnia*, iv (Freiburg, 1905); HUYSMANS, *Sainte Lydwine de Schiedam* (Paris, 1901).

P. ALBERS.

Lieber, ERNST MARIA; b. at Camberg in the Duchy of Nassau, 16 Nov., 1838; d. 31 March, 1902. He was the principal leader of the Centre Party in the German Imperial Parliament (*Reichstag*) and the Prussian Diet (*Landtag*) after the death of Dr. Windthorst. Lieber's father, Moritz Lieber, Councillor of Legation, had long endeared himself to his Catholic countrymen by boldly defending their rights against bureaucratic aggressions in the petty German states. Ernst Maria was trained from his earliest years to take an active interest in public and especially Catholic, affairs. After graduating from the gymnasium, he studied law at Würzburg, Munich, Bonn, and Heidelberg, and received the degree of Doctor of Civil and Canon Law, 30 July, 1861. The next four years he devoted to a profound study of philosophy, history, literature, and law, with the hope of becoming a university professor. He was obliged, however, to abandon his purpose and retired to his native town, where he established his regular abode. In the meantime he became actively interested in the political life of the Duchy of Nassau. The Catholics of that small state desired a system of separate schools, such as existed in Prussia, instead of the mixed public schools where all were educated together without regard to creed. In the agitation carried on for this purpose Lieber was a zealous worker.

When Garibaldi invaded (1868) the Papal States, Lieber called a great mass-meeting in Walmerod to protest against this aggression. In 1870 the peasants of the *Westerwald* (West Forest) elected him their representative in the Prussian Diet, and later, when the German Empire was created (1871), in the Reichstag. In this capacity he took an active part in founding the famous Centre Party, which was organized at Berlin in December, 1870, by about fifty Catholic members of the Reichstag. These deputies had foreseen the conflict with the Church (*Kulturkampf*), and announced their intention to act on purely constitutional lines. From 1870 to 1878 the members of the new party were mostly engaged in the great battle for the interests of the Church. During this time Lieber developed his talent as a parliamentary orator and popular speaker, though as yet he wielded no influence as a leader. The *Kulturkampf* was chiefly the work of the individual states, the Empire taking no great part in it, except in the matter of the expulsion of the Jesuits, carried out by virtue of an imperial law. In 1878 a decided change took place in the inner political situation of Germany. Bismarck was meditating a change of attitude toward the tariff and needed the votes of the Centre to secure a majority in the coming parliamentary contest. Windthorst took advantage of the situation to win influence for his party in the Reichstag. His diplomatic attitude on the social question, and the abilities of many of his followers, aided him in the accomplishment of his purpose. Among these followers was Lieber. For the moment, however, he was too interested in the great question of the relations between Church and State to devote himself to social questions, though he fully realized what a prominent place the social programme was to hold in the history of the German Empire. He also knew that the Centre might hope for great success, should it manifest a sincere interest in the cause of social improvement. In the years that followed Lieber advocated unceasingly his party's programme

for the protection of the labouring classes, a policy that was gradually adopted by all other groups.

The Centre did not, however, become identified with the Government as a result of its temporary alliance. Though the *Kulturkampf* was gradually discontinued, other difficulties with Bismarck succeeded, especially in regard to the socio-political agitation. The great chancellor understood its importance, but believed that the duty of the State in respect of social reform was limited to the insurance of labourers against sickness, accidents, and disability. The Centre, on the other hand, paid more attention to the legal protection of labourers against extortion and overtaxation. In the meantime the chancellor's demands in the matter of the army led to a rupture between himself and the Centre. In the debates on the Army Bill (1887), the so-called *Septennate*, Bismarck strenuously resisted the influence of the hated party. He even tried to diminish the power of the Reichstag, and to increase that of the Prussian Landtag, in order to effect his object. During the heated debates which followed it was Lieber who attacked Bismarck and his associates in the Landtag with the greatest vehemence. In 1890 Emperor William II relieved Bismarck of the chancellorship, and declared himself in favour of state protection for the labouring classes. In succeeding years, almost every bill for this purpose advocated by the Centre since 1877 has received imperial sanction. The Prussian ministry and Landtag, however, retained their power in local politics, notwithstanding Bismarck's retirement. On 14 March, 1891, the Centre lost its leader by the death of Windthorst. Several prominent members of the party were of opinion that they should come to an understanding with the Prussian Government and with the Conservative Party, in order to obtain more influence in Prussian affairs, This policy met with Lieber's approval, but fell through temporarily, when, in the spring of 1892, the Government withdrew a bill in the interest of Christian public schools. This bill endorsed the principles of Christian education, but failed owing to the violent opposition of the Liberals. A few weeks later, the Prussian Liberals and Conservatives formed a coalition in order to cripple the Centre policy of extending to the miners the advantages already granted to the labourers. The Catholic party was hopelessly outvoted.

The situation now became very critical for the Centre. Their failure to pass their bills was aggravated by discord within the party itself, so serious as to jeopardize its existence. Its unity had suffered by the loss of Windthorst. The defence of the rights of the Church, on which his followers had hitherto been as one man, no longer held the first place in the political field, being overshadowed by the differences, mostly economical, which had arisen between North and South Germany. To protect their diverging interests it appeared best to dissolve the party. The possibility of a split between the northern and southern members of the Centre grew more threatening when, in 1893, a great agrarian agitation arose in Germany. This led the Catholic voters of Bavaria, nearly all farmers, to desert the Prussian followers of the Centre, whose interests in this matter diverged from theirs. The crisis was approaching its culmination, but was obviated when in December, 1893, the government introduced a bill in the Reichstag to increase the army. This caused great excitement throughout the Empire. All the members of the Centre were united in their determination to grant only a part of the Kaiser's demands. The two most prominent, however, Baron von Huene and Dr. Lieber, disagreed on one point, namely as to whether only a part of the estimates should be voted for without the guarantees of the several state-governments. Lieber learned that the governments would not give the required guarantees, and moved for the consideration of the estimates only. The majority of the Centre seconded him, especially the southern members, thereby constituting him unquestionable leader of the party and Windthorst's successor. The Reichstag was dissolved by the emperor and a new election took place amid great popular interest and enthusiasm. The Centre Party returned to the Reichstag as the most numerous and important political factor in Germany.

Lieber's great qualities as a leader were demonstrated from 1893 to 1898, during which period his prominence became more and more manifest; at the same time took place the greatest domestic development of the Empire since 1870. In those years Germany so developed its political organization and became so self-reliant that the imperial idea has ever since dominated the popular mind, completely overshadowing the local patriotism of the individual states. This is primarily due to three main factors: the Russo-German commercial treaty of 1894; the civil code of 1896 with its resultant commercial law; as well as the reform of the procedure in army cases and the law of 1898 concerning the navy, the foundation of the actual German navy. These measures were so thoroughly discussed in Parliament as to bring home to the German people the full significance of an united Empire. It is to Lieber's credit that he grasped this idea fully and that he induced his party, and others in the Reichstag, to forget their differences and finish this great work in union with the Government. At the same time he re-organized his party. Its former organization, dating from the time of the *Kulturkampf*, owed its origin to a politico-religious condition of affairs, and it aimed at special legislation. Beginning with 1890, a new organization had come into existence with social reform as its principal object, the *Volksverein für das Katholische Deutschland* (People's Union for Catholic Germany). Lieber made numerous speeches in many cities on behalf of this association. He regarded it as the most important means of ensuring the continuance of the Centre by giving it a wider sphere of activity in the domain of politics than was attainable by a merely ecclesiastical party, also by reshaping it along such lines as would make it permanently influential as an imperial party, extending to all the states of the Empire, with social reform for its chief object (*eine sociale und föderative Reichspartei*).

Lieber was very active during these years; his great speeches are full of vivid German patriotic sentiment, and recall at once the political romanticists of 1813–60 and the heroes of 1848. His idea was the political unity of Germany, so established, however, as to preserve the historical peculiarities of the different nationalities, with German science and educational methods, German industrial life, and the unifying power of a universal system of commerce. He was ever mindful of the prestige of the fatherland abroad, and was ever a sincere friend of universal peace and of an amicable rivalry in the pursuit and furtherance of civilization. He crossed the ocean three times to visit the United States. In his speeches he urged the preservation of the German racial characteristics. He was anxious for this in proportion as he studied American institutions, and realized their value, especially in their possible application to Germany.

When the election for the *Reichstag* took place in 1898, Lieber's party returned to Berlin with its former strength. New, and perhaps more difficult, problems awaited solution: the completion of the navy, the renewal of the commercial treaties, and the reform of the financial affairs of the Empire. Prussia was also endeavouring to secure greater influence in German politics by the construction of a large canal-system, and by the execution of Bismarck's policy against the Poles. The Prussian Government was ably led by Miquel, Minister of Finance, formerly Lieber's friend, but now his intriguing opponent.

Lieber now fell fatally ill. He continued his work without flinching, however, until January, 1900,

though he no longer took part in any important proceedings. He recognized clearly that the Centre might henceforth have a standing in the Prussian Landtag. But the Canal bill, by means of which he hoped to achieve this end, failed at the last moment; he himself prevented the financial reform which he had desired only as a means of cancelling debts, and not as a measure for regulating the financial relations of the Empire with the confederated states, that were at this time overburdened by their share of imperial taxation. In the Polish question, he went no further than to outline a positive programme, by no means committing his party to a policy of opposition. He endorsed, however, the completion of the navy, and emphasized the need of a united national spirit in Parliament by means of which such great results had been obtained in the former Reichstag. In a word, he was the Catholic parliamentarian who attained the most definite results for the nation in the Reichstag, a skilled tactician, a politician ripe in knowledge and experience, discreet, shrewd and cautious, inspired by lofty aims and an enthusiasm for high ideals. He was a brave German citizen, unselfish, yet eager for action, a true Catholic Christian both in principle and in conduct.

Stenographic Records of the Reichstag and Landtag; HELD, *Eulogium* (delivered on 3 April, 1903), pp. 63; SPAHN, *Ernst Lieber*, a biographical essay (1906).

M. SPAHN.

Lieber, MORIZ, politician and publicist, b. at the castle of Blankenheim in the Eifel, 1 Oct., 1790; d. at Kamberg, in Hesse-Nassau, 29 Dec., 1860; a man of eminent ability, great learning, and the highest culture, from his youth to his death a true Christian and a faithful son of the Church, and an intrepid champion of her rights and interests. His earliest literary activity was the translation of prominent Catholic works from foreign tongues, seeking thus to combat the spirit of "enlightenment" and rationalism which had been rampant in Germany since the days of Joseph II. He first published under the title "Die Werke des Grafen Joseph von Maistre" (5 vols., Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1822–24), the three principal works of de Maistre: "Du pape", "De l'Eglise gallicane dans son rapport avec le souverain pontife", and "Les soirées de Saint-Pétersbourg". He also translated John Milner's "The End of Religous Controversy" under the title "Ziel und Ende religiöser Kontroversen" (Frankfort, 1828; new ed., Paderborn, 1849); and Thomas Moore's "Travels of an Irish Gentleman in Search of a Religion": "Reisen eines Irländers um die wahre Religion zu suchen" (Aschaffenburg, 1834; 6th ed., 1852). In answer to the pamphlet "Bruchstück eines Gespräches über die Priesterehe" (Hadamar, 1831), in which an anonymous "friend of the clergy and of women" attacked the celibacy of the Catholic priesthood, Lieber wrote "Vom Cölibat" (Frankfort, 1831). As a member of the Lower Chamber of Nassau, he published "Blick auf die jüngste Session der Landesdeputierten zur Ständeversammlung des Herzogthums Nassau" (Frankfort, 1832). Lieber's name became known, however, throughout Germany by his manly championship of the Archbishop of Cologne, Clemens August von Droste-Vischering, who had been imprisoned by the Prussian Government. In his defence he issued under the pseudonym of "A Practical Jurist" the powerful polemic, "Die Gefangennehmung des Erzbischofs von Köln und ihre Motive" (3 parts, Frankfort, 1837–38). Effective as were his published writings for the liberties and interests of the Church, even more valuable were his professional opinions and advice. Thus he was entrusted by the assembly of bishops at Würzburg in 1848 and by the first conference of the bishops of the ecclesiastical Province of the Upper Rhine held at Freiburg in 1851, with the commission to draw up a memorial to the Government. His greatest services, however, were rendered in the cause of Catholic associations and the Catholic press. He took a prominent part in the founding of "Der Katholische Verein Deutschlands". He presided at its sessions held in 1849 at Breslau, and in 1857 at Salzburg, the predecessors of the great Catholic congresses, and as president of the Breslau Congress he drew up the protest of the "Katholische Verein Deutschlands" against the proposals for reform made by the Freiburg professor, J. B. Hirscher, in his work "Erörterungen über die grossen religiösen Fragen der Gegenwart" (3 parts, Freiburg im Br., 1846–55). In the conflict between the ecclesiastical Province of the Upper Rhine and the Government, Lieber interposed with a second pamphlet, "In Sachen der oberrheinischen Kirchenprovinz" (Freiburg im Br., 1853); and, especially in his last years, as a member of the Upper Chamber of Nassau he was an energetic champion of the interests of the Church, for which he also used his personal influence with his duke, who had appointed him counsellor of legation. His philanthropy is evidenced by his erection of a hospital at Kamberg, towards the foundation of which his father had left a rich bequest.

BRÜCK, *Geschichte der katholischen Kirche im 19. Jahrhundert*, 2nd ed. prepared by KISSLING, III (Münster, 1905), passim; MAY, *Geschichte der Generalversammlungen der Katholiken Deutschlands* (Cologne ,1903), 52 sq., 106 sq., and passim; *Historisch-politische Blätter*, XXIII (1849), 785 sq.; XXIV, 118 sq.; *Der Katholik*, XLI (1861), I, 127 sq.

GREGOR REINHOLD.

Lieber, THOMAS. See ERASTUS AND ERASTIANISM.

Liebermann, BRUNO FRANZ LEOPOLD, Catholic theologian, b., at Molsheim in Alsace 12 Oct., 1759; d. at Strasburg, 11 Nov., 1844. Having finished his humanities in the college at Molsheim, he studied theology from 1776 to 1780 in the seminary at Strasburg, after which, as he was too young for ordination, he was as subdeacon appointed teacher in the college at Molsheim. He became a deacon and a licentiate of theology in 1782, and was ordained priest on 14 June, 1783. He shortly afterwards became professor in the Strasburg seminary, in 1784 preacher at the cathedral, and in 1787 pastor at Ernolsheim near Molsheim. During the Revolution he was obliged to take refuge across the Rhine (1792), and the Bishop of Strasburg, Cardinal Rohan, appointed him rector of the seminary which had been transferred for the time to the Abbey of All Saints, in the Black Forest. Here he taught dogmatic theology and canon law, and wrote his unpublished "Institutiones iuris canonici universalis". In 1795 he secretly returned to his parish at Ernolsheim, where he laboured in secret and in great danger for the cure of souls until 1801, holding at the same time the office of extraordinary episcopal commissary for this division of the diocese. In 1801 he was called to Strasburg as preacher at the cathedral and secretary of the diocese, but returned once more to Ernolsheim in 1803. On 12 March, 1804, he was there unexpectedly arrested, and, on the groundless suspicion that he was in secret communication with the royal family, was held a prisoner in Paris for eight months. When, through the intercession of Bishop Colmar of Mainz with Napoleon, he regained his freedom, he was called by this bishop to Mainz in 1805 as rector of the newly founded seminary there, and in 1806 became also a member of the cathedral chapter. In the seminary he lectured on canon law, church history, pastoral theology, and, after 1812, also on dogmatic theology.

Personally and through the clergy trained by him, Liebermann exerted a wholesome and long-continued influence upon the revival of the ecclesiastical spirit in Mainz and the adjoining dioceses. Among his pupils were the future bishops Räss, Weis, Geissel, and such other distinguished men as Klee, Lüft, Lennig, Remling, and Nickel. After he had declined in 1823 the appointment to the See of Metz, Bishop Tharin summoned him as his vicar-general to Strasburg, where he

continued his fruitful activity. Under Tharin's successor, Bishop Lepappe de Trevern, he withdrew more from public life. His last years were spent in retirement in the mother-house of the Sisters of Charity. Liebermann's name will live in theological literature through his well-known "Institutiones theologicæ", first published in five vols. (Mainz, 1819–27; 6th ed., 1844) and later in two (10th ed., Mainz, 1870). Owing to the correctness of its contents and its clear and well-ordered style, this work was used as a textbook for years in many theological seminaries in Germany, France, Belgium, and America. During the time of the Revolution, Liebermann published several anonymous pamphlets in defence of the rights of the Church and against the required oath of the civil constitution of the clergy. Of his sermons several have been published separately, e. g. "Lob- und Trauerrede bei Gelegenheit des Hintrittes des hochwürdigsten Herrn Joseph Ludwig Colmar, Bischof zu Mainz" (Mainz, 1818). After his death appeared:—"Liebermann's Predigten, herausgegeben von Freunden und Verehrern des Verewigten" (3 vols., Mainz, 1851–3). From 1825 to 1826 he was editor of the "Katholik".

GUERBER, *Bruno Franz Leopold Liebermann* (Freiburg im Br., 1880); *Hist.-pol. Blatt.*, LXXXVI (1880), 735–57; *Katholik*, I (1881), 90–109, 201–12; FELDER-WAITZENEGGER, *Gelehrten- und Schriftsteller-Lexikon der deutschen kathol. Geistlichkeit*, III (Landshut, 1822), 287–94; GUERBER in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.; REUSCH in *Allgem. deut. Biog.*, XVIII, 578–80.

FRIEDRICH LAUCHERT.

Liège, DIOCESE OF (LEODIENSIS).—Liège (VICUS LEUDICUS; LEODIUM; LEGIA) is now the capital of a Belgian province of the same name.

The first capital of this diocese was Tongres, northeast of Liège; its territory originally belonged to the Diocese of Trier, then to Cologne; but after the first half of the fourth century Tongres received autonomous organization. The boundaries were those of the *Civitas Tungrorum*, and they remained unchanged until 1559. These boundaries were, on the north, the Diocese of Utrecht; east, that of Cologne; south, the Dioceses of Trier and Reims; west, that of Cambrai. Thus Tongres extended from France, in the neighbourhood of Chimay, to Stavelot, Aachen, Gladbach, and Venlo, and from the banks of the Semois as far as Eeckeren, near Antwerp, to the middle of the Isle of Tholen and beyond Moerdyck, so that it included both Latin and Germanic populations. In 1559, its 1656 parishes were grouped in eight archdeaconries, and twenty-eight councils, *chrétientés*, or deaneries. Some trace the bishops of Tongres to the first century, but the first Bishop was St. Servais, installed in 344 or 345, assisted at the Council of Rimini (359–60), and died in 384 (?). The invasion of 406 shattered the diocese, and its restoration required a long time. The conversion of the Franks began under Falco (first half of the sixth century) and continued under Sts. Domitian, Monulphus, and Gondulphus (sixth and seventh centuries). St. Monulphus built over the tomb of St. Servais a sumptuous church, near which his successors often resided. During the whole of the seventh century the bishops had to struggle against paganism. St. Amandus (647–50) abandoned the episcopal chair in discouragement, and built monasteries. St. Remaculus (650–60) did the same. St. Theodard (660–69), died a martyr.

St. Lambert (669–705?) completed the conversion of the pagans; probably about 705 he was murdered at Vicus Leudicus, for his defence of church property against the avarice of the neighbouring lords, and he was popularly regarded as a martyr. His successor, St. Hubert, built, to enshrine his relics, a basilica which became the true nucleus of the city, and near which the residence of the bishops was fixed.

Those bishops, nevertheless, continued to use the style of Bishop of the Church of Tongres, or Bishop of Tongres and of Liège. Agilbert (768–84), and Gerbald (785–810) were both placed in the see by Charlemagne. Hartgar built the first episcopal palace. Bishop Franco, who defeated the Normans, is celebrated by the Irish poet Sedulius. Stephen (903–20), Richaire (920–45), Hugh (945–47), Farabert (947–53), and Rathier were promoted from the cloister. To Stephen, a writer and composer, the Church is indebted for the feast and the Office of the Blessed Trinity. Rathier absorbed all the learning of his time. Heraclius, who occupied the see in 959, built four new parish churches, a monastery, and two collegiate churches. He inaugurated in his diocese an era of great artistic activity.

The domain of the Church of Liège had been developed by the donations of sovereign princes and the acquisitions of its bishops. Notger (972–1008), by securing for his see the feudal authority of a countship, became himself a sovereign prince. This status his successors retained until the French Revolution; and throughout that period of nearly eight centuries the Prince-Bishopric of Liège, with a temporal jurisdiction of less extent than its spiritual, succeeded in maintaining its autonomy, though theoretically attached to the Empire. This virtual independence it owed largely to the ability of its bishops, under whom the Principality of Liège, placed between France and Germany, on several occasions played an important part in international politics. Notger, the founder of this principality, was also the second founder of his episcopal city. He rebuilt the cathedral of St. Lambert and the episcopal palace, finished the collegiate church of St. Paul, begun by Heraclius, faciliated the erection of Sainte-Croix and Saint-Denis, two other collegiate churches, and erected that of St. John the Evangelist. This bishop also strengthened the parochial organization of the city. He was one of the first to spread the observance of All Souls' Day, which he authorized for his diocese. But the most notable characteristic of Notger's administration was the development which, following up the work of Heraclius, he gave to education: thanks to these two bishops and to Wazo, "Liège for more than a century occupied among the nations a position in regard to science which it has never recovered". "The schools of Liège were, in fact, at that time one of the brightest literary foci of the period." Balderic of Looz (1008–18), Walbodon (1018–21), Durandus (1021–25), Reginard (1025–38), Nitard (1038–42), the learned Wazo, and Theoduin (1048–75) valiantly sustained the heritage of Notger. The schools went on forming many brilliant scholars, and gave to the Catholic Church Popes Stephen IX and Nicholas II.

In the reign of Henry of Verdun (1075–91) a tribunal was instituted (*tribunal de la paix*) to take cognizance of infractions of the Peace of God. Otbert (1091–1119) increased the territory of the principality. He remained faithful to Henry IV, who died as his guest. The violent death of Henry of Namur (1119-21) won for him veneration as a martyr. Alexander of Juliers (1128–34) received at Liège the pope, the emperor, and St. Bernard. The episcopate of Raoul of Zachringen was marked by the preaching of the reformer, Lambert le Bègue, who is credited with founding the *béguines*. The time at length came when the schools of Liège were to yield to the University of Paris, and the diocese supplied that university with some of its first doctors—William of Saint-Thierry, Gerard of Liège, Godfrey of Fontaines.

Albert of Louvain was elected Bishop of Liège in 1191, but Emperor Henry VI, on the pretext that the election was doubtful, gave the see to Lothair of Hochstadt. Albert's election was confirmed by the pope, and he was consecrated, but was assassinated at Reims, in 1192, by three German knights. It is probable that the emperor was privy to this murder, the victim of which was canonized. In 1195, Albert de Cuyck (1195–1200) formally recognized the franchises

of the people of Liège. In the twelfth century the cathedral chapter assumed a position of importance in relation to the bishop, and began to play an important part in the history of the principality.

The struggles between the upper and lower classes, in which the prince-bishops frequently intervened, developed through the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, to culminate, in the fifteenth, with the pillage and destruction of the episcopal city. In the reign of Robert of Thourotte, or of Langres (1240–46), St. Juliana, a religious of Cornillon, Liège, was led by certain visions to the project of having a special feast established in honour of the Blessed Sacrament. After much hesitation, the bishop approved of her idea and caused a special office to be composed, but death prevented his instituting the feast. The completion of the work was reserved for a former prior of the Dominicans of Liège, Hugh of Saint-Cher, who returned to the city as papal legate. Hugh, in 1252, made the feast one of obligation throughout his legatine jurisdiction. John of Troyes, who, after having been archdeacon at Liège, was elected pope as Urban IV, caused an office to be composed by St. Thomas, and extended the observance of the feast of Corpus Christi to the whole Church. Another archdeacon of Liège, becoming pope under the name of Gregory X, deposed the unworthy Henry of Gueldres (1247–74). The Peace of Fexhe, signed in 1316, in the reign of Adolph of La Marck (1313–44), regulated the relations of the prince-bishop and his subjects; nevertheless the intestinal discord continued, and the episcopate of Arnould of Hornes (1378–89) was marked by the triumph of the popular party. Louis of Bourbon (1456–82) was placed on the throne by the political machinations of the dukes of Burgundy, who coveted the principality. The destruction of Dinant, in 1466, and of Liège, in 1468, by Charles the Bold, marked the ending of democratic ascendancy.

Erard de la Marck brought a period of restoration; he was an enlightened protector of the arts. He it was who commenced that struggle against the Reformation, which his successors maintained after him, and in which Gerard of Groesbeeck (1564–80) was especially distinguished. With the object of assisting in this struggle, Paul IV, by the Bull "Super Universi" (12 May, 1559), created the new bishoprics of the Low Countries. This change was effected largely at the expense of the Diocese of Liège; many of its parishes were taken from it to form the entire Dioceses of Ruremonde, Bois-le-Duc (Hertogenbosch), and Namur, as well as, in part, those of Mechlin and Antwerp. The number of deaneries in the Diocese of Liège was reduced to thirteen.

Most of the bishops in the seventeenth century were foreigners, many of them holding several bishoprics at once. Their frequent absences gave free scope for those feuds of the Chiroux and the Grignoux to which Maximilian Henry of Bavaria (1650–88) put a stop by the Edict of 1684. In the middle of the eighteenth century the ideas of the French *encyclopédistes* began to be received at Liège; Bishop de Velbruck (1772–84), encouraged their propagation and thus prepared the way for the Revolution, which burst upon the episcopal city on 18 August, 1789, during the reign of Bishop de Hoensbroech (1784–92). At last the territory of the principality was united to France, and thenceforward shared the destines of the other Belgian provinces. The diocese, too, disappeared in the Revolution.

The new diocese, erected 10 April, 1802, included the two Departments of Ourte and Meuse-Inférieure, with certain parishes of the Forest districts. In 1818 it lost a certain number of cantons, ceded to Prussia. After the establishment of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, the diocese comprised the Provinces of Liège and Limburg. On 6 May, 1833, Mgr Van Bommel divided the Province of Liège into two deaneries. In 1839 the diocese lost those parishes which were situated in Dutch Limburg. The present Diocese of Liège, suffragan to Mechlin, consists of 670 parishes, grouped in 40 deaneries, and has (1909) a population of 1,152,151, the majority (Walloons) speaking French; the minority, Flemish or German. Diocesan statistics (1909): deaneries, 40; curacies, 44; succursal parishes, 620; chapels, 30; vicariates paid by the State, 307; annexes, 22. After the Concordat, the diocese was governed by Zaepffel (1802–08); after him, Lejeas, nominated in 1809 by Napoleon, failed to obtain canonical institution, and the diocese was administered successively by the two vicars-capitular, Henrard (1808–14) and Barrett (1814–29). The succeeding bishops have been: Corneille Van Bommel (1829–52), Théodore de Montpellier (1852–79), Victor Joseph Doutreloux (1879–1901). Mgr Martin-Hubert Rutten, the present bishop was instituted in 1901. On account of the Law of Separation, a number of French religious communities have settled in the diocese.

FISEN, *Flores ecclesiæ Leodiensis* (Lille, 1647); IDEM, *Historia ecclesiæ leodiensis* (Liège, 1696); FOULLON, *Historia leodiensis* (Liège, 1735–37); BOUILLE, *Histoire de la ville et pays de Liège* (Liège, 1725–32); DE GERLACHE, *Histoire de Liège depuis César jusqu'à la fin du XVIII^e siècle* (Brussels, 1874); DARIS, *Histoire du diocèse et de la principauté de Liège, Des origines à 1879* (Liège, 1868–92); PAQUAY, *Les origines chrétiennes dans le diocèse de Tongres* (Tongres, 1909); KURTH, *La cité de Liège au moyen âge* (Liège, 1910); DEMARTEAU, *Liège et les principautés épiscopales de l'Allemagne occidentale* (Liège, 1900); *Bulletin de l'Institut archéologique liégois* (Liège, 1852—); *Bulletin de la Société d'Art et d'Histoire du diocèse de Liège* (Liège, 1881—); *Leodium* (Liège, 1902—); PIRENNE, *Bibliographie de l'histoire de Belgique* (Brussels, 1902), after that, in *Archives Belges*.

JOSEPH BRASSINNE.

Liesborn, a former noted Benedictine Abbey in Westphalia, Germany, founded in 815; suppressed in 1803. It was situated near Beckum, in the south-eastern part of the district of Münster. According to an old tradition the monastery was established in 785 by Charlemagne. More probably, however, it was built in 815 by two laymen, Bozo and Bardo, whom the register of deaths of Liesborn names as the founders. At first Liesborn was a convent for women. As time passed on the nuns grew more and more worldly, so that in 1131 Bishop Egbert of Münster expelled them, and installed Benedictine monks in their place. It was several times besieged by enemies, and from the thirteenth century ascetic life steadily declined as the abbey increased in wealth. The monastery became a kind of secular foundation, into which the nobility gained admittance through influence. In 1298 the property of the abbey was divided into separate prebends, twenty-two of them full prebends, and six for boys. The Bursfeld Union successfully worked here also (1465) for the restoration of discipline. To the Union was due the flourishing condition of Liesborn in the period of the excellent abbots Heinrich of Cleves (1464–90), and Johann Smalebecker (1490–1522), who restored the buildings and greatly improved the economic condition of the abbey. Monastic life, art, and study flourished again. The zeal of Liesborn influenced other Benedictine abbeys, and it succeeded in re-establishing discipline and the cloister in several convents for women. The beautiful altar-paintings with which Abbot Heinrich adorned the church became famous, but under French administration (1807) they sold for a mere song. The artist is unknown, and the best pictures are now in the National Gallery, London.

The pious Bernard Witte, a warm friend of Humanistic learning, was a monk at Liesborn (1490 to about 1534). He wrote a history of Westphalia and a chronicle of the abbey. The period of prosperity, however, did not last long. Abbot Anton Kalthoff (1522–32) adopted the doctrines of the Anabaptists and was deposed; Gerlach Westhof (1554–82) favoured the Protestants and involved the monastery heavily in debt;

under Johann Rodde (1582–1601) immorality and economic decay again increased. Conditions were still worse during the disorders caused by the wars of the seventeenth century. It was not until the Peace of Westphalia (1648) that any improvement appeared, and then it was only for a short time, for the wars of the eighteenth century also laid waste Liesborn so that at the time of the suppression there were still several thousand *thalers* of debt. The abbey was suppressed 2 May, 1803, and was declared the property of the Prussian Crown. The Gothic church, rebuilt 1499–1506, and several monastic buildings, are still standing.

Studien und Mitteilungen aus dem Benediktiner- und Zisterzienser-orden, XXV (1904), 738–744; SCHMITZ-KALLENBERG, *Monasticon Westfaliæ* (Münster, 1909), 41; BECKER, *Die Wirtschaftsverhältnisse des Klosters Liesborn am Ende des Mittelalters* (Münster Dissertation, 1909).

KLEMENS LÖFFLER.

Liesborn, MASTER OF, a Westphalian painter, who in 1465 executed an altar-piece of note in the Benedictine monastery of Liesborn, founded by Charlemagne. His name is not mentioned by the historian of the monastery, who, however, declares that the Greeks would have looked on him as an artist of the first rank. Even in the fourteenth century the Cologne school of painting found a rival in Westphalia, and in the fifteenth century the latter could oppose the great Liesborn painter to Stephen Lochner. These two have something in common with each other and with the Van Eycks in Flanders, and both in their work rather reflect the past than look into the future. On the suppression of the monastery in 1807, the *chef d'œuvre* of the Westphalian artist was unfortunately sold, divided into parts, and thus scattered. The principal parts, some of these purely fragmentary, are now to be found in the National Gallery of London, in the Münster Museum, and in private hands. A fair idea of the altar-piece may be formed from a copy in a church at Lünen. The altar had not folding wings, the painting being placed side by side on a long panel: in the centre was the Redeemer on the Cross, while Mary stood on one side with Cosmas and Damian, and on the other John, Scholastica, and Benedict. Four angels caught the blood which poured from the wounds. The touchingly beautiful head of the Saviour is still preserved, as are the busts of the saints, whose countenances are so full of character and nobility, and several angels with golden chalices. The background is also golden. Four scenes chosen from Sacred History were reproduced on the sides.

The painting of the Annunciation represents a double apartment with vaulted ceiling, the front room being represented as an oratory and the other as a sleeping chamber: the marble floor, the damask curtains which surround the bed, a wardrobe, a bench, some vases, and writing material, all are carefully drawn and with due regard for perspective; the arched doorway and the partition wall are adorned with figures of Prophets and Christ, and a representation of the world. The window looks out on a landscape. The Blessed Virgin, clad in a blue mantle over a robe of gold brocade, is seen in the front room turning from her *prie-dieu* towards the angel, who, richly robed and bearing in his left hand a sceptre, delivers his greeting. Of the Nativity group, there still remain five beautiful angels, who kneel on the ground around the effulgent form of the Child: there also remain two busts of male figures which were probably part of this scene. Of the "Adoration of the Magi" there is but one fragment left. The "Presentation in the Temple" shows a venerable priest, to whom the Mother presents her Child laid on a white cloth: three witnesses surround the priest, while the mother is attended by two maidservants carrying the doves. Several panels have been lost. The Liesborn artist is not as skilfully realistic as van Eyck, but his genius for delineation becomes quite apparent when one observes the nobility of expression about the mouths of his figures, the almond-shaped eyes, the loose curly hair, and the natural folds of the garments. But his most characteristic claim to fame lies in the purity of his taste and in his ideal conception of a sacred subject. The great master's influence is evident in other works, but no second work can be attributed directly to him.

NORDHOFF, *Die Chronisten des Klosters Liesborn* (Münster, 1866); FÖRSTER, *Gesch. der deutschen Kunst*, pt. II (Leipzig, 1853); JANITSCHEK, *Gesch. der deutschen Malerei* (Berlin, 1890).

C. GIETMANN.

Liessies, a Benedictine monastery near Avesnes, in the Diocese of Cambrai, France (Nord), founded about the middle of eighth century and dedicated to St. Lambert. The monastery appears to have been destroyed twice in the wars of the ensuing centuries, and was only finally established about the year 1110 by Theodoric of Avesnes and his wife Ada. From this time its continued history is on record, but without any fullness of detail; a list of the abbots may be found in "Gallia Christiana". The chief glory of Liessies is the famous Louis de Blois, who became a monk there at the early age of fourteen. In 1530 he was made abbot and at once inaugurated his well known series of reforms, which were rendered necessary by the gradual decline from strict monastic observance (see BLOSIUS). After the death of Abbot Blosius the next six abbots seem to have maintained the high state of observance inaugurated by him, but the forty-first abbot, Lambert Bouillon, was of a different type. He is said to have lived extravagantly, exhausted the monastery exchequer with lawsuits, and diverted the revenues to the advantage of his nephews and nieces. The illustrious Fénelon, then Archbishop of Cambrai, accordingly held a visitation of the abbey in the year 1702 and left certain instructions of which the abbot circulated a largely fictitious account. The archbishop, however, having secured the changes he desired, refrained from any public disavowal of the abbot's declaration. After Abbot Bouillon's death in 1708 the existence of the monastery continued smoothly until the final suppression of religious houses in France. In 1791 the last abbot, Dom Mark Verdier, and his community signed a declaration, as ordered by the decree of 14 October, 1790, in which they protested their earnest desire to remain in religion, but the suppression followed nevertheless. The property of the monastery was sold in 1791 and 1792 and the church pillaged and destroyed. The valuable paintings for which the abbey was famous, which included a series of "religious founders", were burned or dispersed, a few being still to be seen in neighbouring churches.

Chronicon Lætiense, in REIFFENBURG, *Mon. Hist. Namur.*, VII, 393; *Gallia Christiana*, III (Paris, 1725), 123–126; MABILLON, *Annales Bened.*, II, 190, 278; V, 522; BINET, *Abrégé des vies des principaux fondateurs des religions de l'Eglise, representez dans le chœur de l'abbaie de s. Lambert de Liessies . . .* (Antwerp, 1634). BLOSIUS, *A Benedictine of the sixteenth century*, tr. LOVAT (London, 1878).

G. ROGER HUDLESTON.

Life (Gk. *ζωή*; Lat. *vita;* Fr. *La vie;* Ger. *Das Leben;* vital principle; Gk. *ψυχή*; Lat. *anima, vis vitalis;* Ger. *Lebenskraft*).—The enigma of life is still one of the two or three most difficult problems that face both scientist and philosopher, and notwithstanding the progress of knowledge during the past twenty-three hundred years we do not seem to have advanced appreciably beyond the position of Aristotle in regard to the main issue. What are its characteristic manifestations? What are its chief forms? What is the inner nature of the source of vital activity? How has life arisen? Such are among the chief questions which present themselves with regard to this subject.

I. HISTORY.—A. *Greek Period.*—The early Greek philosophers for the most part looked on movement as

the most essential characteristic of life, different schools advocating different material elements as the ultimate principle of life. For Democritus and most of the Atomists it was a sort of subtle fire. For Diogenes it was a form of air. Hippo derives it from water. Others compound it of all the elements, whilst some of the Pythagoreans explain it as a harmony—foreshadowing modern mechanical theories. Aristotle caustically remarks that all the elements except earth had obtained a vote. With him genuine scientific and philosophic treatment of the subject begins; and the position to which he advanced it is among the finest evidences of both his encyclopedic knowledge and his metaphysical genius. His chief discussions of the topic are to be found in his *περὶ ψυχῆς* and *περὶ ζώων γενέσεως*.

For Aristotle the chief universal phenomena of life are nutrition, growth, and decay. Movement or change in the widest sense is characteristic of all life, but plants are incapable of local movement. This follows on desire, which is the outcome of sensation. Sentiency is the *differentia* which constitutes the second grade of life—that of the animal kingdom. The highest kind of life is mind or reason, exerting itself in thought or rational activity. This last properly belongs to man. There are not in man three really distinct souls, as Plato taught. Instead, the highest or rational soul contains eminently or virtually in itself the lower animal or vegetative faculties. But what is the nature of the inner reality from which vital activity issues? Is it one of the material elements? Or is it a harmony, the resultant of the balance of bodily forces and tendencies? No. The solution for Aristotle is to be found in his fundamental philosophical analysis of all sensible being into the two ultimate principles, matter and form. Prime Matter (*materia prima*) is the common passive potential element in all sensible substances; form is the determining factor. It actualizes and perfects the potential element. Neither prime matter nor any corporeal form can exist apart from each other. They are called substantial principles because combined they result in a being; but they are incomplete beings in themselves, incapable of existing alone. To the form is due the specific nature of the being, with its activities and properties. It is the principle also of unity. (See Form; Matter.) For Aristotle, in the case of living natural bodies the vital principle, *ψυχή*, is the form. His doctrine is embodied in his famous definition: *ψυχή ἐστιν ἐντελέχεια ἡ πρώτη σώματος φυσικοῦ δυνάμει ζωὴν ἔχοντος*. (De Anima, II, i), i. e. the soul is therefore the first entelechy (substantial form or perfect actualization) of a natural or organized body potentially possessing life. The definition applies to plants, animals, and man. The human soul, however, endowed with rationality is of a higher grade. It is form of the body which it animates, not in virtue of its rationality but through the vegetative and sentient faculties which it also possesses. The union of these two principles is of the most intimate character, resulting in one individual being. The form, or entelechy, is therefore not a substance possessed of a distinct being from that of the body; nor in the case of animals and plants is it a reality separable from the body. The human soul, however, seems to be of a different kind (*γένος ἕτερον*), and separable as the eternal from the perishable. Aristotle's conception of the soul differs fundamentally from that of Plato for whom the vital principle is related to the body only as the pilot to the ship; who moreover distinguishes three numerically different souls in the individual man.

B. *Medieval Period.*—The Aristotelian theory in its essential features was adopted by Albertus Magnus and St. Thomas, and the doctrine of the vital principle as form of the body prevailed supreme throughout the Middle Ages. The differences separating the rational soul from the vital principle of the plant or animal, and the relations between intellectual activity and sensory cognition became more clearly defined. The human soul was conceived as a spiritual substantial principle containing virtually the lower faculties of sensory and vegetative life. It is through this lower organic capacity that it is enabled to inform and animate the matter of the body. But the human soul always remains a substance capable of subsisting of itself apart from the body, although the operations of its lower faculties would then necessarily be suspended. Because of its intrinsic substantial union with the material of the organism, the two principles result in one substantial being. But since it is a spiritual being retaining spiritual activities, intrinsically independent of the body, it is, as St. Thomas says, *non totaliter immersa*, not entirely submerged in matter, as are the actuating forms of the animal and the plant.

Moreover, the vital principle is the only substantial form of the individual being. It determines the specific nature of the living being, and by the same act constitutes the prime matter with which it is immediately and intrinsically united a living organized body. The Scotist School differed somewhat from this, teaching that antecedently to its union with the vital principle the organism is actuated by a certain subordinate *forma corporeitatis*. They conceived this form or collection of forms, however, as incomplete and requiring completion by the principle of life. This conception of inferior forms, though not easy to reconcile with the substantial unity of the human being, has never been theologically condemned, and has found favour with some modern Scholastic writers, as being helpful to explain certain biological phenomena.

With respect to the question of the origin of life Aristotle, followed by Albertus Magnus, St. Thomas, and the Schoolmen generally, believed in the spontaneous generation even of organisms comparatively high in the animal kingdom (see Biogenesis). The corruption of animal and vegetable matter seemed to result in the spontaneous generation of worms and insects, and it was universally assumed that the earth under the influence of moisture and the sun's heat could produce many forms of plant and animal life. St. Augustine taught in the fifth century that many minute animals were not formally created on the sixth day, but only potentially in a seminal condition in certain portions of matter; and subsequently several Catholic philosophers and theologians admitted this view as a probable theory (cf. St. Thomas, I, Q. lxix, a. 2; I, Q. lxxi, ad 1). However, the concurrent agency of a higher cause working in nature was assumed as a necessary factor by all Christian thinkers (cf. Salis Sewis, "Vera dottrina di S. Agostino e di S. Tommaso contra la generazione spontanea", Rome, 1897).

C. *Modern Period.*—In respect to the nature of life, as in regard to so many other questions, Descartes (1596–1650) inaugurated a movement against the teaching of Aristotle and the Scholastics which, reinforced by the progress of science and other influences, has during the past two centuries and a half commanded at times considerable support among both philosophers and scientists. For Descartes there are but two agents in the universe—matter and mind. Matter is extension; mind is thought. There is no possibility of interaction between them. All changes in bodies have to be explained mechanically. Vital processes such as "digestion of food, pulsations of heart, nutrition, and growth, follow as naturally from dispositions of the organism as the movements of a watch". Plants and animals are merely ingeniously constructed machines. Animals, in fact are merely automata. In the "Traité de l'homme" (1664), he applied the language of cogs and pulleys also to human physiology. Thus muscular movement was explained as due to the discharge of "animal spirits" from the brain ventricles through the nerves into the

muscles, the latter being thereby filled out as a glove when one blows into it. This tendency to regard the organism as a machine was also fostered by the rapid advances made in physics and chemistry during the eighteenth century and the earlier part of the nineteenth, as well as by the progress in anatomical research of the Italian schools, and even by the discoveries of such men as Harvey, Malpighi, and Bishop Stensen. The earlier crude mechanical conceptions were, however, constantly met by criticism from men like Stahl. If the advance of science seemed to explain some problems, it also showed that life-phenomena were not so simple as had been supposed. Thus Lyonet's work on the goat-moth revealed such a microscopic complexity that it was at first received with incredulity.

Stahl (1660–1734) himself advocated an exaggerated form of vitalism. Rejecting the mechanical theories of the Cartesian School, he taught that life has its source in a vital force which is identical with the rational soul in man. It is conceived as constructor of the body, exerting and directing the vital processes in a subconscious but instinctively intelligent manner by what he calls λόγος in contrast with λογισμός, whilst it rather inhabits than informs the body. Others separated the vital force from the sentient soul and adopted "didynamism". Notwithstanding the growth of materialism, vitalism achieved considerable success during the second half of the eighteenth century. It was, however, mostly of a vague and inconsistent character tinged with Cartesian dualism. The entity by which the organic processes were regulated was generally conceived as a *tertium quid* between soul and body, or as an *ensemble* of the vital forces in antagonism and conflict with those of inanimate matter. This was substantially the view held by the Montpellier school (e. g. Barthez, Bérard, Lordat) and by Bichat. Even to men like Cuvier life was simply a *tourbillon*, a vortex, a peculiar kind of chemical gyroscope. The *Bildungstrieb* or *nisus formativus* of Blumenbach (1752–1840), who judiciously profited by the work of his predecessors, exhibits an improvement; but succeeding vitalists still showed the same want of philosophic grasp and scientific precision. Even a physiologist of the rank of Claude Bernard was constantly wavering between *une idée créatrice*—whatever that may mean—and *une sorte de force législative mais nullement exécutive*, and the mechanical organism of Descartes. Von Baer, Treviranus, and J. Müller favoured a mild kind of vitalism. Lotze here, as in his general philosophy, manifests a twofold tendency to teleological idealism and to mechanical realism. The latter, however, seems to prevail in his view as to the nature of vegetative life. The second and third quarters of the nineteenth century witnessed a strong anti-vitalist reaction: a materialistic metaphysic succeeded the idealistic *Identitätsphilosophie*. Even the crude matter-and-motion theories of Moleschott, Vogt, and Büchner gained a wide vogue in Germany, whilst Tyndall and Huxley represented popular science philosophy in England and enjoyed considerable success in America.

The advent of Darwinism, too, turned men's minds to "phylogeny", and biologists were busy establishing genetic relationships and tracing back the infinite variety of living types to the lowly root of the genealogical tree. To such men life was little better than the movements of a complicated congeries of atoms, evolved from some sort of primitive protoplasmic nebula. The continuous rapid advance both of physics and chemistry flattered the hope that a complete "explanation" of vital processes was at hand. The successful syntheses of organic chemistry and the establishment of the law of the conservation of energy in the first half of the nineteenth century were proclaimed as the final triumph of mechanism. Ludwig, Helmholtz, Huxley, Häckel, and others brought out new and improved editions of the seventeenth-century machine view of life. All physiology was reduced to processes of filtration, osmosis, and diffusion, plus chemical reactions. But with the further advance of biological research, especially from about the third quarter of the last century, there began to find expression among many investigators an increasing conviction that though physico-chemistry might shed light on sundry stages and operations of vital processes, it always left an irreducible factor unexplained. Phenomena like the healing of a wound and even regular functions like the behaviour of a secreting cell, or the ventilating of the lungs, when closely studied, did not after all prove so completely amenable to physical treatment. But the insufficiency of physico-chemistry became especially apparent in a new and most promising branch of biological research,—experimental morphology, or as one of its most distinguished founders, W. Roux, has called it, *Entwicklungsmechanik*. The embryological problem of individualistic development had not been adequately studied by the older vitalists—the microscope had not reached anything like its present perfection—and this was one main cause of their failure. The premature success of the evolution theory too, had led to a blind, unquestioning faith in "heredity", "variation", and "natural selection", as the final solvents of all difficulties, and the full significance had not yet been realized of what Wilson styles "the key to all ultimate biological problems"—the lesson of the cell. Recent investigation in this field and better knowledge of morphogenesis have revealed new features of life which have conduced much towards a widespread neo-vitalistic reaction.

Among the chief of these has been the increased proof of the doctrine of epigenesis. Already in the eighteenth century embryologists were sharply divided as to the development of the individual organism. According to the advocates of *preformation* or *predelineation*, the growth of the embryo was merely the expansion or evolution of a miniature organism. This theory was held by ovulists like Swammerdam, Malpighi, Bonnet, and Spallanzani, and by animalculists like Leeuwenhoek, Hartsoeker, and Leibniz. In this view the future organism pre-existed in the primitive germ-ovum or spermatazoon, as the flower in the bud. Development is a mere "unfolding", analogous to the unrolling of a compressed pocket-handkerchief. Though not quite so crude as these early notions, the views of men like Weismann are really reducible to preformation. Indeed the logical outcome of all such theories is the "encasement" of all succeeding generations within the first germ-cell of the race. The opposite doctrine of "epigenesis", viz., that the development of the embryo is real successive production of visible manifoldness, real construction of new parts, goes back to Aristotle. It was upheld by Harvey, Stahl, Buffon, and Blumenbach. It was also advocated by the distinguished Douai priest, J. Turberville Needham (1713–1781), who achieved distinction in so many branches of science. In its modern form O. Hertwig and Driesch have been amongst its most distinguished defenders. With some limitations J. Reinke may also be classed with the same school, though his system of "dominants" is not easy to reconcile with unity of form in the living being and leaves him what Driesch styles a "problematic vitalist". The modern theory of epigenesis, however, in the form defended, e. g. by Driesch, is probably not incompatible with the hypothesis of prelocalized areas of specific cytoplasmic stuffs in the body of the germ-cells, as recently advocated by Conklin and Wilson. But anyhow the modern theory of pre-delineation demands a regulating formative power in the embryo just as necessarily as the epigenetic doctrine. Moreover, in addition to the difficulty of epigenesis, the inadequacy of mechanistic theories to account for the

regeneration of damaged parts of the embryo is becoming more clearly recognized every day. The trend of the best scientific thought is clearly evident in current biological literature. Thus Professor Wilson of Columbia University in 1906 closes his admirable exposition of the course of recent research over the whole field with the conclusion that "the study of the cell has on the whole seemed to widen rather than to narrow the enormous gap that separates even the lowest form of life from the inorganic world" (The Cell, 434). In these words, however, he is only affirming a fact to which the distinguished Oxford biologist Dr. Haldane also testifies: "To any physiologist who candidly reviews the progress of the last fifty years, it must be perfectly evident that, so far from having advanced towards a physico-chemical explanation of life, we are in appearance very much farther from one than we were fifty years ago. We are now more definitely aware of the obstacles to any advance in this direction, and there is not the slightest indication that they will be removed, but rather that with further increase of knowledge and more refined methods of physical and chemical investigation they will only appear more and more difficult to surmount." (Nineteenth Century, 1898, p. 403). In Germany Hans Driesch of Heidelberg is at the present day, perhaps, the most candid and courageous advocate of vitalism among German biologists of the first rank. Since 1899 he has proclaimed his belief in the "autonomy" and "dynamical teleology" of the organism as a whole. The vital factor he boldly designates "entelechy", or "psychoid", and recommends us to return to Aristotle for the most helpful conception of the principle of life. His views on some points are unfortunately and quite unnecessarily, as it seems to us, encumbered by Kantian metaphysics; and he appears not to have adequately grasped the Aristotelian notion of entelechy as a constitutive principle of the living being. Still, he has furnished valuable contributions both to science and the philosophy of life.

Side by side with this vitalistic movement there continues, of course, an energetic section of representatives of the old mechanical school in men like Häckel, Loeb, Le Dantec, and Verworn, who still attempt physico-chemical explanations; but no new arguments have been adduced to justify their claims. Many others, more cautious, adopt the attitude of agnosticism. This position, as Reinke justly observes, has at least the merit of dispensing from the labour of thinking. The present neo-vitalistic reaction, however, as the outcome of very extensive and thorough-going research, is, we venture to think, the harbinger of a widespread return to more accurate science and a sounder philosophy in respect to this great problem. With regard to the question of the origin of life, the whole weight of scientific evidence and authority during the past half century has gone to demonstrate with increasing cogency Harvey's axiom *Omne vivens ex vivo*, that life never arises in this world save from a previous living being. It claims even to have established Virchow's generalization (1858) *Omnis cellula ex cellula*, and even Flemming's further advance (1882), *Omnis nucleus e nucleo*.

The history of vitalism, which we have thus briefly outlined, shows how the advance of biological research and the trend of the best modern scientific thought is moving steadily back in the direction of that conception of life to be found in the scholastic philosophy, itself based on the teaching of Aristotle. We shall now attempt a fuller positive treatment of the doctrine adopted by the great body of Catholic philosophers.

II. Doctrine.—A. *Science.*—Life is that perfection in a living being in virtue of which it is capable of self-movement or immanent action. Motion, thus understood includes, besides change of locality, all alterations in quality or quantity, and all transition from potentiality to actuality. The term is applied only analogically to God, who is exempt from even accidental modification. Self-movement of a being is that effected by a principle intrinsic to the nature of the being, though it may be excited or stimulated from without. *Immanent* action is action of which the terminus remains within the agent itself, e. g. thought, sensation, nutrition. It is contrasted with *transient* action, of which the effect passes to a being distinct from the agent, e. g. pushing, pulling, warming, etc. Immanent activity can be the property only of a principle which is an intrinsic constituent of the agent. In contrast with the power of self-movement *inertia* is a fundamental attribute of inanimate matter. This can only be moved from without. There are three grades of life essentially distinct: vegetative, sentient or animal, and intellectual or spiritual life; for the capacity for immanent action is of three kinds. Vegetative operations result in the assimilation of material elements into the substance of the living being. In animal conscious life the vital act is a modification of the sentient organic faculty; whilst in rational life the intellect expresses the object by a purely spiritual modification of itself. Life as we know it in this world is always bound up with organized matter, that is, with a material structure consisting of organs, or heterogeneous parts, specialized for different functions and combined into a whole.

The ultimate units of which all organisms, whether plant or animal, are composed, are minute particles of protoplasm, called cells. But even in the cell there is differentiation in structural parts and in function. In other words, the cell itself living apart is an organism. The complexity of living structures varies from that of the single cell amœba up to the elephant or man. All higher organisms start from the fusion of two germ-cells, or gametes. When these are unequal the smaller one—the spermatozoon—is so minute in relation to the larger, or ovum, that their fusion is commonly spoken of as the fertilization of the ovum by the spermatozoon. The ovum thus fertilized is endowed with the power, when placed in its appropriate nutrient medium, of building itself up into the full-sized living being of the specific type to which it belongs. Growth throughout is effected by a continuous process of cell cleavage and multiplication. The fertilized ovum undergoes certain internal changes and then divides into two cells juxtaposed. Each of the pair passes through similar changes and subdivides in the same way, forming a cluster of four like cells; then of eight; then of sixteen and so on. The specific shape and different organs of the future animal only gradually manifest themselves. At first the cells present the appearance of a bunch of grapes or the grains of a mulberry, the *morula* stage; the growth proceeds rapidly, a cavity forms itself inside and the *blastosphere* stage is reached. Next, in the case of invertebrates, one part of the sphere invaginates or collapses inwards and the embryo now takes the shape of a small sac, the *gastrula* stage. In vertebrates instead of invagination there is unequal growth of parts and the development continuing, the outlines of the nervous system, digestive cavity, viscera, heart, sense-organs, etc. appear, and the specific type becomes more and more distinct, until there can be recognized the structure of the particular animal—the fish, bird, or mammal. The entire organism, skin, bone, nerve, muscle, etc. is thus built up of cells, all derived by similar processes ultimately from the original germ cell. All the characteristic features of life and the formative power which constructs the whole edifice is thus possessed by this germ-cell, and the whole problem of life meets us here.

The chief phenomena of life can be seen in their simplest form in a unicellular organism, such as the amœba. This is visible under the microscope as a minute speck of transparent jelly-like protoplasm,

with a nucleus, or a darker spot, in the interior. This latter, as Wilson says, may be regarded as "a controlling centre of cell activity". It plays a most important part in reproduction, and is probably a constituent part of all normal cells, though this point is not yet strictly proved. The amœba exhibits irritability or movement in response to stimulation. It spreads itself around small particles of food, dissolves them, and absorbs the nutritive elements by a process of intussusception, and distributes the new material throughout its substance as a whole, to make good the loss which it is constantly undergoing by decomposition. The operation of nutrition is an essentially immanent activity, and it is part of the metabolism, or waste and repair, which is characteristic of living organisms. The material thus assimilated into the living organism is raised to a condition of chemically unstable equilibrium, and sustained in this state while it remains part of the living being. When the assimilation exceeds disintegration the animal grows. From time to time certain changes take place in the nucleus and body of the cell, which divides into two, part of the nucleus, reconstituted into a new nucleus, remaining with one section of the cell, and part with the other. The separated parts then complete their development, and grow up into two distinct cells like the original parent cell. Here we have the phenomenon of reproduction. Finally, the cell may be destroyed by physical or chemical action, when all these vital activities cease. To sum up the account of life in its simplest form, in the words of Professor Windle:—"The amœba moves, it responds to stimuli, it breathes and it feeds, it carries on complicated chemical processes in its interior. It increases and multiplies and it may die." (What is Life?, p. 36.)

B. *Philosophy.*—These various phenomena constituting the cycle of life cannot, according to the Schoolmen, be rationally conceived as the outcome of any collection of material particles. They are inexplicable by mere complexity of machinery, or as a resultant of the physical and chemical properties of matter. They establish, it is maintained, the existence of an intrinsic agency, energy, or power, which unifies the multiplicity of material parts, guides the several vital processes, dominates in some manner the physical and chemical operations, controls the tendency of the constituents of living substance to decompose and pass into conditions of more stable equilibrium, and regulates and directs the whole series of changes involved in the growth and the building-up of the living being after the plan of its specific type. This agency is the *vital principle;* and according to the Scholastic philosophers it is best conceived as the *substantial form* of the body. In the Peripatetic theory, the *form* or *entelechy* gives unity to the living being, determines its essential nature, and is the ultimate source of its specific activities. The evidence for this doctrine can be stated only in the briefest outline.

(1) Argument from physiological unity.—The physiological unity and regulative power of the organism as a whole necessitate the admission of an internal, formal, constituent principle as the source of vital activity. The living being—protozoon or vertebrate, notwithstanding its differentiation of material parts and manifoldness of structure, is truly *one.* It exercises *immanent* activity. Its organs for digestion, secretion, respiration, sensation, etc., are organs of *one* being. They function not for their own sakes but for the service of the whole. The well-being or ill-being of each part is bound up in intimate sympathy with every other. Amid wide variations of surroundings the living organism exhibits remarkable skill in selecting suitable nutriment; it regulates its temperature and the rate of combustion uniformly within very narrow limits; it similarly controls respiration and circulation; the composition of the blood is also kept unchanged with remarkable exactness throughout the species. In fact, life selects, absorbs, distributes, stores various materials of its environment for the good of the whole organism, and rejects waste products, spending its energy with wonderful wisdom. This would not be possible were the living being merely an aggregate of atoms or particles of matter in local contact. Each wheel of a watch or engine—nay each part of a wheel—is a being quite distinct from, and in its existence intrinsically independent of every other. No spoke or rivet sickens or thrives in sympathy with a bar in another part of the machine, nor does it contribute out of its actual or potential substance to make good the disintegration of other parts. The combination is artificial; the union accidental, not natural. All the actions between the parts are transient, not immanent. The phenomena of life thus establish the reality of a unifying and regulating principle, energy, or force, intimately present to every portion of the living creature, making its manifold parts one substantial nature and regulating its activities.

(2) Morpho-genetic argument: Growth.—The tiny fertilized ovum placed in a suitable medium grows rapidly by division and multiplication, and builds up an infinitely complex structure, after the type of the species to which it belongs. But for this something more than the chemical and physical properties of the material elements engaged is required. There must be from the beginning some intrinsic formative power in the germ to direct the course of the vast series of changes involved. Machines may, when once set up, be constructed to perform very ingenious operations. But no machine constructs itself; still less can it endow a part of its structure with the power of building itself up into a similar machine. The establishment of the doctrine of epigenesis has obviously increased indefinitely the hopelessness of a mechanical explanation. When it is said that life is due to the organization of matter, the question at once arises: What is the cause of the organization? What but the formative power—the vital principle of the germ cell? Again, the growing organism has been compared to the building up of the crystal. But the two are totally different. The crystal grows by mere aggregation of external surface layers which do not affect the interior. The organism grows by intussusception, the absorption of nutriment and the distribution of it throughout its own substance. A crystal liberates energy in its formation and growth. A living body accumulates potential energy in its growth. A piece of crystal too is not a unity. A part of a crystal is still a crystal. Not so, a part of a cow. A still more marvellous characteristic of life is the faculty of restoring damaged parts. If any part is wounded, the whole organism exhibits its sympathy; the normal course of nutrition is altered, the vital energy economizes its supplies elsewhere and concentrates its resources in healing the injured part. This indeed is only a particular exercise of the faculty of adaptation and of circumventing obstacles that interfere with normal activity, which marks the flexibility of the universal working of life, as contrasted with the rigidity of the machine and the immutability of physical and chemical modes of action.

The argument in favour of a vital principle from growth has been recently reinforced in a new way by the introduction of experiment into embryology. Roux, Driesch, Wilson, and others, have shown that in the case of the sea-urchin, amphioxus, and other animals, if the embryo in its earliest stages, when consisting of two cells, four cells, and in some cases of eight cells, be carefully divided up into the separate single cells, each of these may develop into a complete animal, though of proportionately smaller size. That is, the fertilized ovum which was naturally destined to become one normal animal, though prevented by artificial interference from achieving that end, has yet attained its purpose by producing several smaller animals; and in doing so has employed the cells which it

produced to form quite other parts of the organism than those for which they were normally designed. This proves that there must be in the original cell a flexible formative power capable of directing the vital processes of the embryo along the most devious paths and of adapting much of its constituent material to the most diverse uses.

(3) *Psychical Argument.*—Finally, we have immediate and intimate knowledge of our own living conscious unity. I am assured that it is the same ultimate principle within me which thinks and feels, which originates and directs my movements. It is this same principle which has governed the growth of all my sense-organs and members, and animates the whole of my body. It is this which constitutes me one rational, sentient, living being.

All these various classes of facts prove that life is not explicable by the mechanical, physical, and chemical properties of matter. To account for the phenomena there is required within the living being a principle which has built up the organism after a definite plan; which constitutes the manifold material a single being; which is intimately present in every part of it; which is the source of its essential activities; and which determines its specific nature. Such is the *vital principle.* It is therefore in the Scholastic terminology at once the final, the formal, and even the efficient cause of the living being.

C. *Unity of the Living Being.*—In each animal or plant there is only one vital principle—one substantial form. This is obvious from the manner in which the various vital functions are controlled and directed to one end—the good of the whole being. Were there more than one vital principle, then we should have not one being but a collection of beings. The practice of abstraction in scientific descriptions and discussions of the structure and functions of the cell has sometimes occasioned exaggerated notions as to the independence and separateness of existence of the individual cell, in the organism. It is true that certain definite activities and functions are exercised by the individual cell as by the eye or the liver; and we may for convenience consider these in isolation: but in concrete reality the cell, as well as the eye or the liver, exerts its activity by and through the living energy of the whole being. In some lowly organisms it is not easy to determine whether we are in presence of an individual being or a colony; but this does not affect the truth of the proposition that the vital principle being the substantial form, there can only be one such principle animating the living being. With respect to the nature of this unity of form there has been much dispute among the adherents of the Scholastic philosophy down to the present day. It is agreed that in the case of man the unity, which is of the most perfect kind, is founded on the simplicity of the rational or spiritual soul. In the case of the higher animals also it has been generally, though not universally held that the vital principle is indivisible. With respect to plants and lower forms of animal life in which the parts live after division, the disagreement is considerable. According to some writers the vital principle here is not simple but extended, and the unity is due merely to its continuity. According to others it is actually simple, potentially manifold, or divisible in virtue of the nature of the extended organism which it animates. There does not seem to be much prospect of a final settlement of the point. (Urraburu, "Psychologia", bk. I.)

D. *Ultimate Origin of Life.*—The whole weight of the evidence from biological investigation during the last fifty years, as we have already observed, goes to prove with constantly increasing force that life never appears on the earth except as originating from a previous living being. On the other hand science also proves that there was a time in the past when no life could have possibly existed on this planet. How then did it begin? For the Christian and the Theist the answer is easy and obvious. Life must in the first instance have been due to the intervention of a living First Cause. When Weismann says that for him the assumption of spontaneous generation is a "logical necessity" (Evolution Theory, II, 366), or Karl Pearson, that the demand for "special creation or an ultra-scientific cause" must be rejected because "it would not bring unity into the phenomena of life nor enable us to economize thought" (Grammar of Science, 353), we have merely a psychological illustration of the force of prejudice even in the scientific mind. A better sample of the genuine scientific spirit and a view more consonant with actual evidence are presented to us by the eminent biologist, Alfred Russel Wallace, who, in concluding his discussion of the Darwinian theory, points out "that there are at least three stages in the development of the organic world when some new cause or power must necessarily have come into action. The first stage is the change from inorganic to organic, when the earliest vegetable cell, or the living protoplasm out of which it arose, first appeared. This is often imputed to a mere increase of complexity of chemical compounds; but increase of complexity, with consequent instability, even if we admit that it may have produced protoplasm as a chemical compound, could certainly not have produced *living* protoplasm—protoplasm which has the power of growth and of reproduction, and of that continuous process of development which has resulted in the marvellous variety and complex organization of the whole vegetable kingdom. There is in all this something quite beyond and apart from chemical changes, however complex; and it has been well said that the first vegetable cell was a new thing in the world, possessing altogether new powers—that of extracting and fixing carbon from the carbon dioxide of the atmosphere, that of indefinite reproduction, and still more marvellous, the power of variation and of reproducing those variations till endless complications of structure and varieties of form have been the result. Here, then, we have indications of a new power at work, which we may term *vitality*, since it gives to certain forms of matter all those characters and properties which constitute Life" ("Darwinism", London, 1889, 474–5). For a discussion of the relation of life to the law of the conservation of energy, see ENERGY, where the question is treated at length.

Having thus expounded what we believe to be the teaching of the best recent science and philosophy respecting the nature and immediate origin of life, it seems to us most important to bear constantly in mind that the Catholic Church is committed to extremely little in the way of positive definite teaching on the subject. Thus it is well to recall at the present time that three of the most eminent Italian Jesuits, in philosophy and science, during the nineteenth century, Fathers Tongiorgi, Secchi, and Palmieri, recognized as most competent theologians and all professors in the Gregorian University, all held the mechanical theory in regard to vegetative life, whilst St. Thomas and the entire body of theologians of the Middle Ages, like everybody else of their time, believed implicitly in spontaneous generation as an everyday occurrence. If therefore these decayed scientific hypotheses should ever be rehabilitated or—which does not seem likely—be even established, there would be no insuperable difficulty from a theological standpoint as to their acceptance.

Many articles deal with questions touched upon in the present subject: ACTUS ET POTENTIA; BIOGENESIS; BIOLOGY; ENERGY; EVOLUTION; FORM; MATTER. The general literature is so large our selection must be somewhat arbitrary.

HISTORICAL.—ARISTOTLE, *De Anima*, tr. HAMMOND (London, 1902); also tr. HICKS; IDEM, *De Generatione Animalium; De Historia Animalium*, tr. CRESWELL; ST. THOMAS, I, Q. lxxvi, and passim; ROLFES, *Die Substantiale Form und der Begriff der Seele bei Aristoteles* (Paderborn, 1896); BOUILLIER, *Du Principe vital et de l'âme pensante* (Paris, 1863); DRIESCH, *Der*

Vitalismus als Geschichte und als Lehre (Leipzig, 1905); FOSTER, *History of Physiology* (Cambridge, 1901); LOCY, *Biology and its Makers* (New York, 1908).

SCIENCE AND PHILOSOPHY OF LIFE.—WINDLE, *What is Life?* (London, 1908); DRIESCH, *The Science and Philosophy of the Organism* (London, 1907–1908); WILSON, *The Cell in Development and Inheritance* (New York, 1906); JENNINGS, *Contributions to the Study of the Behaviour of Lower Organisms* (Washington, 1904); GERARD, *The Old Riddle and the Newest Answer* (London, 1908); MAHER, *Psychology* (New York and London, 1905); DRESSEL, *Der belebte und der unbelebte Stoff* (Freiburg, 1883); GUTBERLET, *Der Kampf um die Seele* (Mainz, 1899); IDEM, *Naturphilosophie* (Münster, 1903); REINKE, *Philosophie der Botanik* (Leipzig, 1905); WASMANN, *Die Moderne Biologie und die Entwicklungstheorie* (Freiburg, 1906); MERCIER, *La définition philosophique de la vie* (Louvain, 1898); FARGES, *La vie et l'évolution des espèces* (Paris, 1900); GRASSET, *Les limites de la biologie* (Paris, 1906); LA CHIESA, *La Biomeccanica, il neovitalismo, il vitalismo tradizionale* (Rome, 1900); CARAZZI, *Teorie e critiche nella moderna biologia* (Padua, 1906); GEMELLI, *L'enigma della vita* (Florence, 1910).

LIMITED MECHANICISM.—TONGIORGI, *Institutiones Philosophicæ* (Brussels, 1869); CARBONELLE, *Les confins de la science et de la philosophie* (Paris, 1881); SECCHI, *L'unità della forze fisiche* (Rome, 1869); PALMIERI, *Institutiones Philosophicæ*, II (Rome, 1875); MATERIALISTIC MECHANICAL VIEWS.—WEISMANN, *Evolution Theory* (London and New York, 1904); LE DANTEC, *The Nature and the Origin of Life* (London, 1907); VERWORN, *General Physiology;* (tr. London and New York, 1899); PEARSON, *Grammar of Science* (London, 1900).

MICHAEL MAHER.

Ligamen (Lat. for *bond*), the existing marriage tie which constitutes in canon law a public impediment to the contracting of a second marriage. As marriage is monogamous and indissoluble, it follows that one who is still united in valid marriage cannot contract another valid marriage (Matt., v, 31 sq., xix, 4 sqq.; Mark, x, 11 sq.; Luke, xvi, 18; I Cor., vii, 10 sq.). The existence of a previous valid marriage at the moment of contracting a second entails of itself the invalidity of the latter. The Church enforces the law that no one can contract two or more marriages at the same time. Protestantism on the contrary does not take this stand as is shown, among other cases, by the action of Luther and other reformers in the case of the double marriage of the Landgrave Philip of Hesse (Janssen, "History of the German People at the close of the Middle Ages", VI (tr. London, 1908), book II, xii, 75 sqq.; Rockwell, "Die Doppelehe des Landgrafen Philipp von Hessen" (Marburg, 1904); Paulus, "Cajetan and Luther über die Polygamie" in "Historisch-politische Blatter", CXXXV, 81 sqq.; Köhler, "Die Doppelehe des Landgrafen Philipp von Hessen" in "Historische Zeitschrift", XCIV, 385 sqq.). Hence he who has already contracted a marriage, in order to proceed legally with another, must prove that the first marriage tie (*ligamen*) no longer exists. Since marriage, apart from "matrimonium ratum" which is dissolved for one party by religious profession, is regularly dissolved by death alone, proof of this death must be established before the second marriage can validly be contracted (C. 19, X, de sponsal., IV, I).

The proof of death required is either an official death certificate, issued by the parish priest or other authorized ecclesiastic, or by the proper civil official, the directors of hospitals, the military commanding officer, or satisfactory evidence from other public records and reports. The decision of a secular judge supported by a death certificate cannot *ipso facto* decide the question for the ecclesiastical authorities; they may, however, utilize the same. Death may be proved by two credible witnesses on their oath; by one witness of such rank or character that he is above suspicion; by hearsay witnesses, if their statements originate from unsuspected sources. Should such credible evidence be unattainable directly, and from ecclesiastical sources, the bishop should try as far as possible to obtain at least a moral certainty regarding the position of the contracting parties. He ought also to consider the previous marital relations of the missing party, his religious attitude, age, health, property relations with the surviving spouse, etc.

Should the bishop be unable to obtain moral certainty or should the case be extraordinary, appeal must be made to the Apostolic See (C. 8, X, qui filii sint legit., IV, 17; Cong. S. Off., 13, Mai, 1868, i. e. the "Instructio ad probandum obitum alicuius coniugis"; Sac. Cong. Inq., 18 Juli, 1900). Whoever, in spite of the certainty of an existing marriage, attempts to contract a second, commits an act juridically null and void, is guilty of the sin of bigamy, incurs the ecclesiastical penalty of infamy, and is excommunicated with a consequent refusal of the sacraments and Christian burial. Should it prove, however, that in fact the first marriage at the time of contracting the second, was really dissolved, then the second, despite bad faith, would be valid. Should the second marriage have been contracted in good faith, if only by one party, and it subsequently appear that the first spouse still lived, then the second marriage would not only be invalid but the parties to it must be separated by the ecclesiastical authorities, and the first marriage re-established. However, the second and invalid marriage would enjoy the advantage of being putative marriage (C. 8, X, qui filii sint legit., IV, 17). This second marriage, though illegal during the lifetime of the first spouse, may be validly contracted after his or her death; indeed, should the party who acted *bona fide* demand it, the guilty one is then bound to contract marriage validly with the petitioner.

Since monogamy and the indissolubility of marriage are founded on the natural law, this impediment of *ligamen* is binding also on non-Catholics and on the unbaptized. If an unbaptized person living in polygamy become a Christian, he must keep the wife he had first married and release the second, in case the first wife is converted with him. Otherwise, by virtue of the "Pauline privilege", the converted husband may choose that one of his wives who allows herself to be baptized (C. 8, X, de divort., IV, 19, Pius V, "Romani Pontificis", 2 Aug., 1571; Gregory XIII, "Populis ac nationibus", 25 Jan., 1585). Polygamy is likewise forbidden by the civil law, though it is much more indulgent than the Church in the dissolving of marriages and granting divorces, and often permits a new marriage where the first marriage still exists. In this matter Catholics must not follow the civil law where it conflicts with the law of the Church.

WERNZ, *Jus decretalium*, IV (Rome, 1904), 520 sqq.; LAURENTIUS, *Institutiones juris ecclesiastici* (Freiburg, 1908), n. 626 sqq.; PAULI, *Archiv für katholisches Kirchenrecht*, LXXXVIII, 273 sqq.; SMITH, *Elements of Ecclesiastical Law* (New York, 1877–89).

JOHANNES BAPTIST SÄGMÜLLER.

Lights.—Upon the subject of the liturgical use of lights, as an adjunct of the services of the Church, something has already been said under such headings as ALTAR (IN LITURGY), sub-title *Altar-Candles;* BENEDICTION OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT; CANDLES; CANDLESTICKS; LAMPS AND LAMPADARII. The present article will be concerned only with the more general aspect of the question, and in particular with the charge so often levelled against Catholicism of adopting wholesale the ceremonial practices of the pagan world.

How far the use of lights in the daytime as an adjunct of the Liturgy can be traced back to the second or third century A. D. is not quite easy to decide. On the one hand, there seems to be some evidence that the Christians themselves repudiated the practice. Although Tertullian ("Apol.", xlvi and xxxv; "De Idololat.", xv) does not make any direct reference to the use of lights in religious worship, still he speaks in strong terms of the uselessness of burning lamps in the daytime as an act of piety towards the emperors. This would be somewhat inconsistent, if the Christians themselves had been open to the same reproach. Moreover, several of the Fathers of the fourth century might seem to be more explicit in their condemnation of a display of lamps. For example, about the year 303, Lactantius writes: "They [the pagans] burn lights as to one dwelling in

darkness. . . Is he to be thought in his right mind who offers for a gift the light of candles and wax tapers to the author and giver of light? . . . But their Gods, because they are of the earth, need light that they need not be in darkness" ("Institut. Div.", VI, ii). In like manner, St. Gregory of Nazianzus, towards the end of the same century, observes: "Let not our dwelling-place blaze with visible light and resound with minstrelsy, for this indeed is the custom of the Greek holy-month, but let us not honour God with these things and exalt the present season with unbecoming rites, but with purity of soul and cheerfulness of mind and with lamps which enlighten the whole body of the Church, i. e. with divine contemplations and thoughts" (Orat., v, 35). The rhetorical character of such passages makes it dangerous to draw inferences. It may well be that the writers are merely protesting against the illuminations which formed part of the ordinary religious cultus of the emperors, and wish to state forcibly the objections against a similar practice which was beginning to find favour among Christians. It is, at any rate, certain that even earlier than this the liturgical use of lights must have been introduced. The decree of the Spanish Council of Illiberis, or Elvira (about A. D. 305), is too obscure to afford a firm basis for argument (see Hefele-Leclercq, "Hist. des Conciles", I, 212). Still this prohibition, "that candles be not lighted in a cemetery during the day, for the spirits of the saints ought not to be disquieted" (can. xxxiv), at least shows that the practice—which we know to have been long in use among pagans—of burning lights, for some symbolical or superstitious reason, even in the daytime, was being adopted among the Christians also. To discuss in detail the perplexing and seemingly inconsistent references of St. Jerome to the use of lights would not be possible here. But two facts stand out clearly: (1) that he admitted the existence of a pretty general custom of burning candles and lamps in honour of the martyrs, a custom which he apologizes for without unreservedly approving it; and (2) that the saint, though he denies that there is any general practice among the Christians of burning lights during the daytime, still admits at least some instances of a purely liturgical use of light. Thus he says: "Apart from honouring the relics of martyrs, it is the custom, through all the Churches of the East, that when the gospels are to be read lights are kindled, though the sun is already shining, not, indeed, to dispel darkness, but to exhibit a token of joy . . . and that, under the figure of bodily light, that light may be set forth of which we read in the psalter 'thy word is a lamp to my feet and a light to my paths'" (C. Vigilantium, vii). This testimony is particularly valuable because it so clearly refutes any exclusively utilitarian view of the use of lights in the churches.

From Eusebius, St. Paulinus of Nola, the "Peregrinatio Ætheriæ" (Pilgrimage of Ætheria), and other authorities, we have abundant evidence that the Christians of the fourth century, and probably earlier still, upon Easter eve and some other solemn festivals, made a great display of lamps and candles of all kinds. Moreover, this does not seem to have been confined to the nocturnal vigil itself, for St. Paulinus, in describing the feast of St. Felix to whom his church was dedicated, tells us in verse how "the bright altars are crowned with lamps thickly set. Lights are burnt, odorous with waxed papyri. They shine by night and day; thus night is radiant with the brightness of the day, and the day itself, bright in heavenly beauty, shines yet more with light doubled by countless lamps" ("Poem.", xiv, "Nat." iii, in P. L., LXI, 467). Still this poetical language may very possibly mean no more than that in a rather dark church it was found desirable to keep the lamps burning even in daytime upon great festivals, when there was a large concourse of people. It tells us nothing of any use of lights which is liturgical in the stricter sense of the word. The same may be said of various references to the festal adornment of churches with lamps and candles which may be found in the writings of the Christian poet Prudentius (cf. P. L., LIX, 819, 829; and LX, 300). Still, when we find in the newly discovered "Testament of our Lord" (l. 19) an injunction regarding church buildings, that "all places should be lighted both for a type and also for reading", it seems clear that St. Jerome was not alone in attaching a mystical significance to the use of lights. Hence we may infer that before the days (about A. D. 475) of the liturgical homilist Narsai (see LAMPS AND LAMPADARII) the use of lamps and candles around the altar during the Liturgy had become universal.

It should be added that no great importance can be attached to the mention by St. Paulinus of Nola, of "a perpetual light" in the church ("continuum scyphus argenteus aptus ad usum"; cf. P. L., LXI, 539). This certainly cannot be assumed to have been intended as a mark of respect to the Blessed Sacrament reserved for the sick. In the days before the invention of matches the continuance of some source of fire from which a light could be readily obtained was a matter of great convenience. Such a perpetual light seems to have been usually kept up, then as now, in Jewish synagogues (cf. Ex., xxvii, 20; Lev., xxiv, 2), but it was only the later Talmudists who discovered in this a purpose of honouring the Torah, or Books of the Law, preserved in the Ark. The same utilitarian design probably underlay any Christian practice, which, after all, is not very widely attested, of keeping a light perpetually burning in the church.

But to return to the liturgical use of lights in the stricter sense, there are not wanting many considerations to suggest that, despite the lack of direct evidence, this practice is probably of very much older date than the fourth century. To begin with, the seven-branched "candlestick", or more accurately lamp-stand, was a permanent element in the Temple ritual at Jerusalem and more than one Jewish festival (e. g. the Dedication feast and that of Tabernacles), was marked by a profuse use of lights. Moreover, the Apocalypse (i, 12; iv, 5; xi, 4), in the prominence which it gives to the mention of candlesticks and lamps, is probably only echoing the more or less liturgical conceptions already current at the time. Again, the fact that the Liturgy was at first no doubt celebrated in the evening (cf. I Cor., xi, 21), as also the necessity that the faithful should often assemble by stealth (as in the catacombs) or in the early hours of the morning (cf. Pliny, "Epp", X, n. 97—*ante lucem convenire;* and Tertullian, "De Cor.", iii—*antelucanis cætibus*), render it highly probable that artificial light must have come to be regarded as an ordinary adjunct of the Liturgy. Hence the use of lamps and candles was probably continued even when not actually needed, just as, in more modern days, the bishop's *bugia*, which in the beginning served an entirely practical purpose, has come in time to be purely ceremonial. It is also noteworthy that early representations of the Last Supper nearly always give prominence to the lamp, while something of the same kind obtains in the first rude sketches of Christian altars. In any case, lamps and chandeliers are conspicuous amongst the earliest recorded presents to churches (see the "Liber Pontificalis", ed. Duchesne, passim; and cf. the inventory of Cirta, A. D. 303, in Morcelli, "Africa Christiana", II, 183; and Beissel, "Bilder aus der altchrist. Kunst", 247).

Both in ancient and modern times, the reproach has been leveled against the Church that in her ceremonial use of lights she has taken over without scruple the sensuous and often idolatrous practices of paganism. For this charge there is very little real justification. To begin with, it must be evident that such

simple elements as light, music, rich attire, processions, ablutions, and lustrations, flowers, unguents, incense, etc., belong, as it were, to the common stock of all ceremonial, whether religious or secular. If there is to be any solemnity of external worship at all it must include some at least of these things, and whether we turn to the polytheistic ritual of ancient Greece and Rome, or to the nations of the far East, or to the comparatively isolated civilizations of the aborigines of Mexico and Peru, human striving after impressiveness is found to manifest itself in very similar ways. A multiplicity of lights is always in some measure joyous and decorative, and it is a principle taught by everyday experience that marks of respect which are shown at first with a strictly utilitarian purpose are regarded in the end as only the more honorific if they are continued when they are plainly superfluous. Thus an escort of torches or candle-bearers, which is almost a necessity in the dark, and is a convenience in the twilight, becomes a formality indicative of ceremonious respect if maintained in the full light of day. Again, since the use of lights was so familiar to Jewish ritual, there is no sufficient ground for regarding the Christian Church as in this respect imitative either of the religions of Greece and Rome or of the more oriental Mithra worship. At the same time, it seems probable enough that certain features of Christian ceremonial were directly borrowed from Roman secular usages. For example, the later custom that seven acolytes with candlesticks should precede the pope, when he made his solemn entry into the church, is no doubt to be traced to a privilege which was common under the Empire of escorting the great functionaries of the State with torches. This right is expressly recognised in the "Notitia Dignitatum", but it may also be found in embryo at an earlier date, when the Consul Duilius for his victory over the Carthaginians, in the third century before Christ, obtained the privilege of being escorted home by a torch and a flute player. But granting, as even so conservative an historian as Cardinal Baronius is fully prepared to grant, a certain amount of direct borrowing of pagan usages, this is no subject of reproach to the Catholic Church. "What", he says, "is to prevent profane things, when sanctified by the word of God, being transferred to sacred purposes? Of such pagan rites laudably adopted for the service of the Christian religion we have many examples. And with regard more especially to lamps and candles, of which we are now speaking, who can reasonably find fault if those same things which were once offered to idols are now consecrated to the honour of the martyrs? If those lamps which were kindled in the temples on Saturdays—not as though the gods needed light, as even Seneca points out (Ep. xv, 66), but as a mark of veneration—are now lighted in the honour of the Mother of God? If the candles which were formerly distributed at the Saturnalia are now identified with the feast of the Purification of our Lady? What, I ask, is there so surprising if holy bishops have allowed certain customs firmly rooted among pagan peoples, and so tenaciously adhered to by them that even after their conversion to Christianity they could not be induced to surrender them, to be transferred to the worship of the true God?" (Baronius, "Annales", ad ann. 58, n. 77).

With regard to the use of lights in direct connexion with the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, we find the whole system of portable lights elaborated in the earliest of the "Ordines Romani". Indeed, St. Jerome's plain reference, already quoted, to the carrying of lights at the Gospel, seems probably to take the practice back to at least three hundred years earlier, even if we may not appeal, as many authorities have done, to the words of the Acts of the Apostles (xx, 7–8): "And on the first day of the week, when we were assembled to break bread, Paul discoursed with them. . . . And there were a great number of lamps in the upper chamber where we were assembled." It does not seem to have been customary to place lights upon the altar itself before the eleventh century, but the "Ordines Romani" and other documents make it clear that, many centuries before this, lights were carried in procession by acolytes (see ACOLYTE), and set down upon the ground or held in the hand while Mass was being offered and the Gospel read. A decree of the so-called Fourth Council of Carthage directs that in the ordination of an acolyte a candlestick is to be given him, but this collection of canons does not belong, as was once supposed, to the year 398, but to the time of St. Cæsarius of Arles (about A. D. 512). A little later, i. e. in 636, St. Isidore of Seville (Etymol., VII), xii, n. 29) speaks quite explicitly on the point: "Acolytes", he says, "in Greek, are called Ceroferarii in Latin, from their carrying wax candles when the Gospel is to be read or the sacrifice to be offered. For then lights are kindled by them, and carried, not to drive away darkness, as the sun is shining, but for a sign of joy, that under the form of material light may be represented that Light of which we read in the Gospel: That was the true light." It was only at a later date that various synodal decrees required the lighting of first one candle, and afterwards of two, during the time of the celebration of Mass.

The use of lights in baptism, a survival of which still remains in the candle given to the catechumen, with the words: "Receive this burning light and keep thy baptism so as to be without blame", etc., is also of great antiquity. It is probably to be connected in a very immediate way with the solemnities of the Easter vigil, when the font was blessed, and when, after careful preparation and a long series of "scrutinies", the catechumens were at last admitted to the reception of the Sacrament. Dom Morin (Revue Bénédictine, VIII, 20; IX, 392) has given excellent reason for believing that the ceremonial of the paschal candle may be traced back to at least the year 382 in the lifetime of St. Jerome. Moreover the term *φωτισθέντες* (*illuminati*), so constantly applied to the newly baptized in early writings, most probably bears some reference to the illumination which, as we know from many sources, marked the night of Holy Saturday. Thus St. Ambrose (De Laps. Virg., v, 19), speaking of this occasion, mentions "the blazing light of the neophytes", and St. Gregory of Nazianzus, in his great "Sermon on Holy Baptism", tells the candidates that "the lamps which you will kindle are a symbol of the illumination with which we shall meet the Bridegroom, with the lamps of our faith shining, not carelessly lulled to sleep" (Orat., xl, 46; cf. xlv, 2).

Again, the pagan use of lights at funerals seems to have been taken over by the Church as a harmless piece of ceremonial to which a Christian colour might easily be given. The early evidence upon this point in the writings of the Fathers is peculiarly abundant, beginning with what Eusebius tells us of the lying in state of the body of the Emperor Constantine: "They lighted candles on golden stands around it, and afforded a wonderful spectacle to the beholders, such as never was seen under the sun since the earth was made" (Vita. Const., iv, 66). Similarly, St. Jerome tells us of the obsequies of St. Paula in 386: "She was borne to the grave by the hands of bishops, who even put their shoulders under the bier, while other pontiffs carried lamps and candles before her" (Ad Eustoch., ep. cviii, n. 29). So, again in the West, at the funeral of St. Germanus of Auxerre, "The number of lights beat back the rays of the sun, and maintained their brightness even through the day" (Constantius, "Vita S. Germani", II, 24).

It is also certain that, from a very early period, lamps and candles were burnt around the bodies, and then, by a natural transition, before the relics, of the martyrs. How far this was merely a development

of the use of lights in funerals, or how far it sprang from the earlier pagan custom of displaying a number of lamps as a tribute of honour to the emperor or others, it is not easy to decide. The practice, as we have seen, was known to St. Jerome, and is with some reservation defended by him. This burning of lights before shrines, relics, and statues naturally assumed great developments in the Middle Ages. Bequests to various "lights" in the churches which the testator desired to benefit generally occupy a considerable space in medieval wills, more particularly in England.

Upon the symbolism of ecclesiastical lights much has been written by medieval liturgists from Amalarius downwards. That all such lights typify Jesus Christ, Who is the Light of the World, is a matter of general agreement, while the older text of the "Exultet" rendered familiar the thought that the wax produced by virgin bees was a figure of the human body which Christ derived from His immaculate Mother. To this it was natural to add that the wick was emblematic of Christ's human soul, while the flame represented His Godhead. But the medieval liturgists also abound in a variety of other symbolic expositions, which naturally are not always quite consistent with one another.

BÄUMER in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v. *Kerze;* SCHROD, *ibid.*, s. v. *Licht;* SCUDAMORE in *Dict. Christ. Antiq.*, s. v.; BARONIUS, *Annales ad ann.*, 58; THALHOFER, *Liturgik*, I (Freiburg, 1883), 666–83; MÜHLBAUER, *Geschichte und Bedeutung der Wachslichter bei den kirchlichen Functionen* (Augsburg, 1874); STALEY, *Studies in Ceremonial* (London, 1901), 169–94.

HERBERT THURSTON.

Ligugé, a Benedictine Abbey, in the Diocese of Poitiers, France, was founded about the year A. D. 360, by St. Martin of Tours. The miracles and reputation of the holy founder attracted a large number of disciples to the new monastery. When, however, St. Martin became Bishop of Tours and established the monastery of Marmoutiers a short distance from that city, the fame of Ligugé declined considerably. Among St. Martin's successors as abbots of Ligugé may be mentioned St. Savin, who resigned the post of abbot to become a hermit, and Abbot Ursinus, during whose reign the monk Defensor compiled the well-known "Scintillarum Liber" printed in P. L., LXXXVIII. The Saracenic invasion, the wars of the dukes of Aquitaine and the early Carlovingians, and lastly the Norman invasion were a series of disasters that almost destroyed the monastery. By the eleventh century it had sunk to the position of a dependent priory attached to the Abbey of Maillezais, and finally reached the lowest level as a benefice *in commendam*. One of the commendatory priors, Geoffrey d'Estissac, a great patron of literature and the friend of Rabelais, built the existing church, a graceful structure but smaller by far than the ancient basilica which it replaced. In 1607 Ligugé ceased to be a monastery and was annexed to the Jesuit college of Poitiers to which institution it served as a country house until the suppression of the society in 1762. At the French Revolution the buildings and lands were sold as national property, the church being used for some time as the Municipal Council chamber. Eventually, when the upheaval of the Revolution had subsided, the building was constituted a parish church.

In 1849 the famous Mgr Pie, afterwards cardinal, became Bishop of Poitiers. This prelate was the intimate friend of Dom Prosper Guéranger, re-founder of the French Benedictine Congregation of monks, and in 1852 he established at Ligugé a colony of monks from Solesmes. In 1864 the priory was erected into an abbey by Pope Pius IX, and Dom Léon Bastide was appointed first abbot. When, in 1880, the monks were driven from their cloister as a result of the "Ferry laws", many of them retired under Dom Bourigaud, the successor of Dom Bastide, to the monastery of Silos in Spain which was saved from extinction by the recruits thus received. Some years later the buildings at Ligugé were sold to a syndicate, civil in its constitution, by which they were leased to the abbot and community who thus entered their monastery once more. Novices now came in considerable numbers and, in 1894, the ancient Abbey of St. Wandrille de Fontenelle in the Diocese of Rouen was repeopled by a colony from Ligugé. In 1902 the community were again driven out by the "Association Laws", and they are now settled in Belgium at Chevetoigne, in the Diocese of Namur. On Dom Bourigaud's resignation, in 1907, Dom Léopold Gaugain was elected abbot. The community now numbers about forty choir monks and ten lay brothers.

Gallia Christiana, II (Paris, 1720), 1222; CHAMARD, *St. Martin et son monastère de Ligugé* (Paris, 1873); OLIM, *Ligugé premier monastère des Gaules* in *Revue d'Aquitaine*, I (1875), 467–478); BESSE, *St. Martin's Abbey Ligugé*, in *Downside Review*, XVIII (1899), 128–139).

G. ROGER HUDLESTON.

Liguori, ALPHONSUS. See ALPHONSUS LIGUORI, SAINT.

Lilienfeld, a Cistercian Abbey fifteen miles south of St. Polten, Lower Austria, was founded in 1202 by Leopold the Glorious, Margrave of Austria, the first monks being supplied from the monastery of Heiligen Kreuz near Vienna. The early history of the foundation presents no exceptional features, but as time went on the monastery became one of the richest and most influential in the empire, the abbots not infrequently acting as councillors to the emperor. Perhaps the most remarkable in the whole long series was Matthew Kollweis (1650–1695) who, when the Turks advanced against Vienna, literally turned his monastery into a fortress, installing a garrison and giving shelter to a large number of fugitives. In 1789 Emperor Joseph II decreed the suppression of the abbey and the spoliation was actually begun. The archives, manuscripts, and valuables of all kinds were carried away to Vienna, the library was dispersed, and the monuments in the church mostly removed or destroyed. Luckily, however, Joseph II died before the ruin was completed and one of the first acts of his successor, Leopold II, was to reverse the decree suppressing Lilienfeld, which thus preserved its ancient territorial possessions. In 1810 a disastrous fire ravaged the abbey buildings, but the church, considered one of the finest in the empire, fortunately escaped damage. The ruined monastery was afterwards restored at great expense and is now a fine specimen of the Austrian type of abbey; vast, somewhat heavy in style and suggesting in its outward appearance the power and dignity of an institution which has survived from feudal times. In 1910 the community numbered forty-nine choir monks, the abbot being Dom Justin Panschab. The abbey belongs to the Austro-Hungarian Congregation *Communis observantiæ* in which the observance, both as regards spirit and tradition, is allied far more closely to that of the Black Monks of St. Benedict, than to the reform of Abbot de Rancé, commonly known as the Trappist Congregation.

JANAUSCHEK, *Origines Cistercienses* I (Vienna, 1877), 212; HANTHALER, *Fasti Campilienses* (Linz, 1747–1754); BRUNNER, *Cisterzienserbuch* (Würzburg, 1881), 139–205; HANTHALER, *Recensus diplomatico-genealogicus archivii Campilienses*, 2 vols. (Vienna, 1819–1820); PERTZ, *Archiv.*, VI (1831), 185–186.

G. ROGER HUDLESTON.

Lilius, ALOISIUS, principal author of the Gregorian Calendar, was a native of Cirò or Zirò in Calabria. His name was originally Aloigi Giglio, from which the Latinized form now used is derived. Montucla (Histoire des Mathématiques, I, 678) erroneously calls him a Veronese, and Delambre (Histoire de l'Astronomie moderne, 1812, I, 5 and 57) calls him Luigi Lilio Giraldi, mixing up Aloigi with Lilius Gregorius Giraldi, the author of a work "De Annis et Mensibus".

Of Lilius's life nothing is known beyond the fact that he was professor of medicine at the University of Perugia as early as 1552. In that year he was recommended by Cardinal Marcello Cervini (afterwards Pope Marcellus II) for an increase of salary as an eminent professor and a man highly esteemed by the entire university. This date may explain why Lilius did not live to see his calendar introduced thirty years later. The statement in Poggendorff's "Handwörterbuch", that Lilius was a physician in Rome and that he died in 1576, is apparently not supported by recent researches. In that year, 1576, his manuscript on the reform of the calendar was presented to the Roman Curia by his brother Antonius, likewise doctor of arts and medicine. Antonius was probably many years younger, as he survived the reform and owned the copyright of the new calendar, until, by retarding its introduction, he lost that privilege, and its printing became free. Mention is made of a Mgr Thomas Giglio, Bishop of Sora, as first prefect of the papal commissions for the reform. If he was a relative of the two brothers, he was not guilty of family favouritism, as he proved himself an obstruction to Aloigi's plans. Lilius's work cannot be understood without a knowledge of what was done before him and in what shape his reform was introduced.

GREGORIAN REFORM OF THE CALENDAR.—*From the Council of Nicæa to that of Constance.*—The reform of the calendar was from the start connected with general councils, viz. those of Nicæa (325), of Constance (1414–1418), of Basle (1431), the Fifth of the Lateran (1512–1517), and that of Trent (1545–1563). The double rule, ascribed to the first council, that the vernal equinox shall remain on 21 March, where it then was, and that Easter shall fall on the Sunday after the first vernal full moon, was not respected by all those that planned reforms, but was strictly adhered to in the Gregorian Calendar. It was well known, at the time of the Council of Nicæa, that both the Julian year and the lunar cycle of Meton were too long; yet a remedy could not be adopted until the errors were more exactly determined. This state of knowledge lasted throughout the first twelve hundred years of our era, as is testified by the few representatives of that period: Gregory of Tours (544–595), Venerable Bede (c. 673–735), and Alcuin (735–804). Some progress was made during the thirteenth century. In the "Computus" of Magister Chonrad (1200) the error of the calendar was again pointed out. A first approximation of its extent was almost simultaneously given by Robert Grosseteste (Greathead, 1175–1253), Chancellor of Oxford and Bishop of Lincoln, and by the Scottish monk Joannes a Sacrobosco (Holywood or Halifax). According to the former one leap day should be omitted every 300 years; according to the latter 288 Julian years were just one day too long, and 19 Julian years were one and one-third hours shorter than the lunar cycle. While the latter error is estimated correctly, the other two numbers 300 and 288 should be replaced by 128. The Franciscan friar, Roger Bacon of Ilchester (1214–1294), basing his views on Grosseteste, recommended to the pope a series of reforms, the merits of which he did not decide. Campanus (between 1261 and 1264) made to Urban IV the specific proposition to replace the lunar cycle of 19 years by two others of 30 and 304 years. The most important step in the thirteenth century was made by the appearance, in 1252, of the astronomical tables of King Alphonsus X of Castile.

The fourteenth century is remarkable for an astronomical conference held at the papal court in Avignon. In 1344 Clement VI sent invitations to Joannes de Muris, a canon of Mazières (Canton Bourges), who was held to be no mean astronomer, and to Firminus de Bellavalle (Beauval), a native of Amiens, and others. The result of the conference was a treatise written by the two authors just mentioned: "Epistola super reformatione antiqui Calendarii". It had four parts: the solar year, the lunar year, the Golden Number, Easter. A third author was the monk Joannes de Thermis. Whether he was a member of the same conference or not, certain it is that he was charged by Clement VI to write his "Tractatus de tempore celebrationis Paschalis". It appeared nine years after the conference (1354) and was dedicated to Innocent VI, successor to Clement VI. In the same century other treatises on the errors and the reform of the calendar are recorded, one of Magister Gordianus (between 1300 and 1320) and one of a Greek monk, Isaac Argyros (1372–3).

The Councils of Constance and Basle.—The fifteenth century marks an epoch in the reform of the calendar by two scientific authorities, Pierre d'Ailly and Nicolas de Cusa, both cardinals. Pierre d'Ailly (1350–1425), Bishop of Cambrai and Chancellor of the Sorbonne, followed the views of Roger Bacon. After advising Pope John XXIII in 1412, he pointed out to the Council of Constance, in 1417, the great errors of the calendar. He suggested different remedies: first, to omit one leap day every 134 years, thereby correcting the solar year; second, to omit one day of the lunar cycle every 304 years; or third, to abandon all cyclical computation and follow astronomical observation. It must be noticed that the first and third proposition of Cardinal d'Ailly are reiterated in our own days (substituting for 134 the correct number 128). The first and second of d'Ailly's propositions were elaborated and again proposed by Cardinal de Cusa (1401–1446) to the Council of Basle. The error should be corrected by omitting 7 days in the solar cycle (passing, in 1439, from 24 May to 1 June) and 3 days in the lunar cycle. His "Reparatio Calendarii" furnished much information to subsequent reformers. He was the first to take into account differences of longitude for various meridians. The two councils wisely postponed the reform of the calendar to some future time. The fifteenth century was not to close, however, without considerable progress connected with the names of Zoestius, John of Gmund, George of Purbach, and John of Koenigsberg (Regiomontanus). A treatise on the reform of the calendar by Zoestius appeared after 1437. The first printed almanacs were issued by John of Gmund (d. 1442), dean and chancellor of the University of Vienna. His disciple was Purbach, afterwards professor of mathematics at the same university and teacher of John Müller, called Regiomontanus after his native place in Franken. The latter (1435–1476) continued the work of the chancellor in publishing calendars that served as models for a century to come. The Golden Numbers of the lunar cycle were retained, but the lunations were taken from observation. This combination made the errors of Easter more and more manifest. Regiomontanus was called to Rome by Sixtus IV, for the purpose of reforming the calendar, but died shortly after his arrival at the age of forty-one.

The Councils of the Lateran and of Trent.—The two councils of the sixteenth century were finally to pave the way for the long desired reform. The efforts made at the Lateran Council are described by Marzi. From the twelve or more authors enumerated by him it will suffice to mention the two that exercised a decisive influence: Paul of Middleburg, who started the proceedings, and Copernicus, who brought them to a temporary conclusion. The life of the former is described by Baldi in Appendix I to Marzi. Paul born in 1445, died as Bishop of Fossombrone in 1534. He was called from Louvain to Italy by the Republic of Venice, became professor of mathematics at Padua, and physician and astrologer to the Duke of Urbino. Before the opening of the council in 1512 he asked Julius II to attend to the calendar. Leo X sent out briefs to Maximilian I, the princes, bishops, and universities, to obtain their opinion on the calendar, and appointed the Bishop of Fossombrone as president of the com-

mission for the reform. The treatise which Paul of Middelburg laid before the council is entitled: "Paulina sive de recta Paschæ celebratione etc." (Fossombrone, 1513). He was against bringing the equinox back to 21 March, and opposed the idea of abandoning the lunar cycle or putting Easter on a fixed Sunday of the year. He proposed, however, a change in the cycle by reducing the seven embolismic months to five. Emperor Maximilian charged the Universities of Vienna, Tübingen, and Louvain, to express an opinion. Vienna supported the first and third propositions of Cardinal d'Ailly at the Council of Constance, viz. to correct the Julian intercalation by omitting a leap day every 134 years, and to abandon the lunar cycle. Tübingen was of the same opinion, and agreed with Bishop Paul in leaving the equinox where it was.

Copernicus had been asked by the papal commission in 1514 to state his views, and his decision was, that the motions of sun and moon were not yet sufficiently known to attempt a reform of the calendar. The commission was to make definite propositions in the tenth session of the council. Although this was postponed from 1514 to 1515, no conclusion was reached. After the Lateran Council considerable progress was made. Copernicus had promised to continue the observations of sun and moon and he did so for more than ten years longer. The results laid down in his immortal work "De Revolutionibus Orbium Cœlestium" (1543) enabled Erasmus Reinhold to compute the Prutenic Tables (Wittenberg, 1554), which were afterwards made the basis of the Gregorian reform. The principal writers at the time are the following: Albertus Pighius, magister at the University of Louvain, who dedicated to Leo X, in 1520, a treatise in which he supported Cardinal d'Ailly's intercalation, omitting a leap day every 134 years, but, on the other hand, recommended the retention of the lunar cycle. About the equinox he committed an error, reckoning it from the constellation of Aries and advising the omission of 16 days. The two Florentine monks, Joannes Lucidus and Joannes Maria de Tholosanis, may be mentioned in passing. The latter pleaded for cyclic reckoning but was opposed to changing the date of the equinox. During the Council of Trent a number of plans were written and proposed to the council and to the pope. Cardinal Marcellus Cervinus, president of the council, summoned to Trent the Veronese Girolamo Fracastoro, a physician and renowned astronomer, and had several conferences with him on the subject of the calendar. In 1548 Bartholomæus Caligarius, a priest in Padua, offered a memorandum to the Bishop of Bitonto, wherein he based his plans on Paul of Middelburg, Stoeffler, and Joannes Lucidus. The Spanish Franciscan Joannes Salon, addressed a proposition to Cardinal Gonzaga, first president of the council under Pius IV. An abridgment of it he offered, immediately after the council, in 1564, to Pius IV, and, on the advice of Sirleto, also to Gregory XIII, in 1577. His memorandum is remarkable for the reasons he puts forth against an immovable Easter, and for the advice that a leap day should be omitted by the pope on the occasion of general jubilees.

Other memoranda were that of Begninus, a canon of Reims, which was handed to Cardinal de Lorraine on his way to the council; that of Lucas Gauricus, who signed himself *Episcopus Civitatensis*, and based his "Calendarium Ecclesiasticum" of 1548 on Paul of Middelburg; that of the Spanish priest Don Miguel of Valencia, which was presented to Pius IV in 1564. More important than all these was a plan proposed by the Veronese mathematician Petrus Pitatus. Basing his ideas likewise on Paul of Middelburg he wanted the lunar cycle retained and the equinox restored to Cæsar's date, by the omission of fourteen days, which for two years should be taken from the seven months having 31 days each. His original idea, which took final effect in the Gregorian reform, was to correct the Julian intercalation of the solar year, not every 134 years, but by full centuries. No earlier writer seems to have called attention to the fact, that applying the rule of 134 years three times comes, within a small error, to the same thing as omitting three leap days in 400 years. His "Compendium" was published and offered to Pius IV in 1564. The Council of Trent was the first since that of Nicæa that took a positive step towards a reform of the calendar. In the last session, 4 December, 1563, it charged the pope to reform both Breviary and Missal, which included the perpetual calendar.

After the Council of Trent.—Pius V published a Breviary (Rome, 1568), with a new perpetual calendar, which was faulty and soon discarded. Gregory XIII, the immediate successor of Pius V, charged Carolus Octavianus Laurus, lector of mathematics at the Sapienza, with working out a plan of reform. It was completed in 1575, and it again recommended the correction of the intercalations by full centuries. A certain Paolo Clarante also composed a calendarium and offered it to the pope for examination. In 1576 the famous manuscript of the late Aloisius Lilius was presented to the papal Curia by his brother Antonius.

Whether Antonius acted in response to the pope's request is not known. Certain it is that Aloisius Lilius commenced his work before the accession of Gregory XIII to the throne and even before the publication of the new Breviary, spending ten years on it. Gregory then organized a commission to decide upon the best plan of reform. During the many sessions the members of the commission changed several times. From the names of those who signed the report offered to Gregory XIII it may be inferred that its composition was intended to represent various nations, grades, and rites of the Church. Besides four Italians there was the French Auditor of the Rota Seraphinus Olivarius, the German Jesuit Christoph Clavius, the Spaniard Petrus Ciaconus, and the Syrian Patriarch Nehemet Alla. Religious Orders were represented by Clavius, by the celebrated Dominican friar Ignatius Dantes and, for a while, by the Benedictine monk Teofilus Martius. The hierarchy we find represented by Vincentius Laureus, Bishop of Mondovi, by the Patriarch of Antioch, and by Cardinal Sirleto. The laity was represented by Antonius Lilius, doctor of arts and medicine, and, as it seems, collaborator of his brother Aloisius in the reform. About the Spaniard Ciaconus or Chacon nothing seems to be known.

The first president of the commission, Bishop Giglio, did not succeed in securing a majority. He favoured the corrections suggested for Lilius's manuscript by the two professors of the Roman Sapienza, the mathematician Carolus Laurus and the professor of Greek, Giovanni Battista Gabio. The commission, however, condemned the corrections as false and addressed itself directly to Gregory XIII. Thomas Giglio, being promoted to the See of Piacenza in 1577, was superseded as president by the learned and pious Cardinal Sirleto, a native of Calabria like Lilius. Another disagreement was caused by the Sienese Teofilus Martius, who was mentioned above. He blamed the commission for the spirit of innovation and for lack of reverence towards the Council of Nicæa; he wanted the equinox restored to the older Roman date 24 or 25 March; he rejected the new cycle of Lilius, and wanted the old cycle corrected; he accepted neither the Alphonsine nor the Prutenic Tables and he desired a leap day to be omitted every 124 years or ten years sooner than the Alphonsine Tables required. Teofilus put his dissent on record in a "Treatise on the Reform of the Calendar" (after 1578) and in a "Short Narration of the Controversy in the Congregation of the Calendar". This would seem to show that he was a member of the commission; at least for a time, for he did not sign the report of the latter to the pope. It was probably owing to his objections that the new cycle of Epacts was

changed at least twice and recommended by the commission in a third or even later form.

The opposition of the Sienese Teofilus against the innovation of the Epacts was supported by Alexander Piccolomini, coadjutor Bishop of Siena. If he was not a member of the commission, he was at least requested to express an opinion. He laid down his theories in a "Libellus on the new form of the ecclesiastical calendar" (Rome, 1578). He was influenced by the "Epitoma" of the Florentine Joannes Lucidus (1525). Underrating the exactness of the Alphonsine Tables he gave preference to Albategni's length of the year and advocated the correction of the Julian intercalation once in every hundred years (thinking the error to amount to one day in 106 years). Piccolomini's name is not among the eight that recommended the official report of the commission to Gregory XIII in 1580; they are: Sirleto, Ignatius, Laureus, Olivarius, Clavius, Ciaconus, Lilius, Dantes, all mentioned above. The last mentioned, usually called Ignazio Danti, was afterwards made Bishop of Alatri. His scientific reputation may be inferred from the praises given to him more than a hundred years later (1703) by Clement XI for his large solar instruments in Rome, Florence, and Bologna, which affirmed the correctness of the Gregorian equinox. The instruments consisted of meridian lines and gnomons. The former were usually strips of white marble inset in stone floors. The gnomon was sometimes replaced by a small opening in a wall, which projected the image of the sun on the meridian line. An arrangement of this description is visible in the old Vatican Observatory, called the Tower of the Winds. It was on this line that, according to Gilii and Calandrelli, the error of ten days was demonstrated in the presence of Gregory XIII.

The manuscript of Lilius was never printed and has never been discovered. Its contents are known only from the manuscript report of the commission and from the "Compendium" of Ciaconus, which was printed by Clavius. The request of Clarante, that his "Calendarium" be distributed together with the "Compendium", was not granted by the commission. The "Compendium" was sent out in 1577 to all Christian princes and renowned universities, to invite approbation or criticism. With Lilius, it left open the questions, whether the equinox should be placed on 24 March or 21 March, following the old Roman Calendar or the Council of Nicæa; and if the latter (which seemed preferable), whether the ten days should be omitted at once, in some suitable month of 1582, or gradually by declaring all of the next forty years common years and thus completing the reform in 1620. That the error from the Nicæan regulation of the equinox had amounted to ten days, was sufficiently known from various observers, like Toscanelli, Danti, Copernicus (Calandrelli, "Opuscoli Astronomici", Rome, 1822, 30). The motions of sun and moon were taken from the Alphonsine Tables. Whether the Prutenic Tables of 1554 were at the time known to Lilius may be doubted. He could be no stranger, however, to Cardinal d'Ailly's "Exhortatio ad Concilium Constantiense", in which the Julian intercalation was shown to be one day in error every 134 years, or to the proposition of the Veronese mathematician Pitatus, who wanted the correction applied by a cycle of four centuries. Lilius considered fractions of centuries unfit for all cyclic or non-astronomical reckoning and used centurial corrections for both solar and lunar motions.

Lilius's masterpiece is the new "Nineteen Years' Cycle of Epacts", by which he kept the Nicæan Easter regulation apace with the astronomical moon. The old lunar cycle gave the lunations four or more days in error, and Easter could thus (by taking the Sunday after Luna XIV) fall on Luna XXVI, within a few days of the astronomical new moon. Lilius brought the new cycle of Epacts in harmony with the year by two equations so called, the solar and the lunar. The solar equation diminishes the epacts by a unit whenever a Julian leap day is omitted, as in 1900; the lunar equation increases the epacts by unity every 300 years, or (after seven repetitions, the eighth time) in 400 years. The former equation accounts for the error in the Julian year and the latter for the error in the Metonic cycle. The Greek cycle is longer than 19 years and the surplus amounts to one day in 310 years. This will explain the lunar equation, and also show that greater exactness could be reached by applying the interval of 400 years the tenth time. It may happen that the two equations cancel each other and leave the epacts unchanged, as happened in 1800. The new cycle of epacts, with the two equations, were joined to the "Compendium". Answers to the "Compendium" are on record from Emperor Rudolf, from the Kings of France, Spain, Portugal, from the Dukes of Ferrara, Mantua, Savoy, Tuscany, Urbino, from the Republics of Venice and Genoa, from the Universities or Academies of Paris, Vienna, Salamanca, Alcalá, Cologne, Louvain, from several bishops and a number of mathematicians.

The Bull "Inter Gravissimas".—The contents of the answers are not officially recorded, but in the Bull of Gregory they are called concordant. How the concordance is to be understood may be illustrated by the answers from Paris and from Florence. While the Sorbonne not only rejected the "Compendium" but condemned every change in the calendar, the king's Parlement fully adopted the reform proposed by Lilius. The Duke of Tuscany forwarded to the pope the judgments of several Florentine mathematicians, no two of which agreed among themselves, while he himself gave full approval to the Gregorian reform. The King of Portugal presented two professional answers without adding a judgment of his own. The emperor also confined himself to forwarding the reply from the University of Vienna. The answers from Savoy, Hungary, and Spain were in approbation of Lilius's plan. All the princes may have seen the necessity of a reform and desired it. This is confirmed by a letter of the Cardinal Secretary of State to Charles Borromeo, Archbishop of Milan, dated 16 June, 1582, in which the statement is made that the reform of the calendar was concluded with the approbation of all Catholic princes. The consent of the princes had more influence with the pope than the opinion of scientists. To bring about an agreement of the latter was utterly hopeless, and, in view of the labours of the papal commission, unnecessary. The variety of opinions, collected by Kaltenbrunner and Schmid, bears testimony to this, quite apart from the bitter polemics that followed the Gregorian reform and which does not concern us in this article.

The propositions made in answer to the "Compendium" may be summed up as follows. In regard to the solar year, the date of the equinox should be 25 March, where Julius Cæsar had put it—this was the wish of the Humanists—or 24 March, where it was at the time of Christ's resurrection—this was the proposal of Salamanca—or 21 March, where the Council of Nicæa had put it, or finally should be left on 11 March, where it was at the time. Those who would not accept the correction of the Julian intercalation by full centuries wanted a leap day omitted as often as the error amounted to a full day—by the Alphonsine Tables every 134 years—, or, as the theological faculty of the Sorbonne demanded, no correction at all. As to the lunar cycle, no university attempted an improvement on Lilius's epacts. Salamanca and Alcalá, as we know from a letter of Clavius to Moleto in Padua, fully approved Lilius's reform. Vienna rejected all cyclical computation, while the theological faculty of the Sorbonne pleaded for the retention of the old cycle, uncorrected. The answers from Louvain de-

serve special mention because of the full approval of Lilius's calendar by the famous astronomer Cornelius Gemma, while Zeelstius (1581) sided with the University of Vienna. The answers from Padua were peculiar. Macigni, in a letter to Sirleto (1580), accepted the idea of the Spanish Franciscan Salon and proposed that during general jubilees a number of mathematicians be called to Rome by the pope to decide upon the date of the equinox. Apparently the first to advocate an immovable Easter Sunday was Sperone Speroni, who calls himself a layman in mathematics. According to him Easter should be fixed on the Sunday nearest to the 25 March; or, as the Spaniard Franciscus Flussas Candalla proposed, on the Sunday nearest the equinox.

Thus, every imaginable proposition was made; only one idea was never mentioned, viz. the abandonment of the seven-day week. The answers delayed the publication of the papal Bull from 1581 to 1582, and some arrived even later. The consent of the Catholic princes on the one side and the variety of scientific opinions on the other left to the papal commission no alternative, but forced it to follow its own judgment. The final framing of the reform seems to have been in great part the work of Clavius; for he alone afterwards took up its defence and furnished full explanations ("Apologia", 1588; "Explicatio", 1603; see CLAVIUS). Sirleto writes of him that he was among the foremost workers in the reform (*cum primis egregie laboravit*), and Clement VIII says, in his Bull "Quæcunque" (17 March, 1603), that Clavius did signal services for the calendar. The papal commission decided, 17 March, 1580, that out of reverence for ecclesiastical tradition, the equinox should be restored to the decree of the Council of Nicæa. The majority, under the leadership of the Bishop of Mondovì, declared itself against astronomical lunations and for the cycle of Epacts. Lilius's century rule for the omission of leap days was adopted, but his lunar cycle was modified. The Prutenic Tables were made the basis, and the epacts were all diminished by unity, in other words, Luna XIV was put one day later, to remove all danger of Easter ever being celebrated on the day of the astronomical full moon, as was forbidden by the old canons. It is known that the month of October, 1582, was to have twenty-one days (not twenty, as Montucla says) and the ten days should be expunged by passing from 4 October to 15 October. The reform, as recommended by the commission on 14 September, 1580, received papal sanction by the Bull "Inter Gravissimas", dated 24 February, 1581, and published on 1 March, 1582. The decrees of the Council of Nicæa were in this manner put on a cyclical basis that secured their correctness for nearly four thousand years, a space of time more than long enough for any human institution. The original task of the papal commission seems to have exceeded its strength and time. The dates of Easter were actually computed for the next three thousand years; the "Liber Novæ Rationis Restituendi Calendarii", which was to accompany the reform, was never written, and the Martyrology did not appear until 1586 under Sixtus V. In 1603, Clavius was the only surviving member of the papal commission. It was by command of Clement VIII that he composed his "Explanation of the new Calendar".

For the technical part of the Gregorian reform see CALENDAR, REFORM OF THE; CHRONOLOGY.

CLAVIUS, *Novi Calendarii Romani Apologia* (Rome, 1588); IDEM, *Romani Calendarii a Gregorio XIII P. M. restituti Explicatio* (Rome, 1603); LIBRI, *Histoire des Sciences Mathématiques en Italie*, IV (Halle, 1865); KALTENBRUNNER, *Die Vorgeschichte der Gregorianischen Kalenderreform* in *Sitzungsberichte der Akademie philos. histor. Klasse*, LXXXII (Vienna, 1876), 289; KALTENBRUNNER, *Die Polemik über die Gregorianische Kalenderreform, ibidem*, LXXXVII (1877), 485; KALTENBRUNNER, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Gregorianische Kalenderreform, ibidem*, XCVII (1880) I, 7; SCHMID, *Zur Geschichte der Gregorianischen Kalenderreform* in *Görresgesellschaft, Historisches Jahrbuch 1832 and 1884*; MARZI, *La questione della Riforma del Calendario nel Quinto Concilio Lateranense 1512–1517* (Florence, 1896); DÉPREZ, *Ecole Française de Rome; Mélanges d'Archéologie et d'Histoire XIX* (1899) 131.

J. G. HAGEN.

Lille, the ancient capital of Flanders, now the chief town of the Département du Nord in France. A very important religious centre ever since the eleventh century, Lille became in the nineteenth a great centre of industry. With a population of 12,818 in 1789, of 24,300 in 1821, of 140,000 in 1860, and of 211,000 in 1905, it is to-day the fourth city of France in population. (For the early history of Christianity at Lille, see CAMBRAI, ARCHDIOCESE OF.) The legend according to which the giant Finard was killed in the seventh century, by Lideric, whose mother, Ermengarde, he held prisoner, and according to which Lideric founded the dynasty of the counts of Flanders, was invented in the thirteenth century. The first Count of Flanders, as a matter of fact, was Baldwin of the Iron Arm, in the ninth century (see FLANDERS), and nothing certain is known of Lille before the middle of the eleventh century. The city seems to have been founded about that time by Count Baldwin V, and in 1054 it was already so well fortified that Henry III, Emperor of Germany, did not dare to besiege it. In 1055 Baldwin V laid the foundation stone of the collegiate church of St. Peter, which was dedicated in 1066.

One of the oldest chronicles of Flanders says that the foundation of this collegiate church was the beginning of the prosperity of the town. St. Peter's was served by forty canons and had very prosperous schools as early as the end of the eleventh century. About the same time Raimbert, a Nominalist, who taught philosophy in St. Peter's school, was in conflict with Odo, a Realist, afterwards Bishop of Cambrai, but at that time professor at the convent of Notre-Dame de Tournai. Raimbert's Nominalism, however, was never carried to the extremes which caused Roscelin's condemnation in 1092. Another teacher in St. Peter's school was the celebrated Gautier de Châtillon (twelfth century), the author of the "Alexandreis", a Latin epic on Alexander the Great, which was used as a substitute for Virgil's work in some of the medieval schools. Connected with the same school about the same time were Alain de Lille, surnamed the Universal Doctor (see ALAIN DE L'ISLE); Adam de la Bassée, a canon of the collegiate church, who composed beautiful liturgical chants; Lietbert, Abbot of Saint-Ruf, author of a great commentary on the Psalms, "Flores Psalmorum". St. Thomas of Canterbury and St. Bernard of Clairvaux visited the collegiate church of Lille, and in it Philip the Good, Duke of Burgundy, held, in 1431, the first chapter of the Order of the Golden Fleece, founded by him in 1430 for the defence of Christendom against the Turks. In a neighbouring palace was held the famous "Feast of the Pheasant" (1453), in the midst of which Religion, mounted on an elephant which was led by a giant Saracen, entered the banquet hall to beg aid from the Knights of the Golden Fleece. Jean Miélot, a canon of St. Peter's at Lille, wrote for Philip the Good twenty-two works, including translations, ascetical works, and biographies. The most important of these works, "La Vie de sainte Catherine d'Alexandrie", was printed later. Miniatures of that period often represent this canon offering Philip a book. It was he who, after the "Vœu du Faisan", translated a work of the Dominican Father Brochart, "Advis directif pour faire le passage d'oultre-mer", and a description of the Holy Land.

About this time the preacher Jean d'Eeckhout, another canon of Lille, author of two celebrated ascetical treatises, on the espousals of God the Father and the Virgin, and on the espousals of God the Son and the sinful soul, yielded to the prevalent impulse towards pilgrimage to the Holy Land, and died while

on his pilgrimage, in 1472. Influenced by the same movement, Anselm and John Adorno, members of a distinguished Genoese family settled at Bruges, made a visit to the Holy Land of which the narrative is preserved in a manuscript at Lille. John Adorno, on his return, became a canon of Lille and devoted himself to spreading, throughout Flanders, the devotion to St. Catherine of Alexandria, whose relics he had seen on Mount Sinai—hence the large number of Flemish works of art having St. Catherine for their subject.

In the thirteenth century the statue of Notre-Dame de la Treille, which stood in the collegiate church of St. Peter, drew thither many pilgrims. The reputed miracles of 14 June, 1254, are famous. It is not certain from what year of that same century the Confraternity of Notre-Dame de la Treille dates; but it is historically certain that in 1470 Margaret, Countess of Flanders, decreed that every year, on the first Sunday after Trinity Sunday and for the nine days following, processions commemorating these miracles should be held in the city. The fragment of the True Cross which is still preserved at St-Étienne, Lille, was given to the chapter of St. Peter's by the Flemish priest, Walter of Courtrai, who was chancellor of the Emperor Baldwin I at Constantinople. From the fourteenth to the sixteenth century, the collegiate church of St. Peter was annually the scene of the curious election of the "Bishop of Fools", on the Eve of the Epiphany, and, on the feast of the Holy Innocents, of the election by the choristers of a "Bishop of the Innocents", who was solemnly carried in procession. Another much frequented religious festival at Lille was that of the "Epinette" (little thorn), the solemnities of which began on Quinquagesima Sunday and lasted until Mid-Lent. The feast was instituted in the first half of the thirteenth century shortly after the convent of the Dominicans at Lille had received from the Countess Jeanne a fragment of the Crown of Thorns; it ceased in 1487, when the burghers began to find the expense too heavy. The veneration of the Mater Dolorosa originated in Flanders in the fifteenth century. The first treatise on this devotion, which dates from 1494, was the work of the Dominican Michel François, Bishop of Selimbria, and confessor of Philip the Fair, a native of Templemars, near Lille. The chapter of St. Peter's immediately combined this devotion with that of Notre Dame de la Treille, and erected in the church of St. Peter the stations of the Seven Dolours, to be made in the same manner as the Way of the Cross.

The collegiate church also originated some important charitable works. Among these were the *Cour Gilson*, a row of houses established by Canon Robert Gillesson in the sixteenth century, the rents of which were to be used for works of piety and charity, the orphanage of the Grange, founded in the sixteenth century by Canon Jean de Lacu; the "marriage burses", or dowries for poor girls, instituted by Canon Etienne Ruélin in the sixteenth century; the "prebends of the poor", a fund instituted by Hangouard, dean of the chapter, to enable the aged poor to live with their children or kin without being a burden to them; and an apprenticeship fund for the benefit of young workmen, established by Provost Manare. Very modern ideas of assisting the poor were devised and carried out as early as the sixteenth century by the canons of St. Peter's and through the liberality of Jean de Lannoy, the collegiate *scholasticus*, a mont-de-piété was established to lend money free of interest to the needy. The collegiate church, again, hospitably received the English refugees, when the persecution of Catholics was raging in England. Among its English canons were John Marshall (1534–68), Allen's auxiliary in the foundation of Douai, and Gilford (1554–1629), who, in 1603, at the peril of his life performed a mission in England for the Holy See, and who died Archbishop of Reims: David Kearney, who in 1603 became Archbishop of Cashel in Ireland, and suffered bitter persecution in that diocese. Until the sixteenth century the school of St. Peter's was the only one in Lille where Latin and the humanities were taught; the city then opened a school which was entrusted to the Jesuits in 1592, and where the humanist John Silvius taught. The collegiate church of St. Peter disappeared with the Revolution.

After having in medieval and modern times followed the destinies of Flanders, which passed from the House of Burgundy to the House of Austria, the city of Lille became French when it was conquered by Louis XIV in 1667 and fortified by Vauban. In 1792 it heroically resisted the Austrians. During the nineteenth century two manufacturers of Lille, Philibert Vrau (1829–1905) and Camille Féron-Vrau (1831–1908) laboured to form among the numerous workingmen of the city a centre of Catholic activity. With the aid of the Abbé Bernard, Philibert Vrau founded, in 1863, the Lille Union of Prayer, the "Bulletin" of which gradually increased its circulation to 22,000; in 1866 he established the "Cercle de Lille", which for many years held the district Catholic Congress for the Département du Nord and the Pas de Calais, and in 1871 the lay association for building new churches in the suburbs. Philibert Vrau and Camille Féron-Vrau undertook to build a basilica for the statue of Notre Dame de la Treille, hoping that the city of Lille would some day be detached from the Diocese of Cambrai and become the seat of a new diocese with Notre Dame de la Treille as its cathedral. In 1885 they established the Corporation of St. Nicholas for spinners and weavers, with an employers' and a workingmen's council, and a co-operative fund supported by monthly assessments on both employers and employees.

The Catholic University of Lille, lastly, was the result of their continued and generous efforts. This scheme was presented by Philibert Vrau in 1873 at the Catholic Congress of the North; the Abbé Mortier, later Bishop of Gap, and the Abbé Dehaisnes, known for his writings on the history of Flanders, were appointed to report on the question. In 1874, in the ancient hall of the Prefecture, which had been rented for the purpose by Philibert Vrau, law courses were opened to the public. The passing of the law on the freedom of higher education (12 July, 1875) hastened the success of the foundation. On 18 Nov., 1875, a complete law course was organized; on 18 Jan., 1877, the four faculties of law, sciences, letters, and medicine were inaugurated; on 22 Nov., 1879, the cornerstone of the university was laid. As early as 1878 it was ascertained that the hospital of St. Eugenia, attached to the faculty of medicine, had cared for as many as 2448 patients, and that the contributions received for the university already amounted to 6,473,263 francs (about $1,294,000). Philibert Vrau also took the initiative in establishing, in 1880, the only professedly Catholic commercial school in France. The school for higher industrial studies was established in 1885. As early as 1876 Philibert Vrau contemplated the foundation of a Catholic school of arts and crafts at Lille, but it was not until 1898 that the institute was inaugurated under Father Lacoutre, S. J. In 1894 there was added to the faculty of law a department of social and political science, and lectures are now given every year by the most distinguished Catholic savants of France. The system of political economy opposed to the intervention of the State in labour affairs—a system long favoured by the Catholic *industriels* of Lille—was gradually overthrown by the teaching given in this department, and Professor Duthoit's "Vers l'organisation professionelle", published in the spring of 1910, finally confirmed the victory of Catholic social ideas at Lille.

In 1897, following the initiative taken by Cambridge and Oxford, the Catholic University of Lille established

a "University Extension" for the organization of lectures by the university professors throughout the manufacturing centres in the vicinity of Lille. In 1898 the university organized higher education for the Catholic girls of Lille. In April, 1907, the Conseil Général du Nord suggested the suppression by the State of the freedom of higher education and insisted upon ordinances preventing physicians coming from the Catholic faculty of Lille from attending paupers in the Département du Nord at the expense of the State. Before the creation of district universities by the French Government, the Catholic University of Lille presented the first example of these institutions. As early as 1886, M. Lavisse, a professor at the Sorbonne, spoke in high terms of this impressive group of faculties, saying that in centralized France it was a distinguished honour to the University of Lille to have been incorporated in Flanders. The faculties of higher education which the State controlled at Douai were transferred to Lille in 1888 and raised, six years later, to the rank of a state university. Mgr Baunard resigned the rectorship of the Catholic University in Oct., 1908, and was succeeded by Mgr Margerin, who had distinguished himself in 1888 at Fournies by placing himself between the workmen and the fire of the soldiers. Among the noteworthy works of art possessed by the city of Lille is a wax head, preserved in the museum, purchased in Italy by Wicar during the Revolution; it is ascribed by this connoisseur to Raphael; Alexandre Dumas the younger attributed it to Leonardo da Vinci; Henry Thode claims that it was an antique modelled after the head of a young Roman girl whose remains were found in 1485; M. Franz Wickhoff, on the other hand, is inclined to regard it as the work of one of the pupils of Victor of Cortona (end of the seventeenth century or the beginning of the eighteenth), and is of opinion that it is the head of a virgin and martyr.

VAN HENDE, *Histoire de Lille de 620 à 1804* (Lille, 1875); ROGIE, *Les Origines du christianisme au pays de Lille* (Lille, 1881); DEROBE, *Histoire de Lille et de la Flandre Wallonne* (4 vols., Lille, 1848–78); FLAMMERMONT, *Lille et le Nord au moyen âge* (Lille, 1888); HAUTCŒUR, *Documents liturgiques et nécrologiques de l'église collégiale de S. Pierre de Lille* (Lille, 1895); IDEM, *Cartulaire de l'église collégiale de S. Pierre de Lille* (2 vols., Lille, 1894); IDEM, *Histoire de l'église collégiale et du chapitre S. Pierre de Lille* (3 vols., Lille, 1896–99); LEURIDAN, *La Chatellerie de Lille* (Lille, 1897); Lefebvre, *L'Evêque des Fous et la fête des Innocents à Lille du XIV^e au XVI^e siècle* (Lille, 1902); BAUNARD, *Philibert Vrau et les œuvres de Lille* (Paris, 1905); BAUNARD *Vingt-cinq années de rectorat* (Paris, 1909); BAUDRILLART; *l'Enseignement catholique dans la France contemporaine* (Paris, 1910); WICKHOFF, *Die Wachsbüste in Lille* (Berlin, 1910); BOUVY, *Annales de la faculté des lettres de Bordeaux*, April–June, 1901.

GEORGES GOYAU.

Lillis, THOMAS F. See LEAVENWORTH, DIOCESE OF.

Lillooet Indians, an important tribe of Salishan linguistic stock, in southern British Columbia, formerly holding a mountainous territory of about one hundred miles in length from north to south, including the river and lake of the same name, with Bridge River, Anderson, and Seton Lakes, and a part of Harrison Lake, and extending on the north-east to beyond Fraser River. They are now settled upon reservations within the same territory, attached to Williams Lake and Fraser River agencies. They have several bands grouped in two main divisions distinguished by slight dialectic differences, and commonly known respectively as Upper (Williams Lake agency) and Lower (Fraser River agency). Their principal settlements are Fountain and Bridge River, of the Upper band; and Pemberton, and Skookumchuck, of the Lower band. From a population of perhaps four thousand souls a century ago they are now reduced by disease and former dissipation after the advent of the whites to about 1230, the most notable destruction having been the result of a small-pox visitation which swept all the tribes of the Fraser River country in 1862.

Lillooet, meaning "wild onion", the name by which they are commonly known, is properly the name of one of their former settlements near Pemberton, and is also a special designation of the lower division. They have no name for themselves as a tribe, but are known as Stlatlimuq to the neighbouring Shuswap and Thompson Indians, whom they closely resemble. Although it is known that the Lillooet and adjacent tribes had obtained some knowledge of the Catholic religion as early at least as 1810 from the Canadian employees of the North-West Fur Company, the beginning of civilization and Christianity in the tribe properly dates from the advent of Father Modeste Demers, who came out from Quebec in 1837, in company with Father Norbert Blanchet, and after several years of work in the Columbia region, in 1842 ascended the Fraser River to Stuart Lake, preaching and baptizing among all the tribes on the way. In 1845 the Jesuit Father John Nobili went over nearly the same ground on his way to the more northern Déné tribes. In 1847 the first Oblate missionaries in the Columbia region arrived at Fort Wallawalla, Washington, and in 1861 Father Charles Grandidier of that order was preaching to the Lillooet. In the same year the Oblate mission of Saint Mary's was established on Fraser River, thirty-five miles above New Westminster, and became the centre of mission work for the whole lower Fraser country. In 1863 the industrial school was added. The entire tribe of the Lillooet is now officially reported as Catholic, with the exception of about twenty individuals attached to the Anglican form. Twelve villages have churches, while a number of children are being educated at St. Mary's mission, under charge of the Oblate Fathers and the Sisters of Saint Anne.

For all that concerns the primitive condition of the Lillooet our best authority is Teit. In habit and ceremonial they closely resembled the cognate Okanagan, Shuswap, and Thompson Indians, and a description of the one will answer fairly well for the others. They lived by fishing, hunting, and the gathering of wild roots and berries. Salmon fishing was their most important industry, the fish being taken by spearing, by hook and line, by nets and by weirs, at favourite fishing stations, and dried in the sun or by smoking. Their ordinary hunting implement was a highly decorated flat bow, with sinew cord, and arrows tipped with stone, copper, bone, or beaver teeth. The principal game animals were the deer, caribou, bear, mountain goat, bighorn, and beaver, besides the porcupine for its quills. Traps, nooses, pitfalls, and deadfalls were used. Dogs were carefully trained for hunting, and were also a favourite food article. A great variety of roots was gathered, some of which were roasted in pits in the ground after the manner of camas. Berries, particularly service berries, were dried in large quantities, pressed into cakes, and used at home or traded to other tribes. Provisions were stored in cellars for winter supply or sale.

The winter house was sometimes a double-lined mat lodge, but more usually a semi-subterranean round structure, from eighteen to fifty feet in diameter, of logs lined with bark and covered with earth. Entrance was by a ladder through a hole in the roof, the projecting ends of the ladder and of the house posts being carved and painted with figures of the clan totem, in the style of the totem poles of the coast tribes. The ordinary summer dwelling was a rectangular communal structure of log framework and cedar boards, with bark roof, from thirty-five to seventy-five feet in length, with fire-places ranged along the centre to accommodate from four to eight families. The bed platform was next the wall. The furnishing consisted chiefly of baskets, bags, and mats. They were expert basket weavers, and basket making is still a principal industry in the tribe. Large closely-woven baskets were used for holding water in which to boil

food by means of heated stones. Mats, blankets, and bags were woven from rushes, bark fibre, twisted strips of skin, and various kinds of animal hair, including that of a special breed of long-haired white dog now extinct. Knives, hammers, scrapers, etc., were of stone; bowls and dishes of wood. They were skilled in the making and use of canoes, both bark and dug-out, together with snowshoes for winter travel. Skins were dressed soft, but seldom smoked. Fire was obtained by means of the fire drill. Houses and much of their portable handiwork were adorned with native paint.

The dress was of skins, or fabrics woven from wool or bark fibre, and included caps, head bands, robes, shirts, belts, sashes, aprons, G-strings, leggings, and moccasins, with ornamentation of fringes, beads, feathers, porcupine quills, dentalium and abalone shells. Nose and ear pendants were worn by both sexes. The hair was cut across the forehead, and either hung loose or was bunched on top and behind. Young women braided their hair, and that of slaves was close cropped. The face was painted with symbolic designs and tattooing was common with both sexes. Head flattening was not practised, and was held in contempt. Of weapons, besides the bow, they had stone knives, stone-bladed spears, and various kinds of clubs. Protective body armour of thin boards, rods, or heavy elk skin was used, but shields were unknown. Scalping or beheading was uncommon. Many villages and communal houses were inclosed by elaborate stockades. Captives were usually enslaved and sometimes sold to other tribes. They had many games, including dice, target games, throwing at hoops, wrestling, horse racing and the nearly universal Indian ball game. Some of these games had song accompaniment.

They had the clan system, but without marriage restriction or fixed rule of descent, the clan being frequently identical with the village community. There were hereditary village chiefs, each assisted by a council, but no tribal head chief. Most of the property of a deceased owner went to his widow and children, instead of being destroyed, as in some other tribes. There was a great number of dances and other ceremonials, including mask dances and the great gift distribution known as Potlatch among the tribes of the North-West coast. Children and young men at certain times were subjected to a whipping ordeal to test their fortitude. Menstrual women were rigorously secluded as in other tribes, and pregnancy, birth, and puberty were attended by elaborate rites and precautions. The puberty ritual for the young woman was especially severe, involving seclusion, fasting, prayer, and special training for a period of two years, during which time she was allowed to go out only at night, wandering through the forest masked and shaking a rattle, and sitting alone in the puberty lodge through the day, for the first month squatting in a hole with only her head above the surface. The puberty ordeal for the young man continued for as long a period, while for *shaman* candidates the tests and training extended over several years. Young men also fasted and prayed in solitary places to obtain visions of their guardian spirits. Marriage was preceded and accompanied by considerable ceremonial, including processions and giving of presents. Compulsion was not usual, but the girl was free to accept the suitor or not as she chose, and in some cases was herself the suitor or proposer. Polygamy was common. Widows and widowers were subjected to a long period of seclusion and purification. As in other tribes, twins were dreaded as uncanny, being believed to be the offspring, not of the husband, but of a grizzly bear and partaking of the bear nature. They were never buried in the ordinary way, but in death were laid away in tree tops in the remote forest.

The dead were usually buried in a sitting posture with best dress, weapons, and smaller personal belongings, in graves lined with grass and marked by circles of stones. In some cases a canoe was inverted over the grave. Among the Lower Lillooet the body was sometimes placed sitting upon the ground, and covered with a heap of stones, or deposited in a grave box, in front of which were set up wooden figures representing the deceased, and dressed in his clothes. Funeral songs were sung about the grave. His head pillow, together with some food, were burned near by. His dogs were killed and their bodies hung near the grave. If he owned slaves, one or more were buried with him, being either killed at the grave or buried alive. Children were made to jump four times over the corpse of the dead parent, in order that they might the sooner forget their loss. In Lillooet cosmogony the East was associated with light and life, the West with darkness and death. In the beginning the world was peopled with beings near akin to animals, many of whom were cannibals and evil magicians. These were changed to animals, birds, and fishes by supernatural beings, who became the gods of the tribe, chief among whom was Old Man, with his messenger Coyote, and his subordinate helpers, Sun, Moon, and others. The Raven brought death, daylight, and fire. The warm "Chinook wind" was the result of the marriage of Beaver and Glacier. Each clan had its own tradition of origin and there is a story of a whole tribe transformed into deer. The stars also were transformed beings, and thunder as usual was a bird. There were giants, but apparently no dwarfs, in their supernatural world. Sacred places were numerous, and sacrifice and propitiation ceremonies frequent, including a special rite by which the hunter asked pardon of the bear which he had killed. They had the same ceremonial feast at the beginning of the salmon fishing season which Father De Smet described as he had seen it among the Kutenai in 1845, as also a solemn consecration of the first wild berries.

The spirit world was far in the West, over a weary and dusty trail by which the soul travelled until it crossed a log over a stream and reached the boundary of the Land of the Dead, standing up like a wall of rock, where, after passing the challenge of the sentinels, it entered, to find a pleasant land and a welcome from former friends, who spent their time dancing, gaming, and making clothes for the dead yet to follow. Children did not go to the spirit world, but were reborn on earth in the same family group and sometimes to the same mother. As usual the *shaman* was at once doctor, prophet, and master of rites. There seem to have been no secret societies. Colours had symbolic meaning, and four was a sacred number. Personal names were significant, and of four classes: hereditary family names, names derived from guardian spirits, dream names, and common nicknames.

The official report of the condition of the Lower bands in 1908 is repeated almost in the same terms for the Upper: "Their health has been fairly good throughout the year. The sanitary condition of their villages is good, and many of them have been vaccinated from time to time. Their chief pursuits are hunting, fishing, packing, and farming. They also act as guides for mining and timber prospectors, and the women earn considerable money at basket making. Their dwellings are mostly all frame structures, and they have good barns and outbuildings. They have a considerable number of horses and cattle, which are well cared for during winter. They are fairly well supplied with farm implements, most of them owning what they have. They are industrious and law abiding and are making some progress. They are temperate and moral."

H. H. Bancroft, *Hist. Brit. Columbia* (San Francisco, 1887) *Canadian Indian Reports*, (Ottawa, annually); Dawson, *Notes on the Shuswa People of Brit. Col.* in *Proc. and Trans. Royal Soc. Can. for 1891*, IX (Montreal, 1892); Hill-Tout, *The Stlatlumh of Brit. Col.* in *Jour. Anthrop. Inst. Great Britain and Ireland*,

XXXV (London, 1905); MORICE, *Catholic Church in Western Canada* (Montreal, 1910); TEIT, *The Lillooet Indians*, memoir, *Am. Mus. Nat. Hist.* (New York, 1906); see also INDIANS, AMERICAN.

JAMES MOONEY.

Lima, ARCHDIOCESE OF (LIMANA).—The city of Lima, in the Department of the same name, is the capital of the Republic of Peru, South America. After the conquest of the Incas in the sixteenth century, Pizarro, convinced of the necessity of a capital near the coast, chose a site about 600 feet above the sea level, on the right bank of the River Rimac (of which name *Lima* is probably a corruption), and the first stone of the cathedral in the wide *plaza* was laid by Pizarro, on 18 January, 1535. Cuzco had been the Inca capital, and in 1534 Fray Valverde had been named Bishop of Cuzco. Lima continued to grow in importance, and in 1543 was made the see of a diocese which became an archdiocese in 1545. Its first bishop and archbishop was the Dominican Loaysa. He died in 1575 and was succeeded by St. Torribio Mogrovejo, who died of fever contracted in the forests where he was visiting and baptizing the Indians, whose language (Quichua) he had mastered. In 1551 the University of San Marcos, the first in the new world, was founded at Lima, and to this day it remains autonomous, and outside all Government influence. It is an important seat of learning, having eight faculties, including theology. In 1567 the Jesuits arrived at Lima, began founding schools and colleges, and introduced the printing press. It is of interest that the first book printed in the New World was a catechism issued from the Jesuit press at Juli on Lake Titicaca in 1577.

Owing to its commodious harbour at Callao, nine miles distant, the town of Lima developed rapidly and was the centre of the Spanish trade monopoly, which lasted until the Treaty of Utrecht (1713). Its domestic affairs followed the changing fortunes of the viceroys of Peru throughout the Colonial period (1542–1816). San Martin broke the Spanish power in 1821, and on 28 Feb., 1823, Riva Agüero entered upon office as first President of Peru, and took over the government at Lima.

During the war with Chile, Lima was assaulted and fell, 14 January, 1881; its national library was turned into a barrack, and many valuable books and MSS. were destroyed or sold as waste paper, works of art were carried off or broken by the victorious Chileans, who occupied the town for two years and nine months. After the evacuation Lima suffered from the political rivalries of Cáceres and Iglesias, and there was civil discord until the presidency of Nicolas de Piérola (1895), who in 1899 yielded the office to Eduardo Romaña, a Stonyhurst scholar, who held it until 1903. Everything now (1910) promises peace; political discussions are kept within bounds, and party government is carried on without bitterness or undue friction.

There are three ways of reaching Lima from Europe or North America: (1) by sailing to Colon, crossing the Isthmus of Panama, and taking boat from Panama to Callao; (2) via, the Straits of Magellan; (3) by going to the river port of Iquitos, 2500 miles up the Amazon from the Atlantic, whence, by steamer and rail, the journey to Lima is about 1200 miles. The trade with Lima and Callao is largely in the hands of British merchants. The main exports are sugar, cotton, olives, wool, and tobacco. The city is built in parallel and cross streets, with a central *plaza*, of which the cathedral occupies one side, and the various government buildings extend along another. At various times it has been damaged by earthquakes, the most serious being that of 1746, when Callao was swept away by a tidal wave, and Lima was almost reduced to ruins. The public buildings are handsome, and include the House of Congress and the Exposition Park. Spanish architecture predominates, and a walk through the streets is like a chapter in stone from old Spain. Among the monuments are the statue of Columbus, the statue of Bolivar, the "Second of May" monument (commemorating the defeat of the Spaniards in 1866), and the Bolognesi monument. The population is variously computed at between 140,000 and 150,000. The press is ably represented by two daily papers, the "Comercio" and the "Prensa". Education is free and obligatory and the public exercise of religion other than the Catholic, while allowed by courtesy, is not recognized by law.

The cathedral, dedicated to St. John the Evangelist, was begun when Pizarro founded Lima; it took ninety years to build, and was consecrated in 1625. It suffered considerably from the earthquake of 1746, and in the restoration which followed the two great towers were added. It is a handsome structure with

THE CATHEDRAL, LIMA

five naves and ten side chapels, one of which contains the remains of Pizarro. Its artistic treasures are valuable, and its high altar is adorned with a painting by Murillo. Other churches of note in the town are San Francisco, Santo Domingo, La Merced, and San Augustin. San Pedro and San Pablo formerly belonged to the Jesuits; Santo Domingo was built by Pizarro, and contains a relic of the True Cross. There are, moreover, twelve convents, including Santa Rosa, where the body of Saint Rose, Lima's patron saint, is preserved. In all there are sixty-six religious houses or establishments in the town.

The archdiocese includes the Department of Lima, having an area of 13,310 sq. miles and a population of 250,000. At the present time its suffragan sees are Arequipa, Cuzco, Puno, Huánuco, Ayacucho, Huaraz, Trujillo, and Chachapoyas. The last Spanish archbishop was Bartholomé de las Heras, who was expelled by San Martin, in 1821. He returned to Spain, where he died at the age of eighty, in 1823. The See of Lima remained vacant until June, 1834, when a native archbishop was installed. The present archbishop, Pedro Manuel Garcia Naranjo, was born at Lima, 29 April, 1838, and was appointed 19 December, 1907.

ENOCK, *Peru, Its Present and Former Civilization* (New York, 1908); WRIGHT, *The Old and the New Peru* (Philadelphia, 1908); HUME, *The Spanish People* (London, 1901); *Annuaire Pontificale* (1910); *Gerarchia Cattolica* (1910).

J. C. GREY.

Limbo (Late Lat. *limbus*), a word of Teutonic derivation, meaning literally "hem" or "border", as of a garment, or anything joined on (cf. Ital. *lembo;* Eng. *limb*). (1) In theological usage the name is applied (a) to the temporary place or state of the souls of the just who, although purified from sin, were excluded from the beatific vision until Christ's triumphant ascension into heaven (the *limbus patrum*); or (b) to the permanent place or state of those unbaptized children and others who, dying without grievous personal guilt, are excluded from the beatific vision on account of original sin alone (the *limbus infantium* or *puerorum*). (2) In literary usage the name is sometimes applied in a wider and more general sense to any place or state of restraint, confinement, or exclusion, and is practically equivalent to "prison" (see, e. g., Milton, "Paradise Lost", III, 495; Butler, "Hudibras", part II, canto i, and other English classics). The not unnatural transition from the theological to the literary usage is exemplified in Shakespeare, "Henry VIII", act v, sc. 3. In this article we shall deal only with the theological meaning and connotation of the word.

I. Limbus Patrum.—Though it can hardly be claimed, on the evidence of extant literature, that a definite and consistent belief in the limbus patrum of Christian tradition was universal among the Jews, it cannot on the other hand be denied that, more especially in the extra-canonical writings of the second or first centuries B. C., some such belief finds repeated expression; and New-Testament references to the subject remove all doubt as to the current Jewish belief in the time of Christ. Whatever name may be used in apocryphal Jewish literature to designate the abode of the departed just, the implication generally is (1) that their condition is one of happiness, (2) that it is temporary, and (3) that it is to be replaced by a condition of final or permanent bliss when the Messianic Kingdom is established. For details see Charles in "Encyclopedia Biblica", s. v. "Eschatology".

In the New Testament, Christ Himself refers by various names and figures to the place or state which Catholic tradition has agreed to call the limbus patrum. In Matt., viii, 11, it is spoken of under the figure of a banquet "with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven" (cf. Luke, xiii, 29; xiv, 15), and in Matt., xxv, 10, under the figure of a marriage feast to which the prudent virgins are admitted, while in the parable of Lazarus and Dives it is called "Abraham's bosom" (Luke, xvi, 22), and in Christ's words to the penitent thief on Calvary the name *paradise* is used (Luke, xxiii, 43). St. Paul teaches (Eph., iv, 9) that before ascending into heaven Christ "also dedescended first into the lower parts of the earth", and St. Peter still more explicitly teaches that, "being put to death indeed, in the flesh, but enlivened in the spirit", Christ went and "preached to those souls that were in prison, which had been some time incredulous, when they waited for the patience of God in the days of Noe" (I Pet., iii, 18–20).

It is principally on the strength of these Scriptural texts, harmonized with the general doctrine of the Fall and Redemption of mankind, that Catholic tradition has defended the existence of the limbus patrum as a temporary state or place of happiness distinct from purgatory (q. v.). As a result of the Fall, heaven was closed against men, i. e., actual possession of the beatific vision was postponed, even for those already purified from sin, until the Redemption should have been historically completed by Christ's visible ascension into heaven. Consequently, the just who had lived under the Old Dispensation, and who, either at death or after a course of purgatorial discipline, had attained the perfect holiness required for entrance into glory, were obliged to await the coming of the Incarnate Son of God and the full accomplishment of His visible earthly mission. Meanwhile they were "in prison", as St. Peter says; but, as Christ's own words to the penitent thief and in the parable of Lazarus clearly imply, their condition was one of happiness, notwithstanding the postponement of the higher bliss to which they looked forward. And this, substantially, is all that Catholic tradition teaches regarding the limbus patrum.

II. Limbus Infantium.—The New Testament contains no definite statement of a positive kind regarding the eternal lot of those who die in original sin without being burdened with grievous personal guilt. But, by insisting on the absolute necessity of being "born again of water and the Holy Ghost" (John, iii, 5) for entry into the kingdom of heaven (see Baptism, subtitle *Necessity of Baptism*), Christ clearly enough implies that men are born into this world in a state of sin, and St. Paul's teaching to the same effect is quite explicit (Rom., v, 12 sqq.). On the other hand, it is clear from Scripture and Catholic tradition that the means of regeneration provided for this life do not remain available after death, so that those dying unregenerate are eternally excluded from the supernatural happiness of the beatific vision (John, ix, 4; Luke, xii, 40; xvi, 19 sqq.; II Cor., v, 10; see also Apocatastasis). The question therefore arises as to what, in the absence of a clear positive revelation on the subject, we ought in conformity with Catholic principles to believe regarding the eternal lot of such persons. Now it may confidently be said that, as the result of centuries of speculation on the subject, we ought to believe that these souls enjoy and will eternally enjoy a state of perfect natural happiness; and this is what Catholics usually mean when they speak of the *limbus infantium*, the "children's limbo".

The best way of justifying the above statement is to give a brief sketch of the history of Catholic opinion on the subject. We shall try to do so by selecting the particular and pertinent facts from the general history of Catholic speculation regarding the Fall and original sin, but it is only right to observe that a fairly full knowledge of this general history is required for a proper appreciation of these facts.

(1) *Pre-Augustinian Tradition.*—There is no evidence to prove that any Greek or Latin Father before St. Augustine ever taught that original sin of itself involved any severer penalty after death than exclusion from the beatific vision, and this, by the Greek Fathers at least, was always regarded as being strictly supernatural. Explicit references to the subject are rare, but for the Greek Fathers generally the statement of St. Gregory of Nazianzus may be taken as representative: "It will happen, I believe", he writes, " . . . that those last mentioned [i. e. infants dying without baptism] will neither be admitted by the just judge to the glory of heaven nor condemned to suffer punishment, since, though unsealed [by baptism], they are not wicked. . . . For from the fact that one does not merit punishment it does not follow that he is worthy of being honoured, any more than it follows that one who is not worthy of a certain honour deserves on that account to be punished" ("Orat.", xl, 23, in P. G., XXXVI, 389). Thus, according to Gregory, for children dying without baptism, and excluded for want of the "seal" from the "honour" or gratuitous favour of seeing God face to face, an intermediate or neutral state is admissible, which, unlike that of the personally wicked, is free from positive punishment. And, for the West, Tertullian opposes infant baptism on the ground that infants are innocent ("De Bapt.", xviii, in P. L., I, 1221); while St. Ambrose explains that original sin is rather an inclination to evil than guilt in the strict sense, and that it need occasion no fear at the day of judgment ("In Ps. xlviii", 9, in P. L., XIV, 1159); and the Ambrosiater teaches that the "second death", which means condemnation to the hell of torment of the damned, is not incurred by Adam's sin, but by our own ("In Rom.", v, 12, in P. L., XVII, 92). This was

undoubtedly the general tradition before St. Augustine's time.

(2) *Teaching of Saint Augustine.*—In his earlier writings St. Augustine himself agrees with the common tradition. This in "De libero arbitrio" (III, in P. L., XXXII, 1304), written several years before the Pelagian controversy, discussing the fate of unbaptized infants after death, he writes: "It is superfluous to inquire about the merits of one who has not any merits. For one need not hesitate to hold that life may be neutral as between good conduct and sin, and that as between reward and punishment there may be a neutral sentence of the judge." But even before the outbreak of the Pelagian controversy St. Augustine had already abandoned the lenient traditional view, and in the course of the controversy he himself condemned, and persuaded the Council of Carthage (418) to condemn, the substantially identical Pelagian teaching affirming the existence of "an intermediate place, or of any place anywhere at all (*ullus alicubi locus*), in which children who pass out of this life unbaptized live in happiness" (Denzinger, 102). This means that St. Augustine and the African Fathers believed that unbaptized infants share in the common positive misery of the damned, and the very most that St. Augustine concedes is that their punishment is the mildest of all, so mild indeed that one may not say that for them non-existence would be preferable to existence in such a state ("De peccat. meritis", I, xxi, in P. L., XLIV, 120; "Contra Jul.", V, 44, ibid., 809; etc.). But this Augustinian teaching was an innovation in its day, and the history of subsequent Catholic speculation on this subject is taken up chiefly with the reaction which has ended in a return to the pre-Augustinian tradition.

(c) Post-Augustinian Teaching.—After enjoying several centuries of undisputed supremacy, St. Augustine's teaching on original sin was first successfully challenged by St. Anselm (d. 1109), who maintained that it was not concupiscence, but the privation of original justice, that constituted the essence of the inherited sin ("De conceptu virginali" in P. L., CLVIII, 431–64). On the special question, however, of the punishment of original sin after death, St. Anselm was at one with St. Augustine in holding that unbaptized children share in the positive sufferings of the damned (ibid., 457–61); and Abelard was the first to rebel against the severity of the Augustinian tradition on this point. According to him there was no guilt (*culpa*), but only punishment (*pœna*), in the proper notion of original sin; and although this doctrine was rightly condemned by the Council of Soissons in 1140 (Denz., 376), his teaching, which rejected material torment (*pœna sensus*) and retained only the pain of loss (*pœna damni*) as the eternal punishment of original sin ("Comm. in Rom." in P. L., CLXXVIII, 870), was not only not condemned but was generally accepted and improved upon by the Scholastics. Peter Lombard, the Master of the Sentences, popularized it ("Sent.", II, xxxiii, 5, in P. L., CXCII, 730), and it acquired a certain degree of official authority from the letter of Innocent III to the Archbishop of Arles, which soon found its way into the "Corpus Juris". Pope Innocent's teaching is to the effect that those dying with only original sin on their souls will suffer "no other pain, whether from material fire or from the worm of conscience, except the pain of being deprived forever of the vision of God" ("Corp. Juris", Decret. l. III, tit. xlii, c. iii—*Majores*). It should be noted, however, that this *pœna damni* incurred for original sin implied, with Abelard and most of the early Scholastics, a certain degree of spiritual torment, and that St. Thomas was the first great teacher who broke away completely from the Augustinian tradition on this subject, and relying on the principle, derived through the Pseudo-Dionysius from the Greek Fathers, that human nature as such with all its powers and rights was unaffected by the Fall (*quod naturalia manent integra*), maintained, at least virtually, what the great majority of later Catholic theologians have expressly taught, that the limbus infantium is a place or state of perfect natural happiness.

No reason can be given—so argued the Angelic Doctor—for exempting unbaptized children from the material torments of hell (*pœna sensus*) that does not hold good, even a fortiori, for exempting them also from internal spiritual suffering (*pœna damni* in the subjective sense), since the latter in reality is the more grievous penalty, and is more opposed to the *mitissima pœna* which St. Augustine was willing to admit (De Malo, V, art. iii). Hence he expressly denies that they suffer any "interior affliction", in other words that they experience any pain of loss (*nihil omnino dolebunt de carentia visionis divinæ*—"In Sent.", II, 33, q. ii, a. 2). At first ("In Sent.", loc. cit.) St. Thomas held this absence of subjective suffering to be compatible with a consciousness of objective loss or privation, the resignation of such souls to the ways of God's providence being so perfect that a knowledge of what they had lost through no fault of their own does not interfere with the full enjoyment of the natural goods they possess. Afterwards, however, he adopted the much simpler psychological explanation which denies that these souls have any knowledge of the supernatural destiny they have missed, this knowledge being itself supernatural, and as such not included in what is naturally due to the separated soul (De Malo, loc. cit.). It should be added that in St. Thomas's view the limbus infantium is not a mere negative state of immunity from suffering and sorrow, but a state of positive happiness in which the soul is united to God by a knowledge and love of Him proportionate to nature's capacity.

The teaching of St. Thomas was received in the Schools, almost without opposition, down to the Reformation period. The very few theologians who, with Gregory of Rimini, stood out for the severe Augustinian view, were commonly designated by the opprobrious name of *tortores infantium* (see the brief list in Noris, "Vind. August.", III, v, in P. L., XLVII, 651 sqq.). Some writers, like Savonarola (De triumpho crucis, III, 9) and Catharinus (De statu parvulorum sine bapt. decedentium), added certain details to the current teaching—for example that the souls of unbaptized children will be united to glorious bodies at the Resurrection, and that the renovated earth of which St. Peter speaks (II Pet., iii, 13) will be their happy dwelling-place for eternity. At the Reformation, Protestants generally, but more especially, the Calvinists, in reviving Augustinian teaching, added to its original harshness, and the Jansenists followed on the same lines. This reacted in two ways on Catholic opinion, first by compelling attention to the true historical situation, which the Scholastics had understood very imperfectly, and second by stimulating an all-round opposition to Augustinian severity regarding the effects of original sin; and the immediate result was to set up two Catholic parties, one of whom either rejected St. Thomas to follow the authority of St. Augustine or vainly tried to reconcile the two, while the other remained faithful to the Greek Fathers and St. Thomas. The latter party, after a fairly prolonged struggle, has certainly the balance of success on its side.

Besides the professed advocates of Augustinianism, the principal theologians who belonged to the first party were Bellarmine, Petavius, and Bossuet, and the chief ground of their opposition to the previously prevalent Scholastic view was that its acceptance seemed to compromise the very principle of the authority of tradition. As students of history, they felt bound to admit that, in excluding unbaptized children from any place or state even of natural happiness and condemning them to the fire of hell, St. Augustine, the

Council of Carthage, and later African Fathers, like Fulgentius ("De fide ad Petrum", 27, in P. L., LXV, 701), intended to teach no mere private opinion, but a doctrine of Catholic Faith; nor could they be satisfied with what Scholastics, like St. Bonaventure and Duns Scotus, said in reply to this difficulty, namely, that St. Augustine, to whom the text of Fulgentius just referred to was attributed, had simply been guilty of exaggeration ("respondit Bonaventura dicens quod Augustinus excessive loquitur de illis pœnis, sicut frequenter faciunt sancti"—Scotus, "In Sent.", II, xxxiii, 2). Neither could they accept the explanation which even some modern theologians continue to repeat: that the Pelagian doctrine condemned by St. Augustine as a heresy (see e. g., "De anima et ejus orig.", II, 17, in P. L., XLIV, 505) consisted in claiming supernatural, as opposed to natural, happiness for those dying in original sin (see Bellarmine, "De amiss. gratiæ", vi, 1; Petavius, "De Deo", IX, xi; De Rubeis, "De Peccat. Orig.", xxx, lxxii). Moreover, there was the teaching of the Council of Florence, that "the souls of those dying in actual mortal sin or in original sin alone go down at once (*mox*) into hell, to be punished, however, with widely different penalties" (Denz., 693).

It is clear that Bellarmine found the situation embarrassing, being unwilling, as he was, to admit that St. Thomas and the Schoolmen generally were in conflict with what St. Augustine and other Fathers considered to be *de fide*, and what the Council of Florence seemed to have taught definitively. Hence he names Catharinus and some others as revivers of the Pelagian error, as though their teaching differed in substance from the general teaching of the School, and tries in a milder way to refute what he concedes to be the view of St. Thomas (op. cit.,vi–vii). He himself adopts a view which is substantially that of Abelard mentioned above; but he is obliged to do violence to the text of St. Augustine and other Fathers in his attempt to explain them in conformity with this view, and to contradict the principle he elsewhere insists upon that "original sin does not destroy the natural but only the supernatural order" (op. cit., iv). Petavius, on the other hand, did not try to explain away the obvious meaning of St. Augustine and his followers, but, in conformity with that teaching, condemned unbaptized children to the sensible pains of hell, maintaining also that this was the doctrine of the Council of Florence. Neither of these theologians, however, succeeded in winning a large following or in turning the current of Catholic opinion from the channel into which St. Thomas had directed it. Besides Natalis Alexander (De peccat. et virtut, I, i, 12), and Estius (In Sent., II, xxxv, 7), Bellarmine's chief supporter was Bossuet, who vainly tried to induce Innocent XII to condemn certain propositions which he extracted from a posthumous work of Cardinal Sfrondati and in which the lenient scholastic view is affirmed (see propositions in De Rubeis, op. cit., lxxiv). Only professed Augustinians, like Noris (loc. cit.), and Berti (De theol. discip., xiii, 8), or out-and-out Jansenists like the Bishop of Pistoia, whose famous diocesan synod furnished eighty-five propositions for condemnation by Pius VI (1794), supported the harsh teaching of Petavius. The twenty-sixth of these propositions repudiated "as a Pelagian fable the existence of the place (usually called the children's limbo) in which the souls of those dying in original sin are punished by the pain of loss without any pain of fire"; and this, taken to mean that by denying the pain of fire one thereby necessarily postulates a middle place or state, involving neither guilt nor penalty, between the kingdom of God and eternal damnation, is condemned by the pope as being "false and rash and as slander on the Catholic schools" (Denz., 1526). This condemnation was practically the death-knell of extreme Augustinianism, while the mitigated Augustinianism of Bellarmine and Bossuet had already been rejected by the bulk of Catholic theologians. Suarez, for example, ignoring Bellarmine's protest, continued to teach what Catharinus had taught—that unbaptized children will not only enjoy perfect natural happiness, but that they will rise with immortal bodies at the last day and have the renovated earth for their happy abode (De vit. et penat., ix, sect. vi, n., 4); and, without insisting on such details, the great majority of Catholic theologians have continued to maintain the general doctrine that the children's limbo is a state of perfect natural happiness, just the same as it would have been if God had not established the present supernatural order. It is true, on the other hand, that some Catholic theologians have stood out for some kind of compromise with Augustinianism, on the ground that nature itself was wounded and weakened, or at least that certain natural rights (including the right to perfect felicity) were lost in consequence of the Fall. But these have granted for the most part that the children's limbo implies exemption, not only from the pain of sense, but from any positive spiritual anguish for the loss of the beatific vision; and not a few have been willing to admit a certain limited degree of natural happiness in limbo. What has been chiefly in dispute is whether this happiness is as perfect and complete as it would have been in the hypothetical state of pure nature, and this is what the majority of Catholic theologians have affirmed.

As to the difficulties against this view which possessed such weight in the eyes of the eminent theologians we have mentioned, it is to be observed: (1) We must not confound St. Augustine's private authority with the infallible authority of the Catholic Church; and (2), if allowance be made for the confusion introduced into the Pelagian controversy by the want of a clear and explicit conception of the distinction between the natural and the supernatural order one can easily understand why St. Augustine and the Council of Carthage were practically bound to condemn the *locus medius* of the Pelagians. St. Augustine himself was inclined to deny this distinction altogether, although the Greek Fathers had already developed it pretty fully, and although some of the Pelagians had a glimmering of it (see Cœlestius in August., "De Peccat Orig.", v, in P.L., XLIV, 388), they based their claim to natural happiness for unbaptized children on a denial of the Fall and original sin, and identified this state of happiness with the "life eternal" of the New Testament. (3) Moreover, even if one were to admit for the sake of argument that this canon of the Council of Carthage (the authenticity of which cannot reasonably be doubted) acquired the force of an œcumenical definition, one ought to interpret it in the light of what was undertood to be at issue by both sides in the controversy, and therefore add to the simple *locus medius* the qualification which is added by Pius VI when, in the Constitution "Auctorem Fidei", he speaks of "locum illum et statum medium expertem culpæ et poenæ". Finally, in regard to the teaching of the Council of Florence, it is incredible that the Fathers there assembled had any intention of defining a question so remote from the issue on which reunion with the Greeks depended, and one which was recognized at the time as being open to free discussion and continued to be so regarded by theologians for several centuries afterwards. What the council evidently intended to deny in the passage alleged was the the postponement of final awards till the day of judgment. Those dying in original sin are said to descend into hell, but this does not necessarily mean anything more than that they are excluded eternally from the vision of God. In this sense they are damned, i. e., they have failed to reach their supernatural destiny, and this viewed objectively is a true penalty. Thus the Council of Florence, however literally interpreted, does not deny the possibility of perfect subjective happiness for those dying in original sin, and this is all that is needed from

the dogmatic viewpoint to justify the prevailing Catholic notion of the children's limbo, while from the standpoint of reason, as St. Gregroy of Nazianzus pointed out long ago, no harsher view can be reconciled with a worthy concept of God's justice and other attributes.

MAMACHI, *De animabus justorum in sinu Abrahæ ante Christi mortem* (Rome, 1766); BOLGENI, *Stato dei bambini morti senza battesimo* (Rome, 1787); HURTER, *Theol. dogmat.*, 11th ed., III (Innsbruck, 1903); PLUMPTRE, *The Spirits in Prison* (New York, 1884); ATZBERGER, *Gesch. d. christlichen Eschatologie* (Freiburg, 1896); POBLE, *Lehrb. d. Dogmatik*, I, 513; II, 200 (Paderborn, 1903–7); TURMEL, *La descente du Christ aux enfers* (Paris, 1905); TONER, *Lot of Those Dying in Original Sin* in *Irish Theol. Quarterly* (July, 1909); BRAUN in *Kirchenlex*, s. v. *Limbus*. See also literature under ORIGINAL SIN.

P. J. TONER.

Limbourg, POL DE, French miniaturist. With his two brothers, he flourished at Paris at the end of the fourteenth and the beginning of the fifteenth century. It is believed that their family name was Maloulel, or Malwel, and that they were nephews of that Jean Malouel who was employed at Dipu, at the Court of the Duke of Burgundy, and whose "Vie de St. Denis", in the Louvre, was painted for the Chartreuse of Champmol and was finished by Henri de Bellechose. The surname *de Limbourg* makes it appear that they came from the region which borders on the country of Van Eyck and was in those days dependent on the Duchy of Burgundy. But it is probable that they came to Paris at an early age, and that it is they who are meant by Guillebert de Metz in his "Description de Paris", when he speaks of the "trois frères enlumineurs". They must, therefore, have been already famous at the date of this book (about 1395), although it is impossible to ascribe to them with certainty any work previous to 1416. At the latter date they worked for the Duc de Berry (brother of the Duke of Burgundy and uncle of Charles VI) on the decoration of a manuscript which is still extant and which forms part of the library of the Musée Condé. This famous book is universally celebrated under the name of the "Très Riches Heures" of Chantilly (sometimes called the Book of Hours of the Duc de Berry).

Of the two hundred and odd paintings which adorn the "Très Riches Heures" only the first half are due to the Limbourg brothers; the rest were done fifty or sixty years later by a pupil of Fouquet (q. v.) named Jean Colomb (brother of Michel Colomb, the sculptor of the famous tomb of Nantes and of the Solesmes "Saints"). Even in the first half of the "Heures" it is impossible to determine the share contributed by any one of the three Limbourg brothers. Judging by the account given in the records, Pol must have been the eldest, and head of the atelier. This being so, he was probably the originator of the designs, or themes, and his pupils were restricted to executing them after the copy set by him. At any rate, the designer, whoever he may have been, was one of the greatest artists of the Renaissance. It is a moot question whether his art was learned in Italy: on the one hand Italianisms abound in the "Très Riches Heures"—it would be easy to point out twenty examples of Florentine or Sienese imitations; the buildings in more than one scene strikingly recall the architecture of Giotto and the taste of the Roman *marmorari;* the "Presentation in the Temple" is an exact reproduction of the composition of Taddeo Gaddi; there is a plan of Rome identical with one on the ceiling of a hall of the public palace at Siena. But such coincidences are not conclusive that the artist of the "Très Riches Heures" travelled through Italy. Communication between the two countries was frequent; Paris was already cosmopolitan in the fourteenth century, and what was called the *ouvraige de Rome*, or *ouvraige de Lombardie* was well known there. Besides, on more than one point the Limbourgs were far in advance of contemporary Italy. From the time of Charles V there had arisen in Paris an elegant naturalism of which numerous traces appear in the work of these three brothers. In the matter of drawing, the "Adam and Eve in Paradise", and still more the study of an "Astrologic Man", are examples of the nude not to be paralleled in Italy earlier than the date of the Carmine chapel (1428), nor in Flanders before that of Van Eyck's retable (1432). Other pages offer studies of contemporary costume or of animals which were not surpassed by Gentile da Fabriano, whose "Adoration of the Magi" dates from 1423. The "Coronation of the Virgin" discovers a beauty of design and a purity of sentiment which perhaps Beato Angelico himself never equalled, while for genre and the portrayal of contemporary manners, whether peasant or noble, the early pages of the manuscript are examples of an art until then without precedent and as exquisite as anything produced in later ages.

It had been usual to place at the beginning of a Book of Hours a calendar giving the principal feasts, the lunations, etc. A similar calendar was generally carved on the porch of a cathedral (see Mâle, "L'Art religieux en France au XIII^{e} siècle"). The months are represented in these calendars by the signs of the zodiac above a small bas-relief showing the characteristic occupations of the several seasons—for August, e. g., the harvest; for September, the vintage. These sculptures, of a classic, almost Greek, style of art, naturally did not admit of more than one or two figures, with a landscape rather suggested than expressed. The calendars of the Books of Hours were still thus conceived in the fourteenth century. For this wholly ideal conception of things Pol de Limbourg substituted one wholly naturalistic. He made the subject over anew and, retaining only the poetic theme, introduced a thousand novel developments, depicting, instead of the abstract conception of the seasons, their real, concrete aspects. Thus it is that the "Très Riches Heures" embodies in its calendar (the month of November is by Jean Colomb) a new theory of æsthetics and constitutes the definite beginning of modern landscape art.

An innovation fraught with such important consequences for the art of painting naturally prompts the question: Whence did the idea originate? In reply, Henri Bouchat suggests this ingenious theory: It will be noticed that each of these landscapes represents one of the dwellings or châteaux of the Duc de Berry—the Louvre, Mehung-sur-Yèvre, Vincennes, etc. Each of these landscapes is made to harmonize with one of the signs of the zodiac—called the "houses" of the sun. Hence it may be conjectured that the prince himself commanded this ambitious parallel. So, too, under Louis XIV, the tapestry of "The Months", woven by the Gobelins after the cartoons of Le Brun, represents the various châteaux of the *roi soleil*. But whatever the origin of the idea, the Limbourgs retain the merit of having, in its execution, given the earliest and some of the most perfect models of modern landscape art. The happiness rarely accorded an artist, of having created a genre, belongs to them more than to any others. Moreover, of all the secrets of this new art—even the resources of atmosphere and of chiaroscuro—they had, if not the developed instinct, at least some presentiment. The poetry of each season, its colour, its gaiety or melancholy, the transparency of the spring air, the winter torpor of nature, are all suggested. The work of the Limbourg brothers was epoch-making, a century later it was still being imitated, and the Flemish artists of the celebrated Grimani Breviary in the Library of St. Mark confined themselves to copying it, while they modernized it and made it dull. It has elsewhere been said (see EYCK, HUBERT AND JAN VAN) how great is the historical importance of this admirable manuscript; but, even if it did not possess in this respect a value impossible to overestimate—even if

we could not trace in it the beginnings of all Northern painting, from the *Maître de la Flémalle* to Jean Fouquet—it would still be, with its extraordinary variety of scenes and its perfect style, one of the most precious monuments of the art of painting.

RENAN, *Discours sur l'état des arts en France au XIV^e siècle* (Paris, 1862); MANTZ, *La Peinture en France du IX^e au XVI^e siècle* (Paris, s. d.); COURAJON, *Leçons professées à l'école du Louvre*, II (1901); DEHAISNES, *Histoire de l'Art dans la Flandre, l'Artois et le Hainaut* (3 vols., 4°., Lille, 1886); DE CHAMPEAUX AND GAUCHERY, *Les Travaux d'art exécutés pour le duc de Berry* (Paris, 1894); GUILLEBERT DE METZ, *Description de Paris sous Charles VI*, published by LE ROULX DE LINCY AND TISSERAND in *Paris et ses historiens aux XIV^e et XV^e siècles*; DELISLE, *Les Livres d'Heures du duc de Berry* (Paris, 1884); DVORAK, *Das Rätsel der Brüder van Eyck* (Vienna, 1904); DURRIEU, *Les Heures de Turin* (Paris, 1902); *Les Très Riches Heures du duc de Berry* (Paris, 1904); *Les Belles Heures du duc de Berry* in *Gazette des Beaux-Arts* (1906); *Les Débuts des Van Eyck* in *Gaz. des Beaux-A.* (1903).

LOUIS GILLET.

Limburg, DIOCESE OF (LIMBURGENSIS), in the Kingdom of Prussia, suffragan of Freiburg.

I. HISTORY.—This diocese dates from the end of the eighteenth century. The city of Limburg then belonged to the Elector of Trier, but the north-eastern part of the present diocese lay outside of any diocesan territory, having been under Protestant rulers since the Peace of Westphalia. It was administered in spiritual matters from Trier, through the ecclesiastical authorities at Coblenz. When the latter city fell into the hands of the French (1794), the administrator, Archdeacon Joseph Ludwig Beck, was given ecclesiastical jurisdiction over that part of the Diocese of Trier which lay on the right bank of the Rhine, the seat of his administration being Limburg. When, in 1801, the left bank of the Rhine came into the possession of the French, the three rural deaneries of the Archdiocese of Trier on the right bank still continued to exist, but in 1803 passed to the princes of Nassau-Weilburg, who allowed the vicariate-general at Limburg to continue, but diverted various ecclesiastical revenues and, in the city of Limburg, suppressed the collegiate chapter which had existed since the tenth century. In 1802 the last Archbishop of Trier, Klemens Wenceslaus, appointed Beck sole vicar-general for what remained of the archdiocese, and after the death of the archbishop (1812) Beck was confirmed in this position by the pope (1813). His ecclesiastical administration was carried on under the most difficult circumstances, in spite of which he did not fail to provide for a well-trained priesthood, and to encourage learning and virtue among his clergy. Upon his death (3 February, 1816), the primate, Dalberg, in his capacity as metropolitan and nearest bishop, appointed Hubert Anton Corden, pastor of Limburg, to be administrator and director of the vicariate (15 December, 1816). Pius VII appointed him, 8 July, 1818, vicar Apostolic for the Archdiocese of Trier. Prussia did not recognize the new vicariate, and forbade Corden to administer the parishes which were under Prussian rule. A separate Diocese of Limburg was the only possible solution of the difficulty. Long negotiations, begun in 1818 at Frankfort-on-the-Main, were carried on between Rome and the Governments interested, with the result that the ecclesiastical Province of the Upper Rhine was established in 1821, and, as a part of it, the Diocese of Limburg. The Bull "Provida solersque", establishing the new diocese, was issued 16 August, 1821, but, on account of a dispute between the pope and the Governments concerned, the See of Limburg was not filled for five years. The first bishop was Jacob Brand, parish priest of Wieskirchen (b. 29 January, 1776, at Mespellbrunn in Franconia), proposed by the Government, confirmed by the pope, and consecrated 21 October, 1827.

The new diocese consisted of the fifty-seven parishes of the Duchy of Nassau that had formerly been under the Archbishop of Mainz and in 1821 had been placed under the vicar Apostolic Corden, the free imperial city of Frankfort-on-the-Main, fifty-one parishes of the former Archdiocese of Trier, and twenty-five parishes in which no episcopal jurisdiction had been exercised since the Peace of Westphalia. In 1828 the diocese was divided into fifteen deaneries. The former collegiate and parish church of St. George, at Limburg, which since the French Revolution had been in a dilapidated condition, became the cathedral. The endowment was, as Pius VIII himself expressed it, a "deplorable" one, and amounted only to 21,606 gulden for both the bishop and the entire cathedral chapter. This endowment was administered by the secular Government, as was also the Catholic central fund (*Zentralkirchenfonds*) for the diocese, over which the bishop had no control whatever. The position of the first bishop, little worthy of his rank, suffered from the ecclesiastical laws of Nassau in which he had too easily acquiesced before his appointment. In truth

THE CATHEDRAL, LIMBURG

he was only a paid official dependent upon the nod of the Government, put in charge of the purely religious affairs of the Catholics of this territory. He issued a number of excellent ordinances during his brief term of office. Having himself been a teacher, he devoted special and enlightened care to the founding of an ecclesiastical seminary, which was opened in 1829 in a former Franciscan monastery granted for the purpose by the Government. He prepared the way for a special theological seminary, but did not live to see it established, dying in 1835. The second bishop, Johann Wilhelm Bausch (1835–40), was likewise unable to secure from the Government any appreciable measure of freedom. Any attempt to control the central diocesan fund brought upon him and the cathedral chapter a sharp rebuke.

In the appointment of the third bishop, Peter Joseph Blum (1842–84), the diocese gained a man who, aided by the changed conditions of the times, was able to carry on a successful contest for greater liberty in the administration of his see. He cared for the religious quickening of his diocese by the introduction and zealous fostering of general confession, of religious brotherhoods, and a Christian press, the dissemination of good books, and the practice of spiritual exercises, which he succeeded in establishing after

some opposition from the Government. The year of the Revolution, 1848, brought to the Catholic Church some freedom from the system of state guardianship until then in force, and permitted for the first time the holding of popular missions, which the bishop introduced as early as 1850. In that year, also, he obtained possession of the former Franciscan monastery of Bornhofen, a much-frequented pilgrimage, and there founded a house of Redemptorists, in spite of government opposition. The first house of the Poor Handmaids of Christ was founded in 1850 at Dernbach; it gradually developed into a large motherhouse with numerous branches. In 1855 followed the house of the Brothers of Mercy at Montabaur; in 1862, the diocesan protectory at Marienstatt; in 1850, the hospital of the Sisters of St. Vincent de Paul at Limburg, etc. Gradually the bishop replaced the old undenominational schools with Catholic schools which he obtained permission to establish. In 1851 a Catholic normal school was founded at Montabaur; in 1852 a college for boys was opened at Hadamar, and in 1872 another at Montabaur. From 1851 the bishop had an eight years' struggle with the Government in regard to the filling of vacant parishes; it ended by the establishment in principle of the bishop's right to independent administration of the diocese, and to the appointment and training of the clergy.

The political independence of the Duchy of Nassau and of the imperial free city of Frankfort-on-the-Main came to an end in the German war of 1866, after which both were incorporated in the Kingdom of Prussia. New religious houses, missions, and exercises were made possible by the introduction into the new territory of the same legal freedom of action as the Catholic Church then enjoyed in Prussia. These favourable circumstances did not last long. The Kulturkampf, beginning in 1872, destroyed at Limburg the greater part of what had been created by long years of work. Several institutions were closed by the expulsion of the Redemptorists, Jesuits, Poor Handmaids of Christ, the English Ladies, etc., while the Old-Catholic legislation transferred a number of Catholic churches to this new sect. By the Sperrgesetz, the clergy of Limburg found themselves deprived of salaries, while the bishop, after suffering fines and distraints for filling parishes without giving to the Government the newly prescribed notification, was, in 1876, expelled from office by the civil authority, and exiled. He administered his diocese, as well as possible, from Haid, in Bohemia, where Prince von Löwenstein generously granted him an asylum. It was not until 1883 that he was able to return to Limburg.

The spirit of Bishop Blum lived in his successors, Johann Christian Roos, who, after a short episcopate (1885–86), was raised to the archiepiscopal See of Freiburg, and Karl Klein (1886–98), dean of the cathedral chapter, appointed by the pope. Dr. Klein had been for many years the trusted vicar-general of Bishop Blum. During his episcopate the former Cistercian Abbey of Marienstatt was restored (1888) by Cistercians from Mehrerau, near Constance. The same bishop also founded a "Schola Gregoriana" to provide music for the cathedral, built a new seminary, and made zealous efforts to repair the damage caused by the Kulturkampf. He was succeeded by Dominikus Willi, first abbot of the new Marienstatt.

II. Statistics.—The Diocese of Limburg includes the Prussian civil district of Wiesbaden in the Province of Hesse-Nassau, with the exception of that part of the city of Frankfort-on-the-Main which belongs to the Diocese of Fulda and four towns in the Grand Duchy of Hesse. There are, taken altogether, 413,000 Catholic inhabitants. The diocese is divided into fifteen deaneries and the commissariat of Frankfort-on-the-Main (q. v.); it contains 210 parishes and cures of souls, 29 benefices, 38 endowed and 49 non-endowed chaplaincies, 48 other positions in the administration and the schools, and, at the close of 1909, there were 368 secular priests. The cathedral chapter consists of a dean, 5 canons, 1 honorary canon, and 2 cathedral vicars. The bishop is elected by the cathedral chapter from a number of candidates who must be approved by the ruler of Prussia; the members are appointed alternately by the bishop and the chapter itself. The institutions of the diocese are: the theological seminary at Limburg, with 18 students; the colleges for boys at Hadamar and Montabaur, each having about 100 pupils; the St. Joseph school for boys at Marienhausen; the asylum for idiots at Aulhausen; the "Schola Gregoriana" and the diocesan museum at Limburg. The monasteries for men in the diocese are:

Kaiserdom of St. Bartholomew, Frankfort

the Cistercian Abbey of Marienstatt, originally founded in 1215, suppressed in 1803, re-established in 1888, now (1910) numbering 32 fathers and 15 brothers; 3 Franciscan monasteries (Mariental, Bornhofen, and Kelkheim), with 17 fathers and 20 lay brothers; 1 Capuchin monastery at Frankfort-on-the-Main, 5 fathers and 3 brothers; the chief house of the Mission Society of the Pallottini at Limburg, 13 fathers, 57 scholastics, and 90 lay brothers; the chief house of the Brothers of Mercy at Montabaur and 5 other monastic houses, 105 professed brothers and 30 novices. The female orders and congregations in the diocese are: the Congregation of St. Vincent de Paul, 1 house, 12 sisters; the Poor Handmaids of Jesus Christ, 1 motherhouse and 86 dependent houses, 940 sisters; the Association of the Sisters of Divine Providence of Mainz, 6 houses, 36 sisters; the Poor Sisters of St. Francis, 1 house, 21 sisters; the Sisters of the Christian Schools of Mercy, 3 houses, 27 sisters; Ursulines, 3 houses, 80 sisters; English Ladies, 2 houses, 48 sisters; Sisters of Charity of the Good Shepherd, 1 house, 32 sisters; Servants of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, 2 houses, 8 sisters; the Pallottine Nuns, a mother-house at Limburg, 65 sisters; the Benedictine Nuns, 1 abbey (St. Hildegard, at Eibingen), 30 sisters; Benedictine Nuns of the Perpetual Adoration, 1 house, 29 sisters; Alexian Nuns, 1 house, 7 sisters.

The diocese has about 35 societies for boys and young men; 18 journeymen's unions; about 60 workmen's unions; 10 merchants' associations; 7 societies for servants; the Bonifatiusverein; a society for the support of priests; the St. Raphael Society; the Mar-

ian Society for the protection of girls, etc. There are 20 charitable institutions under religious administration (orphanages, working-girls' homes, hospitals, etc.). The most important church of the diocese is the cathedral at Limburg. It is in the transition style between Romanesque and Gothic, and was built in the first third of the thirteenth century, consecrated in 1235, and completely restored 1871–78. The celebrated treasure of the cathedral, containing costly reliquaries of the Byzantine period, etc., is kept in the church of the Franciscans. Other churches of the diocese worthy of special notice are: the *Kaiserdom* of St. Bartholomew at Frankfort-on-the-Main, formerly a place of pilgrimage, and the church where the German emperors were crowned (see FRANKFORT-ON-THE-MAIN), the Romanesque church of the former monastery of Augustinian Canons at Dietkirchen near Limburg, the oldest church of the diocese (ninth century), the Gothic pilgrimage church of Bornhofen (fifteenth century); the church of Eltville (fourteenth century), the pilgrimage church of Kiedrich (early fourteenth century), Rudesheim (1391–1400), the pilgrimage church of St. Martin at Lorch (end of thirteenth century), the abbey churches of Marienstatt and Eibingen, and the Romanesque-Gothic Church of the former Premonstratensian monastery of Arnstein-on-the-Lahn, etc.

BAHL, *Beiträge zur Geschichte Limburgs* (Limburg, 1889, 1890); IBACH, *Der Dom zu Limburg* (Limburg, 1879); LUTHMER, *Die Bau- und Kunstdenkmäler des Regierungsbezirks Wiesbaden* (3 vols., Frankfort, 1902–07); HÖHLER, *Geschichte des Bistums Limburg mit besonderer Rucksichtnahme auf das Leben und Wirken des dritten Bischofs Peter Joseph Blum* (Limburg, 1908); *Schematismus der Diocese Limburg* (Limburg, 1907; supplementary vol., 1910).

JOSEPH LINS.

Limerick, DIOCESE OF (LIMERICENSIS), in Ireland, includes the greater part of the County of Limerick and a small portion of Clare, and has an area, approximately, of about 500,000 acres. It corresponds with the ancient territory of Hy Fidhgheinte. St. Patrick visited the district, and was followed in the work of converting the natives by St. Senan, who lived in the sixth century and who was at one time Abbot of Scattery Island. In the same century lived St. Munchin, the patron of the diocese, who established a monastery and school at Mungret. This school became so famous that at one time it had 1,500 students. An offshoot from Mungret was a hermitage at Kill-Munchin, near Limerick. Thither St. Munchin retired, and there he spent his closing years, and, no doubt, from this hermitage and from Mungret the spiritual needs of the surrounding district were supplied. But as yet there was no city of Limerick, and no diocese till after the Danes came. Quick to discern the advantageous position of the place for trade and commerce, they settled there in the ninth century, and from this as their stronghold they oppressed the natives around and plundered the religious establishments along the Shannon. They were severely punished in the end of the tenth century by Brian Boroihme, who expelled them from the city, and they were readmitted only as subjects and tributaries of the kings of Thomond. Gradually they became Christians, though they still disliked the Irish, and had their bishops at Limerick consecrated by the Archbishop of Canterbury and subject to him.



TREATY STONE, LIMERICK
Inscription: "The Treaty of Limerick. Signed A. D. 1691"

ST. JOHN'S CATHEDRAL, LIMERICK

It is said there was a Bishop of Limerick about 1050, but his name and acts are unknown. We do know, however, that there was a bishop at Limerick about 1100, a remarkable man, Gillebert by name. Educated at Bangor, he had been abbot there, and then, having travelled abroad, he met Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury, at Rouen. Perhaps it was through Anselm's influence that he became Bishop of Limerick and also Apostolic delegate. Probably it was under Anselm's advice that he endeavoured to introduce unity of liturgy in the Irish Church, instead of the bewildering diversity of Offices and Masses which prevailed. He presided at the Synod of Rathbreasail (1118), where the number and limits of the Irish dioceses were determined, when Limerick itself, freed from the jurisdiction of Canterbury, was made subject to Cashel as the metropolitan See of Munster. Gillebert resigned his position as papal delegate in 1139 and in the following year died. His immediate successors in the See of Limerick were all Danes; then came Donat O'Brien, of the royal House of Thomond. During his episcopate (1179–1207) the cathedral of St. Mary was built, a cathedral chapter was set up, and Scattery Island was united to Limerick. Meantime the city of Limerick, alternately ruled by native and Anglo-Norman, was in 1199 taken possession of by de Burgh, who soon ruled with the power of an independent prince. Under Anglo-Norman rule English influences prevailed, and for two centuries the bishops appointed were English, or of English descent. Dur-

ing that period the privileges of the diocesan chapter were enlarged, and the diocese was divided into deaneries. One bishop of Limerick, in 1351, ruled Ireland for a short period as lord deputy; and another had a serious quarrel with the Archbishop of Cashel, whom he drove out of Limerick by force. This militant prelate resigned his see in 1400 and was succeeded by a very able man, Cornelius O'Dea, a descendant of one of the ancient Dalcassian chiefs. His mitre and crosier, both beautifully ornamented, still exist. His successors, like his predecessors, were of the Anglo-Irish stock; nor did anything noteworthy occur during their rule until the Reformation, and then, though a Limerick priest, William Casey, accepted from Edward VI the position of Protestant bishop, both Irish and Anglo-Irish united in rejecting the new doctrines.

During the wars of Elizabeth the diocese suffered much, nor did any city rejoice more sincerely than Limerick at the death of the queen. The city was again prominent in the wars of the seventeenth century. The nuncio was present in its cathedral, in 1646, when a Te Deum was sung for the victory of Benburb; and when the city was captured, in 1651, by Ireton, after a most heroic defence, one of those specially excluded from mercy was the Catholic bishop. He managed, however, to escape, and died at Brussels, in 1654. For nearly twenty years subsequently Limerick had no bishop; and then came the partial toleration under Charles II and the fleeting triumph under James II, followed by the Jacobite war, which, in Ireland, was mainly a war of religion. The Treaty of Limerick, which ended the war and was supposed to have secured toleration for the Catholics, was soon shamefully broken, and in the eighteenth century Limerick—city and diocese—experienced to the full the horrors of the penal laws. From 1702 to 1720 there was no bishop, but after that date the episcopal succession was regularly maintained. Shut out from every position of honour or emolument, the Catholics were prohibited from dwelling within the city, unless registered, and as late as 1744 there was no Catholic church within the city walls. Gradually, however, the old religion gained ground. The Catholics, defying the law, settled in Limerick and soon outnumbered the Protestants, and being free to engage in trade, they amassed wealth and built churches. In 1805, when the bishop, Dr. Young, undertook the building of a diocesan college, he had no difficulty in getting sufficient funds for the purpose. Dr. Young was one of those who refused to subscribe to the episcopal resolution of 1799 favouring the veto, and he denounced the project in 1808, when it was sought to have it revived. His successor, Dr. Tuohy, was equally vigorous (1814) in condemnation of the letter of Monsignor Quarantotti. One of Dr. Tuohy's most notable acts was to introduce the Christian Brothers into the city. He died in 1828, and was succeeded by Dr. Ryan, who died in 1864. The long episcopate of the latter was marked by the erection of many churches, including the cathedral of St. John, the foundation-stone of which was laid in 1856. Convents, also, were multiplied, and where, in 1825, there was but one convent for women throughout the whole diocese, at Dr. Ryan's death there were in Limerick City alone five convents, these including the Good Shepherd, Presentation, and Mercy orders. And the good work of building churches, convents, and schools, was carried on with equal energy by Dr. Ryan's successor, Dr. Butler (1864–86).

The present bishop is Dr. Edward Thomas O'Dwyer, born in 1842, educated at Maynooth, ordained priest in 1867, and consecrated bishop in 1886, an eloquent and fearless man, always listened to with respect on public questions. Among eminent persons connected with the diocese may be named the poets Gerald Griffin, Sir Aubrey de Vere, Bart., and his son Sir Aubrey Thomas de Vere, the second baronet. In 1910 the diocese contained 48 parishes, 46 parish priests, 2 administrators, 60 curates, 7 professors, 115 secular and 54 regular clergy, 94 district churches, 12 convents with 144 religious living in community, 4 monastic houses with 38 religious living in community. In 1901 the Catholic population of the diocese was 111,170.

LENIHAN, *History of Limerick* (Dublin, 1866); BEGLEY, *History of the Diocese of Limerick* (Dublin, 1906); LANIGAN, *Ecclesiastical History of Ireland* (Dublin, 1822); MACCAFFREY, *The Black Book of Limerick* (Dublin, 1907); *Irish Catholic Directory* (1910).

E. A. D'ALTON.

Limoges, DIOCESE OF (LEMOVICENSIS), comprises the Departments of Haute Vienne and Creuse in France. After the Concordat of 1801, the See of Limoges lost twenty-four parishes from the district of Nontron which were annexed to the Diocese of Perigueux, and forty-four from the district of Confolens, transferred to the Diocese of Angoulême; but until 1822 it included the entire ancient Diocese of Tulle, when the latter was reorganized.

Gregory of Tours names St. Martial, who founded the Church of Limoges, as one of the seven bishops sent from Rome to Gaul in the middle of the third century. An anonymous life of St. Martial (Vita primitiva), discovered and published by Abbé Arbellot, represents him as sent to Gaul by St. Peter. A great deal of controversy has arisen over the date of this biography. The discovery in the library at Carlsruhe of a manuscript copy written at Reichenau by a monk, Regimbertus, who died in 846, indubitably places the original before that date. From the fact that it is in rhythmical prose, Mgr Bellet thinks it belongs to the seventh century. Père de Smedt and Mgr Duchesne question this conclusion and maintain that the "Vita primitiva" is much later than Gregory of Tours. M. de Lasteyrie gives 800 as the date of its origin. In addition to the manuscript already cited, the Abbey of St. Martial at the beginning of the eleventh century possessed a circumstantial life of its patron saint, according to which, and to the cycle of later legends derived from it, St. Martial was one of the seventy-two disciples who witnessed the Passion and Ascension of Our Lord, was present on the first Pentecost and at the martyrdom of St. Stephen, after which he followed St. Peter to Antioch and to Rome, and was sent to Gaul by the Prince of the Apostles, who assigned Austriclinian and Alpinian to accompany him. The three were welcomed at Tulle and turned away from Ahun. They set out towards Limoges, where, on the site of the present cathedral, St. Martial erected a shrine in honour of St. Stephen. A pagan priest, Aurelian, wished to throw St. Martial into prison, but was struck dead, then brought to life, baptized, ordained, and later consecrated bishop by the saint. Aurelian is the patron of the guild of butchers in Limoges. Forty years after the Ascension, Our Lord appeared to Martial, and announced to him the approach of death. The churches of Limoges celebrate this event on 16 June. After labouring for twenty-eight years as a missionary in Gaul, the saint died at the age of fifty-nine, surrounded by his converts of Poitou, Berri, Auvergne, and Aquitaine.

The writer of this "Life" pretends to be Aurelian, St. Martial's disciple and successor in the See of Limoges. Mgr Duchesne thinks it not unlikely that the real authorship of this "apocryphal and lying" work should be attributed to the chronicler Adhémar de Chabannes, noted for his fabrications; but M. de Lasteyrie is of opinion that it was written about 955, before the birth of Adhémar. Be that as it may, this "Vita Aureliana" played an important part at the beginning of the eleventh century, when the Abbot Hugh (1019–1025) brought before several councils the question of the Apostolic date of St. Martial's mission. Before the Carlovingian period there is no trace of the story that St. Martial was

sent to Gaul by St. Peter. It did not spread until the eleventh century and was revived in the seventeenth by the Carmelite Bonaventure de Saint-Amable, in his voluminous "Histoire de St. Martial". Mgr Duchesne and M. de Lasteyrie assert that it cannot be maintained against the direct testimony of St. Gregory of Tours, who places the origin of the Church of Limoges about the year 250. The most distinguished bishops of Limoges are: St. Roricius (d. 507), who built the monastery and church of St. Augustine at Limoges; St. Roricius II (d. about 553), who built the church of St-Pierre-du-Queyroix and the Basilica of St. Junianus at Limoges; St. Ferréol (d. 597), the friend of St. Yrieix; St. Lupus, or Loup (613–629); St. Sacerdos (Sardon), Abbot of Calabrum, afterwards bishop; St. Cessa (740–761), who led the people of Limoges against the Saracens under Charles Martel; Cardinal Jean du Bellay (1541–1545). The ecclesiastics who served the crypt of St. Martial organized themselves into a monastery in 848, and built a church beside that of St-Pierre-du-Sépulchre which overhung the crypt. This new church, which they called St-Sauveur, was demolished in 1021, and was replaced in 1028 by a larger edifice in Auvergnat style. Urban II came in person to reconsecrate it in 1095. In the thirteenth century the chapel of St. Benedict arose beside the old church of St-Pierre-du-Sépulchre. It was also called the church of the Grand Confraternity of St. Martial. The different organizations which were grouped around it, anticipated and solved many important sociological questions.

Limoges, in the Middle Ages, comprised two towns: one called the "City", the other the "Château" or "Castle". The government of the "Castle" belonged at first to the Abbots of St. Martial who claimed to have received it from Louis the Pious. Later, the viscounts of Limoges claimed this authority, and constant friction existed until the beginning of the thirteenth century, when, owing to the new communal activity, consuls were appointed, to whose authority the abbots were forced to submit (1212). After two intervals during which the English kings imposed their rule, Charles V in 1371 united the "Castle" with the royal demesne, and thus ended the political rôle of the Abbey of St. Martial. Until the end of the old regime, however, the abbots of St. Martial exercised direct jurisdiction over the Combes quarter of the city. In 1534, Abbot Matthieu Jouviond, finding that the monastic spirit had almost totally died out in the abbey, thought best to change it into a collegiate church, and in 1535 the king and the pope gave their consent. It was suppressed in 1791, and early in the nineteenth century even the buildings had disappeared. In the thirteenth century, the Abbey of St. Martial, possessed the finest library (450 volumes) in France after that of Cluny (570 volumes). Some have been lost, but 200 of them were bought by Louis XV in 1730, and to-day are one of the most valuable collections in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris. Most of these manuscripts, ornamented with beautiful miniatures, were written in the abbey itself. M. Emile Molinier and M. Rupin admit a relation between these miniatures of St. Martial and the earliest Limoges enamels, but M. de Lasteyrie disputes this theory. The Franciscans settled at Limoges in 1223. According to the chronicle of Pierre Coral, rector of St. Martin of Limoges, St. Anthony of Padua established a convent there in 1226 and departed in the first months of 1227. On the night of Holy Thursday, it is said, he was preaching in the church of St. Pierre du Queyroix, when he stopped for a moment and remained silent. At the same instant he appeared in the choir of the Franciscan monastery and read a lesson. It was doubtless at Châteauneuf in the territory of Limoges that took place the celebrated apparition of the Infant Jesus to St. Anthony.

The diocese specially honours the following: St. Sylvanus, a native of Ahun, martyr; St. Adorator, disciple of St. Ambrose, suffered martyrdom at Lupersac; St. Victorianus, an Irish hermit; St. Vaast, a native of the diocese who became Bishop of Arras and baptized Clovis (fifth-sixth century); St. Psalmodius, a native of Britain, died a hermit at Eymoutiers; St. Yrieix, d. in 591, chancellor to Theodebert, King of Austrasia, and founder of the monastery of Attanum (the town of St. Yrieix is named after him); St. Etienne de Muret (1046–1126), who together with Guillaume d'Uriel, Bishop of Limoges, founded the famous Benedictine monastery of Grandmont. Mention must also be made of the following who were natives of Limoges: Bernard Guidonis (1261–1313), born at La Roche d'Abeille, Bishop of Lodève and a celebrated canonist; the Aubusson family, one of whom, Pierre d'Aubusson (1483–1503), was Grand Master of the Order of Jerusalem, and one of the defenders of Rhodes; Marc Antoine Muret, called the "Orator of the Popes" (1526–1596). Three popes came from the Diocese of Limoges: Pierre Roger, born at Maulmont, elected pope in 1342 as Clement VI, died in 1352; Etienne Albert, or d'Albret, born near Pompadour, elevated to the papacy in 1352 as Innocent VI, died in 1362; Pierre Roger de Beaufort, nephew of Clement VI, also born at Maulmont. As Gregory XI he reigned from 1371 till 1378. Maurice Bourdin, Archbishop of Prague, antipope for a brief space in 1118, under the name of Gregory VIII, also belonged to this diocese. St. Peter Damian came to Limoges in 1062 as papal legate, to compel the monks to accept the supremacy of the Order of Cluny.

The Council of Limoges, held in 1031, is noted not only for its decision with regard to St. Martial's mission, but because, at the instigation of Abbot Odolric, it proclaimed the "Truce of God" (q. v.) and threatened with general excommunication those feudal lords who would not swear to maintain it. It was at the priory of Bourganeuf in this diocese that Pierre d'Aubusson received Zizin, son of Mohammed II, after he had been defeated in 1483 by his brother, Bajazet II. The Gothic cathedral of St-Etienne, begun in 1273, was noted for a fine rood loft built in 1534; the church of St-Pierre-du-Queyroix, begun in the twelfth century, and that of St-Michel-des-Lions, begun in 1364, are worthy of notice. In 994, when the district was devastated by a plague (*mal des ardents*), the epidemic ceased immediately after a procession ordered by Bishop Hilduin, on the Mont de la Joie, which overlooks the city. The Church of Limoges celebrates this event on 12 November. The principal pilgrimages of the diocese are those of: Saint Valéric (hermit) at Saint-Vaubry (sixth century); Our Lady of Sauvagnac at St-Leger-la-Montagne (twelfth century); Notre-Dame-du-Pont, near St-Junien (fourteenth century), twice visited by Louis XI; Notre-Dame-d'Arliguet, at Aixe-sur-Vienne (end of the sixteenth century); Notre-Dame-des-Places, at Crozant (since 1664).

Before the Associations Law of 1901, there were in the Diocese of Limoges, Jesuits, Franciscans, Marists, Oblates of Mary Immaculate, and Sulpicians. The principal congregations of women which originated here are the Sisters of the Incarnation founded in 1639, contemplatives and teachers. They were restored in 1807 at Azerables, and have houses in Texas and Mexico. The Sisters of St. Alexis, nursing sisters, founded at Limoges in 1659. The Sisters of St. Joseph, founded at Dorat in February, 1841, by Elizabeth Dupleix, who, with other pious women, had visited the prisons at Lyons since 1805. The Congregation of Our Saviour and that of the Blessed Virgin, a nursing and teaching congregation, founded at la Souterraine in 1835 by Joséphine du Bourg. The Sisters of the Good Shepherd (called Marie

Thérèse nuns) nursing sisters and teachers; their mother-house is at Limoges. The religious orders maintained in this diocese at the close of the nineteenth century 19 nurseries, 1 home for sick children, 2 orphanages for boys, 14 for girls, 1 for both sexes, 5 work rooms (*ouvroirs*), 4 reformatories, 28 hospitals, 26 houses to care for the sick at their homes, 2 houses of retreat, 1 asylum for the insane. At the end of the concordat period the Diocese of Limoges contained 679,584 inhabitants; 70 canonical parishes; 404 succursal parishes, and 35 curacies supported by the Government.

Concerning the date of St. Martial's mission, see GREGORY OF TOURS; ARBELLOT, *Etude historique sur l'ancienne vie de Saint Martial* (Paris, 1892), gives the text of the *Vita Primitiva;* GRAY-BIRSCH, *The life of St. Martial* (London, 1877); *Vita Alpiniani* in LABBE, *Nova bibliotheca manuscriptorum*, II, 472.

Writers who place the mission in Apostolic times: BONAVENTURE DE SAINT-AMABLE, *Histoire de Saint Martial* (3 vols., Paris, 1676–1685); ARBELLOT, *Dissertation sur l'apostolat de Saint Martial et sur l'antiquité des Eglises de France* (Paris, 1855); BELLET, *La prose rythmée et la critique hagiographique* (Paris, 1899).

Writers belonging to the critical school: DUCHESNE, *Fastes épiscopaux*, II, 47–54 and 104–117; DE LASTEYRIE, *L'Abbaye de Saint Martial de Limoges* (Paris, 1901); DE SMEDT, *Analecta Bollandiana*, XVI (1897), 501; XVII (1898), 387.

For the history of the Church of Limoges, see *Gallia Christiana* [*nova*, II (1720), 498–548, *instrumenta*, 161–204]; *Chroniques de Saint Martial de Limoges*, ed. DUPLIS-AGIER (3 vols., Paris, 1874); LEROUX, *Les sources de l'histoire du Limousin* (Limoges, 1895); GRENIER, *La cité de Limoges, son évêque* (Limoges, 1907); GUIBERT, *Les évêques de Limoges et la paix sociale* (Limoges, 1898); LECLER, *Pouillé du Diocèse de Limoges* (Limoges, 1887); DOUAIS, *Les Frères Prêcheurs de Limoges* (Toulouse, 1892); ARBELLOT, *Saint-Pierre-Damien à Limoges* (Limoges, 1893); ARBELLOT, *Notice sur Saint Antoine de Padoue en Limousin* (Paris, 1895); DE MOUSSAC, *Une corporation d'autrefois encore vivante anjourd'hui: la corporation des bouchers de Limoges* in *Revue de Lille*, V (1892); MEYNIEUX, *Le clergé du diocèse de Limoges; l'œuvre de réforme morale des évêques d'après les statuts synodaux: 1275–1529* (Limoges, 1901); AULAGNE, *La réforme catholique du XVI^me^ siècle dans le diocèse de Limoges* (Paris, 1906); LECLER, *Martyrs et confesseurs de la foi du diocèse de Limoges pendant la révolution française* (4 vols., Limoges, 1902–1904); RUPIN, *L'œuvre de Limoges* (Paris, 1890); MOLINIER, *L'émaillerie* (Paris, 1891); CHEVALIER, *Topobibl*, s. v.

GEORGES GOYAU.

Limyra, a titular see of Lycia, was a small city on the southern coast of Lycia, on the Limyrus, and twenty stadia from the mouth of this river. It is mentioned by Strabo (XIV, 666), Ptolemy (V, 3, 6), and several Latin authors. Nothing, however, is known of its history except that Caius Cæsar, adopted son of Augustus, died there (Velleius Paterculus, II, 102). Limyra is mentioned in the "Notitiæ Episcopatuum" down to the twelfth and thirteenth centuries as a suffragan of Myra. Six bishops are known: Diotimus, mentioned by St. Basil (ep. ccxviii); Lupicinus, present at the Council of Constantinople, 381; Stephen, at Chalcedon (451); Theodore, at Constantinople (553); Leo, at Nicæa (787); Nicephorus, at Constantinople (879). The ruins of Limyra are to be seen three or four miles east of the village of Fineka, in the sanjak of Adalia, vilayet of Konia; they consist of a theatre, tombs, sarcophagi, bas-reliefs, Greek and Lycian inscriptions, etc.

LEQUIEN, *Oriens christianus*, I, 971; LEAKE, *Asia Minor* (London, 1893), 186; FELLOWS, *Journal of an Excursion in Asia Minor* (London, 1859), 214; IDEM, *Account of Discoveries in Lycia* (London, 1852), 205 sq.; SMITH, *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Geography*, s. v.; TEXIER, *Asie mineure* (Paris, 1862), 694.

S. PÉTRIDÈS.

Linacre, THOMAS, English physician and clergyman, founder of the Royal College of Physicians, London, b. at Canterbury about 1460; d. in London, 20 October, 1524. Nothing is known of his parents, but they seem to have been poor and obscure. His preliminary education was obtained at the monastery school of Christ Church, Canterbury, then presided over by the famous William Selling, the first great student of the "new learning" in England. Through Selling's influence Linacre entered All Souls College, Oxford, about 1480, and in 1484 was elected fellow. He distinguished himself in Greek under Cornelio Vitelli. When Selling was sent to Rome as ambassador by Henry VII, Linacre accompanied him, obtaining an introduction to Lorenzo de' Medici, who welcomed him into his own household as a fellow-student of his sons, of whom one was later to become Pope Leo X. Here under Politian in Latin, and Demetrius Chalcondylas in Greek, Linacre obtained a knowledge of these languages which made him one of the foremost humanistic scholars in England. During ten years in Italy, Linacre also studied medicine at Vicenza under Nicholas Leonicenus, a famous physician of the time, and received his degree of M.D. at Padua. Returned to England, Linacre became, after years of distinguished practice, the royal physician to Henry VIII and the regular medical attendant of Cardinal Wolsey, Archbishop Warham, Primate of England, Fox, Bishop of Winchester, and many of the highest nobility of the country. He was also the intimate friend of Sir Thomas More, Erasmus, and Dean Colet. After some eleven years of a life which brought him constantly in contact with the great nobles and the best scholars of England, he resigned his position as physician to the king in 1520 to become a priest. He devoted the fortune which had come to him from his medical practice to the foundation of chairs in Greek medicine at both Oxford and Cambridge, and to the establishment of the Royal College of Physicians. This institution was for the regulation of the practice of medicine, which had fallen into disrepute in consequence of the great increase of irregular practitioners. After Linacre obtained his charter, no one except a regular physician could practise in and around London. The constitution of the college, drawn up by Linacre, and still in force, is a standing monument of his far-seeing judgment. The college is an honoured English institution and the oldest of its kind in the world. Linacre's contributions to medicine consist mainly of his translations of Galen's works from Greek into Latin. Erasmus said Linacre's Latin was better than Galen's Greek. He published the "Methodus Medendi", "De Sanitate Tuenda", "De Symptomatum Differentiis et Causis", and "De Pulsuum Usu". Linacre was greatly respected by his contemporaries; Johnson, his biographer, says, "He seems to have had no enemies", and his reputation has lasted to the present day.

JOHNSON, *Life of Thomas Linacre* (London, 1835); MURRAY, *Lives of British Physicians* (London, 1830); *The Roll of the College of Physicians;* WALSH, *Catholic Churchmen in Science* (Philadelphia, 1906); PAYNE, in *Dict. Nat. Biog.* (London, 1885), s. v.

JAMES J. WALSH.

Linares (or MONTEREY or NUEVO LEÓN), ARCHDIOCESE OF (DE LINARES).—In 1777, at the request of Charles III of Spain, Pius VII erected the episcopal See of Linares as suffragan of the Archdiocese of Mexico. Its first bishop was Fra Antonio di Gesu, O.F.M. For reasons of ecclesiastical administration the see was raised to archiepiscopal rank by Leo XIII, 23 June, 1891, with San Luis Potosi, Saltillo, and Tamaulipas, or Ciudad de Victoria, as suffragans. Monterey, the cathedral town and residence of the archbishop, is the capital of the State of Nuevo León, Mexico. It is situated about 1600 feet above sea-level, and in 1900 it had a population of 62,266, ranking as sixth city in the republic. Its streets are handsome, well paved and clean, and the suburbs are famous for the beauty of their gardens and orchards. The principal buildings include the fine cathedral, a spacious seminary, schools of law and medicine, and elaborate public schools where education is free and compulsory, as it is throughout the republic, though the law on this head cannot always be enforced. Owing to improved railway facilities the trade of Monterey is very active, as it lies in the heart of a rich agricultural district, and the neighbourhood abounds

in silver mines and metalliferous ores. The town was founded by the Spaniards in 1581 and long bore the name of León. In September, 1846, during the war between the United States and Mexico, General Taylor with 6700 men assaulted Monterey, which was defended by General Ampudia and 10,000 Mexicans. It capitulated on 24 September, and the battle of Monterey is famous owing to the very liberal terms of capitulation granted by General Taylor. The town of Linares from which the archdiocese derives its ecclesiastical name is situated on the left bank of the River Tigris about fifty miles from Monterey. The population of the archdiocese is 327,937, and includes the whole of the State of Nuevo León, an area of 23,592 sq. miles.

The chapter consists of a dean and four canons: there are eighty secular priests, and seventy-five churches: the seminary contains twenty students. The present archbishop is Rt. Rev. Leopold Ruiz y Flórez, born at Amealco in the Diocese of Queretaro, 13 November, 1865, appointed to León 1 October, 1900, and transferred to Monterey 14 September, 1907. He succeeded Archbishop García Zambrano, a native of Monterey who had occupied the see from 19 April, 1900. The See of Linares was originally in the hands of the Friars Minor, and among the members of that order who succeeded its first bishop, Fray Antonio de Jesús, were Fray R. J. Verger (1782–1791); Andrew Ambrose de Llanos y Valdes (1791–1801); Prima Feliciano Marin di Tamaros (1801–1817); Jos. Ign. de Aranciva (1817–1831); Jos. de Jesús (1831–1843). In the archdiocese there is 1 college with 50 students; 2 schools under the care of the Brothers of Mary with 250 boys; 2 schools (Christian Brothers), 400 pupils; 3 academies (Sisters of the Incarnate Word), 250 pupils; 2 academies (Salesian Sisters), 190 pupils; 1 academy, the Religious of the Sacred Heart, 50 pupils; 7 parochial schools; 2 orphan asylums; 1 hospital; 1 home for the aged. Population practically all Catholic.

Ann. Pont. Cath. (1910); *Gerarchia Cattolica* (1910); BANCROFT, *History of Mexico*, V (San Francisco, 1885); HOWARD, *General Taylor* (New York, 1892); *Diccionario de Ciencias Eclesiásticas*, s. v.

J. C. GREY.

Lincoln, DIOCESE OF (LINCOLNIENSIS), suffragan of Dubuque, erected 2 August, 1887, to include that part of the State of Nebraska, U. S. A., south of the Platte River; area 23,844 square miles. There were about 17,000 Catholics in the section of Nebraska out of which the diocese was formed, organized in 27 parishes attended by 28 secular and 3 regular priests. Added to these were 38 missions with churches, 40 stations without churches, and 1 chapel. The Jesuits and Benedictines had representatives working among the clergy, and Benedictine Nuns and Sisters of the Holy Child took charge of the three schools established, in which about 290 children were enrolled. The Rev. Thomas Bonacum, rector of the Church of the Holy Name, St. Louis, Missouri, was appointed the first bishop, consecrated 30 November, 1887, and took formal possession of the see on 21 December following. He was born near Thurles, County Tipperary, Ireland, 29 January, 1847, and emigrated in infancy with his parents to the United States, settling at St. Louis. He studied at St. Vincent's College, Cape Girardeau, Missouri, and at the University of Würzburg, Bavaria, after which he was ordained priest at St. Louis, 18 June, 1870. He attended the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore as theologian for Archbishop Kendrick, and was named by the fathers of that council as the first Bishop of the Diocese of Belleville which it was proposed to erect in Southern Illinois. The Sacred Congregation of Propaganda deferred action on the proposal of the Plenary Council, and in the meantime Father Bonacum was appointed to the Bishopric of Lincoln, Nebraska, by Apostolic letters under date of 9 August, 1887.

Statistics:—Religious communities in the diocese—Men: Lazarists, Benedictines, Franciscans, Oblates of Mary Immaculate. Women: Sisters of Charity, Ursuline Sisters, Sisters of Charity of the Blessed Virgin, Sisters of St. Francis, Sisters of the Third Order of St. Dominic, Sisters of St. Benedict, School Sisters of Notre Dame, Sisters of Loretto, Sisters of St. Dominic, Sisters of the Most Precious Blood, Bernardine Sisters, Felician Sisters. Priests, 77 (regulars, 11); churches, with resident priests, 64; missions with churches, 72; stations, 34; chapels, 5; academies for girls, 5; pupils, 400; parish schools, 27; pupils, 2235; hospitals, 3; orphanage, 1. Catholic population, 37,200.

Catholic Directory (Milwaukee, 1888–1910); *Church Progress*, and *The Western Watchman* (St. Louis), contemporary files; *National Cycl. of Am. Biog.* (New York, 1904).

THOMAS F. MEEHAN.

Lincoln, DIOCESE OF (ANCIENT.—LINCOLNIENSIS). This see was founded by St. Theodore, Archbishop of Canterbury, in 678, when he removed the Lindiswaras of Lincolnshire from the Diocese of Lindisfarne. The original seat of the bishop was at Sidnacester, now Stow (eleven miles north-west of Lincoln), and for almost two hundred years the episcopal succession was there maintained, till in 870 the Northmen burnt the church of St. Mary at Stow, and for eighty years there was no bishop. About the middle of the tenth century the See of Sidnacester was united to the Mercian See of Leicester, and the bishop's seat was fixed at Dorchester-on-Thames. But this was situate in the extreme corner of what was the largest diocese in England, so that the first Norman bishop, Remigius of Fécamp, decided after the Council of 1072, which ordered all bishops to fix their sees in walled towns, to build his cathedral at Lincoln, a city already ancient and populous. On the top of the steep hill the cathedral and Norman castle of Lincoln rose side by side. In 1075 Remigius signed himself "Episcopus Lincolniensis", so that the transfer took place at once. The diocese then comprised no fewer than ten counties: Lincoln, Northampton, Rutland, Leicester, Cambridge, Huntingdon, Bedford, Buckingham, Oxford, and Hertford. A striking part of the Norman church still remains in the three deep arches of the west front of the cathedral. It was so solid an edifice that during the civil wars between Stephen and Matilda it was used as a fortress, but it was ultimately captured and plundered. In 1185 the cathedral suffered much damage in the great earthquake, and when in the following year St. Hugh was made Bishop of Lincoln he found it necessary to commence building again from the foundations. It was a momentous decision, as it resulted in the first English Gothic building and introduced the architecture of the pointed arch. The saint had completed the whole eastern portion of the church by the time of his death in 1200. Of his work the transepts alone remain. The nave was built during the next half century, when the great scholar Robert Grosseteste was bishop. His pontificate was marked by many reforms in the monasteries of the diocese and in the cathedral itself. In 1255 St. Hugh's choir was pulled down to make way for the splendid "Angel Choir", which was designed to hold his shrine, and is one of the masterpieces of Gothic architecture. On 6 Oct., 1280, the translation took place in the presence of King Edward I and nearly all the English hierarchy. During the fourteenth century the three towers were raised to their present height, and the cathedral attained its present form, one of the finest and most remarkable in England. At the Reformation the shrine of St. Hugh was destroyed (6 June, 1540).

In 1536 the Diocese of Lincoln was the scene of the "Pilgrimage of Grace", an armed protest against the religious changes which was followed by numerous executions. The reformer, Bishop Holbeach, plundered the cathedral during the reign of Edward VI, and the restored Catholic bishops under Mary had little

LINCOLN CATHEDRAL

time to repair the damage. The line of bishops of Lincoln, which had included two saints, three cardinals, and six chancellors (marked below *), was brought to a worthy close by Thomas Watson, who died a prisoner for the Faith at Wisbech Castle on 27 Sept., 1584, being the last survivor on English soil of the ancient Catholic hierarchy. The following is the complete list of bishops: Remigius de Fécamp, 1067; *Robert Bloet, 1094; *Alexander, 1123; Robert de Chesney, 1148; vacancy, 1168; *Walter de Coutances, 1173; vacancy, 1184; St. Hugh of Lincoln, 1186; William de Blois, 1201 (cons. 1203); vacancy, 1206; *Hugh de Wells, 1209; Robert Grosseteste, 1235; Henry de Lexinton, 1253; Richard de Gravesend, 1258; Oliver Sutton, 1280; John de Dalderby (popularly regarded as a saint), 1300; Henry Burghersh, 1320; Thomas Bek, 1341; John Gynwell, 1347; John Bokyngham, 1363; Henry Beaufort (Cardinal), 1398; Philip Repyngdon (Cardinal), 1405; Richard Fleming, 1420; William Gray, 1431; William of Alnwick, 1436; Marmaduke Lumley, 1450; vacancy, 1451; John Chadworth, 1452; *Thomas Rotherham (Scot), 1472; *John Russell, 1480; William Smyth, 1496; Thomas Wolsey (Cardinal), 1514; William Atwater, 1514; John Longland, 1521; Henry Holbeach, 1547 (schismatic); John Taylor, 1552 (schismatic); John White, 1554; Thomas Watson, 1557. The diocese included the counties of Lincoln, Leicester, Huntingdon, Bedford, Buckingham, and part of Hertfordshire, and was divided into six archdeaconries: Lincoln, Leicester, Bedford, Buckingham, Huntingdon, and Stow. From the diocese three other sees have been formed: Ely, under Henry I; Oxford and Peterborough, under Henry VIII—yet the Anglican diocese is to-day the largest in England. The arms of the see were: gules, two lions passant gardant or, in a chief azure Our Lady sitting with her Babe, crown and sceptre of the second.

GODWIN, *De præsulibus Angliæ* (London, 1743); ALLEN, *History of the County of Lincoln* (London, 1834); DUGDALE, *Monasticon Anglicanum*, vol. VI, pt. III (London, 1846); WINKLE, *Cathedral Churches of England and Wales* (London, 1860); LUARD, *Roberti Grossteste Epistolæ, Rolls Series* (London, 1861); WALCOT, *Memorials of Lincoln* (London, 1866); IDEM, *English Minsters* (London, 1879); WHITE, *History of Lincolnshire* (London, 1872); *Archæologia*, LIII (London, 1892), i (*inventories*); WORDSWORTH, *Notes on Mediæval Services with Index of Lincoln ceremonies* (London, 1898); VENABLES AND PERRY, *Lincoln* in *Diocesan Histories Series* (London, 1880); IDEM, *Lincoln Cathedral* (London, 1898); BRADSHAW, *Statutes of Lincoln Cathedral* (London, 1892–7); KENDRICK, *Lincoln, the Cathedral and See* (London, 1898); FAIRBAIRNS, *Cathedrals of England and Wales* (London, 1907).

EDWIN BURTON.

Lindanus (VAN LINDA), WILLIAM DAMASUS, Bishop of Ruremonde and of Ghent, b. at Dordrecht, in 1525; d. at Ghent, 2 November, 1588; he was the son of Damasus van der Lint. He studied philosophy and theology at Louvain, and having during this time applied himself also to Greek and Hebrew, went to Paris to perfect himself in these languages. In 1552 he won the licenciate at Louvain, and the same year was ordained to the priesthood. Two years later, he was appointed professor of Sacred Scripture at the University of Dillingen. In 1556, he took the doctor's degree at Louvain, and was appointed vicar-general to the Bishop of Utrecht and dean of the chapter at The Hague. Soon afterwards he became a royal counsellor and inquisitor in Friesland. In 1562, Philip II designated Lindanus for the newly erected See of Ruremonde, and the following year, on 4 April, he was consecrated in Brussels by Granvelle. He was not, however, able to enter his diocese until 11 May, 1569. Throughout the Low Countries the erection of this bishopric had caused displeasure, especially in the country of Guelders, of which Ruremonde was a part: where every act of the royal authority excited defiance. The heretics, moreover, were dissatisfied with the appointment of Lindanus, who was a staunch defender of the Faith. The new bishop began at once to reform his diocese, assisted in person at the Provincial Synods of Mechlin and of Louvain (1570, 1573) and carried out the laws and regulations of the Council of Trent.

NAVE, LINCOLN CATHEDRAL

In 1572, he was obliged to flee for several months from Ruremonde to the South of the Low Countries; on his return to his see, he defended vigorously the properties of the Church against the civil authorities. In 1573, a violent conflict broke out between himself and the Duke of Alba; and the heretics obliged him to flee on several occasions. In 1578, he journeyed to

Rome and to Madrid in order to obtain justice against the chapter of Maestricht, which had refused to execute the regulations concerning the episcopal endowment, as well as to confer with the Holy Father and the king upon the measures necessary for the safeguarding of the Faith in the Low Countries. Returning to Ruremonde, with the help of Philip II, he founded the royal seminary or college at Louvain, for the education of young clerics. Lindanus went to Rome again in 1584 to treat of the interests of his diocese and of the state of the Church in the Low Countries and in Germany, and he insisted particularly upon the urgent necessity of replying in a scientific way to the Centuriators of Magdeburg. His work in Ruremonde was now brought to a close by his elevation to the See of Ghent, where he began his new episcopal duties on 22 July, 1588, and where three months later, he passed away. Among his numerous works the following are especially worthy of mention: "De optimo scripturas interpretandi genere" (Cologne, 1558); "Panoplia evangelica" (Cologne, 1560); "Stromatum libri III pro defensione Concilii Tridentini (Cologne, 1575); "Missa apostolica" (Antwerp, 1589), and in a more popular form, the dialogues, "Dubitantius" and "Ruwardius" (Cologne, 1562–3). He edited also the academic discourses of Ruard Tapperus (1577–78), and he wrote many works in Dutch for the instruction of his flock, in order to keep them from Protestantism and to refute the Confession of Antwerp of 1566.

HAVENSIUS, *De erectione novorum in Belgio episcopatuum* (Cologne, 1609); KUIPPENBERG, *Historia ecclesiastica ducatus Gelriæ* (Brussels, 1719); HOLLIN, *Histoire chronologique des évêques de Gand* (Ghent, 1772); LAMY in *Annuaire de l'université catholique de Louvain* (1860), 98; CLAESSENS, ibid. (1871), 299; WELTERS in *Publications de la Société historique et archéologique dans le duché de Limbourg*, XXVII (Maestricht, 1890), 225; BROM, ibid., XXIX (1892), 277; VAN VEEN, ibid., XLIV (1908), 149; THUS in *De Katholiek*, CXXV (Leyden and Utrecht, 1904), 435.

H. DE JONGH.

Linde, JUSTIN TIMOTHEUS BALTHASAR, FREIHERR VON, Hessian jurist and statesman, b. in the village of Brilon, Westphalia, 7 Aug., 1797; d. at Bonn during the night of 8–9 June, 1870. His father, who was a barrister, died when Justin was only three years old; this occurrence, and the fact that the widow had to support four children in war times, darkened in a measure the youth of the unusually talented boy. After he had completed his gymnasium studies at Arnsberg (1816), he devoted himself with great zeal and success to the study of jurisprudence at the universities of Münster, Göttingen, and Bonn. In the last-mentioned he received the doctorate (1820), and qualified in 1821 as university tutor. Two years later he was called to Giessen, where, as extraordinary (1823), and subsequently as ordinary professor of law (1824–9), he attracted numbers of students, and became distinguished through his learned publications. In 1829 he was called to Darmstadt, as ministerial counsel (*Ministerialrat*), and was later (1832) named director of the Board of Education. The year 1833 found him Chancellor of the University of Giessen. Soon after (1836) he was named privy councillor, and 1839 brought him a patent of nobility. After repeated requests, he was permitted to retire with a pension in 1847. In 1848 he was a member of the Frankfort Parliament and in 1850 of the Parliament of Erfurt, and from the latter year he acted as Prince Lichtenstein's ambassador to the German Diet—from 1863 he also represented the elder line of Reuss and Hesse-Homburg—until its dissolution in 1866. The wreck of his political ideals, espoused by him with great warmth, was not without effect upon Linde's mind and temper. His former almost inexhaustible capacity for work was broken, as well as his wonderful cheerfulness. He withdrew almost entirely to his country seat, Dreys, and during a visit to one of his sons at Bonn he was carried away by a stroke of apoplexy in 1870.

In his younger days he was, in politics, friendly to Prussia (cf. his "Rede über den Geburtstag des Königs von Preussen", Soest, 1816), and in religion somewhat Josephinistic. Gradually, however, he developed into a strong particularist, as well as a zealous champion of the rights and claims of the Church, although he did not succeed in winning the entire confidence of the strict Catholic party. To Linde is due the establishment of the Catholic theological faculty in the University of Giessen, in which many excellent men laboured —among others the well-known ecclesiastical historian Riffel (q. v.), who later quarrelled with Linde. For the erection of a church in the same place especial thanks are due to him. His orthodoxy is unquestionable. Linde's numerous official reports have still to be collected from the archives; most of his pamphlets are forgotten, although many are of permanent value. The best collection of his intellectual productions is given by Schulte in the "Allgemeine deutsche Biographie", s. v. "Linde" (XVIII, 671). The most important and extensive of these works are: "Abhandlungen aus dem Civilprozess" (2 vols., Bonn, 1823–9); "Lehrbuch des deutschen gemeinen Civilprozesses" (7th ed., Bonn, 1850); "Archiv für das öffentliche Recht des deutschen Bundes" (4 vols., Giessen, 1850–63).

In addition to the works mentioned in the text, consult LINDE in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.; Short notices are also found in the encyclopedias of BROCKHAUS, PIERER, etc.

PIUS WITTMANN.

Lindemann, WILHELM, a Catholic historian of German literature, b. at Schonnebeck near Essen, 17 December, 1828; d. at Niederkruechten near Erkelenz (Rhine Province) 20 December, 1879. He attended the gymnasium at Essen; studied theology at Bonn from 1848 to 1851, and was ordained in Cologne, 2 September, 1852. He was rector of the municipal high school of Heinsberg from 1853 to 1860, then parish-priest at Rheinbreitbach, and later at Venrath from 1863 to 1866, when he became pastor of Nieder-Kruechten, and so remained till his death. From 1870 to 1879 he served as a member of the Prussian Diet as one of the Centre Party. His principal literary work is the "Geschichte der Deutschen Literatur", which first appeared in 1866 (eighth edition, Freiburg, 1905). This was the first exhaustive treatise made of the history of German literature from a Catholic point of view, and was an effort on the part of the author to bring out into greater prominence Catholic poets and thinkers who theretofore had either failed of recognition or had been treated with hostility. It is a notable work. The author modelled it on Vilmar's widely read and meritorious "History of Literature". Connected to a certain extent, as authorities, with his history of literature, is the "Bibliothek deutscher Klassiker" (1868–71) containing selections from Goethe, Schiller, Lessing, Herder, from writers of the Romantic school and poets of later times. To these are to be added his "Blumenstrauss von Geistlichen Gedichten des deutschen Mittelalters" (1874), and a collection of religious poems "Für die Pilgerreise" (1877). Besides these Lindemann produced two biographical works, the one on Angelus Silesius (1876) and the other on Geiler von Kaysersberg, from the French by Dacheux (1877), both of which appear in the "Sammlung historischer Bildnisse" 3rd series, vol. VIII, and 4th series, vol. II. Lindemann was also a contributor to the "Bonner Theologischer Literaturblatt", and to other periodicals. The University of Würzburg recognized his literary achievements by conferring on him, in 1872, the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. As a man he was simple and unassuming, with an amiable manner and a spontaneous flow of humour, a genuine son of the Rhineland.

HÜLSKAMP, *Literarischer Handweiser* (1880), 30; *Germania* (24 December, 1879), supplement; REUSCH in *Allgem. Deutsche Biog.*, XVIII, 680.

KLEMENS LÖFFLER.

Lindisfarne, Ancient Diocese (Lindisfarnensis) and Monastery of.—The island of Lindisfarne lies some two miles off the Northumberland coast, nine and one-half miles south-east of the border-town of Berwick. Its length is about three miles and its breadth about one and one-half. At low water it is joined to the mainland. Twice each day it is accessible by means of a three-miles track from Beal across the sands. The wet and plashy road is indicated by wooden posts. The population does not exceed 700. This island is now usually called Holy Island, a designation dating back to the eleventh century. Lindisfarne is famous as being the mother-church and religious capital of Northumbria, for here St. Aidan, a Columban monk-bishop from Iona, founded his see in 635. The resemblance of Lindisfarne to the island whence St. Aidan came has obtained for it the title of the Iona of England. Aidan's mission was started at the request of King Oswald, who had been educated by the Celtic monk, and who then resided on the mainland at the royal fortress of Bamborough. Holy Isle became the centre of great missionary activity and also the episcopal seat of sixteen successive bishops. The influence of these spiritual rulers was considerable, owing in great measure to the patronage afforded by kings such as St. Oswald. Not only did St. Aidan fix his see here, but he also established a monastic community, thus conforming himself, as Bede says, to the practice of St. Augustine at Canterbury (Hist. eccl., IV, xxvii). From this monastery were founded all the churches between Edinburgh and the Humber, as well as several others in the great midland district and in the country of the East Angles. Among the holy and famous men educated in Lindisfarne were St. Ceadda (Chad) of Lichfield and his brothers Cedd, Cynibill, Caelin, also St. Egbert, St. Edilhun, St. Ethelwin, St. Oswy the King, and the four bishops of the Middle Angles: Diuma, Cellach, Trumhere, and Jaruman. Bishop Eata was one of the twelve native Northumbrian boys whom Aidan had taken to Lindisfarne "to be instructed in Christ". St. Adamnan visited the monastery, and St. Wilfrid received his early training there. The original buildings were probably of wood. We gain some notion of their unpretending character from the fact that St. Finan, Aidan's successor, found it necessary to reconstruct the church so as to make it more worthy of the see. This he did after the Irish fashion, using hewn oak with a roof of reeds. A later bishop, Eadbert, removed the reeds and substituted sheets of lead. This modest structure was dedicated by Archbishop Theodore of Canterbury in honour of St. Peter, and within it, on the right side of the altar, reposed the body of St. Aidan. Portions of this primitive cathedral existed in 1082, when they disappeared to make room for a more elaborate and lasting edifice. Owing probably to a desire to guard against irregularities, such as had taken place at Coldingham, entrance to the church was not permitted to women. For the latter a special church was provided, called the Green Church from its situation in a green meadow. This exclusion of women was for a time observed at Durham.

Lindisfarne owes much of its glory to St. Cuthbert, who ruled its church for two years, and whose incorrupt body was there venerated during two centuries. In 793 the Danes invaded the island, pillaged the church, and slaughtered or drowned the monks. In 875 they returned, bent on further destruction, but the monks had fled, bearing with them St. Cuthbert's shrine. This took place during the episcopate of Bishop Eardulf, who was the last to rule the See of Lindisfarne. The half-ruined church, however, gave temporary shelter to the relics of St. Cuthbert at the time when William the Conqueror was engaged in subduing Northumbria, but the see was never re-established there. It was fixed for a time at Chester-le-Street by Eardulf, and in 995 transferred to Durham. Here it remained till the change of religion in the sixteenth century. The Anglican succession, however, still continues. When the hierarchy was restored to England by Pius IX in 1850, this venerable Catholic bishopric was refounded under the title of Hexham and Newcastle.

The ecclesiastical ruins on Holy Island date from the eleventh century. By a charter of 1082 Bishop Carileph bestowed the church of Lindisfarne on the Benedictines, whom he had brought to Durham from Wearmouth and Jarrow; and for them he began the Norman church the remains of which still exist. His successor, Bishop Flambard, completed the work, the architect being a monk of Durham named Ædward. The succession of priors and monks was always appointed by the mother-church of Durham, and their yearly accounts were rendered to the same parent-house. From these statements, still extant, we gather that in its best days the priory income was equal to about £1200 of present money. During the priorate of Thomas Sparke (1536) the house was dissolved, and at his death, in 1571, the property passed into the hands of the Dean and Chapter of Durham. Since 1613 the site of the priory has belonged to the crown. The church, under the invocation of St. Cuthbert, was a copy of Durham cathedral on a small scale. The similarity is especially observable in the voluted and chevroned columns of the nave. Its length was 150 feet. The tower was still standing in 1728. A pilgrimage, consisting of 3000 persons, crossed the sands to Holy Island in 1887—the twelfth centenary of St. Cuthbert's death. The following is a list of the bishops of Lindisfarne, with dates of accession:—(1) Aidan, 635; (2) Finan, 652; (3) Colman, 661; (4) Tuda, 664. (For fourteen years Lindisfarne was included in Diocese of York under Chad and Wilfrid.) (5) Eata, 678; (6) Cutbert, 685; (7) Eadbert, 688; (8) Eadfrid, 698; (9) Ethelwold, 724; (10) Cynewulf, 740; (11) Higbald, 780; (12) Egbert, 803; (13) Heathored, 821; (14) Ecgred, 830; (15) Eanbert, 845; (16) Eardulf, 854.

The book called the "Lindisfarne Gospels" ("St. Cuthbert's Gospels" or the "Durham Book") is still preserved in the British Museum Library (Cotton MS. Nero D.iv). This volume must not be confounded with a small copy of St. John's Gospel found in St. Cuthbert's coffin in 1104, and now at Stonyhurst. The former was written at Lindisfarne by Eadfrid "in honour of St. Cuthbert" about 700. It consists of 258 leaves of thick vellum, $13\frac{1}{2} \times 9\frac{7}{8}$ inches, and contains the Four Gospels in the Latin of St. Jerome's Version, written in double columns with an interlinear Saxon gloss—the earliest form of the Gospels in English. It also contains St. Jerome's Epistle to Pope Damasus, his Prefaces, the Eusebian Canons, arguments of each Gospel, and "Capitula", or headings of the lessons. The glossator, Aldred, states that the ornamentation was the work of Ethelwold (724–40), and that the precious metal cover was made by Bilfrid (Billfrith) the anchorite. It is written in a splendid uncial hand, and adorned with intricate patterns, consisting of interlaced ribbons, spiral lines, and geometrical knots, terminating sometimes in heads of birds and beasts. The intervening spaces are filled with red dots in various designs. Before each Gospel is a representation of the Evangelist. A table of festivals with special lessons seems to indicate that this manuscript was copied from one used in a church at Naples. It is surmised that the Neapolitan manuscript found its way into England in the time of Archbishop Theodore, whose companion, Adrian, was abbot of Nisita near Naples. (For a fuller treatment of the origin of the manuscript, see Dom Chapman's "Early History of the Vulgate Gospels", where he gives a slightly different view of the subject.) The book remained at Lindisfarne till the flight of the monks, about 878, when it was carried away together with the relics. During the attempted passage to Ireland, it fell into the sea,

but was miraculously rescued after four days. In 995 it was brought to Durham, and afterwards replaced in Lindisfarne, when the church there was rebuilt. There it remained till the Dissolution in 1536. For the space of 100 years it was lost sight of. In 1623 it was in the possession of Robert Bowyer, clerk to the House of Commons. He disposed of it to Sir Robert Cotton, whence it passed to the British Museum. Traces of its immersion in the sea have been detected by experts. Its present precious binding was a gift of Bishop Maltby. The codex was edited by Stevenson and Waring (1854–65), and by Skeat (1887).

BEDE, *Hist. Eccl.*, I, 100; EYRE, *History of St. Cuthbert* (London, 1887); RAINE, *History and Antiquities of North Durham* (London, 1852); MONTALEMBERT, *Monks of the West*, the chapter on Celtic Monks and appendix; SYMEON OF DURHAM, *Op. omnia*, ed, ARNOLD in *Rolls Series* (2 vols., London, 1882); O'HANLON, *Lives of the Irish Saints*, 31 August; BUTLER, *Lives of the Saints*, 31 August. For Lindisfarne Gospels, see *Rites of Durham* (Surtees Soc., 1902), 248; *Revue Bénédictine*, for Nov. and Dec., 1891; CHAPMAN, *Early History of the Vulgate Gospels* (Oxford, 1908); KENYON, *Handbook to Tertual Criticism of the New Testament* (London, 1901), 199; *Bibliographica, Papers on Books* (London, 1895); ROBINSON, *Celtic Illuminative Art* (Dublin, 1908); TYMMS AND WYATT, *Art of Illuminating* (1860); WESTWOOD, *Miniatures and Ornaments* (1868)—several of foregoing give facsimiles.

COLUMBA EDMONDS.

Lindores, BENEDICTINE ABBEY OF, on the River Tay, near Newburgh, Fifeshire, Scotland, founded by David, Earl of Huntingdon, younger brother of King William the Lion, about 1191. Boece (Chronicles of Scotland) gives 1178 as the date, but his romantic story of the foundation (adopted by Walter Scott in "The Talisman") is quite uncorroborated and almost certainly fictitious. The monks were Tironensian Benedictines, brought from Kelso; Guido, Prior of Kelso, was the first abbot, and practically completed the extensive buildings. The church, dedicated to the Blessed Virgin and St. Andrew, was 195 feet long, with transepts 110 feet long. Earl David richly endowed the abbey, making over to it the ten parish churches which were in his gift, as well as tithes and other sources of revenue, and asking nothing in return "save only prayers for the weal of the soul". The monks, by the foundation charter, were to be free of all secular and military service, and they gradually acquired extensive powers and jurisdiction over the people living on their property. Other churches were granted by the Leslies and subsequent benefactors to the abbey, which had finally as many as twenty-two belonging to it. Dowden, in his introduction to the Lindores chartulary, gives details of these endowments, as well as of the privileges granted to the abbey by successive popes: these do not seem to have differed from those enjoyed by other great monasteries. Edward I of England, John de Baliol, David II, and James III were among the monarchs who visited Lindores at different times. David, Duke of Rothesay, who perished mysteriously at Falkland Palace, not far off, was buried at Lindores in 1402. Twenty-one abbots ruled the monastery from its foundation to its suppression. Lindores was the first of the great Scottish abbeys to suffer violence from the Protestant mob, being sacked and the monks expelled by the populace of Dundee in 1543. Knox describes a similar scene in 1559: "The abbey of Lindores we reformed: their altars overthrew we; their idols, vestments of idolatrie and mass-books we burnt in their presence, and commanded them to cast away their monkish habits". The last abbot was the learned and pious John Leslie, afterwards Bishop of Ross (d. 1596). The abbey was created a temporal lordship in 1600 in favour of Patrick Leslie, in whose family it remained till 1741. It now belongs to the Hays of Leys. The fragments of the buildings which remain are mostly of the twelfth century; they include the groined archway of the principal entrance, and part of the chancel walls and of the western tower of the church.

Chartulary of the Abbey of Lindores, ed. DOWDEN from the *Caprington MS.*, with introduction and appendixes (Edinburgh, Scot. Hist. Soc., 1903). The volume published by the Abbotsford Club (1841, incorrectly called *Chartularies of Balmerino and Lindores*, is really a sixteenth-century transcript of miscellaneous documents relating to these abbeys. See also LAING, *Lindores Abbey and its burgh of Newburgh* (Edinburgh, 1876); GORDON, *Monasticon*, III (Glasgow, 1868), 539–550; DUGDALE, *Monasticon Anglicanum*, VI (London, 1830), 1150. Dowden, *op. cit.* gives some interesting reproductions of ancient seals of the Chapter and various Abbots of Lindores.

D. O. HUNTER-BLAIR.

Line, MRS. ANNE, English martyr, d. 27 Feb., 1601. She was the daughter of William Heigham of Dunmow, Essex, a gentleman of means, and an ardent Calvinist, and when she and her brother announced their intention of becoming Catholics both were disowned and disinherited. Anne married Roger Line, a convert like herself, and shortly after their marriage he was apprehended for attending Mass. After a brief confinement he was released and permitted to go into exile in Flanders, where he died in 1594. When Father John Gerard established a house of refuge for priests in London, Mrs. Line was placed in charge. After Father Gerard's escape from the Tower in 1597, as the authorities were beginning to suspect her assistance, she removed to another house, which she made a rallying point for neighbouring Catholics. On Candlemas day, 1601, Father Francis Page, S.J. was about to celebrate Mass in her apartments, when priest-catchers broke into the rooms. Father Page quickly unvested, and mingled with the others, but the altar prepared for the ceremony was all the evidence needed for the arrest of Mrs. Line. She was tried at the Old Bailey 26 Feb., 1601, and indicted under the Act of 27 Eliz. for harbouring a priest, though this could not be proved. The next day she was led to the gallows, and bravely proclaiming her faith, achieved the martyrdom for which she had prayed. Her fate was shared by two priests, Mark Barkworth, O.S.B., and Roger Filcock, S.J., who were executed at the same time.

Roger Filcock had long been Mrs. Line's friend and frequently her confessor. Entering the English College at Reims in 1588, he was sent with others in 1590 to colonize the seminary of St. Albans at Valladolid, and, after completing his course there, was ordained and sent on the English mission. Father Garnett kept him on probation for two years to try his mettle before admitting him to the Society of Jesus, and finding him zealous and brave, finally allowed him to enter. He was just about to cross to the Continent for his novitiate when he was arrested on suspicion of being a priest and executed after a travesty of a trial.

MORRIS, *Life of Fr. John Gerard;* CHALLONER, *Memoirs*, I, 396; FOLEY, *Records S.J.* I, 405; VII, 254; *Douay Diaries*, p. 219, 280; *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep. Rutland Coll. Belvoir Castle*, I, 370; GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.*

STANLEY J. QUINN.

Linen. See ALB; ALTAR, sub-title ALTAR-LINENS; AMICE; CORPORAL; ETC.

Lingard, JOHN, English priest and historian; b. at Winchester, 5 February, 1771; d. at Hornby, 17 July, 1851. He was the son of Lincolnshire yeomen, John Lingard and Elizabeth Rennell, whom poverty and persecution had driven to migrate from their native Claxby, first to London, where they met again and married, then, after a short return to their old home, to Winchester, where he was born. He inherited from a stock winnowed and strengthened by the ceaseless oppression of two centuries the silent, stubborn, almost sullen longing for the conversion of his native land, that is so intimate a characteristic of the pre-Emancipation Catholic.

The first step towards realizing this longing was taken in 1779, when the Rev. James Nolan, Milner's predecessor at Winchester, arranged with Bishop Challoner the first preliminaries for his reception at Douai. These were concluded by Milner himself

PAGE OF THE LINDISFARNE GOSPELS

BRITISH MUSEUM (Cotton MSS.)

three years later, and Lingard "entered the doors of Douai on the afternoon of 30 September, 1782". His career there was remarkably brilliant: only at one examination in the whole of his course did he fail to lead his class, and at the end of his course in philosophy he was retained as professor of one of the lower humanity schools. Shortly before the final catastrophe which the French Revolution brought upon the house he escaped to England, in charge of two brothers named Oliveira and of William, afterwards Lord, Stourton. For nearly a year, he took charge of the latter's education at his father's residence, till, in May, 1794, Bishop William Gibson asked him to aid in caring for a section of the Douai refugees who were assembled, first at Tudhoe, then at Pontop and Crook Hall—all places within a few miles of Durham. Nominally, he held the chair of philosophy; practically, besides the duties of vice-president to the Rev. Thomas Eyre, he undertook in addition those of prefect of studies, procurator, and of professor of church history. It was in this last subject that he first found the true bent of his genius. The result was his "History of the Anglo-Saxon Church", a development of conversations and informal lectures round the winter evening fire. Its success suggested two further literary schemes: a history of the Anglo-Norman Church and a school epitome of the history of England, of which the former was finally abandoned about 1814, and the latter about the same time began to expand into his life's work. It had been impossible for him to accomplish anything during the interval, except in the way of gathering materials. The labours antecedent to and consequent upon the removal to Ushaw, in 1808; the post of vice-president which he held there; and the sole charge of the house which devolved upon him on Eyre's death, in May, 1810, effectually deprived him of leisure. He found time, however, for a few controversial works, the titles of which will be found at the end of this article.

In 1811 the Rev. John Gillow was appointed President of Ushaw, and Lingard, refusing the corresponding position at Maynooth, which was offered him by Bishop Moylan, retired in September to Hornby, a country mission about eight miles from Lancaster. Various controversial publications (one of which, "A Review of Certain Anti-Catholic Publications", earned him the formal thanks of the Board of Catholics of Great Britain) were the first fruits of his leisure here. The "History", however, still in the form of an abridgement for schools, formed his principal occupation. By the end of 1815 he had "buried Henry VII and was returning to revise." But the revision proved a rewriting, and the work began to exceed the bounds of a school-book. Two years more were devoted to the examination and comparison of original authorities, for Lingard's new method of history—practically unheard of till then—insisted on tracing every statement back to its original author. He journeyed to Rome in the spring of 1817, partly to consult authorities in the Vatican archives, partly as the confidential agent of Bishop Poynter; and in this capacity he successfully concluded negotiations for the reconstitution and reopening of the English College at Rome. This was by no means the first or the last of similar delicate commissions with which he was entrusted. Throughout his life he was in the confidence of the English bishops; he exhorted, he restrained, he advised, he was their authority on procedure, he drafted their letters to Rome; indeed, the most notable fact in his career, next to his power of writing history, was the part which he took in making it, in Catholic England during the first half of the nineteenth century.

In the winter after his return from Rome he was ready to think of publication, and the first three volumes, extending to the death of Henry VII, were finally purchased by Mawman of London for 1000 guineas. These were published in May, 1819, and met with speedy and surprising success not only among English Catholics, but among scholars of every nationality and belief. A fourth volume was called for as soon as it could be prepared, and a second edition of all four was found necessary before three years were out. A growing enthusiasm greeted each successive volume till the work was brought to what proved its ultimate conclusion—the revolution of 1688—by the eighth volume, which appeared in 1830. Meanwhile, a third edition had appeared in England; two translations had been published in France (one with a continuation to the nineteenth century, revised and corrected by Lingard himself); another had appeared in German, and yet another, in Italian, was printed by the Propaganda Press. Honours from every part of Europe confirmed the general appreciation of the "History". Lingard's triple doctorate from Pius VII in 1821, his associateship of the Royal Society of Literature, and many other similar honours were finally crowned, in 1839, by a grant from the Privy Purse of £300 and his election as a corresponding member of the French Academy. It had also been generally, if not universally, believed—till Cardinal Wiseman first traversed the tradition nearly forty years later, in his "Last Four Popes"—that Leo XII, in a consistory of 2 October, 1826, had created Lingard cardinal *in petto*, deferring the promulgation of the honour till the completion of the "History" should leave him free to come to Rome. A somewhat heated controversy between Tierney and Wiseman followed the publication of the "Last Four Popes", and for a matter in which certainty is now, as then, almost impossible, Tierney seems to have had the better of the argument. Perhaps Lingard's own opinion is more likely to be right than any other, and, though he affected to despise the rumour in the autumn of 1826, we find him before the end of the year asking and receiving advice on the advisability of allowing the offer to be made. Towards the end of his life he seems to have had no hesitation at all about the question. "He made me cardinal", is his unqualified assertion to a friend in a letter of 22 August, 1850.



JOHN LINGARD

Of course the "History" was criticized, but the very sources of the criticism showed how successfully Lingard had attained his ideal of unbiased accuracy. Milner attacked the tone of the work in "The Orthodox Journal", but the disagreement was rather one of method than of anything else; Milner would have converted England by the heavy bombardment of hard-hitting controversy; Lingard realized that his only chance of reaching the audience he desired lay in a sober, unimpassioned statement of incontrovertible fact. Dr. John Allen, then Master of Dulwich School, reached the other pole of criticism, and accused him of prejudiced distortion and suppression of facts in his account of the Massacre of St. Bartholomew. It was the only attack of which Lingard ever took formal notice, and the publication of Salviani's secret dispatches a few years later scarcely added anything to the weight of his triumphant "Vindication". Indeed

his essential accuracy on any leading point has seldom, if ever, been called in question; and the mass of historical material that has flooded our libraries since his death has left unshaken not only his statements of facts, but even their conjectural restorations, which at times, prophetwise, he allowed himself to make. Hence his work has lost little of its value, and, sixty years after its author's last revision, still holds its place as the standard authority on many of the periods of which it treats.

The twenty years of life that still remained to him, he spent in revision of his two principal works: "The Anglo-Saxon Church", which was practically re-written in 1846, and the "History", of which every succeeding edition (five were published in his lifetime) bore evidence of his unfailing zeal for impartial accuracy; in the composition of many smaller works and essays, some of which, like his "New Translation of the Four Gospels", have scarcely met with the recognition that their scholarship and literary merits deserve; and in untiring vigilance for the interests of the Church in England. His researches at home and abroad had brought him into touch with friends in every part of Western Europe, and only his extraordinary energy and vitality could have coped with the ensuing correspondence, which would have crushed most other men. He suffered too from a complication of maladies that forbade him to travel more than a few miles from home, yet, even in his isolation at Hornby, he was to the end a centre of spiritual and intellectual activity, a living force which still employed its every energy for the one ambition it had always held—the advancement of Catholic, the conversion of Protestant, England. In 1849 he said farewell to his books and to their readers in his pathetic preface to the fifth edition of the "History", and two years later he died. He had always preserved an active interest in the college at Ushaw, in whose beginnings he had played so prominent a part. His solid prudence was always at its service; the profits of his writings were devoted to aiding its resources; he even once found himself, by the death of his co-trustees, its sole owner. In its cemetery cloister, therefore, by his own wish, he was buried, by the side of its bishops and presidents, and Ushaw still remains the shrine of his body and of his memory.

His published works include: "Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church" (Newcastle, 1806 and 1810; London, 1846); "Letters on Catholic Loyalty" (Newcastle, 1807); "Remarks on a Charge . . . by Shute, Bishop of Durham" (London, 1807); "Vindication of the 'Remarks'" (Newcastle, 1807); "General Vindication of the 'Remarks': Replies to Le Mesurier, and Faber; and Observations on . . . Method of interpreting the Apocalypse" (Newcastle, 1808; Dublin, 1808); "Remarks on . . the Grounds on which the Church of England separated from Rome, reconsidered by Shute, Bishop of Durham" (London, 1809) (these last four tracts have been collected and republished several times); "Introduction to Talbot's Protestant Apology for the Catholic Church" (Dublin, 1809); "Preface to Ward's Errata to the Protestant Bible" (Dublin, 1810, 1841); "Documents to ascertain Sentiments of British Catholics in former Ages, respecting the Power of the Popes" (London, 1812); "Review of Certain Anti-Catholic Publications" (London, 1813); "Examination of Certain Opinions advanced by Dr. Burgess, Bishop of St. David's" (Manchester, 1813); "Strictures on Dr. Marsh's Comparative View of the Churches of England and Rome" (London, 1815); "Observations on the Laws . . in Foreign States relative to their Roman Catholic Subjects" (London, 1817, 1851); "History of England to the Accession of William and Mary" (London, 1819–30; 2nd ed., 1823–30; 3rd ed., 1825–30; 4th ed., 1837–39; 5th ed., 1849–51; 6th ed., 1854–55; 7th ed., 1883); "Charters granted . . to the Burgesses of Preston" (Preston, 1821); "Supplementum ad Breviarium et Missale Romanum, adjectis officiis Sanctorum Angliæ" (London, 1823); "Vindication of certain Passages in the Fourth and Fifth Volumes of the History of England" (London, 1826, 4 editions; 1827); "Collection of Tracts" (London, 1826); "Remarks on the 'St. Cuthbert' of the Rev. James Raine" (Newcastle, 1828); "Manual of Prayers for Sundays and Holidays" (Lancaster, 1833); "New Version of the Four Gospels" (London, 1836, 1846, 1851); "The Widow Woolfrey versus the Vicar of Carisbrooke" (London, 1839); "Is the Bible the only Rule?" (Lancaster, 1839, 1887); "Catechetical Instructions" (London, 1840); "Did the Church of England Reform Herself?" (Dublin Review, VIII, 1840); "The Ancient Church of England and the Liturgy of the Anglican Church" (Dub. Rev., XI, 1841); "Journal on a Tour to Rome and Naples in 1817" (Ushaw Magazine, XVII, 1907).

GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.*, s. v.; TIERNEY, *Memoir* (London, 1855); *Reply to Wiseman* (London, 1858); WISEMAN, *Recollections of the Last Four Popes* (London, 1855); IDEM, *Reply to Tierney* (London, 1858); BONNEY, *The Making of Lingard's History* (Ushaw Mag., XIX, 1909); BRADY, *Annals of the English Hierarchy*, III (Rome, 1877); BUTLER, *Records and Recollections of Ushaw* (Preston, 1889); C. BUTLER, *Historical Memoirs*, IV (London, 1822); HUGHES, *John Lingard* (Lancaster, 1907); HUSENBETH, *Life of Milner* (Dublin, 1862); LAING, *Ushaw Centenary Memorial* (Newcastle, 1895); *Dublin Review*, XII, 295; *Orthodox Journal*, VII, 228, 266, 302, etc.; *Tablet*, XII, 466, 473, 484; *Ushaw Mag.*, XI, 196; XVI, 1–29; *Historical Collections, MSS. and Correspondence preserved at Ushaw College.*

EDWIN BONNEY.

Linoe, a titular see of Bithynia Secunda, known only from the "Notitiæ Episcopatuum" which mention it as late as the twelfth and thirteenth centuries as a suffragan of Nicæa. The Emperor Justinian must have raised it to the rank of a city. It is probably the modern town of Biledjik, a station on the Häidar-Pasha railway to Konia, with 10,000 inhabitants, 7000 of whom are Mussulmans, and 3000 Armenians, 600 of the latter being Catholics. It is an important centre for the cultivation of the silk-worm. Lequien (Oriens christianus, I, 657) mentions four bishops of Linoe: Anastasius, who attended the Council of Constantinople (692); Leo, at Nicæa (787), Basil and Cyril, the one a partisan of St. Ignatius, the other of Photius, at Constantinople (879).

RAMSAY, *Asia Minor* (London, 1890), 15, 183.

S. PÉTRIDÈS.

Linus, SAINT, POPE (about A. D. 64 or 67–76 or 79). All the ancient records of the Roman bishops which have been handed down to us by St. Irenæus, Julius Africanus, St. Hippolytus, Eusebius, also the Liberian catalogue of 354, place the name of Linus directly after that of the Prince of the Apostles, St. Peter. These records are traced back to a list of the Roman bishops which existed in the time of Pope Eleutherus (about 174–189), when Irenæus wrote his book "Adversus hæreses". As opposed to this testimony, we cannot accept as more reliable Tertullian's assertion, which unquestionably places St. Clement (De præscriptione, xxxii) after the Apostle Peter, as was also done later by other Latin scholars (Jerome, "De vir. ill.", xv). The Roman list in Irenæus has undoubtedly greater claims to historical authority. This author claims that Pope Linus is the Linus mentioned by St. Paul in his II Tim., iv, 21. The passage by Irenæus (Adv. hæreses, III, iii, 3) reads: "After the Holy Apostles (Peter and Paul) had founded and set the Church in order (in Rome) they gave over the exercise of the episcopal office to Linus. The same Linus is mentioned by St. Paul in his Epistle to Timothy. His successor was Anacletus". We cannot be positive whether this identification of the pope as being the Linus mentioned in II Tim., iv, 21, goes back to an ancient and reliable source, or originated later on account of the similarity of the name.

Linus's term of office, according to the papal lists

handed down to us, lasted only twelve years. The Liberian Catalogue shows that it lasted twelve years, four months, and twelve days. The dates given in this catalogue, A. D. 56 until A. D. 67, are incorrect. Perhaps it was on account of these dates that the writers of the fourth century gave their opinion that Linus had held the position of head of the Roman community during the life of the Apostle; e. g., Rufinus in the preface to his translation of the pseudo-Clementine "Recognitiones". But this hypothesis has no historical foundation. It cannot be doubted that according to the accounts of Irenæus concerning the Roman Church in the second century, Linus was chosen to be head of the community of Christians in Rome, after the death of the Apostle. For this reason his pontificate dates from the year of the death of the Apostles Peter and Paul, which, however, is not known for certain. The "Liber Pontificalis" asserts that Linus's home was in Tuscany, and that his father's name was Herculanus; but we cannot discover the origin of this assertion. According to the same work on the popes, Linus is supposed to have issued a decree "in conformity with the ordinance of St. Peter", that women should have their heads covered in church. Without doubt this decree is apocryphal, and copied by the author of the "Liber Pontificalis" from the first Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians (xi, 5) and arbitrarily attributed to the first successor of the Apostle in Rome. The statement made in the same source, that Linus suffered martyrdom, cannot be proved and is improbable. For between Nero and Domitian there is no mention of any persecution of the Roman Church; and Irenæus (1. c., III, iv, 3) from among the early Roman bishops designates only Telesphorus as a glorious martyr.

Finally this book asserts that Linus after his death, was buried in the Vatican beside St. Peter. We do not know whether the author had any decisive reason for this assertion. As St. Peter was certainly buried at the foot of the Vatican Hill, it is quite possible that the earliest bishops of the Roman Church also were interred there. There was nothing in the liturgical tradition of the fourth-century Roman Church to prove this, because it was only at the end of the second century that any special feast of martyrs was instituted, and consequently Linus does not appear in the fourth-century lists of the feasts of the Roman saints. According to Torrigio ("Le sacre grotte Vaticane", Viterbo, 1618, 53) when the present confession was constructed in St. Peter's (1615), sarcophagi were found, and among them was one which bore the word Linus. The explanation given by Severano of this discovery ("Memorie delle sette chiese di Roma", Rome, 1630, 120) is that probably these sarcophagi contained the remains of the first Roman bishops, and that the one bearing that inscription was Linus's burial place. This assertion was repeated later on by different writers. But from a MS. of Torrigio's we see that on the sarcophagus in question there were other letters beside the word Linus, so that they rather belonged to some other name (such as Aquilinus, Anullinus). The place of the discovery of the tomb is a proof that it could not be the tomb of Linus. (De Rossi, "Inscriptiones christianæ urbis Romæ", II, 236–7). The feast of St. Linus is now celebrated on 23 September. This is also the date given in the "Liber Pontificalis". An epistle on the martyrdom of the Apostles St. Peter and Paul was at a later period attributed to St. Linus, and supposedly was sent by him to the Eastern Churches. It is apocryphal and of later date than the history of the martyrdom of the two Apostles, by some attributed to Marcellus, which is also apocryphal ("Acta Apostolorum apocrypha", ed. Lipsius and Bonnet, I, ed. Leipzig, 1891, XIV sqq., 1 sqq.).

LIGHTFOOT, *The Apostolic Fathers*, I; *St. Clement of Rome*, I (London, 1890), 201 sqq.; HARNACK, *Geschichte der Altchristlichen Literatur*, II: *Die Chronologie* I (Leipzig, 1897), 70; *Acta SS.* September, VI, 539 sqq., *Liber Pontificalis*, ed. DUCHESNE, I, 121: cf. *Introduction*, lxix; DE SMEDT, *Dissertationes selectæ in primam ætatem hist. eccl.*, I, 300 sqq.

J. P. KIRSCH.

Linz, DIOCESE OF (LINCIENSIS), suffragan of the Archdiocese of Vienna.

I. HISTORY.—In the early Middle Ages the greater part of the territory of the present Diocese of Linz was subject to the bishops of Lauriacum (Lorch); at a later date it formed part of the great Diocese of Passau, which extended from the Isar to the Leitha. The Prince-Bishop of Passau personally administered the upper part or Upper Austria, while an auxiliary bishop, having his residence at Vienna and called the *Official*, administered for him the eastern part or Lower Austria. To do away with the political influence in his territories of the bishops of Passau, who were also princes of the Empire, Joseph II decided to found two new dioceses. These were Linz and St. Pölten, which in a certain measure were to renew the old Lauriacum, and the emperor only awaited the death of Cardinal Firmian, then Bishop of Passau, to carry out his plans. The cardinal's eyes were scarcely closed (d. 13 March, 1783), before the emperor on 16 March seized all the landed property of the Diocese of Passau in his territories. On the same day he appointed the former Official for Passau at Vienna, Count von Herberstein, first Bishop of Linz. It was the intention of the emperor that the new bishop should at once assume his office. Against these acts of the emperor the cathedral chapter of Passau sent, first, an appeal to the emperor himself, which naturally was rejected; then an appeal to the Imperial Diet at Ratisbon, from which body, however, help could scarcely be expected. Assistance offered by Prussia was refused by Cardinal Firmian's successor, Bishop Auersperg, an adherent of Josephinism. The Bishop of Passau and the majority of his cathedral chapter finally yielded in order to save the secular property of the diocese. By an agreement of 4 July, 1784, the confiscation of all the properties and rights belonging to the Diocese of Passau in Austria was annulled, and the tithes and revenues were restored to it. In return Passau gave up its diocesan rights and authority in Austria, including the provostship of Ardagger, and bound itself to pay 400,000 gulden ($900,000)—afterwards reduced by the emperor to one-half—toward the equipment of the new diocese. There was nothing left for Pope Pius VI to do but to give his consent, even though unwillingly, to the emperor's despotic act. The papal sanction of the agreement between Vienna and Passau was issued on 8 November, 1784, and on 28 January, 1785, appeared the Bull of Erection, "Romanus Pontifex".

The first bishop (1785–8), Ernest Johann Nepomuk, Imperial Count von Herberstein, formerly titular Bishop of Eucarpia, had been the Official of the Prince-Bishop of Passau and Vicar-General of Lower Austria. The appointment was confirmed by the pope on 14 February, 1785, and the bishop was enthroned on 1 May, 1785. By order of the emperor the cathedral chapter was to consist of a vicar-general, a provost, a dean, a *custos*, and thirteen simple ecclesiastics; the members were appointed by the emperor, before the approval of the pope was received. The Bull of Erection assigned the ancient parish church of Linz as the cathedral, but the former church of the Jesuits was, without notification to the Papal See of the substitution, at once chosen in its place; it was not until 1841 that the change was sanctioned by a Bull. In 1789 the endowment of the diocese was fixed at 12,000 gulden ($4,800), to which were added the revenues from the property of several suppressed monasteries. The territorial limits of the diocese corresponded to those of the crownland of Upper Austria with the addition of several parishes of Salzburg, to the separation of which the Archbishop of Salzburg gave his consent in

1786. At the time of its foundation, the diocese included 26 deaneries with 404 parishes.

The new diocese, like the whole of Austria at that time, suffered much from the numerous, often precipitate and reckless, ordinances of the government officials, who interfered in almost all domains of Church life and often subjected bishop, clergy, and laity to petty regulations. As early as 1785 the Viennese ecclesiastical order of services was made obligatory, "in accordance with which all musical litanies, novenas, octaves, the ancient touching devotions, also processions, vespers, and similar ceremonies, were done away with." Numerous churches and chapels were closed and put to secular uses; the greater part of the old religious foundations and monasteries were suppressed as early as 1784. In all these innovations the Bishop of Linz and his chapter aided and supported the government much too willingly. Not only in secular matters did the bishop ask for the assistance of the provincial government at Linz, he also sought to obtain the approbation of the civil authorities for the statutes of his chapter, as well as for the episcopal and consistorial seals. Nevertheless there could be no durable peace with the bureaucratic civil authorities, and Herberstein was repeatedly obliged to complain to the emperor of the tutelage in which the Church was kept, but the complaints bore little fruit.

The next bishop, Joseph Anton Gall (1788–1807), had been of great service to the Austrian school system as cathedral *scholasticus* and chief supervisor of the normal schools. He was an adherent of Josephinism, and permitted the chancellor of the consistory, George Rechberger, a layman and Josephinist, to exercise great influence over the ecclesiastical administration of his diocese. Ecclesiastical conditions became more satisfactory during his episcopate, but much of the credit for this is due to Emperors Leopold II and Francis II who repealed many over-hasty reforms of Joseph II. The general seminaries introduced in 1783 were set aside, and the training of the clergy was again made the care of the bishops. Bishop Gall, therefore, exerted himself for years to establish a theological institute for his diocese; it was opened in 1794. Another permanent service of the bishop was the founding of a seminary for priests; for this he bought in 1804 a house out of his own means, and made the institution heir to all his property. The third Bishop of Linz, Sigismund von Hohenwart (1809–25), had been a cathedral canon of Gurk and Vicar-General of Klagenfurt. He was appointed by the emperor on 10 January, 1809, but the appointment did not receive papal approbation until December, 1814, on account of the imprisonment of the pope. The bishop took energetic measures against the visionary followers of Pöschl and Boos, who were then numerous in Upper Austria. His successor was the Benedictine Gregor Thomas Ziegler (1827–52), formerly Bishop of Tarnov. Although the Church throughout Austria at this date was still dependent to a very great degree on the government in ecclesiastical matters, the bishop knew how to revive and strengthen the ecclesiastical spirit in his clergy and people. Of great importance was the introduction of the Jesuits and their settlement on the Freinberg near Linz, which was accomplished by means of the vigorous and generous aid of Archduke Maximilian of Este, and the foundation of numerous other religious establishments (Franciscans, Salesians, Sisters of Mercy etc.).

Franz-Josef Platz and the Old Cathedral

The Revolution of 1848 not only increased political liberty, but also gave to the Church greater independence in its own province, and the bishop at once made use of the regained freedom to revive popular missions, which had been discontinued since the reign of Maria Theresa. In 1850 at his instance a ten days' mission was held by the Redemptorists, at which the number of communicants was reckoned at 50,000. In the same year the diocesan theological institute was placed entirely under episcopal supervision, and an examination of candidates for the position of parish priests was established; in October for the first time examinations were held by prosynodal examiners. The session of the Third German Catholic Congress, held at Linz in 1850, also strengthened the Church in the diocese. A great development of religious life in the diocese resulted from

the restored liberties of the Church. Much of the credit for this growth is due to the vigorous and unwearied labours of the fifth bishop, the great Franz-Josef Rudigier (1853–84). His deep religious faith and his pre-eminently Catholic principles, as well as his unyielding will, made him for many years the intellectual leader of the Austrian Catholics in their struggle with Liberalism. Austrian Liberalism, antagonistic to the Church, controlled for decades the destinies of the country. The bishop was the zealous friend and promoter of every expression of religious life: Christian schools, religious associations, the building of churches, the Catholic press, the founding of houses of the religious orders and congregations, which greatly increased during his episcopate. Ever memorable is the manly stand he took on behalf of the Concordat of 1855. This Concordat was bitterly antagonized and much calumniated by the Liberals, and was annulled by the government in 1868 and 1870 without consultation with the Holy See.

Equally memorable is his struggle against what are called the "Interconfessional" laws of 25 May, 1868, which were hostile to the Church, and to the marriage and school laws. The bishop's opposition to these ordinances led to judicial proceedings against him and to a fine, which was, however, at once remitted by the emperor. His defence of the rights of the Church in regard to the Christian schools had for result that the Liberal parliamentary majority in 1869 confiscated the lands forming the endowment of the diocese, and withheld them until the downfall of Liberalism in 1883. The great bishop left a lasting memorial in the cathedral of the Immaculate Conception at Linz, for which he prepared the way by founding in 1855 an association for building the cathedral. His successor, Ernst Maria Müller, had only a short episcopate (1885–8). In the next bishop, Franz Maria Doppelbauer (1889–1908), the diocese received a truly apostolic head, whose influence extended far beyond his own sphere of work. He was a vigorous patron and promoter of every Catholic interest in Austria. As a true modern bishop he gave special encouragement to Catholic associations and the Catholic press, which, even during his earliest years on the mission, he had done much to encourage, establishing personally a newspaper. He founded at Urfahr a magnificent seminary for boys, the *Petrinum*, as a fine training-ground for the future clergy. The completion of the cathedral (consecrated May, 1905) was also due to his energetic efforts. The present bishop is Rudolf Hittmair, who has written the history of the suppression of the monasteries in Austria by Joseph II. He was born 24 July, 1859; appointed bishop 17 March, 1909; consecrated 1 May, 1909.

II. Statistics.—The Diocese of Linz includes the Duchy of Upper Austria and some townships in Lower Austria. The Duchy of Upper Austria has an area of nearly 4625 square miles; the population is 840,900. According to the census of 1900, it possessed 810,246 inhabitants, of whom 790,270 were Catholics, 18,373 Protestants, 1280 Jews. The Diocese of Linz is divided into 34 deaneries, and, at the beginning of 1910, included 419 parishes, 1 *Expositur*, 48 benefices, 718 secular priests, 479 regulars, 561 Catholic schools, and 813,541 souls (20,506 non-Catholics) of pure German descent. The bishop is appointed by the emperor. The cathedral chapter consists of a mitred provost, who is appointed by the pope, a dean, a *scholasticus*, five canons (one appointed by the bishop, the others by the emperor), and six honorary canons. The ecclesiastical schools and institutions for training and education in the diocese are: the seminary for priests in connexion with the diocesan theological school (7 professors, 84 students), the aforesaid episcopal seminary for boys (Collegium Petrinum), connected with the episcopal private gymnasium at Urfahr on the bank of the Danube and opposite Linz (18 professors and teachers, 8 prefects, 365 pupils), and 3 preparatory seminaries for boys.

The male orders in the diocese are: 2 monasteries of Canons Regular of St. Augustine at St. Florian and Reichersberg, with (in 1910) 114 fathers, 12 clerics, 6 lay brothers, and a theological school of the order at St. Florian; 1 monastery of Præmonstratensian Canons at Schlägl, 42 fathers, 3 clerics, 1 brother; 2 Benedictine abbeys at Kremsmünster and Lambach, 112 fathers, 10 clerics, 12 brothers; 2 Cistercian abbeys, Schlierbach and Wilhering, 60 fathers, 10 clerics, 1 lay brother; 7 Franciscan monasteries, 33 fathers, 31 brothers; 4 Capuchin monasteries, 33 fathers, 20 brothers; 1 monastery of the Discalced Carmelites, 10 fathers, 4 clerics, 8 brothers; 1 monastery of the Brothers of Mercy, 1 father, 19 brothers; 3 houses of the Jesuits, 45 fathers, 14 brothers; 2 houses of the

The Cathedral of the Immaculate Conception, Linz (The New Cathedral)

Redemptorists, 14 fathers, 16 brothers; 2 houses of the Congregation of Mary (Brothers of Mary), 5 fathers, 50 brothers; 1 mission-house of the Oblates of St. Francis de Sales, 5 fathers, 2 clerics, 3 brothers; 1 house of the Society of the Divine Saviour (Salvatorians), 5 fathers, 20 brothers; 1 institute of the Brothers of the Christian Schools, 4 brothers. Total, 479 priests, 41 clerics, 205 brothers. The female orders and congregations have numerous houses in the diocese; the members devote themselves mainly to the training and education of girls in boarding-schools, day schools, orphan asylums, etc., and also to nursing the sick: Ursulines, 58 sisters; Sisters of St. Elizabeth, 46 sisters; Discalced Carmelites, 39 sisters in 2 houses; Salesian Nuns, 38 sisters; Redemptorists, 41 sisters; Ladies of Charity of the Good Shepherd, 53; Sisters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, 297 in 17 houses; Sisters of Mercy of St. Charles Borromeo, 111 in 44 houses; Sisters of the Holy Cross, 637 in 79 houses; School Sisters of the Third Order of St. Francis, 377 in 39 institutes; School Sisters of Notre Dame, 24 in 2 houses; Sisters of the Third Order of Mount Carmel, 153 in 26 institutes; Oblates of St. Francis de Sales, 25 sisters; Sisters of the Congregation of Christian Charity, 18 sisters. Total, 186 houses with 1917 sisters.

Religious life is in general in a flourishing condition; there are numerous religious associations and brotherhoods. The Piusverein, with its headquarters at Linz, has for its special object the encouragement of the Catholic press. The most important church in the

diocese is the new Gothic cathedral of the Immaculate Conception, built from the plans of the Cologne architect, Vincenz Statz. It was begun in 1862 and consecrated in 1905; the tower, 443 feet high, was finished in 1902. The old cathedral, originally the church of the Jesuits, was built in the Barocco style between 1669 and 1682. There are several old collegiate churches (St. Florian, Kremsmünster, Mondsee, Lambach, Garsten, Reichersberg, Wilhering etc.), originally built in the Romanesque period and nearly all rebuilt in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in the Barocco style. The most important churches in the Barocco style of architecture are the collegiate churches of St. Florian (1636–1745), and of Baumgartenberg (rebuilt 1684–1718). The most important buildings of the Gothic period are the parish church at Steyr (begun in 1443), with a tower 263 feet high, and the church of the hospital at Braunau on the Inn (1439–92), with a tower 300 feet high. A work of sculpture celebrated in the history of art is the high altar at St. Wolfgang carved by Michael Pacher in 1481.

PILLWEIN, *Gesch., Geogr. u. Statistik des Erzherzogtums Oesterreich ob der Enns* (5 vols., Linz, 1827–39); *Urkundenbuch des Landes ob der Enns* (9 vols., Linz, 1852–1906); HITTMAIR, *Gesch. des Bistums Linz* (Linz, 1885); *Die Oesterreich-Ungarische Monarchie in Wort und Bild*, VI: *Oberösterreich und Salzburg* (Vienna, 1889); KOLB, *Marianisches Oberösterreich* (Linz, 1889); HITTMAIR, *Der josephinische Klostersturm im Lande ob der Enns* (Freiburg, 1907); PACHINGER, *Das Linzer Bistum* (Linz, 1907); RETTENBACHER, *Das bischöfliche Priesterseminar der Diöcese Linz* (Linz, 1907); *Archiv für Gesch. des Bistums Linz* (Linz, 1904—), supplement to the diocesan newspaper; *Schematismus der Geistlichkeit der Diöcese Linz für 1910* (Linz, 1910).

JOSEPH LINS.

Lipari. See MESSINA, DIOCESE OF.

Lippe, one of the Confederate States of the German Empire. The occasional use of the designation "Lippe Detmold" so called after the chief town, to distinguish it from Schaumberg Lippe, is legally inaccurate. It comprises 469 sq. miles and consists of a larger division lying between the Prussian Provinces of Westphalia and Hanover, including the ancient Countships of Lippe, Schwatonberg, and Sternberg and, in addition, of the three exclaves of Grevenhagen, Lipperode, and Cappel, lying in Prussian territory. The principality originated as an immediate suzerainty of the twelfth century, belonging to the lords of Lippe who, in 1529, were counts of the empire. In 1807, by taking part in the Rhenish Confederation the country achieved independence and at the same time became a principality. Since 1815 it had belonged to the German Confederation. In the German War of 1866 Lippe sided with Prussia and became a part of the North German Confederation, and in 1871 of the German Empire. A contest for the throne which had lasted for years was finally settled in 1905, since when Leopold IV (b. 1871) has been reigning prince. In the census of 1 December, 1905, the returns showed 145,577 inhabitants, of whom 5,481 were Catholics; 139,127 Protestants; 229 other Christians; 735 Jews, and five members of other religions. The Catholics increased from 2.4% to 3.8% of the population between 1871 and 1905.

From the time of the Reformation the greater part of the country has belonged to the Diocese of Paderborn, smaller portions to Minden and Cologne. The Reformation obtained its first foothold in Lemgo, at that time the most important town in the principality. The ruler, Simon V, in vain endeavoured to suppress the new doctrines. His son and successor, Bernard VIII (1536–63), a minor, was educated a Lutheran. He forced a Lutheran ritual upon the country in 1538. Simon VI (1563–1613) confirmed the reformed doctrines (Calvinism) in 1605, which ever since then have prevailed in the country. Only the city of Lemgo remained Lutheran, in spite of a struggle carried on for ten years with great bitterness between the princes and the city. During the last decade of the nineteenth century, however, the number of Calvinists, even in Lemgo, has exceeded that of the Lutherans. After the Peace of Augsburg in 1555 by which religious matters were settled, the establishment of the Reformation in Lippe was substantially accomplished. In spite of the axiom "cujus regio, ejus religio", and of much persecution and many struggles, there remained a small number of Catholics in Lippe all through the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, notably a convent at Falkenhagen established in 1228 and belonging first to the Cistercians, then to the Williamites, and since 1432 to the Knights of the Cross. It was confiscated in 1596, though its possessions fell to the Paderborn Jesuits and only after the Papal suppression of the order, to the reigning house. With the assistance of the Jesuits, particularly Father Tönnemann, the confessor of Charles IV, the reigning count in 1720 obtained the rank of prince, but he did not assume this title because the exchequer could not defray the dues, notwithstanding the fact that, through Father Tönnemann's exertions, they were reduced from 20,000 to 5773 gulden. The letters patent granting the princely title were not redeemed until 1789.

A Catholic community grew up in Lemgo in the eighteenth century. Here in 1774 the Catholics were given the right to practise their religion privately, and in 1786 openly, though under many restrictions. After 1672, when the Catholics of the neighbouring Countship of Ravensburg, which had belonged since 1609 to Brandenburg-Prussia, received their right to public worship, the Franciscans from Bielefeld took charge of the Catholics in Lippe, though able to perform religious duties only in secret. Nominally the Catholics (as well as Lutherans) were allowed free practice of their religion and given full political and civil rights, through their country's participation in the Rhenish (1807) and the German (1815) Confederations. As a matter of fact, the situation remained unchanged. The control of livings exercised by the Calvinists continued in force. In 1821 the Papal Bull "De salute animarum", made over to the See of Paderborn the Lippian parishes of Cappel, Lipperode, and Lippstadt, which had previously belonged to Cologne without producing any ensuing agreement with the State. As a result of this Bull, the Bishop of Paderborn continued as he had formerly done, in spite of numerous protests from the Government, to interest himself in all the Catholics of the country, whose number had greatly increased through immigration.

In the sovereign edict of 9 March, 1854, owing in no small degree to the fairmindedness of the first cabinet minister, Laurenz Hannibal Fischer, the Catholic Church was placed on an equality with the state Calvinist religion. The Lutherans obtained the same status on 15 March, 1854. The diocesan rights of the bishops of Paderborn were recognized. The bishop presented the livings, though the sovereign could reject an unacceptable candidate. The parish priest was obliged to take the oath of allegiance to the prince and his dynasty. In mixed marriages the religion in which the children were to be educated was settled by agreement between the parents. Should nothing be discussed or decided in the marriage settlements, the children without regard to sex must be brought up in the father's faith. In order to elucidate this measure beyond doubt, the State passed the ordinance of 7 October, 1857, which decreed that ante-nuptial agreements or promises were, from a legal standpoint, null and void. The mixed marriages have resulted in a larger number of Protestant than of Catholic children. In other respects the legislation concerning marriage corresponds throughout to that in the civil code of the German Empire. With regard to sepulture, the Catholics are free to use the general cemeteries or to open special ones for themselves. If Catholics have obtained right of sepulture in a non-Catholic cemetery, the use of the liturgy of their Church is permitted

but if they have not this right notice must be given to the evangelical ministers, and permission obtained. To the five parishes of Detmold, with the subordinate parishes of Horn, Cappel (founded in 784 by Charlemagne), Falkenhagen, Lemgo, and Schwalenberg, were added in 1888, the three parishes of Lage, Lipperode, and Salzuflen. The entire eight were united in 1892 to the deanery of Detmold, presided over by ten priests.

Over and above its obligations to the parish of Falkenhagen, which are based on civil claims, the State pays 300 marks additional salary from the treasury of the confiscated monasteries and institutions to the Catholic rector at Lemgo only. Catholic church property is regulated by the civil code of the German Empire, and the Lippian common law. The only religious community is that of St. Elizabeth's Institute in Detmold, a combined sewing school and protectory conducted by the Sisters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul (from Paderborn). Concerning orders and congregations there is no provision made by the State.

THE VISION OF ST. BERNARD (DETAIL)

THE ADORATION OF THE MAGI
FILIPPINO LIPPI

PORTRAIT BY HIMSELF

However, article 13 of the edict of 1854 provides that all cases of doubt concerning the application of the said edict or any conflicts over the bounds of episcopal authority, shall be determined by the definitions of the Prussian Constitution of 31 January, 1850. The Catholic schools are private, but the State furnishes half of the salaries and pensions of the teachers. The people of the eight Catholic school districts are exempt from payment of school assessments (Law of 30 December, 1904). Two free Catholic schools (Falkenhagen and Grevenhagen) enjoy the privileges of public primary schools. That of Cappel is a public school, attended by members of different Churches, yet Catholic in character as long as the majority of the inhabitants of the school district are Catholics.

FALKMANN, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Fürstentums Lippe* (Lemgo and Detmold, 1847–1902); SCHWANOLD, *Das Fürstentum Lippe, das Land und seine Bewohner* (Detmold, 1899); WOKER, *Geschichte der norddeutschen Franziskaner-Mission* (Freiburg, 1880), 614 sqq., 627 sqq.; GEMMEKE, *Geschichte der katholischen Pfarreien in Lippe* (Paderborn, 1895); FREISEN, *Staat und katholische Kirche in den deutschen Bundesstaaten*, I (Stuttgart 1906), 1–282.

HERMANN SACHER.

Lippi, FILIPPINO, Italian painter, son of Filippo Lippi (see next article), b. at Prato, in 1458; d. at Florence, 18 April, 1515. His father, leaving him an orphan at the age of ten, confided him to the care of Fra Diamante, his best pupil and his friend, who placed the boy in Botticelli's studio. The earliest works of Filippino now extant are the panels of a *cassone,* or marriage chest, at Casa Torrigiani, representing the history of Esther. He was only twenty years old when he painted the picture of the "Vision of St. Bernard", preserved at the Badia of Florence, which is perhaps the most charming of all Florentine altarpieces (1480). It is an exquisite song of youth and love. The chaste beauty of the Virgin, her hands of lilylike purity, the tenderly impassioned countenance of the saint, the very realistic and manly portrait of the donor (Francesco del Pugliese), the vast and strange landscape where the apparition takes place—all form an absolutely novel harmony in Florentine painting, and one which Leonardo da Vinci in his "Virgin of the Rocks" did little more than embellish, without allowing the beholder to lose sight of the model.

Having become famous through this picture, the young master was commissioned to complete in the Carmelite church the famous frescoes of the Brancacci chapel, before which the genius of his father had awakened, and which had been interrupted for more than fifty years. On the two pilasters of the entrance he painted the "Visit of St. Paul to St. Peter in Prison" and the "Deliverance of St. Peter"; on the left wall the "Resurrection of the Emperor's Son" (one group of which composition had already been sketched by Masaccio); finally, on the right wall, "Sts. Peter and Paul before the Proconsul" and the "Crucifixion of St. Peter". With marvellous suppleness the young artist adapted himself to the style of this grandiose cycle, and composed in the same tone a continuation not unworthy of the beginning, and in harmony with the grave and classic genius of Masaccio. But he sought this harmony only in the general outlines, and (like his father, in the "Death of St. Stephen") he introduced into scenes from the Acts of the Apostles a gallery of contemporary costumes and portraits. Among these portraits Vasari mentions Soderini, P. Guicciardini (father of the historian), Francesco del Pugliese, the poet Luigi Pulci, Sandro Botticelli, Antonio Pollaijuolo, and, lastly, the author himself.

The young master was of a nervous, mobile, impressionable temperament, susceptible to every influence, as well as marvellously gifted and an artist to his finger tips; his face showed lively intelligence; his genius was hospitable to all types of beauty, however diverse, welcoming all with a strange, youthful ardour. Still, his later work never equalled the happy grace of his earliest efforts. His picture painted in 1485 for the altar of the Signory, the "Virgin between Sts.

John the Baptist, Victor, Bernard, and Zanobi" (Uffizi), shows an exaltation of tone and a metallic dryness beyond the most glaring and the sharpest of Botticelli's works. Shortly afterwards Filippino went to Rome to paint, at the Minerva, the frescoes of the "Life of St. Thomas Aquinas" (1487–93). This work is very powerful, and enough has not been said of Raphael's indebtedness to it for his first ideas for the "School of Athens" and the "Disputa". These frescoes mark an important period in the artist's development. At Rome the antique inspired him, not as an historian, a humanist, or a scholar, but as a painter and a poet who discovered in it new elements of delight. The antique appeared to him as an inexhaustible source of the picturesque: the rich ornamentation with its foliage, garlands, masks, trophies, was like a new toy in his hands. He even enriched it still more with whatever he could find of Oriental luxury—Moorish, Chinese. "It is marvellous", writes Vasari, "to see the strange fancies which he has expressed in his painting. He was always introducing vases, footgear, temple-ornaments, head-dresses, strange trappings, armour, trophies, scimitars, swords, togas, cloaks, and an array of things so various and so beautiful that we owe him to-day a great and eternal obligation for all the beauty and ornamentation that he thus added to our art."

To these antique influences were soon added those of German engraving, so widespread at that time. The trace of them is visible in the "Adoration of the Magi" (Uffizi), painted in 1495 for the Convent of Scopeto. This is an astonishing picture, full of confusion and oddities, eccentric, disjointed in composition, and crowded with admirable trifles and accessories. Of all Filippino's works it is perhaps the most hybrid and composite. At Prato, however, he sometimes recovered momentarily a pure inspiration as in the "Virgin with Four Saints", a fresco in a niche at the market corner (1498); it is one of his simplest and most delightful figures. His last important work was the decoration of the Strozzi chapel at Sta. Maria Novella, completed in 1502, which shows on the ceiling figures of patriarchs, and on both walls episodes from the lives of St. John and St. Philip. Nowhere else is the strange, theatrical character of his imagination so strongly shown as in this composition, in which there is, nevertheless, much of grace, movement, and lyricism. In the scene "St. Philip forcing an exorcized demon to enter the idol of Mars", the Apostle uses so commanding a gesture that Raphael has reproduced it in his "Preaching of St. Paul". Here the brilliant and fantastic architecture suggests some dream city or magic temple. Its glitter and profusion of ornament, its waving lines and undulating surfaces, foreshadow the style of Bernini and Borromini; and yet some of the patriarchs, such as the Adam and Jacob, possess an ascetic and meditative grandeur which foreshadow the Prophets of the Sistine Chapel, while some of the female figures are the closest approach to the "St. Anne and the Virgin" of Leonardo.

Filippino had no pupils of distinction. It cannot even be said that he founded a tradition; he himself was too much dominated by the influence of others. But of the generation immediately preceding the great works of Michelangelo and Leonardo, of that restless and subtle, complex and nervous generation of Botticelli and Cosimo Roselli, he is perhaps the most varied, the most gifted, and the most lovable.

VASARI, ed. MILANESI, *Vite*, II, III (Florence, 1878); CROWE AND CAVALCASELLE, *Hist. of Painting in Italy* (London, 1864–66); RUMOR, *Italienische Forschungen*, II (Leipzig, —); MÜNTZ, *Hist. de l'art italien pendant la Renaissance* (Paris, —); GOONCHENS, *L'Age d'Or* (Paris, 1891); PEPINO, *Archivio storico dell' arte* (Florence, 1889); LAFENESTRE, *La Peinture italienne* (Paris).

LOUIS GILLET.

Lippi, FILIPPO, Italian painter, b. at Florence about 1406; d. at Spoleto, 9 October, 1469. Left an orphan at the age of two he was cared for by an aunt who being too poor to rear him placed him at the age of eight in the neighbouring Carmelite convent, where he was educated. At the age of fifteen he received the habit, and at sixteen pronounced his vows (1421). At this time Masolino and Masaccio undertook in the Carmelite church those frescoes of the Brancacci chapel (1423–28), which brought about a revolution in the Florentine school. This event decided Lippi's vocation. Perhaps he even worked in the Brancacci chapel under the direction of the two masters but nothing remains of the cameo frescoes which he executed in the cloister.

A life of adventure was about to begin for the young

THE ANNUNCIATION
Fra Filippo Lippi, Santa Maria sopra Minerva, Rome.
The kneeling figure is Cardinal Oliviero Caraffa

Carmelite. Vasari's account of a journey to Ancona, during which, in the course of a sea-trip, he was seized by Barbary pirates and held captive for two years, is assuredly nothing but a romance. It is not likely that he was at Padua in 1434; on the contrary everything proves that at that date he was not absent from Florence, where he had already acquired a great reputation. Cosmo de' Medici commanded him to paint for his private oratory the charming "Madonna" of the Uffizi, and for his wife's the "Nativity" of the Académie des Beaux-Arts. In 1438 he painted the retable of San Spirito, now at the Louvre, and the "Coronation of the Blessed Virgin", ordered by Charles Marsuppini, and preserved at Rome in the Lateran Museum. In 1441 he painted a variation of the same subject at the Academy of Florence for the religious of S. Ambrogio, receiving 1200 *livres* for it. Lastly, in 1447 he painted for the Chapel of the Signiory the wonderful "Vision of St. Bernard" now in the National Gallery. In the midst of all these labours the painter could not have taken long journeys. The great artist lived in the continual embarrassments caused by his deplorable morals. Never was anyone less fitted for religious life. His portraits show us a flat-nosed individual with a jesting, but vicious looking, thick-lipped, sensual face. To compel him to work Cosmo de' Medici was forced to lock him up, and even then the painter escaped by a rope made of his sheets. His escapades threw him into financial difficulties from which he did not hesitate to extricate himself by forgery. Callistus III was obliged to deprive this

unworthy monk, "who perpetrated many nefarious crimes", of a benefice. In 1452 the Carmelite was requested by the commons of Prato to paint the choir of the cathedral.

At length, despite his evil reputation, Lippi succeeded in having himself appointed chaplain of a convent of Augustinians. Here his misbehaviour was no less flagrant than elsewhere. It is significant and shows plainly what were the ideas of the Renaissance that Lippi was not punished for his bad conduct. Glory or genius then constituted a soil of privilege and a warrant of impunity. Talent placed its possessor beyond and above the moral law. Not only did Cosmo de' Medici make merry over what he called the "folly of the frater" (Letter of J. de Medici, 27 May, 1458), but Pope Pius II thought he could do no better than to release him from his vows and permit him to marry. A son, Filippino Lippi, had already been born to him. He afterwards had a daughter (1465). In the midst of these intrigues and disorders Filippo continued to paint his greatest works. From this period, indeed, (1452–64) date, beside several pictures of the Prato Museum, his works at the cathedral, which are perhaps the chief work of the second generation of the Renaissance, before the decorations of the Sistine chapel and the frescoes of Ghirlandajo at Sta Maria Novella. The theme of these paintings is borrowed from the lives of St. John Baptist and St. Stephen. The two most celebrated scenes represent the "Feast of Herod with the dance of Salome", and the "Death of St. Stephen". Both have remained classics. In his "Salome" the painter has in fact created the leading type which owes nothing to the chastely observed formulæ of the preceding age, and which in its voluptuous grace, the delicate and rare arabesques of its draperies, and the affected arrangement of the coils of the head-dress, became the favourite type of Botticelli's "Judith" and "Daughters of Jethro". His "Death of St. Stephen" on the other hand shows us a magnificent architectural study, which reproduces the outlines of the nave of S. Lorenzo, one of the earliest examples of great monumental composition and majestic symmetry in a portrait scene, such as those which were later to form the glory of Ghirlandajo.

Monument of Fra Filippo Lippi
Cathedral, Spoleto

This was the period at which Filippo's talent grew and broadened and seemed to reach its even perfection. His last works, the "Death and the Coronation of the Blessed Virgin", at the cathedral of Spoleto are also his noblest and most strongly conceived. He did not have time to complete them. His pupils, especially his friend Fra Diamante, finished the remainder of the work (an Annunciation and a Nativity) after his death. He was buried in the cathedral of Spoleto, the inhabitants of the city having refused to allow Florence to remove the ashes of so great a man. Lorenzo de' Medici erected his tomb at his own expense, and Angelo Poliziano composed his epitaph.

In the evolution of the Renaissance Fra Filippo played a part of the utmost importance. This man of fiery passions is one of the great workmen of art. He is the incarnation of the invincible naturalness of this period. His power springs exactly from this attitude of instinct and spontaneity, and is not at all the result of a system or a theory. It is a great plebeian force, tumultuous and unconscious, let loose through art and life. Nothing equals the ingenuity and the sort of innocence of his love of nature. This monk without rule or cloister possesses literally the senses of a *primitif*. He adores everything, the commonest herb and the least flower. Certain of his pictures, such as the "Nativity", in the Louvre, contain an amount of documents and a collection of studies, birds, lizards, sheep, plants, stones, still-life, which equal the contents of ten albums of a Japanese artist. He was an indefatigable student of the universe. He embraced life in all its forms with the candour of a child, as well as the eyes of a naturalist and a miniaturist. Hence the extreme poetry of his early pictures. The "Nativity", in Berlin, is a *sylva rerum* unequalled in art. No one has ever done more to bring art closer to life and to make it the complete mirror of reality, which accounts for the good humour and novel familiarity of his touch. One cannot be astonished at the enthusiasm aroused by his fervent works. His art is like a window looking out upon a flower garden and exhibiting all its beauties.

Filippo afterwards lost something of this charming freshness. A more scholarly generation, the school of Castagno and Uccello, began to appear. He borrowed from it his passion for rigorous form and for extreme linear definition. By dint of pursuing the true he arrived at crudity, sometimes at grimace and caricature. There is nothing more vulgar than certain of Filippo's angels, the models of which were taken from among the rabble of Florence. His colour began to decompose and took on a hard and metallic reflection. But this was only a crisis. At Prato and Spoleto, though under the influence of pedantic theories he recovered himself, but ripened and transformed. He regained even in the labour and exigencies of fresco, the decorative sense and the great laws of composition imparted by his first masters, Masaccio and Masolino. His naturalism tempered by artistic feeling inspired him with the most beautiful masterpieces; and as his early and descriptive paintings were to be the inspiration of Benozzo Gozzoli, so the author of the frescoes of Prato and Spoleto was to inspire Ghirlandajo and Botticelli. It will be readily understood that his contemporaries did not rigorously condemn the errors of the poor Carmelite, since he was always so great a painter and was in the end so perfect an artist.

Vasari, ed. Milanesi, II (Florence, 1878); Crowe and Cavalcaselle, *Storia della Pittura in Italia* (Florence, 1892), V, VI; Muntz, *Histoire de l'art pendant la renaissance, les primitifs* (Paris, 1889); Baldanzi, *Relazione delle pitture di Fra Filippo Lippi nel coro della cattedrale di Prato* (Prato, 1835); Milanesi in *L'Art* (30 Dec., 1877; 6 and 7 Jan., 1878); Mendelsohn, *Fra Filippo Lippi* (Berlin, 1909).

Louis Gillet.

Lippomano, Luigi or Aloisius Lipomanus, cardinal, hagiographer, b. in 1500; d. 15 August, 1559. Of a noble Venetian family, he devoted himself from his youth to the study of the classical languages and later to the pursuit of the sacred sciences. Distinguished for his piety and integrity of character, he was among

the first in Rome to join the "Oratorio della Carità" founded by St. Cajetan of Tiene, and composed of distinguished men, who in the Roman Curia were the leaven of Church reform, and afterwards took a prominent part in the Council of Trent. He was consecrated titular Bishop of Methone (1538), and appointed coadjutor to his uncle Pietro Lippomano, Bishop of Bergamo, who was also active in Catholic reform. When Pietro was transferred to Verona (1544), Luigi accompanied him and succeeded him in that see in 1548, whence he was transferred to Bergamo in 1558. In 1542 Paul III sent him as nuncio to Portugal to announce the convocation of the Council of Trent, where he arrived in 1547 and was commissioned to present to the pope the reasons for transferring the council to Bologna. In 1548 he was sent with Bertano and Pighi to Germany. From 1551 he was one of the presidents of the council until its suspension (25 April, 1552); during that period the dogmatic decrees on the Eucharist, penance, and extreme unction were published, as well as several decrees on reform. In 1556 Paul IV sent him as nuncio to Poland, where, on account of his lively opposition to the pretensions of the Protestant nobility, his life was frequently threatened. After his return to Rome he remained in the Curia until his death. Amid his numerous official duties, he did not neglect his studies, which, however, he directed towards spiritual edification. Thus he wrote "Catenæ in Genesin" (Paris, 1546), "In Exodum" (Paris, 1550)—both works republished at Rome in 1557; "Confirmazione e stabilimento di tutti li dogmi cattolici . . . contro i novatori" (Venice, 1553). His chief work was "Sanctorum priscorum patrum vitæ" (8 vols., Venice, 1551–60; 2 vols., Louvain, 1564), for which he engaged the services of many learned men, and himself, on his travels, searched libraries and archives. This collection gave a great impulse to scientific hagiography, and opened the way for Surius and the Bollandists.

JUSTUS LIPSIUS
Painting by Antoon van Dyck—Engraving by Scheltius a Bolswert

FOSCARINI, *Della letteratura veneta* (Venice, 1854); UGHELLI, *Italia sacra*, IV (2nd ed.), 497–9; STREBER in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.; *Diaria Conc. Trid.*, I–II (Freiburg, 1901–4), passim.

U. BENIGNI.

Lipsanotheca, a term sometimes used synonymously with *reliquary* (q. v.), but signifying, more correctly, the little box containing the relics, which is placed inside the reliquary.

Lipsius, JUSTUS (JOSSE LIPS), philologian and humanist of the Netherlands, b. at Overyssche, 18 Oct., 1547; d. at Louvain, 23 March, 1606. Descended from an illustrious family, he studied first at Ath, and afterwards at the Jesuit College, Cologne. He wished to enter the Society of Jesus on 29 Sept., 1562, and become a novice. But this displeased his father, who recalled him and sent him to study law and literature at Louvain. In this university Pierre Nannius (Nanninck) had established in the Collegium Trilingue a fine seminary of philology, which was at the time directed by Valerius (Corneille Wouters). There Lipsius found companions such as Louis Carrion, Jean Dousa, Martin Delrio, André Schott. He ardently took up the emendation and critical examination of Latin texts, especially of Cicero, Propertius, and Varro, and, as early as 1566, had collected three books of "Variæ Lectiones", which were published in 1569 at Antwerp, dedicated to Cardinal Granvelle. The latter, who was in Rome, made him his Latin secretary (1569–70). Lipsius returned to Louvain, but left it again in 1571, alarmed by the government of the Duke of Alba. He made a more or less prolonged stay at Liège, Dôle, Vienna, and Jena. In the last city he became a Lutheran, and, all through the constant changes of confessions of faith and religious tendencies, he was careful to be constantly with the masters of the moment. On a visit to Cologne he met a widow, a native of Louvain, and married her although she was older than he (1573). She refused to accompany him to Jena and he resigned his professorship there in February, 1574. Settled at Cologne he supervised the publication of his "Tacitus" (Antwerp, 1574). He was the first scholar to differentiate the "Annals" from the "History", and although he did not have access to the principal manuscripts—the two Medicean MSS.—he introduced in his text over 450 emendations, which have been accepted by all subsequent editors. It was only much later, for his fourth edition (1605), that he became acquainted with these manuscripts through the Pichena edition (1600). He also deserves commendation for his use of inscriptions in the explanation of texts. At the same time appeared "Antiquæ lectiones" (Antwerp, 1575), miscellaneous criticisms devoted mainly to Plautus, to the fragmentary works of archaic authors, or to Propertius.

Lipsius was lecturing at Louvain during the following years (1576–77), but the victory of Don John of Austria forced him to go over to Leyden where he taught in the newly founded university (1578–91). During this period he published collections of his letters, new conjectures, antiquarian dissertations, and two new editions of Tacitus with an historical commentary. Apart from the philological works, he composed treatises on politics and ethics; of these the treatise on constancy (De Constantia, Antwerp, 1584) is the best known, and has had thirty-two editions, without including the translations. However, Leyden was not favourable to his health, and he and his wife regretted their native town. He had already made an attempt to get away in 1586. The States and the city did their utmost to detain him. In 1590 Dirk Coornhert publicly called upon him to take sides in the religious controversies. Lipsius answered evasively and tried to dissemble. Finally, he left the city and became reconciled with Catholicism in the Jesuit Chapel at Mainz (April, 1591). He went to Spain in search of health, and during a sojourn at Liège he prepared new works, drew from a psalter of the ninth century Frankish glosses of great interest, and was finally forgiven for his stay in an heretical country rebellious to the King of Spain. From that time began a new period in Lipsius's life. Coldly received at first by some of his compatriots, but encouraged by a few warm admirers, he was appointed professor of history and

Latin at the Collegium Trilingue of Louvain (1592), then historiographer to the King of Spain (1595), and later honorary member of the State Council (1605). To give a proof of his piety, he wrote the "De Cruce" (1593), in which confusion between *patibulum* and *crux* often make the conclusions debatable.

Lipsius contemplated writing a general treatise on Roman antiquities (Fax historica), and, as a result of his studies, produced treatises on the army ("De militia romana", Antwerp, 1595), and on the defence and attack of fortified towns ("Poliorceticon", Antwerp, 1596), a kind of statistical work on the Roman Empire ("Admiranda," 1598), short dissertations upon libraries, upon Vesta, and the Vestals (1602). However, every now and then, his religious wanderings were recalled to the public mind. He succeeded in producing the impression that one of his former discourses of Jena, "De duplici concordia", published at Zurich in 1599, was not his. He himself called forth the sneers and the refutations of the Protestants by describing the veneration and the miracles of Our Lady of Hal (1604), and of Our Lady of Montaigu (1605). His co-religionists greatly respected and trusted him. In 1599 Archduke Albert and his wife Isabella, having come on a visit to Louvain, expressed the wish to have him prepare a Latin oration, which he did within two hours. He chose as a subject the greatness of a prince, from a passage of Seneca (De Clementia, I, iii). Many imaginary accounts have been given of this speech. Lipsius did not broach the subject of clemency, and still less did he interrupt one of his lectures to bring it up before the princes. The discourse was published in 1600, with Pliny's panegyric of Trajan and a commentary on this work. But Lipsius's most important works of this period were on Seneca and Stoicism. He wished to explain in detail the Stoic philosophy, for which he professed the greatest admiration, objecting only to its toleration of suicide. He had time only for a general outline of the system and of its place in ancient philosophy ("Manuductionis ad stoicam philosophiam libri III", 1604), and an analysis of the theology, the physics, and the cosmology of the Stoics ("Physiologiæ stoicorum libri III", 1604); he had not time to write the ethics. Nevertheless these two works are even to-day the most complete treatise ever written on Stoicism as a whole. The "Seneca" was published in 1605, with a dedication to Pope Paul V. Unfortunately, Lipsius was misled by a poor manuscript which he believed excellent, and the commentary concerns the Epistles to Lucilius only. His last work was a description and history of Louvain (1605).

Before his death he gave solemn expression to his faith. His manuscripts have been in the Leyden library since 1722. There have been four editions of his complete works (Lyons, 1613; Antwerp, 1614; Antwerp, 1637, a very fine one; Wesel, 1675). In religion, for a long time, Lipsius held aloof from both parties. His "Politica" (1589) were considered too severe in Holland and too tolerant at Rome. He escaped being placed on the Index only by accepting torture as a legitimate last resort to bring back heretics (1593). He believed, however, in sorcerers, in charms and spells, and in the commerce of witches with devils, from which children were born (Phys. stoic., p. 61). His philological work is brilliant, but at times superficial. He knew little Greek, but was well acquainted with Roman antiquity. His "Tacitus" is a masterpiece of discernment and erudition. His Latin style is peculiar. He chose to imitate the style of Tacitus and Apuleius, which caused him to be criticised by Henry Estienne (1595). Notwithstanding some imperfections, he is, with Joseph Scaliger, Casaubon, and Saumaise, one of the most eminent representatives of classical philology between 1550 and 1650.

ROERSCH in *Bibliogr. nationale publiée par l'Académie de Belgique*, XII (Brussels, 1892), 239; VAN DER HAEGEN, *Bibliogr. lipsienne* in *Bibl. belgica* (Ghent, 1886–8); autobiography of Lipsius in *Epistolarum centuria miscella*, III, 87; HALM in *Allg. deutsche Biogr.*, XVIII, 741; NISARD, *Le triumvirat littéraire du XVI^e siècle, J. Lipse, J. Scaliger, et Casaubon* (Paris, 1852); URLICHS, *Gesch. der klass. Altertumswissenschaft* in MULLER, *Handbuch*, I (2nd ed., Munich, 1891), 62; SANDYS, *A history of classical scholarship*, II (Cambridge, 1908), 301.

PAUL LEJAY.

Lisbon, PATRIARCHATE OF (LISBONENSIS), includes the districts of Lisbon and Santarem. The area of the district of Lisbon is 3065 sq. miles; pop. 709,509 (1900). Area of Santarem 2,555 sq. miles; pop. 283,-154.

Lisbon is said to owe its origin to Ulysses, and hence its oldest name Ulissypo or Olissipo, which became on Phœnician lips Alisubbo, meaning the "friendly bay". Its charm was acknowledged by the Romans in the name they gave it, *Felicitas Julia;* and when the Moors came they changed it back to Al Aschbuna, a variant of the Phœnician title. From Alisubbo and Al Aschbuna we have the later name Lissabona, whence the modern Portuguese Lisboa and the English Lisbon. It lies on the north bank of the Tagus, 12 miles from the open sea, clustered around seven hills that rise above one another, ending in the Serra of Cintra.

The town was taken by the Moors in 716 and remained in their possession until 1145, when Affonso Henriques with the assistance of an army of Crusaders, English, Normans and Flemings bound for the Holy Land, drove out the invaders, and removed the capital of the country from Coimbra to Lisbon. An English monk named Gilbert who was with the expedition was chosen Bishop of Lisbon at this time. On two occasions the city suffered from disastrous earthquakes; in 1531 more than 1500 houses were destroyed, besides many churches and palaces. On 1 November, 1755, a second disastrous earthquake shook the city and more than 30,000 of the inhabitants perished. To add to the misery, a fire broke out which lasted four days. Carvalho, Marquis of Pombal, at that time Minister of War, took charge of the panic-stricken city, and having extinguished the flames, drew up plans for the rebuilding of Lisbon. A bronze equestrian statue of King José with a medallion of Pombal, was erected in the new Praça do Commercio to commemorate the rebuilding. Except in this new quarter, around the Praça do Commercio, the streets of Lisbon are irregular and steep, but there is an elaborate electric trolley system connecting all parts of the town, and the *ascensores* or giant lifts help to overcome the difficulties of high and low levels. There are fountains everywhere and the streets are lined by trees, of which the olaia or judas-tree is the most common. The oldest portion of Lisbon is along the steep slopes of the Castello de S. Jorge, which had been the stronghold of the Moors. In the neighbourhood of the Cathedral or Sé, Roman remains have been found including the ruins of a Roman Theatre. The Sé or Cathedral of Santa Maria is the oldest church in Lisbon; it dates back to the year 306. It served as a mosque for the Moors during their occupation of the city, and the façade with its towers and massive portico was rebuilt during the fourteenth century. It has been restored many times.

Outside what were the old walls of Lisbon stands the church of S. Vincente da Fora (St. Vincent's without) with a monastery attached, which is now the residence of the Patriarch of Lisbon. The church contains the mortuary chapel of the Kings of the House of Braganza, and the great constable Nuno. Alvara Periera lies buried here. St. Vincent is the patron saint of Lisbon; he was martyred for the Faith under Diocletian. According to the legend, his body was attached to a millstone and flung into the sea (336), but was miraculously discovered on the sands at Valencia by some Christians of that place. In the eighth century the Moors took Valencia, and the inhabitants fled by sea, taking the relics of St. Vincent with them. They were driven ashore on the coast of Algarve at the

cape now known as Cape St. Vincent, and there they remained until D. Affonso Henriques had expelled the Moors from Lisbon, when they were brought from Cape Saint Vincent and deposited in the cathedral he had just built. At this same time Affonso began the building of the Cistercian monastery of Alcobaca, in fulfilment of a vow he had made to build a monastery for St. Bernard's monks, if he were successful in his war against the Moors. The Castello of S. Jorqe was built in the time of Julius Cæsar, and strengthened by the Moors, who held out there against the assault of Affonso Henriques. It had three towers, known as Ulysses, Albarram, and Managem, but every trace of them disappeared in the earthquake of 1755. It was the royal residence until the Spanish kings of Portugal chose the famous Paco do Terriero which was ruined in 1755. Don João I made St. George its patron saint; he had married an English princess, Philippa, daughter of John of Gaunt. The procession on the feast of Corpus Christi from the Castello to the church of S. Domingo was a brilliant one in former years. St. George, lance in hand and on horseback in heavy armour, was personated by one of the faithful and his standard was borne before him by another rider. King and court all took part in this procession, the patriarch carrying the sacred Host.

The Modern City.—The church of St. Roque looks onto a square of its own name; it contains the chapel of St. John the Baptist, built in Rome from designs by the architect Vaneteli. Its costly marbles and mosaic reproductions of paintings by Guido Reni, Raphael, and Michelangelo took ten years to complete. Close by is the *Casa de Unisencordia*, a hospital and an orphanage. Near at hand is the Graca church and convent (now a barracks) facing the city. The church contains a remarkable crucifix known as Nosser Senhor dos Passos da Graca. The church of the Carmo, a beautiful relic of Portuguese Gothic, is now a museum. Belem, a suburb of Lisbon, contains the church and monastery of Santa Maria, known locally as the Jeronymos. The old name of Belem was Restello, and it was from here that Vasco da Gama set out to discover a sea route to India. A chapel had been built on the spot by Prince Henry the Navigator, and to it king and court went in procession, 8 July, 1497. On that same day Vasco da Gama embarked; he returned in September, 1499, having rounded the Cape of Good Hope. To immortalize the event King Manuel built a monastery near Prince Henry's chapel, changed the name of the locality from Restello to Belem or Bethlehem, and gave the new building to the monks of St. Jerome; hence the name Jeronymos. The first stone was laid in 1500. The building is of white stone from the quarries of Estramadura, and the foundations were laid on piles of pinewood. The style of architecture is pure Manueline (a mixture of Gothic, Renaissance, and Moorish) and the doorway is exuberantly decorated. The church is fast becoming a mausoleum of celebrated men. It contains the tombs of Vasco da Gama, of Camões, the great poet, and of Almeida Garrett, the chief Portuguese poet of the nineteenth century. In the chapter house of the monastery is the tomb of Alexandro Herculano, greatest of Portuguese historians. The columned arches of the cloisters are decorated with the twisted cable moulding so common in Manueline buildings. High above Belem stands the Ajuda Palace, built early in the nineteenth century to replace the royal palace which had been destroyed by the earthquake of 1755. It is a conspicuous edifice and is one of the first seen on entering the port of Lisbon. The actual residence of the royal family is the Palace of the Necessidades. Since 1834 the Cortes, a generic designation for the Constitutional Chambers of peers and deputies, occupies the monastery of San Bento. The actual number of deputies is 148, elected by the people, whereas the chamber of peers consists of nominated members appointed by the crown, and none of them under 40 years of age. One of the most remarkable monuments connected with the city is the Aqueducto das Aguas Livras (built in 1713), which reaches a distance of ten miles to Chellos.

Near the Estrella Gardens is a Protestant cemetery containing the tomb of Henry Fielding, the English novelist, who died in Lisbon in 1754. This part of the city also contains the Basilica of the SS. Corãcao de Jesus with its commanding cupola of white marble. The old Franciscan convent has been turned into a museum of fine arts; and a portion of the building contains the National Library of Lisbon, where are stored about 300,000 volumes, besides many rare manuscripts. The first book printed by Guttenberg is shown there, and a Bible from the same press. It also contains books from the Duke of Northumberland's library brought to Lisbon when the nuns of Sion were driven out of England during the Reformation. The largest church in Lisbon is S. Domingo in the Praça do Rocio. It was dedicated in 1241, and has undergone many changes. The kings of Portugal are usually married there, and it was the former church of the Inquisition. In 1761 it witnessed the *auto da fé* of Father Malagrida the Jesuit, who was falsely accused of complicity in a plot against Pombal's life.

Except around the Praça do Commercio, nearly all the important buildings of Lisbon are or have been churches and monasteries. Since their suppression, 28 May, 1834, the monasteries have been mainly used as barracks. The Catholic Faith is the State religion, but all other forms of worship are tolerated, and in government circles the feeling is anti-clerical if not anti-religious. The press is represented by two able journals, the "Diario dos Noticias" and "O Seculo". The population of Lisbon in 1900 was computed at 357,000. The present King of Portugal is Manuel II, born 15 November, 1889, who succeeded to the throne on the assassination of his father and elder brother 1 February, 1908. The reigning dynasty belongs to the House of Braganza-Coburg; John IV of Braganza having expelled the Spaniards from Lisbon in 1640, and Maria II of Braganza, having married Fernando, Prince of Coburg-Gotha, in the middle of the nineteenth century.

The Avenida da Libertade is one of the new boulevards. It begins at the Praça do Restoradores, which commemorates Portugal's Independence Day, 1 Dec., 1640, when the Duke of Braganza freed the land from Spanish domination. The avenue is lined with trees and subtropical plants and is divided by flower-beds and rockeries into three arteries to facilitate traffic. Twenty years ago all this district did not exist, and as in the newer quarters in Rome, there has been some overbuilding. Behind the Avenida lie the Botanical Gardens with their leafy lanes and wealth of tropical vegetation. The Praça do Principe Real, a few minutes' walk from the gardens, stands on the site of the Sé Patriarchal, built by João V (1706–1750), as the cathedral of Western Lisbon, and destroyed by fire during the great earthquake. The port of Lisbon, one of the safest and most commodious roadsteads in the world, is annually entered and cleared by an average of 6000 vessels sailing under every flag. The chief manufactures of the neighbourhood are pottery, woollens, glass, preserved food, and fish. The wine trade of Lisbon is also important. Besides the public buildings referred to, the Academia Real, the Escola Polytechnica (580 pupils), and the Escola Medico-Cirurgica (224 pupils), as well as the observatory, deserve mention. Lisbon has also a military school (339 students), a school of fine arts (69 students), and a Conservatorio (503 students). Lisbon was occupied by the French in 1807, but the English took it in 1808 and made it a centre of operations against Napoleon during the Peninsular War.

Ecclesiastical History.—The See of Lisbon dates from early Christian times, and tradition has enshrined

the names of its bishops as far back as the sub-Apostolic epoch. It seems certain that a St. Potamius, who took part in the Council of Rimini (356), was Bishop of Lisbon. Other bishops are mentioned up to the year 716 when Lisbon passed into the hands of the Moors and the see remained vacant till 1147. Before the Moorish conquest the diocese was suffragan of Merida; the liberation under Alfonso I took place in 1147, and in 1199 Lisbon was made suffragan of Compostela. At the request of King John I, Pope Boniface IX, by Bull dated 10 November, 1394, erected Lisbon into an archdiocese and gave it as suffragans, Coimbra, Leiria, Guarda, Evora, and Silves (in 1396, however, Evora was detached by the same pope) and the first archbishop was John Anes. Among his more famous successors were Roderiguez da Cunha (1636) and Cardinal Luiz da Souza (1676). As Portugal grew in political importance and colonial possessions, the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan of Lisbon expanded, and we learn from Stadel, "Compend. Geogr. Eccles." (1712) that Coimbra, Leiria, Portalegre, Elvas, Funchal, Angra, Congo, St. James of Cape Verde, San Thomé, and Baia of All Saints were suffragans of Lisbon. As a reward for assistance against the Turks, Clement XI in 1708 raised the Chapel of the Royal Palace to Collegiate rank and associated with it three parishes in the dioceses of Braganza and Lamego. Later in that same year, yielding to the request of John V, he issued the Bull "In Supremo Apostolatus Solio" (22 Oct., 1716), known as the Golden Bull, because the seal or bulla was affixed with gold instead of lead, giving the collegiate chapel cathedral rank, with metropolitical rights, and conferring on its titular the rank of patriarch. The town of Lisbon was ecclesiastically divided into Eastern and Western Lisbon. The former Archbishop of Lisbon retained jurisdiction over Eastern Lisbon, and had as suffragans Guarda, Portalegre, St. James of Cape Verde, San Thomé, and San Salvator in Congo. Western Lisbon and metropolitical rights over Leiria, Lamego, Funchal, and Angra, together with elaborate privileges and honours were granted to the new patriarch and his successors. It was further agreed between pope and king that the Patriarch of Lisbon should be made a cardinal at the first consistory following his appointment. The first Patriarch of Lisbon was a saintly man, Thomas d'Almeyda, formerly Bishop of Porto, and he was raised to the cardinalate 20 Dec., 1737. There thus existed side by side in the city of Lisbon two metropolitical churches. To obviate the inconvenience of this arrangement Benedict XIV (13 Dec., 1740) united East and West Lisbon into one single archdiocese under Patriarch d'Almeyda, who ruled the see until 1754. The double chapter however remained until 1843, when the old cathedral chapter was dissolved by Gregory XVI. It was during the patriarchate of Cardinal d'Almeyda (1746) that the famous chapel of Saint John the Baptist, now in the church of São Roque, was built in Rome at the expense of King John V, and consecrated by Pope Benedict XIV.

At what date the patriarchs of Lisbon began to quarter the tiara with three crowns, though without the keys, on their coat of arms is uncertain and there are no documents referring to the grant of such a privilege. By Apostolic letters dated 30 Sept., 1881 the metropolitan of Lisbon claims as suffragans the Dioceses of Angola, St. James of Cape Verde, San Thomé, Egitan, Portalegre, Angra, Funchal. The archdiocese comprises the civil districts of Lisbon and Santarem, and has a Catholic population of 728,739. The estimated number of Protestants and Jews is 5000. The total number of parishes is 341, of priests 662, and of churches and chapels 1555. The present patriarch is Antonio Mendes Bello, who was born at Gouvea in the Diocese of Guarda in June, 1842, appointed Archbishop of Mitylene 24 March, 1884, translated to Faro 13 Nov., 1884, and appointed patriarch of Lisbon, 19 Dec., 1907, in succession to Cardinal Neto, who resigned. The patriarch is assisted by an auxiliary bishop, Mgr. José Alves de Mattos, titular Archbishop of Mitylene. Cardinal Neto, the ex-patriarch, was born at Lagos in the Diocese of Faro, 8 Feb., 1841; was ordained in 1863; joined the Order of Friars Minor in 1875; was appointed Bishop of Angola and Congo in 1879; became Patriarch of Lisbon in 1883; was named Cardinal of the Title of the Twelve Apostles, 24 March, 1884, and at present ranks as senior cardinal priest. He resigned his patriarchate in November, 1907, and retired to a convent of his own order in Lisbon. In 1624 a college for English students desiring to study for the priesthood and for mission work in England, was founded in Lisbon by Pietro Catinho, a member of an illustrious family. It is known as SS. Peter and Paul's and has the same rights and privileges as the English College, Rome. It suffered severely from the earthquake of 1755, but continues its work to this day, and is now governed by Monsignor Hilton, who was born in 1825; educated at Lisbon; ordained 1850; served some time on the mission in the Diocese of Shrewsbury, England; made a domestic prelate in 1881; and returned to Lisbon as president in 1883. A college for Irish students was founded by royal charter in 1593; it escaped all injury from the earthquake, but was closed during the civil wars in Portugal in the nineteenth century and has never been reopened. A convent of Irish Dominican monks and another of Irish Dominican nuns exist in Lisbon to this day.

SANTAREM.—The ancient Scalabis, the *Præsidium Julium* of the Romans, and capital of the district of Santarem lies on the right bank of the Tagus about 46 miles from Lisbon. The population in 1901 was 9400. It does a large trade in wine and oil, and is the vegetable garden of Lisbon. In the sixteenth century it was of more importance than nowadays, and its population stood at 21,000. A long narrow bridge spans the Tagus, and on a rock in the river stands the castle of Almourel, a building in Gothic architecture. Roman relics unearthed in the vicinity incline archæologists to the opinion that the noted Nabantia of the Romans and Goths stood there. The Franciscan convent is now a barracks, and the convent of Santa Iria or Irene is in ruins. Saint Irene (whence the name of the town Santarem) is said to have been the niece of the prior of the Benedictine monastery when the Goths ruled that portion of Portugal.

INCHBOLD, *Lisbon and Cintra* (New York, 1908); STEPHENS, *Portugal* (London, 1903); ADAM, *La patrie portuguaise* (Paris, 1896); CRAWFORD, *Portugal Old and New* (London, 1880); *Annuaire Pontificale* (1910); *Gerarchia* (1910).

J. C. GREY.

Lisieux. See BAYEUX, DIOCESE OF.

Lismore (IRELAND). See WATERFORD, DIOCESE OF.

Lismore, DIOCESE OF (LISMORENSIS), extends over a territory of 21,000 square miles in the north-east of New South Wales (Australia). It comprises a portion of the Eastern Coast district, from Point Danger on the Queensland border to the north of Mount Lindsay, and from the western base of the latter to a point ten miles south of Mount Seaview, thence to a point ten miles south of Port Macquarie. The diocese is watered by the Macleay, the Clarence, the Richmond, and other rapid rivers that rise in the New England and Macpherson ranges, and contains a good deal of rich pastoral, agricultural, and dairying land. Among its chief products are sugar and maize. In 1837 the waters of the Clarence were first cleft by white men's keels—two sailing vessels, one of which made a beginning of the pastoral settlement of the district by landing the first cattle that ever browsed upon the banks of that fine river. The first Catholic family (the Hawthornes) arrived in Grafton, on the Clarence,

in 1841. Their first two children were taken to Sydney (450 miles by sea) to be baptized. In 1859 Grafton (then with a population of about 1800) was incorporated as a borough. There was no resident priest in any part of the present diocese till 1862, and the rugged and sparsely populated North Coast (as it is called) was visited occasionally from Sydney, Ipswich (Queensland), and annually from Armidale, from March, 1854, till 1862.

The first church on the North Coast was opened at South Grafton on 23 September, 1857, at a cost of £100. Archbishop Polding paid his first visit to these outlying parts of his see in 1860, and two years later the first resident priest (Rev. Timothy McCarthy) took up his quarters in the principal town, Grafton, his parochial charge extending—till Tenterfield received a resident priest in 1866—from Coff's Harbour to the Tweed Heads, and from Tenterfield to Ballina. In 1869 the territory of the present See of Lismore was included in the newly formed Diocese of Armidale. The pioneer religious of the Lismore diocese (the Sisters of Mercy) reached Grafton in 1884. By Brief of 10 May, 1887, Grafton was erected into an episcopal see, and the Right Rev. Jeremiah Joseph Doyle, then in charge of Lismore, was shortly afterwards (28 August, 1887) consecrated its first bishop in St. Mary's cathedral, Sydney. He chose Lismore as his residence (later on, the name of the diocese was changed to Lismore). In 1878 there were only three Catholic families and a scanty population in Lismore, but, owing to the richness of its soil, the district has since then progressed at a rapid rate. The foundation stone of the new cathedral was laid on Rosary Sunday, 1892, and the edifice was completed in 1908. Bishop Doyle died suddenly, 4 June, 1909. Rev. John Carroll, of Moss Vale, Australia, born at Piltown, Kilkenny, Ireland, 1866, and ordained at The College, Carlow, 1890, was consecrated bishop 4 April, 1910. There were in the Diocese of Lismore, at the close of 1909, 19 parochial districts, 51 churches, 20 secular priests, 104 nuns, 6 boarding schools, and 6 superior day schools for girls, 11 primary parochial schools, 1907 children receiving Catholic education, and about 19,500 Catholics in a total white population of some 80,000.

MORAN, *History of the Catholic Church in Australasia* (Sydney, s. d.); *Sydney Freeman's Journal* (files); *Australasian Catholic Directory.*

HENRY W. CLEARY.

Lismore, SCHOOL OF.—As the School of Armagh in the North of Ireland, and that of Clonmacnoise in the centre, so the School of Lismore was the most celebrated in the South of Ireland. It was founded in the year 635 by St. Carthach the Younger, in a most picturesque site, steeply rising from the southern bank of the Blackwater. Its founder had spent nearly forty years of his monastic life in the monastery of Rahan on the southern borders of ancient Meath, in what is now King's County. He dearly loved that monastery which he had founded, and which he fondly hoped would be the place of his resurrection; but the men of Meath—clerics and chieftains—grew jealous of the great monastery founded in their territory by a stranger from Munster, and they persuaded Prince Blathmac, son of Aedh Slaine, of the southern Hy Niall, to expel the venerable old man from the monastic home which he loved so well. The eviction is described by the Irish annalists as most unjust and cruel, yet, under God's guidance, it led to the foundation of Lismore on the beautiful margin of what was then called Avonmore, "the great river", a site granted to St. Carthach by the prince of the Desii of Waterford. Lismore was founded in 635; and the founder survived only two years, for he died in 637, but Providence blessed his work, and his monastery grew to be the greatest centre of learning and piety in all the South of Erin. The "Rule of St. Carthach" is the most notable literary monument which the founder left behind him. It is fortunately still extant in the ancient Gaelic verse in which it was written. It consists of 135 four-lined stanzas, which have been translated by O'Curry—who has no doubt of its authenticity—and is beyond doubt one of the most interesting and important documents of the early Irish Church.

But Lismore produced a still more famous saint and scholar, the great St. Cathaldus of Tarentum. His Irish name was Cathal, and it appears he was born at a place called Rathan, not far from Lismore. Our Irish annals tell us nothing of St. Cathaldus, because he went abroad early in life, but the brothers Morini of his adopted home give us many particulars. They tell us he was a native of Hibernia—born at Rathan in Momonia—that he studied at Lismore, and became bishop of his native territory of Rathan, but that afterwards, inspired by the love of missionary enterprise, he made his way to Jerusalem, and on his return was, with his companions, wrecked at Tarentum—the "beautiful Tarentum"—at the heel of Italy. Its pleasure-loving inhabitants, forgetting the Gospel preached to them by St. Peter and St. Mark, had become practically pagans when Cathaldus and his companions were cast upon their shores. Seeing the city given up to vice and sensuality, the Irish prelate preached with great fervour, and wrought many miracles, so that the Tarentines gave up their sinful ways, and from that day to this have recognized the Irish Cathaldus as their patron saint, and greatly venerate his tomb, which was found intact in the old cathedral as far back as the year 1140, with his name "Cathaldus Rachan" inscribed upon a cross therein. Another distinguished scholar of Lismore, and probably its second abbot, was St. Cuanna, most likely the half-brother and successor of the founder. He was born at Kilcoonagh, or Killcooney, a parish near Headford in the County Galway which takes its name from him. No doubt he went to Lismore on account of his close connexion with St. Carthach, and for the same reason was chosen to succeed him in the school of Lismore. Colgan thought that the ancient but now lost "Book of Cuanach", cited in the "Annals of Ulster", but not later than A. D. 628, was the work of this St. Cuanna of Kilcooney and Lismore. It is also said that Aldfrid, King of Northumbria, spent some time at the school of Lismore, for he visited most of the famous schools of Erin towards the close of the seventh century, and at that time Lismore was one of the most celebrated. It was a place of pilgrimage also, and many Irish princes gave up the sceptre and returned to Lismore to end their lives in prayer and penance. There, too, by his own desire, was interred St. Celsus of Armagh, who died at Ardpatrick, but directed that he should be buried in Lismore—but we have sought in vain for any trace of his monument.

Two interesting memorials of Lismore are fortunately still preserved. The first is the crosier of Lismore, found accidentally in Lismore Castle in the year 1814. The inscription tells us that it was made for Niall Mac Mic Aeducan, Bishop of Lismore, 1090–1113, by Neclan the artist. This refers to the making of the case or shrine, which enclosed an old oak stick, the original crosier of the founder. Most of the ornaments are richly gilt, interspersed with others of silver and niello, and bosses of coloured enamels. The second is the "Book of Lismore" found in the castle at the same time with the crosier, enclosed in a wooden box in a built-up doorway. The castle was built so long ago as 1185 by Prince John. Afterwards the bishops of Lismore came to live there, and no doubt both crosier and book belonged to the bishops and were hidden for security in troublesome times. The Book of Lismore contains a very valuable series of the lives of our Irish saints, written in the finest medieval Irish. It was in 1890 admirably translated into English by Dr. Whitley Stokes.

Irish Lives in Salamanca MS.; O'HANLON, *Lives of the Irish Saints*; HEALY, *Ireland's Ancient Schools and Scholars* (5th ed., Dublin, 1908); *Lives of the Irish Saints from the Book of Lismore*, edited by WHITLEY STOKES (Oxford, 1890); O'CURRY, *Lectures on the MS. Materials of Ancient History of Ireland* (Dublin, 1874).

JOHN HEALY.

Lister, *alias* BUTLER, THOMAS, Jesuit writer, b. in Lancashire, about 1559; d. in England, probably shortly before 1628; was the son of Christopher Lister of Midhope, Yorks. He entered Douai College, 1576. Having occasion to return to England, he was seized and imprisoned. He, however, obtained his release, and in 1579 was received into the English College, Rome. There, three years later, he joined the Society of Jesus in February, 1582–3. He graduated in Divinity at Pont-à-Mousson in 1592. In 1596 he went on the English mission, but was arrested in 1598 and endured a long incarceration. Just at this period difficulties had broken out among the English clergy, owing to the refusal of certain amongst them to recognize the authority of the newly appointed archpriest, Dr. George Blackwell. Lister was consulted by one of the priests as to the conduct of those who had refused obedience. While a man both of piety and ability, he was unfortunately lacking in judgment; and his reply took the form of a small treatise entitled, "Adversus factiosos in ecclesia", in which their conduct was vigorously censured. They are declared to have *ipso facto* fallen into schism, and to have incurred excommunication and irregularity. It is doubtful whether this tractate was published; but it was widely circulated in manuscript, and aroused the deepest resentment. It certainly served not a little to fan the flames of the unhappy dispute. To the request of the clergy that he would prohibit it, Blackwell replied curtly (April, 1597): "Your request is that we should call in the treatise against your schism; and this is unreasonable, because the medicine ought not to be removed before the sore be thoroughly cured. If it grieve you, I am not grieved thereat." His conduct in regard to Lister's tract formed the first of the six grounds on which was based the "Appeal of the thirty-three clergymen", against his administration. The appellants obtained a favourable hearing at Rome. Lister's tract was suppressed by papal Brief (May, 1601), and Blackwell rebuked for his unreasonable conduct. Lister seems to have resided continuously in England. His death probably occurred shortly before 1628. The treatise "Adversus factiosos" is incorporated in Christopher Bagshaw's (q. v.) "Relatio compendiosa turbarum"; a portion of it is printed in Law's work cited below.

FRANZ LISZT

DODD, ed. TIERNEY, *Church History of England*, III (London, 1840), cxxxiii sqq.; GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.*, s. v.; LAW, *Historical Sketch of Conflicts between Jesuits and Seculars in the reign of Elizabeth* (London, 1889), appendix D; MORRIS, *The Troubles of our Catholic Forefathers, related by themselves*, I (London, 1872).

G. H. JOYCE.

Liszt, FRANZ, admittedly the greatest pianist in the annals of music, and a composer whose status in musical literature still forms a debatable question, b. at Raiding, Hungary, 22 October, 1811; d. at Bayreuth, Germany, 31 July, 1886. His musical precocity was early recognized by his parents, and his first teacher was his father, Adam Liszt, a musical amateur of rare culture. His first public appearance at Oedenburg at the age of nine was of so startling a character, that several Hungarian magnates who were present at once assumed the financial responsibilities of his further musical education. Taken to Vienna by his father, who devoted himself exclusively to the development of his talented child, he studied the piano for six years with Czerny, and theory and composition with Salieri and Randhartinger. His first public appearance in Vienna (1 Jan., 1823) proved a noteworthy event in the annals of music. From Beethoven, who was present, down to the merest dilettante, everyone forthwith acknowledged his great genius. His entry to the Paris Conservatory, where his father wished him to continue his studies, and which at the time was under Cherubini, proved unsuccessful on account of his not being a native of France. His studies, however, under Reicha and Paer, were of a character that made the youthful prodigy one of the conspicuous figures of the French capital. His one act opera, "Don Sanche", as well as his piano compositions, achieved a flattering success. His brilliant concert tours in Switzerland and England enhanced an already established reputation. His father's death (1827) made Liszt and his mother dependent on his own personal exertions, but the temporary hardship disappeared when he began his literary and teaching career. His charming personality, conversational brilliancy, and transcendent musical ability opened the world of fashion, wealth, and intellect to him. His Catholic sturdiness was temporarily shaken by the "Nouveau Christianisme" of Saint-Simon, to which, however, he never formally or even tacitly subscribed, and by the socialistic aberrations of Chevalier and Péreire. The unhealthy atmosphere of his associations with Alphonse de Lamartine, Victor Hugo, Heinrich Heine, George Sand, and their coterie, could not fail to weaken his religious moorings. Fortunately the contravening influence of Lamennais averted what might have ended in spiritual shipwreck. His intimacy with Meyerbeer and his friendship with Chopin, whose biographer he subsequently became, kept alive and fostered his interest in his art.

The result of this environment led to the unfortunate alliance (1834–44) with the Countess d'Agoult (Daniel Stern). The fruit of it was three children—a son who died early, Blandina, who became the wife of Emile Ollivier, Minister of Justice to Napoleon III, and Cosima, first the wife of Hans von Bülow, then of Richard Wagner, and now the owner of Villa Wahnfried, Bayreuth. The rupture of this liaison signalized the beginning of his dazzling career as a virtuoso, scaling higher altitudes as years progressed, until his reputation, like that of Paganini on the violin, was that of a pianist without peer or rival. His concert tours throughout Europe evoked an unparalleled enthusiasm. Kings and national assemblies bestowed

titles of nobility and decorations on him; universities honoured him with academic degrees; cities vied with one another in granting him their freedom; audiences were thrilled as if by an hypnotic influence; public demonstrations, torchlight processions, poetic greetings met him in all directions and made him the object of a hero-worship, that has seldom, if ever, fallen to the lot of any other artist. In all these intoxicating triumphs, he never lost his mental equipoise. His remunerative concerts allowed him means to make generous provision for his mother and children. His purse was open, his services at the disposal of every appeal of philanthropy. No aspiring talent ever invoked his encouragement, no deserving charity ever appealed to his aid, in vain. The princely contribution to the sufferers of the Danube inundation at Pesth (1837), and the completion of the Beethoven monument at Bonn (1845), are but two striking examples. Having reached the pinnacle of success and fame as a pianist, he now concluded to abandon the career of a virtuoso, to devote his time and energy to creative work and the public fostering of higher musical ideals.

His twelve years at Weimar (1849–61), where he assumed the proffered position of court conductor, were years of devoted, unselfish, and intensive activity. His indefatigable supervision of the court concerts and operatic performances brought them to a perfection that made the small provincial town of Weimar synonymous with the highest achievements in tonal art. His gratuitous guidance and encouragement of talented and ambitious piano pupils raised the standard of pianoforte playing to a height never before attained, and created a specific school of most brilliant virtuosos. During this period he also gave the world a series of notable piano compositions, and even more notable choral and orchestral works, that have made their rounds through the musical world. As he was the originator of the "piano recital", so now he became the creator of a new orchestral form, the "symphonic poem", which, as a type of programme music, has found a universal adoption. While directing the destinies of the Weimar musical world, he not only became a daring pioneer in placing on its concert platform and operatic stage the neglected masterpieces of classical art, but tried the more venturesome experiment of introducing the most meritorious works of contemporary composers. Wagner forms a conspicuous example of his courageous propaganda. His championship of the great dramatic composer in conversation and writing and by the production of his operas, not to allude to financial support (and all this in the face of vehement protest and demonstrative antipathy), did more to advance that master's theories and compositions and to give him a status in the world of art than all other agencies.

It was an act of the same progressive intrepidity, meeting with public manifestations of protest at the performance of an opera of one of his pupils ("The Barber of Bagdad" by Peter Cornelius), that caused him to resign his position as court conductor. After his resignation (1861) he lived in turn at Rome, Budapest, and Weimar. Religion which, in spite of his earlier associations, was only temporarily overshadowed, had for several years been again playing an active part in his life. As early as 1856 or 1858 he became a Franciscan tertiary. The failure of the Princess Caroline von Sayn-Wittgenstein, a most estimable lady whose influence over him was most potent for good, to secure a dispensation to marry him, only brought his religious designs to a more definite point. He received minor orders from Cardinal Hohenlohe in his private chapel at the Vatican on 25 April, 1865. This he did, "convinced that this act would strengthen me in the right road", and therefore he "accomplished it without effort, in all simplicity and uprightness of intention", and as agreeing "with the antecedents of my youth, as well as with the development that my work of musical composition has taken during the last four years" (La Mara, "Letters of Franz Liszt", New York, 1894, II, 100). His career of twenty-one years as an abbé was most exemplary and edifying. Punctilious as he was in the performance of his ecclesiastical duties, his interest in art continued unabated. His piano pupils followed him on his casual wanderings; contemporaneous art was not neglected, but above all the old ecclesiastical masters and the new movement for the restoration of liturgical music, represented by the *Cäcilienverein*, found a devoted, enthusiastic, and generous supporter in him. His own larger ecclesiastical compositions, though no doubt unwittingly deviating from strict liturgical requirements, are nevertheless imbued with deep, religious sentiment. It was while attending the marriage of his granddaughter, and coincidentally the "Parsifal" performances at Bayreuth, that, after receiving the rites of the Church, he succumbed to an acute attack of pneumonia at the home of a friend, near Wagner's Villa Wahnfried. His wish, expressed in a letter (La Mara, I, 439) breathing the most loyal devotion to the Church and humble gratitude to God, to be buried without pomp or display, where he died, was carried out by interring him in the Bayreuth cemetery.

SCHILLING, *Franz Liszt. Sein Leben u. Werke* (Stuttgart, 1844); WOHL, *François Liszt* (London, 1887); BEAUFORT, *The Abbé Liszt* (London, 1886); MÜLLER, *Franz Liszt* (Erlangen, 1885); RAMAN, *Franz Liszt, Artist and Man* (2 vols., London, 1882), only reaches 1840; NOHL, *Life of Liszt* (Chicago, 1889); LA MARA, *Musikalische Studienköpfe* (Leipzig, 1868). For a thematic catalogue of compositions and for his literary works, see GROVE, *Dict. of Music and Musicians* (New York, 1908), s.v.; for criticism of Liszt as a pianist, GROVE, *loc. cit.*; VON LENZ, *Die grossen Piano Virtuosen* (Berlin, 1872), 1–19; FAY, *Music Study in Germany* (Chicago, 1881), 205–272. For critical review and appraisement of his compositions: GROVE, MENDEL, *Musikalisches Conversationslexikon*, VI (Berlin, 1876), 354–7; RAMAN, *Franz Liszt als Psalmensönger* (Leipzig, 1886). Consult also LA MARA, *Letters of Franz Liszt* (2 vols., New York, 1894); HUEFFER, *Correspondence of Wagner and Liszt* (1841–1861) (2 vols., New York, 1889).

H. G. GANSS.

Litany (Lat. *litania, letania*, from Gr. λιτή, prayer or supplication), a well-known and much appreciated form of responsive petition, used in public liturgical services, and in private devotions, for common necessities of the Church, or in calamities—to implore God's aid or to appease His just wrath. This form of prayer finds its model in Psalm cxxxv: "Praise the Lord, for he is good: for his mercy endureth for ever. Praise ye the God of gods . . . the Lord of lords . . . Who alone doth great wonders . . . Who made the heavens", etc., with the concluding words in each verse, "for his mercy endureth for ever." Similar is the canticle of praise by the youths in the fiery furnace (Dan., iii, 57–87), with the response, "praise and exalt him above all for ever." In the Mass of the Oriental Church we find several litanies in use even at the present day. Towards the end of the Mass of the catechumens the deacon asks all to pray; he formulates the petitions, and all answer "Kyrie Eleison". When the catechumens have departed, the deacon asks the prayers: for the peace and welfare of the world, for the Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church, for the bishops and priests, for the sick, for those who have gone astray, etc., to each of which petitions the faithful answer "Kyrie Eleison", or "Grant us, O Lord", or "We beseech Thee." The litany is concluded by the words, "Save us, restore us again, O Lord, by Thy mercy." The last petitions in our Litany of the Saints, with the responses "Deliver us, O Lord" and "We beseech Thee hear us", show a great resemblance to the Mass Litany of the Greek Church. In the Ambrosian or Milanese Rite two litanies are recited on the Sundays of Lent instead of the "Gloria in excelsis". In the Stowe Missal a litany is inserted between the Epistle and Gospel (Duchesne, "Christian Worship", London, 1904, 199). The Ro-

man Missal has retained the prayers for all classes of people in the Mass of the Presanctified on Good Friday, a full litany on Holy Saturday, and the triple repetition of "Kyrie Eleison", "Christe Eleison", "Kyrie Eleison", in every Mass. The frequent repetition of the "Kyrie" was probably the original form of the Litany, and was in use in Asia and in Rome at a very early date. The Council of Vaison in 529 passed the decree: "Let that beautiful custom of all the provinces of the East and of Italy be kept up, viz., that of singing with great effect and compunction the 'Kyrie Eleison' at Mass, Matins, and Vespers, because so sweet and pleasing a chant, even though continued day and night without interruption, could never produce disgust or weariness". The number of repetitions depended upon the celebrant. This litany is prescribed in the Roman Breviary at the "Preces Feriales" and in the Monastic Breviary for every "Hora" (Rule of St. Benedict, ix, 17). The continuous repetition of the "Kyrie" is used to-day at the consecration of a church, while the relics to be placed in the altar are carried in procession around the church. Because the "Kyrie" and other petitions were said once or oftener, litanies were called *planæ, ternæ, quinæ, septenæ*.

When peace was granted to the Church after three centuries of bloody persecution, public devotions became common and processions were frequently held, with preference for days which the heathens had held sacred. These processions were called *litanies*, and in them pictures and other religious emblems were carried. In Rome, pope and people would go in procession each day, especially in Lent, to a different church, to celebrate the Sacred Mysteries. Thus originated the Roman "Stations", and what was called the "Litania Major", or "Romana". It was held on 25 April, on which day the heathens had celebrated the festival of *Robigalia*, the principal feature of which was a procession. The Christian litany which replaced it set out from the church of S. Lorenzo in Lucina, held a station at S. Valentino Outside the Walls, and then at the Milvian Bridge. From thence, instead of proceeding on the Claudian Way, as the heathens had done, it turned to the left towards the Vatican, stopped at a cross, of which the site is not given, and again in the paradise or atrium of St. Peter's, and finally in the basilica itself, where the station was held (Duchesne, 288). In 590, when a pestilence caused by an overflow of the Tiber was ravaging Rome, Gregory the Great commanded a litany which is called "Septiformis"; on the preceding day he exhorted the people to fervent prayer, and arranged the order to be observed in the procession, viz. that the clergy from S. Giovanni Battista, the men from S. Marcello, the monks from SS. Giovanni e Paolo, the unmarried women from SS. Cosma e Damiano, the married women from San Stefano, the widows from S. Vitale, the poor and the children from S. Cæcilia, were all to meet at S. Maria Maggiore. The "Litania Minor", or "Gallicana", on the Rogation Days before Ascension, was introduced (477) by St. Mamertus, Bishop of Vienne, on account of the earthquakes and other calamities then prevalent. It was prescribed for the whole of Frankish Gaul, in 511, by the Council of Orléans (can. xxvii). For Rome it was ordered by Leo III, in 799. In the Ambrosian Rite this litany was celebrated on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday after Ascension. In Spain we find a similar litany from Thursday to Saturday after Whitsuntide, another from the first to third of November, ordered by the Council of Gerunda in 517, and still another for December, commanded by the synod of Toledo in 638. In England the Litany of Rogation Days (Gang-Days) was known in the earliest periods. In Germany it was ordered by a Synod of Mainz in 813. Owing to the fact that the Mass Litany became popular through its use in processions, numberless varieties were soon made, especially in the Middle Ages. Litanies appeared in honour of God the Father, of God the Son, of God the Holy Ghost, of the Precious Blood, of the Blessed Virgin, of the Immaculate Conception, of each of the saints honoured in different countries, for the souls in Purgatory, etc. In 1601 Baronius wrote that about eighty forms were in circulation. To prevent abuse, Pope Clement VIII, by decree of the Inquisition of 6 Sept., 1601, forbade the publication of any litany, except that of the saints as found in the liturgical books and that of Loreto. To-day the litanies approved for public recitation are: of All Saints, of Loreto, of the Holy Name, of the Sacred Heart, and of St. Joseph.

Bishop in *Journal of Theological Studies* (1906), 133; *Römische Quartalschrift* (1904), 13; Punkes in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v. *Litanei;* Thill in *Pastor Bonus* (1891), 217 sqq.; Kellner, *Heortologie* (Freiburg, 1906), 143 sqq.; Krieg in Kraus, *Real-Encyk.*, s. v. *Litanei;* Binterim, *Denkwürdigkeiten*, IV, I, 572 sqq.; *Revue Bénédictine*, III, 111; V, 152; Serarius, *Litaneutici seu de litaniis libelli duo* (Cologne, 1609).

Francis Mershman.

Litany of Loreto.—Despite the fact that, from the seventeenth century onwards, the Litany of Loreto has been the subject of endless panegyrics and ascetical writings, there is a great lack of documentary evidence concerning its origin, the growth and development of the litany into the forms under which we know it, and as it was for the first time definitely approved by the Church in the year 1587. Some writers declare that they know nothing of its origin and history; others, on the contrary, trace it back to the translation of the Holy House (1294); others, to Pope Sergius I (687); others, again, to St. Gregory the Great or to the fifth century; while others go as far back as the earliest ages of the Church, and even Apostolic times. Historical criticism, however, proves it to be of more recent origin, and shows that it was composed during the early years of the sixteenth century or the closing years of the fifteenth. The most ancient printed copy hitherto discovered is that of Dillingen in Germany, dating from 1558; it is fairly certain that this is a copy of an earlier Italian one, but so far, in spite of much careful research, the oldest Italian copy that the writer has been able to discover dates from 1576.

In form, the Litany of Loreto is composed on a fixed plan common to several Marian litanies already in existence during the second half of the fifteenth century, which in turn are connected with a notable series of Marian litanies that began to appear in the twelfth century and became numerous in the thirteenth and fourteenth. The Loreto text had, however, the good fortune to be adopted in the famous shrine, and in this way to become known, more than any other, to the many pilgrims who flocked there during the sixteenth century. The text was brought home to the various countries of Christendom, and finally it received for all time the supreme ecclesiastical sanction.

Appended is a brief résumé of the work published by the present writer on this subject, the references being to the revised and enlarged French edition of 1900, supplemented by any new matter brought to light since that time.

Sauren claims that the first and oldest Marian litany is a pious *laus* to the Virgin in the "Leabhar Breac", a fourteenth-century MS., now in the library of the Royal Irish Academy, and written "in the purest style of Gaedhlic", according to O'Curry, who explained its various parts. This *laus* of fifty-nine eulogies on the Virgin occurs on fol. 121, and O'Curry calls it a *litania*, attributing it at the latest to about the middle of the eighth century. But it has not at all the form of a litany, being rather a sequence of fervent praises, like so many that occur in the writings of the Fathers, especially after the fourth century. As a matter of fact, Dr. Sicking has shown that the entire *laus* of the "Leabhar Breac" is copied almost

word for word from the first and third of the "Sermones Dubii" of St. Ildephonsus.

The earliest genuine text of a Marian litany thus far known is in a twelfth-century codex in the Mainz Library, with the title "Letania de domina nostra Dei genitrice virgine Maria: oratio valde bona: cottidie pro quacumque tribulatione recitanda est". It is fairly long, and was published in part by Mone, and in its entirety by the present writer. It opens with the usual "Kyrie Eleison"; then follow the invocations of the Trinity, but with amplifications, e. g. "Pater de celis deus, qui elegisti Mariam semper virginem, miserere nobis"; these are followed by invocations of the Virgin Mary in a long series of praises, of which a brief selection will be enough: "Sancta Maria, stirps patriarcharum, vaticinium prophetarum, solatium apostolorum, rosa martirum, predicatio confessorum, lilium virginum, ora pro nobis benedictum ventris tui fructum"; "Sancta Maria, spes humilium, refugium pauperum, portus naufragantium, medicina infirmorum, ora pro nobis benedictum ventris tui fructum", etc. This goes on for more than fifty times, always repeating the invocation "Sancta Maria", but varying the laudatory titles given. Then, after the manner of the litanies of the saints, a series of petitions occur, e. g.: "Per mundissimum virgineum partum tuum ab omni immundicia mentis et corporis liberet nos benedictus ventris tui fructus"; and farther on, "Ut ecclesiam suam sanctam pacificare, custodire, adunare et regere dignetur benedictus ventris tui fructus, ora mater virgo Maria." The litany concludes with the "Agnus", also amplified, "Agne dei, filius matris virginis Marie qui tollis peccata mundi, parce nobis Domine", etc.

Lengthy and involved litanies of this type do not seem to have won popularity, though it is possible to find other examples of a like kind. However, during the two centuries that followed, many Marian litanies were composed. Their form remains uncertain and hesitating, but the tendency is always towards brevity and simplicity. To each invocation of "Sancta Maria" it becomes customary to add only one praise, and these praises show in general a better choice or a better arrangement. The petitions are often omitted or are changed into ejaculations in honour of the Blessed Virgin.

A litany of this new form is that of a codex in the Library of St. Mark's, Venice, dating from the end of the thirteenth or the beginning of the fourteenth century. It is found, though with occasional variants, in many manuscripts, a sure sign that this text was especially well known and favourably received. It omits the petitions, and consists of seventy-five praises joined to the usual invocation, "Sancta Maria". Here is a short specimen, showing the praises to be met with most frequently also in other litanies of that or of later times: "Holy Mary, Mother and Spouse of Christ, pray for me [other MSS. have "pray for us"—the "pray" is always repeated]; Holy Mary, Mother inviolate; Holy Mary, Temple of the Holy Ghost; Holy Mary, Queen of Heaven; Holy Mary, Mistress of the Angels; Holy Mary, Stair of Heaven; Holy Mary, Gate of Paradise; Holy Mary, Mother of True Counsel; Holy Mary, Gate of Celestial Life; Holy Mary, Our Advocate; Holy Mary, brightest Star of Heaven; Holy Mary, Fountain of True Wisdom; Holy Mary, unfading Rose; Holy Mary, Beauty of Angels; Holy Mary, Flower of Patriarchs; Holy Mary, Desire of Prophets; Holy Mary, Treasure of Apostles; Holy Mary, Praise of Martyrs; Holy Mary, Glorification of Priests; Holy Mary, Immaculate Virgin; Holy Mary, Splendour of Virgins and Example of Chastity", etc.

The first Marian litanies must have been composed to foster private devotion, as it is not at all probable that they were written for use in public, by reason of their drawn-out and heavy style. But once the custom grew up of reciting Marian litanies privately, and of gradually shortening the text, it was not long until the idea occurred of employing them for public devotion, especially in cases of epidemic, as had been the practice of the Church with the litanies of the Saints, which were sung in penitential processions and during public calamities. Hence it must be emphasized that the earliest certain mention we have of a public recital of Marian Litanies is actually related to a time of pestilence, particularly in the fifteenth century. An incunabulum of the Casanatensian Library in Rome, which contains the Venice litanies referred to above, introduces them with the following words: "Oraciones devote contra imminentes tribulaciones et contra pestem". At Venice, in fact, these same litanies were finally adopted for liturgical use in processions for plague and mortality and asking for rain or for fair weather. Probably they began to be sung in this connexion during the calamities of the fifteenth century; but in the following century we find them prescribed, as being an ancient custom, in the ceremonials of St. Mark's, and they were henceforth retained until after the fall of the republic, i. e. until 1820.

In the second half of the fifteenth century we meet another type of litany which was to be publicly chanted *tempore pestis sive epydimie*. The invocations are very simple and all begin, not with the words "Sancta Maria", but with "Sancta mater", e. g.: Sancta mater Creatoris; Sancta mater Salvatoris; Sancta mater munditie; Sancta mater auxilii; Sancta mater consolationis; Sancta mater intemerata; Sancta mater inviolata; Sancta mater virginum, etc. At the end, however, are a few short petitions such as those found in the litanies of the saints.

Before going further, it may be well to say a few words on the composition of the litanies we have been considering. With regard to their content, which consists mainly of praises of the Blessed Virgin, it would seem to have been taken not so much from the Scriptures and the Fathers, at least directly, as from popular medieval Latin poetry. To be convinced of this, it suffices to glance through the Daniel and Mone collections, and especially through the "Analecta Hymnica medii ævi" of Dreves-Blume. In the earlier and longer litanies whole rhythmic strophes are to be found, taken bodily from such poetry, and employed as praises of the Blessed Virgin. With regard to their form, it is certain that those who first composed the Marian litanies aimed at imitating the litanies of the Saints which had been in use in the Church since the eighth century. During the Middle Ages, as is well known, it was customary to repeat over and over single invocations in the litanies of the saints, and thus we find that the basic principle of the Marian litanies is this constant repetition of the invocation, "Sancta Maria, ora pro nobis." And in order that this repetition might not prove monotonous in the Middle Ages recourse was had to an expedient since then universally used, not only in private devotions but even in liturgical prayer, that of amplifying by means of what are called *tropes* or *farciturœ*. They had a model in the Kyrie of the Mass, e. g. "Kyrie, fons bonitatis, pater ingenite, a quo bona cuncta procedunt, eleison." It was an easy matter to improvise between the "Sancta Maria" and the "Ora pro nobis", repeated over and over, a series of tropes consisting of different praises, with an occasional added petition, imitated however broadly from the litanies of the saints. Thus the Marian litany was evolved.

Gradually the praises became simpler; at times the petitions were omitted, and, from the second half of the fifteenth century, the repetition of the "Sancta Maria" began to be avoided, so that the praises alone remained, with the accompaniment "Ora pro nobis". This made up the new group of litanies which we must now consider. The connecting link between the litanies we have discussed and this new group may

have been a litany found in a manuscript of prayers, copied in 1524 by Fra Giovanni da Falerona. It consists of fifty-seven praises, and the "Sancta Maria" is repeated, but only at intervals of six or seven praises, perhaps because the shape or size of the parchment was so small that it held only six or seven lines to the page, and the copyist contented himself with writing the "Sancta Maria" once at the head of each page. But, because of its archaic form, this litany must be considerably anterior to 1524, and may have been copied from some fifteenth-century MS. The praises are chosen in part from previous litanies, and in part they are original. Moreover, their arrangement is better and more varied. The first place is given to praises bestowed on the name of "Mater"; then come those expressing the Blessed Virgin's tender love for mankind; then the titles given her in the creeds; then those beginning with "Regina", which are identical with those we now have in the Litany of Loreto. Two new titles are introduced: "Causa nostræ lætitiæ" and "Vas spirituale", which are not found in earlier litanies. Noteworthy also are three invocations, "Advocata christianorum", "Refugium desperatorum", "Auxilium peccatorum", which passed by an easy change into the "Refugium peccatorum" and "Auxilium christianorum" of the Litany of Loreto. In a word, if we omit the petitions of this older form, and its reiteration of the "Sancta Maria", we have a litany which in the choice and arrangement of praises comes very close to the Litany of Loreto.

Now there are many similar examples in which the litany consists of praises alone without the repetition of the "Sancta Maria", and in which arrangement and form come nearer and nearer to the Litany of Loreto. Such are: (1) a litany in a manuscript of the Biblioteca Angelica in Rome (formerly, No. 392; second half of the fifteenth century; fol. 123). Except for light variants, it is identical with one printed at Venice in 1561, and another printed at Capri in 1503; (2) a litany found in a manuscript missal of the sixteenth century; (3) a litany printed at Venice in two different editions of the "Officium B. Virginis" in 1513 and 1545; (4) a litany found in a codex of the "Compagnia della Concezione di Maria SS." of Fiorenzuola d'Arda (Piacenza), founded in 1511; (5) a litany found in a codex of the priory of Sts. Philip and James, Apostles, at Montegranaro, in which the baptisms during the years 1548–58 are recorded. This litany is the shortest of all and the closest in similarity to that of Loreto.

This form of litany was widely circulated, both in script and in print, during the sixteenth century. A comparison of the texts will show that they contain the praises in the Loreto Litany, with two exceptions: the "Virgo prudentissima" of the Loreto Litany is found as "Virgo prudens", and the "Auxilium christianorum", though it appears in no text before this time, is, as remarked above, an easy variant of the litany of 1524. So far no MS. of the Loreto Litany has been discovered, but it cannot be doubted that it is nothing more than a happy arrangement of a text belonging to the last group. And, moreover, it may be laid down as probable that the Loreto text became customary in the Holy House towards the close of the fifteenth century, at a time when in other places similar litanies were being adapted for public use to obtain deliverance from some calamity. It is only in 1531, 1547, and 1554, that the documents afford indications of litanies being sung in that sanctuary, though the text is not given.

The earliest printed copy of the Litany of Loreto so far known is that of Dillingen, which is undated, and seems to belong to the end of 1557 or the beginning of 1558. As Dr. Paulus, following up a discovery made by Gass, has observed, it was probably published and circulated in Germany by Blessed Canisius. It is entitled: "Letania Loretana. Ordnung der Letaney von unser lieben Frawen wie sie zu Loreto alle Samstag gehalten" (Order of the Litany of Our Lady as said every Saturday at Loreto). The text is just the same as we have it to-day, except that it has "Mater piissima" and "Mater mirabilis", where we have "Mater purissima" and "Mater admirabilis". Further, the invocations "Mater creatoris" and "Mater salvatoris" are wanting, though this must be due to some oversight of the editor, since they are found in every manuscript of this group; on the other hand, the "Auxilium christianorum" is introduced though it does not occur in the other texts. We find this title in a Litany of Loreto printed in 1558. As already shown in the writer's book on this subject, Pope Pius V could not have introduced the invocation "Auxilium christianorum" in 1571 after the Battle of Lepanto, as stated in the sixth lesson of the Roman Breviary for the feast of S. Maria Auxiliatrix (24 May); and to this conclusion the Dillingen text adds indisputable evidence.

The Litany of Loreto had taken root at Loreto, and was being spread throughout the world, when it ran grave risk of being lost forever. St. Pius V by Motu Proprio of 20 March, 1571, published 5 April, had prohibited all existing offices of the B. V. Mary, disapproving in general all the prayers therein, and substituting a new "Officium B. Virginis" without those prayers and consequently without any litany. It would seem that this action on the part of the pope led the clergy of Loreto to fear that the text of their litany was likewise prohibited. At all events, in order to keep up the old time custom of singing the litany every Saturday in honour of the Blessed Virgin, a new text was drawn up containing praises drawn directly from the Scriptures, and usually applied to the Bl. Virgin in the Liturgy of the Church. This new litany was set to music by the choirmaster of the Basilica of Loreto, Costanzo Porta, and printed at Venice in 1575. It is the earliest setting to music of a Marian litany that we know of. In the following year (1576) these Scriptural litanies were printed in two different handbooks for the use of pilgrims. In both they bear the title: "Litaniæ deiparæ Virginis ex Sacra Scriptura depromptæ quæ in alma Domo lauretana omnibus diebus Sabbathi, Vigiliarum et Festorum decantari solent". But in the second handbook, the work of Bernardine Cirillo, archpriest of Loreto, the old text of the litany is also printed, though with the plainer title, "Aliæ Litaniæ Beatæ Mariæ Virginis", a clear sign that it was not quite forgotten.

On 5 Feb., 1578, the archdeacon of Loreto, Giulio Candiotti, sent to Pope Gregory XIII the "Laudi o lettanie moderne della S^ma^ Vergine, cavate dalla sacra Scrittura" (New praises or litanies of the most holy Virgin, drawn from Sacred Scripture), with Porta's music and the text apart, expressing the wish that His Holiness would cause it to be sung in St. Peter's and in other churches as was the custom at Loreto. The pope's reply is not known, but we have the opinion of the theologian to whom the matter was referred, in which the composition of the new litany is praised, but which does not judge it opportune to introduce it into Rome or into church use on the authority of the pope, all the more because Pius V "in reforming the Little Office of the Blessed Virgin completely abolished, among other things, some proper litanies of the Blessed Virgin which existed in the old [office], and which (if I remember rightly) were somewhat similar to these". The judgment concludes that the litany might be sung at Loreto as a devotion proper to that shrine, and if others wanted to adopt it they might do so by way of private devotion.

This attempt having failed, the Scriptural litany straightway began to lose favour, and the Loreto text was once more resumed. In another manual for pilgrims, published by Angelita in that same year 1578,

the Scriptural litany is omitted, and the old Loreto text appears with the title: "Letanie che si cantano nella Santa Casa di Loreto ogni Sabbato et feste delle Madonna". In a new edition (1580) of Angelita's book, the Scriptural litany is restored but relegated to a secondary position, though included under the title "Altre letanie che si cantano", etc. From this it is clear that for a time both litanies were in use at Loreto. But in subsequent editions of Angelita's manual, and in other manuals of devotion, the Scriptural litany is printed with the bare title "Litaniæ ex S. Scriptura depromptæ", until the seventeenth century when it disappears altogether. Meanwhile, thanks to Angelita's manuals, the Loreto text was introduced elsewhere, and even reached Rome, when Sixtus V, who had entertained a singular devotion for Loreto, by the Bull "Reddituri" of 11 July, 1587, gave formal approval to it, as to the litany of the Holy Name of Jesus, and recommended preachers everywhere to propagate its use among the faithful.

On the strength of this impulse given to the Litany of Loreto, certain ascetical writers began to publish a great number of litanies in honour of the Saviour, the B. Virgin, and the saints, often ill-advised and containing expressions theologically incorrect, so that Pope Clement VIII had promulgated (6 Sept., 1601) a severe decree of the Holy Office, which, while upholding the litanies contained in the liturgical books as well as the Litany of Loreto, prohibited the publication of new litanies, or use of those already published in public worship, without the approbation of the Congregation of Rites.

At Rome the Litany of Loreto was introduced into the Basilica of S. Maria Maggiore by Cardinal Francesco Toledo in 1597; and Paul V, in 1613, ordered it to be sung in that church, morning and evening, on Saturdays and on vigils and feasts of the Madonna. As a result of this example the Loreto Litany began to be used, and is still largely used, in all the churches of Rome. The Dominicans, at their general chapter held at Bologna in 1615, ordered it to be recited in all the convents of their order after the Office on Saturdays at the end of the customary "Salve Regina". Before this they had caused the invocation "Regina sacratissimi rosarii" to be inserted in the litany, and it appears in print for the first time in a Dominican Breviary dated 1614, as has been pointed out by Father Walsh, O.P., in "The Tablet", 24 Oct., 1908. Although by decree of 1631, and by Bull of Alexander VII (1664), it was strictly forbidden to make any additions to the litanies, another decree of the Congregation of Rites, dated 1675, permitted the Confraternity of the Rosary to add the invocation "Regina sacratissimi rosarii", and this was prescribed for the whole Church by Leo XIII (24 Dec., 1883). By decree of 22 April, 1903, the same pope added the invocation "Mater boni consilii", which, under the form of "Mater veri consilii", was contained in the Marian litany used for centuries in S. Mark's, Venice, as indicated above. In 1766 Clement XIII granted Spain the privilege of adding after "Mater intemerata" the invocation "Mater immaculata", which is still customary in Spain, notwithstanding the addition of "Regina sine labe originali concepta". This last invocation was originally granted by Pius IX to the Bishop of Mechlin in 1846, and, after the definition of the Immaculate Conception (1854), the congregation by various rescripts authorized many dioceses to make a like addition, so that in a short time it became the universal practice. For these various decrees of the Congregation of Rites, see Sauren, 27–29; 71–78.

De Santi, *Le Litanie lauretane* in *Civiltà Cattolica* (Dec., 1896–April, 1897); *ibid.* (Nov., 1899), 456–62; *ibid.* (Dec., 1899), 637–38; published in book form: De Santi, *Le Litanie lauretane* (Rome, 1897); French tr. Boudinhon, *Les Litanies de la Sainte Vierge* (Paris, 1900); Germ. tr. Nörpel, *Die lauretanische Litanei* (Paderborn, 1900); Vogel, *De ecclesiis Recanat. et Lauret.*, I (Recanati, 1859), 315–30; Sauren, *Die lauretanische Litanei* (Kempten, 1895); Sicking, *Twee litanien der H. Maagd* in *De Katholick* (Leyden, 1900), 329–36; Gass, *Das Alter der lauretanischen Litanei* in *Strassburger Diocesanblatt* (1901), 264–68; Paulus, *Die Einführung der lauretanischen Litanei in Deutschland durch den seligen Canisius* in *Zeitsch. für kath. theol.* (1902), 571–83; Walsh, *Regina Sacratissimi Rosarii* in *The Tablet* (24 Oct., 1908), 656; De Santi, *Per la storia delle Litanie lauretane* in *Civiltà Cattolica* (Nov., 1909), 302–13.

Angelo De Santi.

Litany of the Holy Name, an old and popular form of prayer in honour of the Name of Jesus. The author is not known. Probably Binterim (Denkwürdigkeiten, IV, I, 597) is correct in ascribing it to the celebrated preachers of the Holy Name, Saints Bernardine of Siena and John Capistran, at the beginning of the fifteenth century. At the request of the Carmelites, Pope Sixtus V (1585–90) granted an indulgence of 300 days for its recitation (Samson, "Die Allerheiligen Litanei", Paderborn, 1894, 14). Though this was an implied recognition of the litany, requests made in 1640, 1642, and 1662, for formal approval were rejected. In 1862 Pius IX approved one of the formularies in use, and attached an indulgence of 300 days for the faithful of the dioceses whose bishops had made special application. Leo XIII (16 Jan., 1886) extended the privilege to the entire world (Beringer, "Die Ablässe", Paderborn, 1900, 142).

This litany is arranged on the plan of the Litany of Loreto, and begins with the invocation of the Holy Trinity. The first part enumerates a list of praises referring to Jesus as God and as man. Remembering the blessing bestowed on Peter's confession (Matth., xvi, 16), we call Jesus, "Son of the Living God", "Splendour of the Father", and "Brightness of Eternal Light" (the true light, which enlighteneth every man that cometh into this world—John, i, 9). He is the "King of Glory" (Ps. xxiii, 10), the "Sun of Justice, rising for them that fear the name of the Lord" (Mal., iv, 2). But, lest this splendour and glory make us fear, we turn to Jesus in His humanity, and appeal to him as "Son of the Virgin Mary", and, as such, "amiable" and "admirable"; and, though annihilating Himself in taking the form of a servant (Phil., ii, 7), He is still the "mighty God", "Father of the world to come", "Angel of the great counsel" (Is., ix, 6). Again, though "most powerful", he has become for us "most patient" (led as a sheep to the slaughter—Acts, viii, 32), "most obedient" (even to the death of the cross—Phil., ii, 8), "meek and humble of heart" (Matth., xi, 29). He is the "Lover of chastity" and "Lover of us", blessing the clean of heart (Matth., v, 8), and proving His love for us by giving His life to procure that peace which the angels announced (Luke, ii, 14) and life everlasting, whence He is "God of peace" and "Author of life". During His sojourn on earth He was, and is to-day, "Model of virtues" and "zealous for souls", "our God" and "our refuge"; He is "Father of the poor" and "Treasure of the faithful", the "Good Shepherd" Who lays down His life for His sheep (John, x, 11); He is the "True Light", "Eternal Wisdom", "Infinite Goodness", "our Way and our Life" (John, xiv, 6); He is the "Joy of Angels" and "King of Patriarchs". Through Him all have obtained the knowledge and strength to accomplish God's designs, for He is "Master of Apostles", "Teacher of Evangelists", "Strength of Martyrs", "Light of Confessors", "Purity of Virgins", and "Crown of all Saints". After again calling for mercy and the granting of our prayers, we, in the second part of the litany, beg Jesus to deliver us from all evil that would keep us from the attainment of our last end, from sin and the wrath of God, the snares of the devil and the spirit of uncleanness, from eternal death and the neglect of His inspirations. We adjure Him by the mystery of His holy Incarnation, His nativity and infancy, His most Divine life and labours, His agony and Passion, His Cross and dereliction, His languor, His Death and burial, His Resurrection and Ascension, His joys and Glory. (Where sanctioned by the bishop, the invo-

cation "Through Thine institution of the most holy Eucharist" may be added after "Through Thine Ascension"—S. R. C., 8 Feb., 1905). The litany closes with the triple invocation of the Lamb of God, the petition, "Jesus hear us", "Jesus graciously hear us", and two prayers.

See under LITANY; also *Theol. prakt. Quartalschrift* (1893), 97; (1902), 300, 521. FRANCIS MERSHMAN.

Litany of the Saints, the model of all other litanies, of great antiquity. It was used in the "Litania Septiformis" of St. Gregory the Great, and in the procession of St. Mamertus. In the Eastern Church, litanies with the invocation of saints were employed in the days of St. Basil (d. 379) and of St. Gregory Thaumaturgus (d. about 270) (Basil, Ep. lxiii; Socrates, VI, viii; Sozomen, VIII, vii). It is not known when or by whom the litany was composed, but the order in which the Apostles are given, corresponding with that of the Canon of the Mass, proves its antiquity (Walafr. Strabo, "De Reb. Eccl.", xxiii).

The litany begins with the call for mercy upon God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, in the "Kyrie eleison", "Christe eleison", "Kyrie eleison". Then, considering Christ as our Saviour and Mediator, we ask Him to hear us. In order to render more secure the hearing of our prayers, we again ask each of the Persons of the Holy Trinity for mercy, and, adding those titles which give us a claim to Their consideration, we call upon the First Person: God, the Father of Heaven, to whom we owe existence and life; the Second: Redeemer of the world, to Whom we owe our salvation; the Third: Holy Ghost, to whom we owe our sanctification; and then on the Holy Trinity, one God. To render God propitious, we, aware of our own unworthiness, ask the intercession of those who have become His special friends, through a holy life, the saints in lasting communion with Him. Foremost among these stands Mary, the chosen daughter of the Father, the undefiled mother of the Son, the stainless bride of the Holy Ghost—we call upon her with the triple invocation: Holy Mary, Mother of God, Virgin of virgins. We then invoke the blessed spirits who remained firm in their allegiance to the Almighty during the rebellion of Lucifer and his adherents: Michael, prince of the heavenly host; Gabriel, "fortitude of God", the messenger of the Incarnation; Raphael, "medicine of God", the trusted companion of Tobias; and the other angels, archangels, and orders of blessed "ministering spirits, sent to minister for them, who shall receive the inheritance of salvation" (Heb., i, 14). Next in our confidence is he of whom Christ says "There hath not risen among them that are born of women a greater than John the Baptist" (Matt., xi, 11), the precursor of the Lord, the last of the Prophets of the Old Law and the first of the New.

Next in order come St. Joseph, the foster-father of the Incarnate Word; and all the Patriarchs and Prophets who saved their souls in the hope of Him Who was the expected of the nations. Then follow the saints: Peter, prince of the Apostles, vice-gerent of Christ; Paul, the Apostle of the Gentiles; Andrew, who first heeded the call of the Master; James the Greater and John the Evangelist, the beloved disciple, who, with St. Peter, were most favoured by Christ; Thomas, called Didymus, who received from Christ signal proofs of His Resurrection; James the Less, first Bishop of Jerusalem; Philip; Bartholomew; Matthew, once called Levi, the toll-gatherer, who wrote the First Gospel; Simon the Zealot; Jude; Thaddeus; Matthias, who was chosen to fill the place of Judas Iscariot; Barnabas, called to the Apostolate by the Holy Ghost (Acts, xiii, 2); Luke, the physician, writer of the Third Gospel and the Acts; Mark, the Evangelist, disciple of St. Peter; all the Apostles and Evangelists; the holy disciples of the Lord; the Holy Innocents, the infant martyr-flowers, "Who, slain at the command of Herod, confessed the name of the Lord not by speaking but by dying"(Rom. Brev.). The glorious martyrs are then invoked: Stephen the Deacon, protomartyr, stoned at Jerusalem whilst praying for his executioners (Acts, vii, 58); Laurence, the Roman archdeacon; Vincent, the deacon of Saragossa in Spain; Fabian, the pope, and Sebastian, the soldier; John and Paul, brothers at the Court of Constantia, daughter of Constantine; Cosmas and Damian, renowned physicians of Ægea in Cilicia; Gervasius and Protasius, brothers at Milan; after which follows a collective impetration of all the holy martyrs. The litany now asks the prayers of St. Sylvester, the pope who saw the triumph of the Crucified over paganism; of the Doctors of the Church; Sts. Gregory the Great, pope; Ambrose of Milan; Augustine of Hippo, in Africa; and Jerome, representing Dalmatia and the Holy Land; of the renowned Bishops Martin of Tours; Nicholas of Myra; of all the holy bishops and confessors; of all the holy teachers; of the founders of religious orders: Anthony, father of the anchorites of the desert; Benedict, patriarch of the Western monks; Bernard; Dominic; Francis; of all holy priests and levites; of monks and hermits. We then invoke Mary Magdalen, the model of Christian penance and of a contemplative life, of whom Christ said: "Wheresoever this gospel shall be preached in the whole world that also which she hath done, shall be told for a memory of her" (Matt., xxvi, 13); the virgins and martyrs: Agatha, Lucy, Agnes, Cecilia, Catherine, and Anastasia the Younger; and in conclusion all the holy virgins and widows; all the holy men and women.

The second part of the litany begins with another cry of "Be merciful to us, spare us O Lord; Be merciful to us, graciously hear us O Lord". We then enumerate the ills from which we hope to be delivered: From all evils; from sin; the wrath of God; sudden and unprovided death; the snares of the devil; anger, hatred, and all ill will; the spirit of fornication; lightning and tempest; the scourge of earthquake; plague, famine, and war; from everlasting death. To make our prayers more effective, we present to Christ all that He did for us through the mystery of the Incarnation, through His coming, nativity, baptism and holy fasting, cross and passion, death and burial, holy resurrection, admirable ascension, the coming of the Holy Ghost, the Comforter, and we conclude by the petition, "In the day of judgment, O Lord, deliver us."

In the third part we humbly acknowledge our unworthiness: "We, sinners, beseech Thee, hear us", and add the list of favours that we wish to obtain: that the Lord spare us; pardon us; and bring us to true penance; that He govern and preserve His holy Church; preserve our Apostolic prelate, and all orders of the Church, in holy religion; humble the enemies of the Church; give peace and true concord to Christian kings and princes; peace and unity to Christian nations; strengthen and preserve us in His holy service; raise our minds to heavenly desires; reward with eternal good all our benefactors; deliver us, our brethren, kinsfolk, and benefactors, from eternal damnation; give and preserve the fruits of the earth; and grant eternal rest to the faithful departed. We ask all this in calling upon the Son of God, thrice invoking the Lamb of God who takes away the sins of the world. We repeat the "Kyrie", as in the beginning, and add the prayer taught by Christ Himself, the Our Father. Then follow psalm lxix, "O God, come to my assistance", etc., and a number of verses, responses, and prayers, renewing the former petitions. We conclude with an earnest request to be heard, and an appeal for the faithful departed.

Three forms of the Litany of the Saints are at present in liturgical use. The form given above is prescribed by the Roman Ritual at the laying of the corner-stone of a new church, at the blessing or recon-

ciliation of the same or of a cemetery, in the rite of blessing the people and fields in virtue of a special papal indult, for the major and minor Rogation Days, in the procession and prayers to obtain rain or fine weather, to avert storms and tempests, in time of famine or war, to escape mortality or in time of pestilence, in any tribulation, during the translation of relics, in solemn exorcisms of the possessed, and at the Forty Hours' Devotion. The Roman Pontifical, besides the occasions given in the Ritual, orders its recitation in the conferring of major orders, in the consecration of a bishop, benediction of an abbot or abbess, consecration of virgins, coronation of a king or queen, consecration of a church, expulsion and readmission of public penitents on Maundy Thursday, and in the "Ordo ad Synodum".

Another form is given in the Roman Missal for Holy Saturday and the Vigil of Pentecost. It is an abbreviation of the other. Each verse and response must be duplicated in this litany and in that chanted on Rogation Days (S. R. C., 3993, ad 4).

A third form is in the "Commendatio" of the Roman Ritual, in which the invocations and supplications are specially chosen to benefit the departing soul about to appear before its Maker (Holzhey, "Thekla-Akten", 1905, 93). This and the preceding form may not be used on other occasions (S. R. C., 2709, ad 1).

Formerly it was customary to invoke only classes of saints, then individual names were added, and in many places local saints were added (Rock, "The Church of Our Fathers", London, 1903, 182; "Manuale Lincopense", Paderborn, 1904, 71). To obtain uniformity, changes and additions to the approved were forbidden (S. R. C., 2093, 3236, 3313).

Römische Quartalschrift (1903), 333; BYKOUKAL in BUCHBERGER, *Kirchliches Handlex.*, s. v. *Litanei;* PUNKES in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v. *Litanei;* SAMSON, *Die Allerheiligen Litanei* (Paderborn, 1894); *Pastor Bonus*, III, 278.

FRANCIS MERSHMAN.

Literature, CLASSICAL. See LATIN LITERATURE IN THE CHURCH.

Lithuania (Ger. *Litauen*), an ancient grand-duchy united with Poland in the fourteenth century.

The Lithuanians belong to the Indo-Germanic family, of which they form with the Letts and the extinct Borussians (Old Prussians) the Balto-Slavonic group. Within the Russian Empire they dwell principally in the governmental districts of Kovno, Grodno, Tchernigoff, and, in smaller numbers, in some few districts of Russian Poland (total in 1897: 1,658,542, or, including the Letts, 3,094,469). In Germany they are found in the northern part of East Prussia and in West Prussia (total about 110,000). Concerning their early history, even to-day little reliable information is available. In the twelfth century of our era, we find them divided into various clans and taking part in the wars between the princes of Polozk, Novgorod, Tchernigoff, etc., now as allies of the princes and again as enemies. From the end of the twelfth century they were engaged in constant warfare with the Order of the Brethren of the Sword, who were extending their conquests along the coast of the Baltic into Livonia. The Lithuanians were divided politically into numerous principalities, mostly hereditary, and to a great extent independent of one another.

The credit of having united them belongs to Prince Mendog (or Mindowe), who, towards the middle of the thirteenth century, succeeded in compelling the lesser princes to recognize his supremacy. With a view to strengthening his position against external enemies, especially the Teutonic Order, Mindowe and his wife sought baptism in 1250 or 1251, and received from Innocent IV the royal crown, with which he was crowned by the Bishop of Kulm, in 1252 (1253) in presence of the Master of the Teutonic Order. As Mindowe desired a special diocese for his territories, one Christian, a member of the Teutonic Order, was by order of the pope consecrated Bishop of Lithuania by Archbishop Albert of Riga. Notwithstanding Albert's efforts to secure this new diocese as suffragan of his see, it was made directly dependent on Rome. Of Christian's activity in Lithuania little is known. At this period, however, Christianity acquired no firm footing in Lithuania proper; it was embraced only by Mindowe and his immediate friends, and by them purely for political reasons, and it was also with an eye to political interest that they reverted to paganism about 1262. As Christian was coadjutor Bishop of Mainz as early as 1259, he cannot have long occupied the See of Lithuania; his successor, John, also a member of the Teutonic Order, also appears as coadjutor Bishop of Constance. The murder of Mindowe by his nephew Traniate was followed by great political confusion and a complete relapse into paganism. In the Russian territories, however, which were then and later known as Lithuanian, Christianity was retained under the Greek Orthodox form, these regions having been evangelized from Byzantium.

The first step towards the restoration of Lithuanian power was taken by Gedymin (archduke from 1316), when he introduced German colonists into his territories, and founded numerous cities and towns, granting them the privileges customary in Germany. The most important of these cities was Wilna, afterwards the capital of Lithuania. Gedymin succeeded in extending his kingdom to the east by successful battles with the Tatars, who had then made themselves masters of Russia. From 1336 he was involved in war with the Teutonic Order, and was slain while besieging Welona, one of their fortresses, in 1340 or 1341. Two of his sons, Olgerd and Keistut, successfully defended the independence of their kingdom against the order, while pushing their conquests further into Russia. Vigorous champions of paganism, they opposed the entrance of Christianity within their frontiers, although Gedymin, while himself remaining a heathen, had granted entire freedom to the Christian religion. Thus, the Franciscan and Dominican monasteries founded at Wilna under Gedymin were suppressed by his sons. Olgerd (d. 1377) was succeeded by his son Jagello, who made overtures to the Teutonic Order and concluded a secret treaty with it. Jagello, however, awakened the suspicions of his uncle, Keistut, who took up arms, surprised him at Wilna, and made him prisoner for a time. In the ensuing civil war, Keistut allowed himself to be enticed into Jagello's camp under pledge of personal safety, but on his arrival there he was at once seized, thrown into prison, and eventually put to death (1382).

In 1384, upon the death of Louis I of Hungary and Poland, the Polish nobles, having crowned his daughter Hedwig, decided that as the new queen was but fifteen years old, she must be provided with a consort capable of protecting her dominions. Their choice fell upon Jagello of Lithuania, whose hostility to the Teutonic Order made him their natural ally. Moreover, the Catholic Church in Poland saw in this union the promise of glorious missionary activity in a land still for the most part pagan. The Franciscan provincial, Kmita, who enjoyed Jagello's confidence, was one of the foremost advocates of union between the kingdoms. Jagello, after formally suing for the queen's hand, promised to embrace the Catholic Faith, with his brothers and all his subjects, to unite his Lithuanian and Russian lands forever with the Polish Crown, to recover at his own expense the territory taken from Poland, and to pay Duke William of Austria, who had been promised Hedwig's hand, an indemnity of 200,000 gulden. Hedwig at length consented to the match. Jagello was baptized on 15 Feb., 1386, taking the name of Wladislaw, and on

4 March he was married to Hedwig and crowned King Consort and Regent of Poland.

As the result of this union between Lithuania and Poland, a mighty Christian kingdom arose in Eastern Europe. Lithuania itself, three times as large as Poland, but far below it in culture, ceased to be independent, but it was now for the first time brought into immediate contact with Western civilization. In 1387 Jagello returned to his home, accompanied by missionaries. He won the good will of the nobles (*boyars*) for Christianity by granting them, on 20 February, the same liberties as were then enjoyed by the Catholic nobles in Poland. A see was established at Wilna, and Vasylo, a Polish Franciscan, appointed its first bishop. The Russian portions of Lithuania (Kiev, Tchernigoff, etc.) remained Greek Orthodox, but the Samoghitians continued for some time longer to be pagans. To strengthen the internal union between the peoples, Polish law was conceded only to the Catholic Lithuanians in the Constitution of 1387, and marriage with the Greek Orthodox was forbidden. At first the relation between Lithuania and Poland was simply a personal union. Jagello retained for himself the princely dignity, but appointed a governor for Lithuania—first his brother Skirgjello and then, from 1392 to 1430, his cousin Witold. His endeavour to maintain this relation of independence towards the Polish Crown was rendered abortive by his defeat at the hands of the Tatars in 1399, which compelled him to enter into closer relations with the Poles. In 1401 the political union of the kingdoms took place; Lithuania was to be independent as long as Witold lived, but was then to be annexed to the Crown of Poland; Witold and the boyars took the oath of allegiance, and the Polish nobility promised to support the Lithuanians, and, after Jagello's death, to elect no king without first consulting them.

Besides their common warfare against the Teutonic Order, the fusion of the two peoples was furthered by the Assembly of Horodlo on the Bug, in 1413, at which the earlier union was renewed, and a large number of the Lithuanian boyars were admitted into the Polish nobility, receiving identical privileges. Furthermore, both the Polish and the Lithuanian nobility received from the king the right of convoking assemblies and parliaments in the interests of the kingdom with the permission of the prince. For the Lithuanians, whose government had previously been absolute, this right meant a constitution—even though oligarchical—by means of which they could readily make their influence felt in the affairs of the nation. But the division between Catholics and Greek Orthodox in the Little Russian districts still continued. To heal this, Witold laboured for ecclesiastical union between the two sections of the people. In 1415 he summoned an Orthodox synod at Nowohorodok, which declared the Lithuanian Orthodox Church, with its Metropolitan of Kiev, independent of the Patriarch of Moscow. In 1418 he sent Gregory Camblak (or Cemiwlak), Metropolitan of Kiev, with eighteen suffragan bishops, to the Council of Constance to conclude a union with Rome, and to secure, in return for their recognition of papal supremacy, the retention of the Slavic Liturgy and Rite. The mission failed, however, nor were the negotiations at the Council of Florence in 1439 more successful. It was, indeed, only about 150 years later, at the Synod of Brest-Litovsk (1595–96), that the union of the Little Russian, or Ruthenian, Church with Rome was accomplished (see UNION OF BREST).

Religious divisions and the establishment of Polish garrisons in Lithuania, created a state of feeling which, after Witold's death, manifested itself in repeated rebellions. The union was formally dissolved when, on the death of Casimir IV, in 1492, the Lithuanians chose his fourth son, Alexander, as their grand-duke, and the Poles elected his third son, John Albert, their king. Only the war against the Teutonic Order, in 1499, brought the two peoples together once more. Even after the death of Alexander, in 1501, there still remained a powerful party in favour of independence; these found support in Russia, which, from the time of Ivan III (1462–1505), had been growing in power. The threatened separation, however, and the daily increasing evidence that Russia was to be the chief rival of Poland in Eastern Europe, led to a reaction among the Poles. They recognized the urgent necessity of exchanging a deceptive union for a genuine unity of the whole Polish Empire. Four previous diets having vainly sought a solution of the problem, that assembled at Lublin in 1569 at last affected the Union of Lublin. The union was proclaimed in July of the same year, and confirmed on oath by both parties. Henceforth, Poles and Lithuanians formed one kingdom, with one king elected in common, with a common diet, a common mint, etc.; of its earlier independence, Lithuania retained its own administration, its own finances, and its own army. Thereafter, Lithuania shared the fate of Poland, although in 1648 one section of the Lithuanians of Little Russia—the Ukraine—separated from Poland and, in 1654, made their submission to the Tsar of Russia. The various partitions of Poland resulted in the larger portion of Lithuania being ceded to Russia, the smaller to Prussia.

(See also GREEK CATHOLICS IN AMERICA; GREEK CHURCH; EASTERN CHURCHES.)

For a complete bibliography of Lithuania consult BELTRAMAITIS, *Bibliographical Materials* (2nd ed., St. Petersburg, 1904) (in Russian). The most important works are: SCHLOEZER, *Gesch. von Litauen als einen eigenen Grossfürstentum bis zum Jahre 1659* (Halle, 1785); NARBUT, *The Ancient History of the Lithuanian People* (Vilna, 1835) (Polish); THEINER, *Vetera Monum. Poloniæ et Lithuaniæ hist. illustrantia* (3 vols., Rome, 1860–63); ANTONWITSCH, *Historical Sketch of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania* (Kiev, 1878) (Russian); BATINSCHKOW, *White Russia and Lithuania* (St. Petersburg, 1890) (Russian); BRÜCKNER *Ancient Lithuania* (Warsaw, 1904) (Polish); TOTORAITIS, *Die Litauer unter dem König Mindowe bis zum Jahre 1263* (Fribourg, 1905); LELEWEL, *Hist. de la Lithuanie* (Paris, 1861); *Allgem. litauische Rundschau* (Tilsit, 1900—). See also works on Poland, especially ROEPELL AND CARO, *Gesch. Polens* (5 vols., Hamburg and Gotha, 1840–88) (reaching to 1506); SCHIEMANN, *Russland, Poland u. Livland bis ins 17. Jahrh.* (2 vols., Berlin, 1884–87); MORFILL, *Poland* (London and New York, 1893), in *Story of the Nations Series*.

JOSEPH LINS.

Litta, a noble Milanese family which gave two distinguished cardinals to the Church.

I. ALFONSO LITTA, Archbishop of Milan, b. in 1608; d. at Rome, 22 Aug., 1679. After filling other important positions, he was appointed governor of the Marches by Innocent X, was made Archbishop of Milan in 1652, and received the purple in 1640. He died shortly after the conclave which elected Innocent XI. He was a learned and charitable man and defended with courage the ecclesiastical immunities against the officers of the King of Spain. His works are enumerated by Argelati in the "Bibliotheca Scriptorum Mediolanensium" (Milan, 1745); his life was written by M. Bardocchi (Bologna, 1691).

II. LORENZO LITTA, b. at Milan, 25 Feb., 1756; d. at Monte Flavio, 1 May, 1820. A distinguished *littérateur*, he played a prominent part in contemporary ecclesiastical history. As a youth he was sent by his parents to the Clementine College in Rome, where he made rapid progress in letters and law. Not long after the completion of his studies he was made prothonotary Apostolic by Pius VI. In 1793 he was consecrated titular Archbishop of Thebes, and sent as nuncio to Poland, where he arrived in March, 1794, shortly before the outbreak of the revolution. Notwithstanding the difficulty of his own position, he used his influence with Kosciuszko on behalf of the Church and churchmen, and saved the life of Monsignor Skarzewski, Bishop of Chelm, already condemned to death, though he was not so successful with regard to the Bishop of Wilna and Livonia. In the negotiations

for the third partition of Poland, he used his utmost endeavours to have the three States guarantee the preservation of the Church organization and property—guarantees which were disgracefully violated by Catherine II. On the latter's death Litta was sent on an extraordinary mission to Moscow for the coronation of Paul I, whence he was transferred as ambassador of Pius VI to St. Petersburg, to settle, according to Paul's wish, the affairs of the Latin and the Uniat Ruthenian church. He secured the erection, or rather restoration, of six dioceses of the Latin Rite and three of the Ruthenian (Polotsk, Lutsk, and Brest). The restoration of the See of Kiev was prevented by the Holy Synod. Church property was only partly restored, though the Government was obliged to establish suitable allowances for the clergy. Litta also induced the metropolitans of Gnesen (Posnania), and Lemberg (Galicia) to renounce their jurisdiction over the dioceses of the Latin Rite in Russian territory, these being transferred to the new metropolis of Mohileff. Through his efforts also the Basilian Order was restored. In April, 1789, he had to leave Russia.

On the death of Pius VI he went to Venice to assist at the conclave. When he returned to Rome he was given an office in the papal treasury which enabled him to eradicate many abuses and introduce a better administration. In 1801 he was created cardinal and was made Prefect of the Congregation of the Index and, later, of Studies. In 1809 he was expelled from Rome with Pius VII and sent to Saint-Quentin on the Seine. During this exile he translated the Iliad, and wrote a series of letters containing a brilliant refutation of the four Gallican Articles of 1682, then the subject of much discussion. Some of these letters were addressed to Napoleon himself, and were later published anonymously. Returning to Rome with Pius VII, Litta was made Prefect of Propaganda, which, under his administration, soon recovered its former status. In 1814 he became suburbicarian Bishop of Sabina, and in 1818 Cardinal Vicar of Rome. He is buried at Rome in SS. Giovanni e Paolo.

A biography was published by BARUFFALDI (Florence, 1828); see also LITTA, *Famiglie celebri italiane.*

U. BENIGNI.

Little Brothers of Mary. See MARY, LITTLE BROTHERS OF.

Little Office of Our Lady, a liturgical devotion to the Blessed Virgin, in imitation of, and in addition to, the Divine Office. It is first heard of in the middle of the eighth century at Monte Cassino. According to Cardinal Bona, who quotes from a MS. of Peter the Deacon (twelfth century), there was, in addition to the Divine Office, another "which it is customary to perform in honour of the Holy Mother of God, which Zachary the Pope [d. 752] commanded under strict precept to the Cassinese Monastery." This would seem to indicate that some form of the Office of Our Lady was already extant and, indeed, we hear of an Office in her honour composed by St. Ildephonsus, who lived about the end of the seventh century. The Eastern Church, too, possesses an Office of the B. V. M., attributed to St. John Damascene (c. 730). But though various Offices in honour of Our Lady were in existence earlier, it is probable that the Little Office, as a part of the liturgy, did not come into general use before the tenth century; and it is not unlikely that its diffusion is largely due to the marked devotion to the Blessed Virgin which is characteristic of the Church in England under the guidance of St. Dunstan and St. Ethelwold. Certainly, during the tenth century, an Office of the Blessed Virgin is mentioned at Augsburg, at Verdun, and at Einsiedeln; while already in the following century there were at least two versions of her "Hours" extant in England. In the eleventh century we learn from St. Peter Damian that it was already commonly recited amongst the secular clergy of Italy and France, and it was through his influence that the practice of reciting it in choir, in addition to the Great Office, was introduced into several Italian monasteries. At Cluny the Office of the B. V. M. was not introduced till the end of the eleventh century, and then only as a devotion for the sick monks. In the twelfth century came the foundation of the Orders of Cîteaux and Prémontré, of which the latter only retained the Little Office in addition to the Divine Office. The Austin Canons also retained it, and, perhaps through their influence, in the course of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, it developed from a private devotion into part of the daily duty of the secular clergy as well. By the fourteenth century the recital of the Little Office had come to be an almost universal practice and was regarded as obligatory on all the clergy. This obligation remained until St. Pius V removed it by the Bull "Quod a nobis" of 1568. At the present time, however, it is recited on certain days by several of the older orders, and it serves, instead of the Greater Office, as the liturgical prayer of lay brothers and lay sisters in some of the contemplative orders, and of the members of most of the congregations of women engaged in active work.

Down to the Reformation it formed a large part of the "Primer or Lay-folk's Prayer-book", and was customarily recited by the devout laity, by whom the practice was continued for long afterwards among the persecuted Catholics. To-day it is recited daily by Dominican, Carmelite, Augustinian, and by large numbers of the Franciscan, Tertiaries, as well as by many pious lay-folk who desire to take part in the liturgical prayer of the Church. It is worth noting that the form of the Little Office of Our Lady has varied considerably at different periods and in different places. The earlier versions varied very considerably, chiefly as regards the hymns and antiphons used: in England in medieval times the main differences seem to have been between the Sarum and York Uses. Since the time of St. Pius V, that most commonly recited has been the version of the reformed Breviary of that pope. In this version, which suffers somewhat from the classicism of the sixteenth century, are to be found the seven "Hours", as in the Greater Office. At Matins, after the versicles follow the invitatory "Ave Maria, gratia plena, Dominus tecum" with the "Venite"; then the hymn "Quem terra, pontus, sidera"; then three groups of psalms, each with their antiphons, of which one group is said on Sundays, Mondays, and Thursdays, the second on Tuesdays and Fridays, the third on Wednesdays and Saturdays. Next follow three lessons with responsories and (except in Lent and Advent) the "Te Deum". At Lauds, there are the eight psalms of the Divine Office for Sundays, sung to five antiphons. Then the Little Chapter, and the hymn "O Gloriosa Virginum". Next a versicle and the canticle "Benedictus" with its antiphon. Lastly, the prayer and commemoration of the saints. In each of the four Little Hours the hymn "Memento rerum conditor" immediately follows the versicles; then three psalms are recited, under one of the antiphons of Lauds; then are said the Little Chapter, versicles, and a prayer. At Vespers, after the versicles and five psalms with their antiphons, follow the Little Chapter, the hymn "Ave Maris stella", a short versicle, and the canticle "Magnificat" with its antiphon; then the prayers as at Lauds. Compline begins with special versicles, then follow three psalms without antiphons, then the hymn "Memento rerum conditor", a Little Chapter, a versicle, the canticle "Nunc Dimittis", versicles, a prayer, and the Benediction. After the hours are recited the "Pater Noster" and the proper antiphon of Our Lady for the season. This last, the antiphons of the psalms and

canticles and the Little Chapters are the only parts of the office that vary with the seasons. Pope Leo XIII granted (17 Nov., 1887), to those who recite the whole Office of Our Lady, an indulgence daily of seven years and seven quarantines, and a plenary indulgence once a month: to those who recite Matins and Lauds only, a daily indulgence of three hundred days: and (8 Dec., 1897) to those who recite Vespers and Compline only, and for each Hour, an indulgence of fifty days.

BATIFFOL, *Histoire du bréviaire romain* (Paris, 1893); BÄUMER, *Geschichte des Breviers* (Freiburg im Br., 1895); BISHOP, *On the Origin of the Primer* in LITTLEHALES, *The Prymer or lay folk's prayer book*, II (Early English Text Society, London, 1897); DEWICK, *Facsimiles of Horæ de Beata Maria Virgine from English MSS. of the Eleventh Century* (Henry Bradshaw Society, London, 1902); HOSKINS, *Horæ Beatæ Mariæ Virginis, or Sarum and York Primers . . . and Primers of the Reformed Roman Use* (London, 1901); TAUNTON, *The Little Office of Our Lady* (London, 1903).

LESLIE A. ST. L. TOKE.

Little Rock, DIOCESE OF (PETRICULANA).—The State of Arkansas and the Indian Territory, parts of the Louisiana Purchase, were formed, 1843, into the Diocese of Little Rock. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries there was no significant church work done in Arkansas. The white population in 1785 was 196 and in 1799 only 368. Bishop Dubourg (1820) visited the Osage Indians and, after him, Father Croix. Under Bishop Rosati, the Lazarists, from their seminary at the Barrens, Missouri, did praiseworthy missionary work (1824–30) among the Indians and scattered whites. The most noted secular priest of these times was Rev. Richard Bole, who established St. Mary's Mission, five miles below the present Pine Bluff, and brought there, 1838, from St. Geneviève, Missouri, five sisters of Loretto, who opened the first Catholic school in Arkansas. Rev. Andrew Byrne, pastor of St. James's Church, New York City, was consecrated the first bishop, 10 March, 1844.

Bishop Byrne, born in Navan, Ireland, 5 Dec., 1802, and ordained by Bishop England at Charleston, South Carolina, 11 Nov., 1827, brought from New York to Arkansas Fathers Corry of Albany and Donohoe of Troy, New York. All the priests of the earlier days had gone. The Catholic population of the diocese was not more than 1000. Bishop Byrne secured from Naas, Ireland, thirteen Sisters of Mercy, who established, 1850, St. Mary's Academy at Little Rock, and, 1851, St. Ann's Academy at Fort Smith. An imposing frame cathedral was erected in Little Rock, and modest structures were built in several parts of the State. During the Civil War, 1861–65, church work was paralyzed. Bishop Byrne died on 10 June, 1862. The diocese remained *sede vacante*, with Very Rev. P. O'Reilly, V.G., as administrator until 3 Feb., 1867, when Rev. Edward Fitzgerald, pastor of St. Patrick's Church, Columbus, Ohio, became bishop. Bishop Fitzgerald, preconized on 22 June, 1866, and consecrated on 3 Feb., 1867, was born in 1833, at Limerick, Ireland. He entered the Lazarist Seminary at the Barrens, Missouri, in 1850, and was subsequently a student at Mount St. Mary's, Cincinnati, and Mount St. Mary's, Emmitsburg, where he was ordained in 1857 by Archbishop Purcell. Bishop Fitzgerald found in his diocese four parishes, five priests, and a Catholic population of 1600. He began work to secure Catholic immigration for the State, sisters for schools and priests for missions. Benedictine monks from St. Meinrad, Indiana, came in 1876 to Logan County and soon flourishing German settlements arose. The Holy Ghost Fathers of Pittsburg, Pennsylvania, established in 1879 successful German colonies near Morrilton. A Polish settlement was made at Marche in 1880, and Italians came later to Sunnyside, Tontitown, New Gascony, and Barton. Bishop Fitzgerald dedicated, 27 May, 1894, the first church in Arkansas for coloured people, at Pine Bluff, where there had been established an excellent industrial school, now in care of the Colored Sisters of the Holy Family. Monsignor John B. Morris, V.G., of Nashville, Tennessee, was consecrated Coadjutor Bishop of Little Rock, 11 June, 1906, and on the death of Bishop Fitzgerald assumed full control.

Bishop Fitzgerald died in 1907, when there were in the diocese: 41 churches with resident priests; 32 missions with churches; 26 secular priests, and 34 religious; 272 sisters; a Catholic popluation of 20,000, and good financial conditions. The Indian Territory, since it was created a vicariate in 1891, ceased to be part of the Diocese of Little Rock. Bishop Morris, who assumed control of the diocese, 1907, was born at Hendersonville, Tennessee, 29 June, 1866. His theological studies were made at the American College, Rome, and he was ordained priest on 11 June, 1892, in the Basilica of St. John Lateran, by Cardinal Parocchi. After several years' rectorship of the cathedral, Nashville, Bishop Byrne appointed him, 1901, vicar-general, and in 1905 Pius X elevated him to the rank of domestic prelate. In the three years of his incumbency Bishop Morris has opened Little Rock College (1908) at a cost of $50,000, and St. Joseph's orphan asylum on a tract of 720 acres, completed at a cost of $150,000. The first diocesan synod was held on 16 Feb., 1909, at Little Rock, and the first normal school of instruction for Catholic teachers was inaugurated at Little Rock, 11 June, 1909.

GAYARRE, *French Domination* (New Orleans, 1845); IDEM, *Spanish Domination* (New Orleans, 1845); IDEM, *American Domination* (New Orleans, 1845); POPE, *A Tour of the United States* (Richmond, 1792); GREENHOW, *History of Oregon and California* (Boston, 1845); MELISH, *Military and Topographical Atlas* (Philadelphia, 1815); NUTTAL, *Travels in Arkansas* (Philadelphia, 1821); POPE, *Early Days in Arkansas* (Little Rock, 1895); WASHBURN, *Reminiscences of the Indians* (Richmond, 1869); PARKMAN, works; BANCROFT, *History of the United States* (Boston, 1879); REYNOLDS, *Makers of Arkansas History* (New York and Boston, 1905); HEMSTEAD, *School History of Arkansas* (New Orleans, 1889); SHINN, *School History of Arkansas* (Richmond, 1900); ROZIER, *History of the Mississippi Valley* (St. Louis, 1890); JEWELL, *History of the Methodist Church in Arkansas* (Little Rock, 1898); *Publications of the Arkansas Historical Association*, I, II (Little Rock, 1908); HALLIBURTON, *History of Arkansas County, Arkansas* (Dewitt, 1909); SHEA, *History of the Catholic Church* (New York, 1892).

J. M. LUCEY.

Littré, PAUL-MAXIMILIEN-EMILE, French lexicographer and philosopher; b. at Paris, 1 February, 1801; d. there, 2 June, 1881. He studied at the Lycée Louis-le-Grand, Paris, and after graduating with honours, he became secretary to Count Daru. He then studied medicine and he was about to obtain his degree, when his father died and he was compelled to abandon his studies to make a living for his mother, by teaching Greek and Latin for a time. Although he could not be a physician, he was interested in medical studies throughout his life. His first publications deal with medical subjects: "Le choléra oriental" (Paris, 1832), "Les grandes épidémies", an article published in the "Revue des Deux Mondes" (Paris, 1836), "Les œuvres d'histoire naturelle de Goethe" (1838). He founded with Dezeimeris a medical magazine, "L'Expérience" (1837), and translated the "Natural History" of Pliny the Elder (Paris, 1848), the "Handbook of Physiology" by Müller (Paris, 1851), and issued a revised edition of Pierre Nysten's "Dictionnaire de Médecine et de Chirurgie" (Paris, 1854). From 1839 to 1861, he published a translation of the works of Hippocrates. On account of his researches in the scientific field, he was elected to the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres in 1839. While pursuing his scientific studies, he was greatly interested in politics. In 1831, having been introduced to Armand Carrel, he had become a regular contributor to the newspaper "Le National" and retained that position up to the Revolution of 1848. Realizing that the political movement was no longer in accordance with his own ideas, he severed his connexions with "Le National" and devoted his entire time to his studies.

It was towards 1840 that he was initiated into the Positivist philosophy and got acquainted with Auguste Comte, of whom he soon became an independent follower. As a philosopher, he wrote: "Analyse raisonné du cours de philosophie positive" (Paris, 1845), "L'Application de la philosophie positive au gouvernement des sociétés" (Paris, 1849), "Conservation, Révolution et positivisme" (Paris, 1852), "Paroles de philosophie positive" (Paris, 1859), "Auguste Comte et la philosophie positive" (1863), "Fragments de philosophie positive et de sociologie contemporaine" (1876). In 1863, he was a candidate for the French Academy, but owing to the strong opposition of Mgr Dupanloup, Bishop of Orléans, who denounced his works as immoral and impious, he was rejected. He was afterwards admitted to the Academy, in 1871, and Bishop Dupanloup sent his resignation, together with a strong letter to protest against that election which, he thought, "was a disgrace to the illustrious company".

PAUL-EMILE LITTRÉ

Besides his numerous contributions to various reviews, and the publication of his works, Littré founded, in 1867, a new magazine, "La revue de philosophie positive". All this work would have absorbed the entire energy of another man; but this is only a part of the tremendous production of Littré. While he was busily engaged in all these philosophical and scientific works, this indefatigable worker, in 1839, became a member of the committee entrusted with the duty of continuing the "Histoire littéraire de la France", a vast undertaking begun in the eighteenth century by the Benedictine monks of the Saint-Maur Congregation, and taken up by the French Institute, after the Revolution. Attracted by that subject, he published a series of articles on history and literature, on comparative philology and study of languages, which were afterwards gathered under the title of "Histoire de la langue française", "Littérature et histoire" (Paris, 1878), "Etudes et glanures" (Paris, 1880). One of his most interesting contributions to philology is a translation of Book I of the Iliad, in verse and in the French language of the thirteenth century. But by far the most important of all his works, which will make his name live forever, is the "Dictionnaire de la langue française", published from 1859 to 1872 (Paris, 5 vols. and a supplement).

In 1871, Littré was elected to the Assemblée Nationale by the Department of Seine and was made a senator for life in 1874. His fame was then exploited by the Radicals who went so far as to induce him to be initiated a Freemason. Much to their surprise, he pronounced, on the occasion of his initiation, a very conservative speech which disappointed the enemies of the Church. In fact, he had never been an implacable opponent to Catholicism. In 1878 he declined the dedication of a certain book because of bitter attacks against the Church. He publicly acknowledged that he "had never been an absolute contemner of Christianity", and he had, on the contrary, constantly "recognized its lofty character and the benefits that may be derived from it". Towards the end of his life, yielding to the entreaties of his wife and daughter, he had long interviews with Fr. Milléroit, S.J., and finally asked to be baptized and he died in the Catholic Church.

SAINTE-BEUVE, *Littré, sa vie et ses travaux* in *Nouveaux Lundis*, V (Paris, 1863); CARO, *Littré et le Positivisme* (Paris, 1883); PASTEUR AND RENAN, *Discours de réception à l'académie française* (Paris, 1882); SAINT-HILAIRE, *Souvenirs personnels sur Littré* in *La Chronique médicale* (1895); KNELLER, *Das Christendum und die Vertreter der neueren Naturwissenschaft* (Freiburg, 1904).

LOUIS N. DELAMARRE.

Liturgical Books.—Under this name we understand all the books, published by the authority of any church, that contain the text and directions for her official (liturgical) services. It is now the book that forms the standard by which one has to judge whether a certain service or prayer or ceremony is official and liturgical or not. Those things are liturgical, and those only, that are contained in one of the liturgical books. It is also obvious that any church or religion or sect is responsible for the things contained in its liturgical books in quite another sense than for the contents of some private book of devotion, which she at most only allows and tolerates. The only just way of judging of the services, the tone, and the *ethos* of a religious body, is to consult its liturgical books. Sects that have no such official books are from that very fact exposed to all manner of vagaries in their devotion, just as the absence of an official creed leads to all manner of vagueness in their belief. In this article the liturgical books of the Roman Rite are described first, then a short account is given of those of the other rites.

I. THE FIRST TRACES OF LITURGICAL BOOKS.—Our present convenient compendiums—the Missal, Breviary, and so on—were formed only at the end of a long evolution. In the first period (lasting perhaps till about the fourth century) there were no books except the Bible, from which lessons were read and psalms were sung. Nothing was written, because nothing was fixed (see LITURGY). Even after certain forms had become so stereotyped as to make already what we should call a more or less fixed liturgy, it does not seem that there was at first any idea that they should be written down. Habit and memory made the celebrant repeat more or less the same forms each Sunday; the people answered his prayers with the accustomed acclamations and responses—all without books.

It has been much discussed at what period we have evidence of written liturgies. Renaudot ("Liturgiarum Orientalium Collectio", 2nd ed., Frankfurt, 1847, I, pp. ix and xi) thought that no books were written even by the fourth century. He argues this from a passage in St. Basil (d. 379), who distinguishes between the written teaching of the Apostles (in the Bible) and the unwritten tradition, and quotes liturgical functions as belonging to this: "Who", he asks, "of the saints has written down for us the words of the Sacred Invocation in the consecration of the bread and chalice?" (De Spir. Sancto, c. xxvii, in P. G., XXXII, 187). Another argument is that no mention is made of liturgical books in the acts of martyrs (who are required to give up their holy books, that is, always, the Bible), or in the quarrels about the books with the Donatists in the fourth century. Daniel ("Codex liturgicus", IV, Leipzig, 1853, pp. 25–32) argues against this opinion at length, and defends the view that liturgies were written down at the beginning of the fourth century. Probst ("Die ältesten römischen Sakramentarien und Ordines", Münster, 1892, pp. 1–19) tries to establish that there were liturgical books back to the time of the Apostolic Fathers. The argument from St. Basil may be dismissed at once. He is only explaining the well-known distinction between the two sources of revelation, Scripture and tradition. Tradition is distinct from Scripture; it may include other written books, but not the Bible. By "saints"

he means only the writers of Scripture, and therefore his statement is that the Eucharistic Invocation is not in the Bible. As for the Donatists, there is, on the contrary, evidence that both they and the Catholics had liturgical books at that time. Optatus of Mileve, writing about the year 370 against them, says: "You have no doubt cleaned the palls" (linen cloths used in Mass), "tell me what you have done with the books?" ("De schism. Donat.", V, Vienna edition, 1893, p. 153.) What were these books? Both palls and books had been taken from the Catholics, both were used in the liturgy (ibid.). The books were not the Bible, because the Donatists thought them polluted (ibid.). So there were other liturgical books besides the Bible. Augustine too reproaches the Donatists with being in schism with the very churches whose names they read in the "holy books" (epp. lii and liii). So also a synod at Hippo in Africa (in 393) forbids anyone to write down the prayers of other Churches and use them, until he has shown his copy to the more learned brethren (can. xxv; Hefele-Leclercq, "Histoire des Conciles", II, Paris, 1908, p. 88; cf. Probst, op. cit., 13–14).

That some prayers were occasionally written down from the first age is evident. Prayers are quoted in the Apostolic Fathers ("Didache", ix, x; Clement, "First Epistle to the Corinthians", lix, 3—lxi. See LITURGY). This does not, however, prove the existence of liturgical books. Probst thinks that the exact quotations made by the Fathers as far back as the second century prove that the liturgy was already written down. Such quotations, he says, could only be made from written books (op. cit., 15–17). This argument does not seem very convincing. We know that formulæ, especially liturgical formulæ, can become very definite and well-known before they are put in a book. A more solid reason for the existence of a written liturgy at any rate by the fourth century is the comparison of the liturgy of the eighth book of the Apostolic Fathers with the Byzantine Rite of St. Basil. Proclus (d. 446) says that Basil (d. 379) modified and shortened the liturgy because it was too long for the people. There is no reason to doubt what he says (see CONSTANTINOPLE, THE RITE OF). The liturgy shortened by Basil was that of Antioch, of which we have the oldest specimen in the Apostolic Constitutions. A comparison of this (especially the Thanksgiving-prayer) with that of St. Basil (Brightman, "Eastern Liturgies", pp. 14–18 and 321–3) shows in effect that Basil is much shorter. It does not seem likely that, after Basil's necessary shortening, anyone should have taken the trouble to write out the discarded long form. Therefore, the liturgy of the Apostolic Constitutions was written before St. Basil's reform, although it is incorporated into a work not finally compiled till the early fifth century (Funk, "Die apostolischen Konstitutionen", Rottenburg, 1891, p. 366; Probst, op. cit., 12–13).

Our conclusion then is that at any rate by the middle of the fourth century there were written liturgies, and therefore liturgical books of some kind, however incomplete. How long before that anything was written down we cannot say. We conceive portions of the rite written out as occasion required. Evidently one of the first things to be written was the diptychs containing the lists of persons and churches for whom prayers were to be said. These diptychs were used liturgically—the deacon read them—in all rites down to the Middle Ages. Augustine's argument against the Donatists refers to the diptychs (epp. lii and liii above). The diptychs were two tablets folded like a book (δίς and πτυχή); on one side the names of the living, on the other those of the dead were written. They have now disappeared and the names are said from memory. But the Byzantine Rite still contains the rubrics: "The deacon remembers the diptychs of the departed"; "He remembers the diptychs of the living" (Brightman, op. cit., 388–9). No doubt the next thing to be written out was the collection of prayers said by the celebrant (Sacramentaries and Euchologia), then indications for the readers (Comites, Capitularia, Synaxaria) and the various books for the singers (Antiphonaries, books of Troparia), and finally the rubrical directions (Ordines, Typika).

II. HISTORY OF THE ROMAN LITURGICAL BOOKS.—So far the development went on in parallel lines in East and West. When we come to the actual books we must distinguish between the various rites, which have different groups and arrangements. In the Roman Rite the first complete books we know are the Sacramentaries (*Sacramentaria*). A Sacramentary is not the same thing as a Missal. It contains more on the one side, less on the other. It is the book for the celebrant. It contains all and only the prayers that he says. At the time that these books were written it was not yet the custom for the celebrant also to repeat at the altar whatever is sung by the ministers or choir. Thus Sacramentaries contain none of those parts of the Mass, no Lessons, no Introits, Graduals, Offertories and so on, but only the Collects, Prefaces, Canon, all that is strictly the celebrant's part. On the other hand they provide for his use at other occasions besides Mass. As the celebrant is normally supposed to be a bishop, the Sacramentary supplies him with the prayers he wants at ordinations, at the consecration of a church and altar and many exorcisms, blessings, and consecrations that are now inserted in the Pontifical and Ritual. That is the order of a complete Sacramentary. Many of those now extant are more or less fragmentary.

The name *Sacramentarium* is equivalent to the other form also used (for instance, in the Gelasian book), *Liber Sacramentorum*. The form is the same as that of the word *Hymnarium*, for a book of hymns. Gennadius of Marseilles (fifth cent.) uses both. He says of Paulinus of Nola: "Fecit et sacramentarium et hymnarium" (De viris illustribus, xlviii). The word *sacramentum* or *sacramenta* in this case means the Mass. *Sacramenta celebrare* or *facere* is a common term for saying Mass. So St. Augustine (d. 430) remarks that we say "Sursum corda" "in sacramentis fidelium", that is at Mass (De Dono Persev., xiii, 33), and two schismatics of the fifth century complain to the Emperors Gratian and Theodosius that Pope Damasus (366–84) will not let them say Mass; but they do so all the same, because "salutis nostræ sacramenta facienda sunt" (Faustinus and Marcellinus, "Lib. prec. ad Imp." in P. L., XIII, 98; cf. Probst, "Die ältesten röm. Sakram.", 20–1). A number of Sacramentaries of the Roman Rite are still extant, either complete or in part. Of these the most important are the three known by the names Leonine, Gelasian, and Gregorian. Their date, authorship, place, and original purpose have been much discussed. What follows is a compilation of the views of recognized scholars.

The so-called "Sacramentarium Leonianum" is the oldest. Only one manuscript of it is known, written in the seventh century. This manuscript was found in the library of the cathedral chapter of Verona, was published by Joseph Bianchini in 1735 in the fourth volume of his edition of Anastasius Bibliothecarius, and was by him attributed arbitrarily to St. Leo I (440–61). On the strength of this attribution the book was included by the Ballerini in their edition of Leo (Venice, 1753–7), and still bears the name Leonine. It was reprinted by Muratori in his "Liturgia Romana vetus" (Venice, 1748). Now the best edition is that of C. L. Feltoe (Cambridge, 1896). The Leonine Sacramentary represents a pure Roman use with no Gallican elements. But it is not a book compiled for use at the altar. The hopeless confusion of its parts shows this. It is a fragment, containing no Canon nor Ordinary of the Mass, but a collection of Propers

(Collects, Secrets, Prefaces, Postcommunions, and Orationes super populum), of various Masses with ordination forms, arranged according to the civil year. It begins in the middle of the sixth Mass for April, and ends with a blessing for the font "In ieiunio mensis decimi" (i. e. the winter Ember-days). In each month groups of Masses are given, often very large groups, for each feast and occasion. Thus, for instance, in June we find twenty-eight Masses for St. Peter and St. Paul, one after another, each headed: "Item alia" (Feltoe's ed., pp. 36–50); there are fourteen for St. Lawrence, twenty-three for the anniversary of a bishop's consecration (123–39), and so on. Evidently the writer has compiled as many alternative Masses for each occasion as he could find. In many cases he shows great carelessness. He inserts Masses in the wrong place. Many of his Masses *in natali episcoporum* have nothing at all to do with that anniversary, and are really Masses for Sundays after Pentecost; in the middle of a Mass of St. Cornelius and St. Cyprian he has put the preface of a Mass of St. Euphemia (p. 104), a Mass for the new civil year is inserted among those for martyrs (XX *item alia*, p. 9); Masses for St. Stephen's day (26 Dec.) with evident allusions to Christmas are put in August (pp. 86–9), obviously through a confusion with the feast of the finding of his relics (3 Aug.). Many other examples of the same confusion are quoted by Buchwald ("Das sogen. Sacramentarium Leonianum", Vienna, 1908). That the collection is Roman is obvious. It is full of local allusions to Rome. For instance, one of the collects to be said by a bishop on the anniversary of his consecration could only be used by the pope of Rome: "Lord God . . . who, although Thou dost not cease to enrich with many gifts Thy Church spread throughout the world, nevertheless dost look more favourably upon the see of Thy blessed Apostle Peter, as Thou hast desired that it should be most exalted, etc." (p. 127). The Preface for St. John and St. Paul remembers that they are buried within "the boundaries of this city" (p. 34); the Masses of the Patrons of Rome, St. Peter and St. Paul, continually allude to the city (so the preface in the twenty-third Mass: "who, foreseeing that our city would labour under so many troubles, didst place in it the chief members of the power of the Apostles", p. 47), and so on continually (cf. Probst, op. cit., 48–53, etc.).

Mgr Duchesne (Origines du Culte Chrétien, 129–37) thinks that the Leonine book is a private collection of prayers copied without much intelligence from the official books at Rome about the year 538. He arrives at this date especially through an allusion in the Secret of a Mass placed in June (but really an Easter Mass), which refers to a recent deliverance from enemies (Feltoe, p. 73). This allusion he understands to refer to the raising of the siege of Rome by Vitiges and his Goths at Easter-time, 538 (see his other arguments, pp. 131–2). Muratori considered that the book was composed under Felix III (483–92; "Liturgia rom. vetus", diss. xxvii). Probst answers Duchesne's arguments (Die ältesten röm. Sakram., pp. 56–61); he attributes the allusion in the Secret to Alaric's invasion in 402, and thinks that the compilation was made between 366 and 461. The latest theory is that of Buchwald (Das sogen. Sacram. Leon., 62–7), who suggests that the book is a compilation of Roman Masses made in the sixth or seventh century for use in Gaul, so that the composers of Roman books who were at that time introducing the Roman Rite into Gaul (see LITURGY) might have a source from which to draw their material. He suggests Gregory of Tours (d. 594) as possibly the compiler.

The "Gelasian Sacramentary" exists in several manuscripts. It is a Roman book more or less Gallicanized; the various manuscripts represent different stages of this Gallican influence. The oldest form extant is a book written in the seventh or early eighth century for use in the abbey of St. Denis at Paris. This is now in the Vatican library (MS. Reginæ 316). It was first published by Tommasi in his "Codices Sacramentorum nongentis annis vetustiores" (Rome, 1680), then by Muratori in "Liturgia romana vetus", I. Other versions of the same book are the Codices of St. Gall and of Rheinau, both of the eighth century, edited by Gerbert in his "Monumenta veteris liturgiæ alemannicæ," I (St. Blaise, 1777). These three (collated with others) form the basis of the standard edition of H. A. Wilson (Oxford, 1894). The book does not in any old manuscript bear the name of Gelasius; it is called simply "Liber Sacramentorum Romanæ ecclesiæ". It is much more complete than the Leonine Sacramentary. It consists of three books, each marked with a not very accurate title. Book I (The Book of Sacraments in the order of the year's cycle) contains Masses for feasts and Sundays from Christmas Eve to the octave of Pentecost (there are as yet no special Masses for the season after Pentecost), together with the ordinations, prayers for all the rites of the catechumenate, blessing of the font at Easter Eve, of the oil, dedication of churches, and reception of nuns (Wilson, ed., pp. 1–160). Book II (Prayers for the Feasts of Saints) contains the Proper of Saints throughout the year, the Common of Saints, and the Advent Masses (ibid., 161–223). Book III (Prayers and the Canon for Sundays) contains a great number of Masses marked simply "For Sunday" (i. e. any Sunday), the Canon of the Mass, what we should call votive Masses (e. g. for travellers, in time of trouble, for kings, and so on), Masses for the Dead, some blessings (of holy water, fruits, trees and so on), and various prayers for special occasions (224–315). An old tradition (Walafrid Strabo, ninth century, "De rebus eccl.", XX; John the Deacon, "Vita S. Gregorii", II, xvii, etc.) ascribes what is evidently this book to Pope Gelasius I [492–6. Gennadius (De vir. illust., xcvi) says he composed a book of Sacraments]. Duchesne (op. cit., 121–5) thinks it represents the Roman service-books of the seventh or eighth century (between the years 628 and 731). It was, however, composed in the Frankish kingdom. All the local Roman allusions (for instance, the Roman Stations) have been omitted; on Good Friday the prayers read: "Let us pray for our most Christian Emperor [the compiler has added] *or king*" (p. 76), and again: "look down mercifully on the Roman, *or the Frankish*, Empire" (ibid.). There are also Gallican additions (Duchesne, 125–8). Dom Bäumer ("Ueber das sogen. Sacram. Gelas." in "Histor. Jahrbuch der Görresgesellschaft", 1893, pp. 241–301) and Mr. Bishop ("The earliest Roman Massbook" in "Dublin Review", 1894, pp. 245–78) maintain that it is much earlier than Duchesne thinks, and ascribe it to the sixth century, at which time the Roman Rite entered Gaul (see LITURGY). Buchwald (Das sogen. Sacr. Leon., ibid., p. 66) agrees with Duchesne in dating this Sacramentary at the seventh or eighth century, and thinks that its compiler used the Leonine collection.

We know most about the third of these books, the so-called "Gregorian Sacramentary". Charlemagne, anxious to introduce the Roman Rite into his kingdom, wrote to Pope Adrian I between the years 781 and 791 asking him to send him the service-book of the Roman Church. The book sent by the pope is the nucleus of the Gregorian Sacramentary. It was then copied a great number of times, so that there are many versions of it, all containing additions made by the various scribes. These are described by Probst (Die ältesten Sakr., pp. 303–13). The first edition is that of Pamelius in his "Rituale SS. Patrum Latinorum", II (Cologne, 1571). The standard edition is Muratori, "Liturgia romana vetus", II. This is based on two manuscripts, both written before 800, now in the Vatican Library (Cod. Ottobonianus and Cod. Vaticanus). Migne (P. L., LXXVIII, 25–602) reprints the edition

of Nicholas Ménard (Paris, 1642). Probst maintains that this is rather to be considered a Gelasian book, reformed according to the Gregorian (Die ältes. Sakr., pp. 165–9). In any case the elements are here completely fused. The original book sent by Adrian to Charlemagne is easily distinguished from the additions. The first who began to supplement Adrian's book from other sources (Pamelius says it was a certain Frankish Abbot named Grimold) was a conscientious person and carefully noted where his additions begin. At the end of the original book he adds a note, a *prefatiuncula* beginning with the word Hucusque: "So far (Hucusque) the preceding book of Sacraments is certainly that edited by the holy Pope Gregory." Then come (in Pamelius's edition) two supplements, one (according to Pamelius) by Abbot Grimold and the other by Alcuin. The supplements vary considerably in the codices. Eventually their matter became incorporated in the original book. But in the earlier versions we may take the first part, down to the *prefatiuncula*, as being the book sent by Adrian. How far it is that of Gregory I is another question. This book then has three parts: (1) The Ordinary of the Mass; (2) the Propers for the year beginning with Christmas Eve. They follow the ecclesiastical year; the feasts of saints (days of the month in the civil year) are incorporated in their approximate places in this. The Roman Stations are noted. There are still no Masses for the Sundays after Epiphany and Pentecost; (3) the prayers for ordinations. There are no votive Masses or requiems. For these reasons Mgr Duchesne considers that the "Sacramentary" is the "pope's book", that is the book used by the pope himself for the public papal services (Origines du Culte Chrétien, p. 117). Is its attribution to St. Gregory I (590–604) correct? That Gregory did much to reform the liturgy is certain. A constant tradition ascribes such a work to him, as to Gelasius. John the Deacon (eighth century) in his life of Gregory expresses this tradition: "He collected the Sacramentary of Gelasius in one book" (we have seen that the two sets of Propers in the Gelasianum are fused together in the Gregorianum), "leaving out much" (this too is verified by comparing the books; numbers of Gelasian Prefaces and ritual elaborations are omitted in the Gregorian book), "changing little, adding something" (II, xvii). Pope Adrian himself, in sending the book to Charlemagne, says that it is composed "by our holy predecessor, the divinely speaking Pope Gregory" (letter in Jaffé, "Cod. Carol.", p. 274). That the essential foundation of this "Sacramentary" goes back to St. Gregory, indeed to long before his time, is certain. Nor need we doubt that he made such changes as are claimed for him by his biographer, and that these changes stand in this book. But it is not his work untouched. It has additions made since his time, for instance his own feast (12 March, in Migne's edition, P. L., LXXVIII, 51) and other feasts not kept at Rome before the seventh century (Duchesne, op. cit., 118). Evidently then the book sent by Pope Adrian has gone through the inevitable development; succeeding centuries since Gregory have added to it. It represents the Roman Rite of the time when it was sent—the eighth century. For this reason Duchesne prefers to call it the "Sacramentary" of Adrian (op. cit., p. 119). We have said that, when it arrived in the Frankish kingdom, it began to receive supplements. It must be remembered of course that the writers who copied it had not in view the future needs of students. The books they made were intended for practical use at the altar. So they added at the end of Adrian's "Sacramentary" whatever other Masses and prayers were wanted by the churches for which they wrote. These supplements are taken partly from the Gelasian book, partly from Gallican sources. We have also noted that the additions were at first carefully distinguished from the original book, eventually incorporated in it. Dom Bäumer sees in these additions a compromise made in carrying out Charlemagne's orders that only the book he had received from Rome should be used (see LITURGIES; and Bäumer, "Ueber das sogen. Sacram. Gelasianum", 295–301). He also thinks that the first additions and the *prefatiuncula* were made by Alcuin (d. 804). Between the ninth and eleventh centuries the book so composed returned to Rome, took the place of the original pure Roman Rite, and so became the foundation of our present Roman Missal. Besides these three most important Sacramentaries there are other fragments, the "Missale Francorum," written in the seventh or eighth century, the "Ravenna Roll" of doubtful date (sixth to eleventh century?), etc. (see Duchesne, "Origines", pp. 128–9, 137–8).

At the same time as the Sacramentaries, books for the readers and choir were being arranged. Gradually the "Comes" or "Liber Comicus" that indicated the texts of the Bible to be read developed into the "Evangelarium" and "Lectionarium" (see GOSPEL IN THE LITURGY and LESSONS IN THE LITURGY). The homilies of Fathers to be read were collected in "Homilaria", the Acts of the martyrs, read on their feasts, in "Martyrologia". The book of psalms was written separately for singing, then arranged in order, as the psalms were sung through the week, in the "Psalterium" that now forms the first part of our Breviary. The parts of the Mass sung by the choir (Introit, Gradual, Offertory, Communion) were arranged in the "Liber Antiphonarius" (or Gradualis), the Antiphons and Responsories in the Office formed the "Liber Responsalis", or "Antiphonarius Officii", as distinct from the "Antiphonarius Missæ". Two early collections of this kind, ascribed to St. Gregory I, are in P. L., LXXVIII, 641–724, and 725–850. The same tradition that attributes to him the Sacramentary attaches his name to these (e. g., John the Deacon, "Vita S. Gregorii", II, vi). Throughout the early Middle Ages such collections were copied with local modifications all over Western Europe. Hymns (in our sense) were introduced into the Roman Rite about the fifth or sixth century. Those of the Mass were written in the Gradual, those of the Divine Office at first in the Psalter or Antiphonary. But there were also separate collections of hymns, called "Hymnaria", and "Libri Sequentiales" (or troponarii), containing the sequences and additions (farcing) to the Kyrie and Gloria, etc. Other services, the Sacraments (Baptism, Confirmation, Penance, Marriage, Extreme Unction), the Visitation of the Sick, the Burial Service, all manner of blessings, were written in a very loose collection of little books called by such names as "Liber Agendorum", "Agenda", "Manuale", "Benedictionale", "Pastorale", "Sacerdotale", "Rituale", the predecessors of our Ritual. As examples of such books we may quote the "Manuale Curatorum" for the Diocese of Roeskilde in Denmark (ed. by J. Freisen, Paderborn, 1898) and the "Liber Agendorum" of Schleswig (ed. J. Freising, Paderborn, 1898). Their number and variety is enormous.

Finally there remained the rubrics, the directions not about what to say but what to do. This matter would be one of the latest to be written down. Long after the more or less complicated prayers had to be written and read, tradition would still be a sufficient guide for the actions. The books of prayers (Sacramentaries, Antiphonaries, etc.) contained a few words of direction for the most important and salient things to be done—elementary rubrics. For instance the Gregorian "Sacramentary" tells priests (as distinct from bishops) not to say the *Gloria* except on Easter Day; the celebrant chants the preface *excelsa voce*, and so on (P. L., LXXVIII, 25). In time, however, the growing elaborateness of the papal functions, the more complicated ceremonial of the Roman Court, made it necessary to draw up rules of what custom and etiquette

demanded. These rules are contained in the "Ordines" —precursors of our "Cærimoniale Episcoporum". Mabillon published sixteen of the Ordines in his "Musæum Italicum", II (Paris, 1689). These are reproduced in P. L., LXXVIII, 937–1372. They are of different dates, from about the eighth to the fifteenth century. The first of them ("Ordo Romanus primus", edited apart by E. G. C. Atchley with excellent notes, London, 1905), which is the most important, was probably drawn up about the year 770 in the reign of Pope Stephen III (768–72), but is founded on a similar "Ordo" of the time of Gregory I (590–604). The "Ordines" contain no prayers, except that, where necessary, the first words are given to indicate what is meant. They supplement the Sacramentary and choir-books with careful directions about the ritual. Since Mabillon other "Ordines" have been found and edited. A famous and important one, found in a manuscript of the church of St. Amand at Puelle, is published by Duchesne in the Appendix of his "Origines du Culte Chrétien" (pp. 440–63). It was composed about the eighth or ninth century.

During the Middle Ages these books were rearranged for greater convenience, and developed eventually into the books we know. The custom of Low Mass changed the Sacramentary into a Missal. At Low Mass the celebrant had to supplement personally what was normally chanted by the deacon and subdeacon or sung by the choir. This then reacted upon High Mass, so that here too the celebrant began to say himself in a low voice what was sung by some one else. For this purpose he needed texts that were not in the old Sacramentary. That book was therefore enlarged by the addition of Lessons (Epistle and Gospel, etc.) and the chants of the choir (Introit, Gradual, etc.). So it becomes a *Missale plenarium*, containing all the text of the Mass. Isolated cases of such Missals occur as early as the sixth century. By about the twelfth century they have completely replaced the old Sacramentaries. But Lectionaries and Graduals (with the music) are still written for the readers and choir.

In the same way, but rather later, compilations are made of the various books used for saying the Divine Office. Here too the same motive was at work. The Office was meant to be sung in choir. But there were isolated priests, small country churches without a choir, that could not afford the library of books required for saying it. For their convenience compendiums were made since the eleventh century. Gregory VII (1073–85) issued a compendium of this kind that became very popular.

First we hear of *Libri nocturnales* or *matutinales*, containing all the lessons and responses for Matins. To these are added later the antiphons and psalms, then the collects and all that is wanted for the other canonical hours too. At the same time epitomes are made for people who recite the Office without the chant. In these the Psalter is often left out; the clergy are supposed to know it by heart. The antiphons, versicles, responsories, even the lessons are indicated only by their first words. The whole is really a kind of concise index to the Office, but sufficient for people who said it day after day and almost knew it by heart. Such little books are called by various names —"Epitomata", "Portiforia", and then especially "Breviaria divini officii" (Abbreviations of the Divine Office). They were used mostly by priests on journeys. In the twelfth century the catalogue of the library of Durham Cathedral includes "a little travelling breviary" (*breviarium parvum itinerarium*). In 1241 Gregory IX says in a Bull for the Franciscan order: "You have (the Divine Office) in your Breviaries" (see Batiffol, "Histoire du Bréviaire", chap. iv, especially pp. 192–202). The parts of these Breviaries were filled up eventually so as to leave nothing to memory, but the convenient arrangement and the name have been kept. It is curious that the word Breviary, which originally meant only a handy epitome for use on journeys and such occasions, has come to be the usual name for the Divine Office itself. A priest "says his breviary" that is, recites the canonical hours.

The development of the other books took place in much the same way. The Missals now contained only the Mass and a few morning services intimately connected with it. Daily Mass was the custom for every priest; there was no object in including all the rites used only by a bishop in each Missal. So these rites apart formed the Pontifical. The other non-Eucharistic elements of the old Sacramentary combined with the "Libri Agendarum" to form our Ritual. The Council of Trent (1545–63) considered the question of uniformity in the liturgical books and appointed a commission to examine the question. But the commission found the work of unifying so many and so varied books impossible at the time, and so left it to be done gradually by the popes. The Missal and Breviary were reformed very soon (see next paragraph), the other books later. The latest work was the production of the "Cærimoniale Episcoporum". John Burchard, Master of Ceremonies to Sixtus IV (1471–84), combined the old "Ordines Romani" into an *Ordo servandus per sacerdotem in celebratione missæ* (Rome, 1502), and arranged the rubrics of the Pontifical. Other editions of the rubrics were made at intervals, till Clement VIII (1592–1605) issued the "Cærimoniale Episcoporum" (in 1600). All the books have been constantly revised and re-edited with additions down to our own time.

III. The Present Roman Liturgical Books.— The official books of the Roman Rite are seven—the Missal, Pontifical, Breviary, Ritual, Cærimoniale Episcoporum, Memoriale Rituum, and Martyrology. These contain all and only the liturgical services of this rite. Several repeat matter also found in others. Other books, containing extracts from them, share their official character inasmuch as the texts conform to that of the original book. Such secondary liturgical books are the Lectionary and Gradual (with musical notes) taken from the Missal, the Day Hours (Horæ diurnæ) of the Breviary, the Vesperal, Antiphonary and other choir-books (with notes), also extracted from the Breviary, various Benedictionals and Ordines taken from the Ritual or Pontifical.

(a) The Roman Missal (*Missale Romanum*), as we now have it, was published by Pope Pius V by the Bull "Quo primum" of 14 July, 1570 (see Liturgies and Roman Rite). A commission, opened by the Council of Trent under Pius IV (1559–65), consisting of Cardinal Bernardine Scotti, Thomas Goldwell, Bishop of St. Asaph (one of the last two English bishops of the old Catholic line), Giulio Poggi, and others, had then finished its task of revising the book. Clement VIII (1592–1605) formed a new commission (Baronius, Bellarmine, and others) to restore the text which printers had again corrupted, and especially to substitute the new Vulgate (1590) texts for those of the Itala in the Missal; he published his revision by the Bull "Cum Sanctissimum" on 7 July, 1604. Urban VIII (1623–44) again appointed a commission to revise chiefly the rubrics, and issued a new edition on 2 September, 1634 (Bull "Si quid est"). Leo XIII (1878–1903) again made a revision in 1884. These names stand for the chief revisions; they are those named on the title-page of our Missal (Missale Romanum ex decreto SS. Concilii Tridentini restitutum S. Pii V Pont. Max. iussu editum, Clementis VIII, Urbani VIII et Leonis XIII auctoritate recognitum). But the continual addition of Masses for new feasts goes on. There are few popes since Pius V who have not authorized some additions, made by the Sacred Congregation of Rites, to the Missal or its various supplements. The reigning pope, Pius X, has issued the chants of the Vatican edition in the Gradual. As far

as these affect the Missal they have again produced new editions of it. Moreover a commission now sitting is considering a further revision of the text. It is believed that when the commission for restoring the text of the Vulgate has completed its work, that text will be issued in the lessons of the Missal, thus making again a new revision. But, in spite of all these modifications, our Missal is still that of Pius V. Indeed its text goes back to long before his time to the Gallicanized Gregorian "Sacramentary" of the ninth to eleventh century, and, in its essential characteristics, behind that to the Gelasian book of the sixth century, and so back into the mist that hangs over the formation of the Roman Rite in the first centuries.

The Missal begins with the Bulls of Pius V, Clement VIII, and Urban VIII. Then come the approbation of the bishop in whose diocese it is printed and a few of the most important decisions of the Sacred Congregation of Rites. A long explanation of the Gregorian Calendar follows, containing much astronomical information. This is headed: "De anno et eius partibus". The two Paschal tables follow (Julian and Gregorian), a table of movable feasts for a number of future years and the Roman Calendar of feasts. Then come three sets of rubrics, first "Rubricæ generales Missæ", containing the more general rules in twenty paragraphs (these were made by Burchard, revised by the commissions of Pius V, Clement VIII, Urban VIII); then the "Ritus servandus in celebratione missæ", in thirteen paragraphs or chapters. This latter gives exact directions for High or Low Mass, whether celebrated by a bishop or priest. Third come the directions about what to do in case of various accidents or defects, headed "De defectibus in celebratione missæ occurrentibus", in ten chapters. A private preparation and thanksgiving for Mass follow "to be made at the opportunity of the priest". The prayers said while vesting come at the end of the preparation. Lastly, figures show the way to incense the altar and oblation. Shorter and special rubrics for various occasions are inserted (in red) in the text.

Then follows the text of the Missal. The first part contains the "Proper of the time" (*Proprium temporis*) from the first Sunday of Advent to the last after Pentecost. The Proper of each Mass is given in order of the ecclesiastical year, that is the Masses of each Sunday and other day (vigils, ember-days, feriæ in Lent) that has a proper Mass. Only Christmas and its cycle of feasts (to the octave of the Epiphany), although fixed to days of the civil year (25 Dec., etc.), come in this part. Certain rites, not Eucharistic, but connected closely with the Mass, are in their place in the Missal, such as the blessing of ashes, candles, and palms, all the morning services of Holy Week (except the Vespers of Thursday and Friday). After the service of Holy Saturday the whole Ordinary of the Mass with the Canon is inserted. This is the (almost) unchanging framework into which the various Propers are fitted. Its place in the book has varied considerably at different times. It is now put here, not so much for mystic or symbolic reasons, as because it is a convenient place, about the middle where a book lies open best (see CANON OF THE MASS). The eleven proper Prefaces, and all changes that can occur in the Canon (except the modifications on Maundy Thursday), are printed here in the Ordinary. Then follows Easter Day and the rest of the year in order. The second part of the Missal contains the Proper of Saints (*Proprium missarum de sanctis*), that is, the feasts that occur on days of the civil year. It begins with the Vigil of St. Andrew (29 Nov.), as occurring at about the beginning of Advent, and continues (leaving out Christmas and its cycle) regularly through the months to the feasts of St. Silvester and St. Peter of Alexandria (26 Nov.).

The third part is always paged anew in brackets, [I], etc. It contains the Common Masses (*Commune Sanctorum*), that is, general Masses for Apostles, Martyrs and so on, that are very commonly used for saints of each class, often with proper Collect, Secret, and Postcommunion. Most saints' days give the rubric: "All of the Common of a Confessor Pontiff (or whatever it may be) except the following prayers". A collection of votive Masses of various kinds follows, ending with the Mass for a wedding (*Pro Sponso et Sponsa*), then thirty-five sets of prayers (*Orationes diversæ*) that may be used on certain occasions in Mass, according to the rubrics. The four Masses for the dead come next, then twelve sets of prayers for the dead. Then the rite of blessing holy water and the Asperges ceremony. Eleven forms of blessings (Sacramentals) used by priests, blessings of vestments, altar-linen, and the tabernacle or ciborium (used by bishops and by priests having a special faculty), and the prayers (Collect, Secret, Hanc Igitur, Postcommunion) said at ordination Masses end the old part of the Missal. There follow, however, the ever-growing supplements. Of these first come a collection of votive Masses appointed by Pius IX for each day of the week, then special Masses allowed for certain dioceses (*Missæ aliquibus in locis celebrandæ*), now forming a second Proper of Saints nearly as long as the old one; and finally with the Missal is bound up another supplement (paged with asterisks, I., etc.) for whatever country or province or religious order uses it. The Missal contains all the music used by the celebrant at the altar (except the obvious chants of Dominus vobiscum, Collects, etc., that are given once for all in the "Cærimoniale Episcoporum") in its place. The new (Vatican) edition gives the various new chants at the end.

The Lectionary (*Lectionarium Romanum*) contains the Epistles and Gospels from the Missal, the Gradual (*Graduale Romanum*), all the choir's part (the Proper, Introit, etc., and the common, Kyrie, etc.) with music. Religious orders that have a special rite (Dominicans, Carmelites, Carthusians) have of course their special Missals, arranged in the same way.

(b) The Pontifical (*Pontificale Romanum*) is the bishop's-book. It was issued by Benedict XIV (1740–58) on 25 March, 1752, and revised by Leo XIII in 1888. It has three parts and an appendix. Part I contains the rites of Confirmation, the tonsure, the seven ordinations, the blessing of abbots, abbesses, nuns, coronation of kings and queens, and blessing of a knight (*miles*). Part II contains the services for laying foundation-stones, consecrating churches, altars, chalices, many episcopal blessings (of vestments, vessels, crosses, statues, bells, weapons, and flags), the seven penitential psalms, and the litany. Part III contains the publication of movable feasts on the Epiphany, the expulsion of public penitents on Ash Wednesday and their reconciliation on Maundy Thursday, the order of synods, degradations from each order, excommunication and absolution from it, of the journeys of prelates (prayers to be said then), visitation of parishes, solemn reception of bishops, legates, emperors, kings, and such people down to a "Princess of great power", the old episcopal scrutiny, a ceremony for the first shaving of a clerk's beard, and a little rite for making or degrading a singer (*psalmista* or *cantor*). The appendix of the Pontifical contains the various rites of baptism by a bishop, the ordinations without music, marriage performed by a bishop, the pontifical absolution and blessing after the sermon at High Mass, the "Apostolic Benediction", and a blessing of Holy Water to reconcile a church after it has been execrated (polluted). A supplement adds the consecration of a church with many altars, of an altar alone, and of a portable altar—all without the chant. A number of extracts from the Pontifical are made, the ordination rites, consecration of a church, and so on. These are not specially authorized; they are authentic if they conform to the original.

The revision of the plain song has not yet touched the Pontifical. When it does, this will necessitate a new edition.

(c) The Breviary (*Breviarium Romanum*) contains all the Divine Office without chant. It has been revised by the same popes (Pius V, Clement VIII, Urban VIII, Leo XIII) as the Missal. It begins with the Bulls, the chapter about the calendar, the paschal tables, tables of movable feasts, calendar, like the Missal. Then follow the general rubrics (*Rubricæ generales breviarii*) in thirty-six chapters, giving full directions for the recital of the office, occurrence of feasts, and so on. Further tables of occurrences, prayers to be said before and after the office, and a table of absolutions and blessings end the introductory matter. The actual text begins with the psalter, that is the psalms arranged for the week, with their normal antiphons and hymns. First come Matins and Lauds for Sunday; then Prime, Terce, Sext, and None, then Matins and Lauds for each weekday. After Lauds for Saturday follow Vespers for each day, then Compline. This ends the Psalterium. The offices for each day follow, arranged exactly as in the Missal (Proper of the season, Proper of saints, Common of saints, votive Offices and Offices for the dead, the supplement for certain places, and a local supplement). After the Office for the dead some extraneous matter is inserted, namely the Gradual psalms, litany, prayers for the dying, blessing for the dying, grace at meals, and prayers for clerics on a journey. At the end of the whole book come the prayers before and after Mass and two private litanies (of the Holy Name and of the Blessed Virgin).

As the Breviary, in spite of its name, is now a very large and cumbersome book, it is generally issued in four parts (Winter, Spring, Summer, Autumn). This involves a good deal of repetition; the whole Psalter occurs in each part, and all feasts that may overlap into the next part have to be printed twice. The first volume only (Winter, which begins with Advent) contains the general rubrics. It is now also usual to reprint the psalms that occur in the Common of saints instead of merely referring back to the Psalter. Many other parts are also reprinted in several places. On the number and judicious arrangement of these reprints depends the convenience of any particular edition of the Breviary. Already in the Middle Ages the countless manuscripts of the Breviary are fond of promising the purchaser that he will find all the offices complete without references ("omnia exscripta sine recursu", "tout le long sans recquerir"), a statement that the writer, after examining a great number of them, has never once found true. The chief book excerpted from the Breviary is the "Day Hours" (*Horæ diurnæ breviarii romani*), containing everything except Matins, which with its lessons forms the main bulk of the book. For singing in choir various books with music exist, representing still more or less the state of things before Breviaries were invented. The complete "Liber Antiphonarius" contains all the antiphons, hymns, and responses throughout the Office. From this again various excerpts are made. For the offices most commonly sung in churches we have the Vesperal (*Vesperale Romanum*), containing Vespers and Compline. The monastic orders (Benedictines, Cistercians, Carthusians, etc.), the Dominicans, Franciscans, Premonstratensians, and several local dioceses still have their own Breviaries. For the various attempts at replacing our Breviary by a radically reformed one (especially that of Cardinal Quiñónez in 1535) see the article BREVIARY and the histories of Bäumer and Batiffol.

(d) The Ritual (*Rituale Romanum*) contains all the services a priest needs besides those of the Missal and Breviary. This book especially was the least uniform in the Middle Ages. Almost every diocese had its own Ritual, or Agenda. Paul V issued in 1614 a book meant to be used everywhere; Benedict XIV revised it in 1752. The Roman Ritual contains ten titles (*tituli*) and an appendix nearly as big again as all the rest. Title I gives general directions for administering Sacraments; II gives all the forms for baptism; III for penance; IV for the Holy Eucharist, V for extreme unction and the care of the sick; VI relates to funerals and gives the Office for the dead from the Breviary; VII relates to matrimony; VIII contains a large collection of blessings for various objects; IX deals with processions; X with exorcisms and forms for filling up in the books of the parish (the books of baptism, confirmation, marriage, the state of souls, and the dead). The appendix (paged anew with asterisks) gives additional directions for the sacraments, some decrees and prayers and a large collection of blessings, first "unreserved", then those to be used only by priests who have a special faculty, those reserved to certain religious orders, and many "newest blessings". There is still a great want of uniformity in the use of this book. Many countries, provinces, and dioceses have their own Ritual or "Ordo administrandi Sacramenta", etc.

(e) The Ceremonial of Bishops (*Cærimoniale Episcoporum*) in spite of its title contains much matter needed by other people than bishops. It is entirely a book of rubrical directions, succeeding the old "Ordines Romani". Much of it is already contained in the rubrics of the Missal, Pontifical, and Ritual. It was first issued by Clement VIII in 1600, then revised by Innocent X (1650), Benedict XIV at various dates (finally 1752), and Leo XIII (1882). It has three books. The first contains general directions for episcopal functions, and for the bishop's attendants (master of ceremonies, sacristan, canons, and so on). Then come full directions for everything connected with Mass, the altar, vestments, ceremonies, etc.; finally the order of a synod. Book II is all about the Divine Office, its chanting in choir and all the ritual belonging to it, as well as certain special functions (the blessing of candles, ashes, palms, the Holy Week services, processions, etc.). Book III is about various extra-liturgical functions, visits of bishops to governors of provinces, solemn receptions and so on, finally conduct for cardinals. The book continually gives directions, not only for bishops but for priests, too, at these functions. It is also here that one finds some of the most ordinary chants used by any celebrant (e. g., the Dominus vobiscum, Collects, I, 27; Confiteor, II, 39). The "Cæremoniale Episcoporum" is thus the official and indispensable supplement to the rubrics of the Missal, Breviary, Ritual, and Pontifical.

(f) The Memorial of Rites (*Memoriale Rituum*) or Little Ritual (*Rituale parvum*) is the latest of these official books. It gives directions for certain rites (the blessing of candles, ashes, palms, the Holy Week services) in small churches where there are no ministers (deacon and subdeacon). The Missal always supposes the presence of deacon and subdeacon at these functions; so there was doubt and confusion about them when carried out by a single priest. Benedict XIII (1724–30) published this book in 1725 to remove the confusion in the smaller parish churches of Rome. Pius VII (1800–23) extended it to all small churches of the Roman Rite in 1821. It is therefore the official norm for all such services without ordained ministers.

(g) The Martyrology (*Martyrologium Romanum*) is an enlarged calendar giving the names and very short accounts of all saints (not only martyrs) commemorated in various places each day. The earliest known martyrologies go back to the fourth century. In the Middle Ages there were, as usual, many versions of the book. Our present Roman Martyrology was arranged in 1584 by Cardinal Baronius under Gregory XIII, and revised four times, in 1628, 1675, 1680, and (by Benedict XIV) 1748. It is read in choir at Prime.

IV. LITURGICAL BOOKS OF OTHER RITES.—Of these

little need be said here. They are described in the articles on the various rites. The other two surviving rites in the West (of Milan and the Mozarabic Rite) have gone through the same development as the Roman—from Sacramentaries, Lectionaries, Psalters, and Antiphonaries to Missals, Pontificals, and Breviaries. Only of course their books contain their own prayers and ritual. The latest editions of the Milanese (Ambrosian) Missal, Breviary, Ritual etc., are published by Giacomo Agnelli at the Archiepiscopal Press (*tipografia arcivescovile*) at Milan. The classical edition of the Mozarabic books is that made by order of Cardinal Ximenes (Archbishop of Toledo, 1495–1517). The Missal (Missale mistum [for *mixtum*] secundum regulam beati Isidori dictum Mozarabes) was printed at Toledo in 1500 (reprinted in P. L., LXXXV), the Breviary (*Breviarium Gothicum*) reprinted (with Romanizing additions) at Toledo in 1502 (P. L., LXXXVI). None of the Eastern Churches has yet made such compendiums of its books as our Missal and Breviary. All their books are still in the state in which ours were in the days of Sacramentaries, Antiphonaries, and so on. One reason for this is that in the East our reduplications are unknown. There the priest does not also say at the altar the parts sung by the readers and choir. Nor has there been any development (except a rudimentary beginning, chiefly among the Uniats) of private recitation of the Office. So their books are only wanted for the choir; the various readers and singers use different volumes of what in some rites is quite a large library.

The Byzantine Books are the Typikon, a kind of perpetual calendar with directions for all services, the Euchologion, containing all the priest wants for the Holy Liturgy and other sacraments and rites (almost exactly the old Latin Sacramentary). The Triodion, Pentekostarion, Oktoechos, and Horologion contain the choir's part of the Liturgy and Office throughout the year. The Menaia and Menologion contain the saints' offices; the Psalterion explains itself. The Apostolos and Evangelion contain the liturgical lessons (these books are described in CONSTANTINOPLE, THE RITE OF). There are many editions. In Greek the Orthodox books are published at the Phœnix Press (formerly at Venice, now Patras), the Uniat books by the Roman Propaganda. Each national Church has further its own editions in its liturgical language. The books of other Eastern Churches correspond more or less to these, but in most cases they are more confused, less known, sometimes not even yet edited. In the very vague state of most of their books one can only say in general that these churches have an indefinite collection, each service having its own book. These are then collected and arranged in all kinds of groups and compendiums by various editors. The Uniat compendiums have a natural tendency to imitate the arrangement of the Roman books. The most obvious cases of liturgical books are always the Lectionaries, then the Book of Liturgies. The others are mostly in a very vague state.

The Nestorian Books (all in Syriac) are the Liturgy (containing their three liturgies), the Gospel (*Euangelion*), Apostle (*Shlicha*) and Lessons (*Kariane*), the "Turgama" (Interpretation), containing hymns sung by deacons at the liturgy (our Graduals and Sequences), the David (*Dawīdha* = Psalter), "Khudhra" (="cycle", containing antiphons, responsories, hymns, and collects for all Sundays), "Kash Kōl" (="Collection of all"; the same chants for week-days), "Kdham u-Wathar" (="Before and after"; certain prayers, psalms, and collects most often used, from the other books), "Gezza" ("Treasury", services for feast-days), Abu-Halīm (the name of the compiler, containing collects for the end of the Nocturns on Sundays), "Bautha d'Ninwaie" (="Prayer of the Ninevites", a collection of hymns ascribed to St. Ephraem, used in Lent). The Baptism Office ("Taksa d'Amadha") is generally bound up with the Liturgies. The "Taksa d'Siamīdha" has the ordination services. The "Taksa d'Husaia" contains the office for Penance, the "Kthawa d'Burrakha" is the marriage service, the "Kahneita", the burial of clergy, the "Annīdha" that of laymen. Lastly the "Khamīs" and "Warda" are further collections of hymns (see Badger, "The Nestorians and their Rituals", London, 1852, II, 16–25). Naturally not every church possesses this varied collection of books. The most necessary ones are printed by the Anglican missionaries at Urmi for the heretics. The Uniat (Chaldean) books are printed, some at Propaganda, some by the Dominicans at Mosul ("Missale chaldaicum", 1845; "Manuale Sacerdotum", 1858; "Breviarium chaldaicum", 1865). A Chaldean "Breviary" was published in three volumes at Paris in 1886–7, edited by Père Bedgan, a missionary of the Congrégation des Missions. The Malabar schismatics use the Nestorian books, the Uniats have books revised (much romanized) by the Synod of Diamper (1599; it ordered all their old books to be burned). The Uniat Malabar "Missal" was published at Rome in 1774, the "Ordo rituum et lectionum" in 1775.

The Coptic Books (in Coptic with Arabic rubrics, and generally with the text transliterated in Arabic characters too) are the Euchologion (Kitāb al-Khūlagi almuqaddas), very often (but quite wrongly) called Missal. This corresponds to the Byzantine Euchologion. Then the Lectionary called "Katamārus" (=κατὰ μέρος), the "Synaksār", containing legends of saints, the "Deacon's Manual", an Antiphonary (called *Difnārī*), the Psalter, Theotokia (containing offices of the B.V.M.), Doxologia, collections of hymns for the choir and a number of smaller books for the various other offices. These books were first grouped and arranged for the Uniats by Raphael Tuki, and printed at Rome in the eighteenth century. Their arrangement is obviously an imitation of that of the Latin service-books ("Missale coptice et arabice", 1736; "Diurnum alexandrinum copto-arabicum", 1750; "Pontificale et Euchologium", 1761, 1762; "Rituale coptice et arabice", 1763; "Theotokia", 1764). Lord Cyril II, the present Uniat Coptic patriarch, has published a "missal", "ritual", and "Holy Week book" (Cairo, 1898–1902). The Monophysite Copts have a very sumptuously printed set of their books, edited by Gladios Labīb, in course of publication at Cairo ("Katamārus", 1900–2; "Euchologion", 1904; "Funeral Service", 1905).

The Ethiopic service-books are (except the Liturgy) the least known of any. Hardly anything of them has been published, and no one seems yet to have made a systematic investigation of liturgical manuscripts in Abyssinia. Since the Ethiopic Rite is derived from the Coptic, one may conjecture that their books correspond more or less to the Coptic books. One may also no doubt conjecture that their books are still in the primitive state of (more or less) a special book for each service. One has not heard of any collections or compendiums. Peter the Ethiopian (Petrus Ethyops) published the Liturgy with the baptism service and some blessings at the end of his edition of the Ethiopic New Testament (Tasfa Sion, Rome, 1548). Various students have published fragments of the Rite in Europe (cf. Chaine, "Grammaire éthiopienne", Beirut, 1907; bibliography, p. 269), but these can hardly be called service-books.

The Jacobite (and Uniat) Syrian Rite has never been published as a whole. A fragment of the liturgy was published in Syriac and Latin at Antwerp (1572) by Fabricius Boderianus (D. Severi alexandrini . . . de ritibus baptismi et sacræ Synaxis). The Uniats have an Euchologion (Syriac and Karshuni), published at Rome in 1843 (Missale Syriacum), and a "Book of clerks used in the ecclesiastical ministries" (Liber ministerii, Syriac only, Beirut, 1888). The Divine Office, collected like a Breviary, was published at Mosul in

seven volumes (1886–96), the ferial office alone at Rome in 1853, and at Sharfi in the Lebanon (1898). A Ritual—"Book of Ceremony"—for the Syrian Uniats is issued by the Jesuits at Beirut.

The Maronites have an abundance of liturgical books for their romanized Syrian Rite. The Maronite Synod at Deir al-Luweize (1736) committed a uniform preparation of all their books to the patriarch (Part II, Sess. I, xiii, etc.) These books are all referred to in Roman terms (Missal, Ritual, Pontifical, etc.). The Missal (in this case the name is not incorrect) was published at Rome in 1592 and 1716, since then repeatedly, in whole or in part, at Beirut. Little books containing the Ordinary of the Liturgy with the Anaphora commonly used are issued by many Catholic booksellers at Beirut. The "Book of the Minister" (containing the deacon's and other ministers' parts of the Liturgy) was published at Rome in 1596 and at Beirut in 1888. The "Ferial Office", called *Fard*, "Burden" or "Duty" (the only one commonly used by the clergy), was issued at Rome in 1890, at Beirut in 1900. The whole Divine Office began to be published at Rome in 1666, but only two volumes of the summer part appeared. A Ritual with various additional prayers was issued at Rome in 1839. All Maronite books are in Syriac and Karshuni.

The Armenian Liturgical Books are quite definitely drawn up, arranged, and authorized. They are the only other set among Eastern Churches whose arrangement can be compared to those of the Byzantines. There are eight official Armenian service-books: (1) the Directory, or Calendar, corresponding to the Byzantine Typikon, (2) the Manual of Mysteries of the Sacred Oblation (= an Euchologion), (3) the Book of Ordinations, often bound up with the former, (4) the Lectionary, (5) the Hymn-book (containing the variable hymns of the Liturgy), (6) the Book of Hours (containing the Divine Office and, generally, the deacon's part of the Liturgy), (7) the Book of Canticles (containing the hymns of the Office), (8) the *Mashdotz*, or Ritual (containing the rites of the sacraments). The books of both Gregorian and Uniat Armenians have been published a great number of times; the latest Gregorian editions are those of Constantinople and Jerusalem, the Uniat ones have been issued at Rome, Vienna, and especially Venice (at S. Lazaro). There are many extracts from them, especially from the Liturgy.

In conclusion it will be noticed that the Eastern and the older Western liturgical books consider rather the person who uses them than the service at which they are used. The same person has the same book, whatever the function may be. On the other hand the later Western books are so arranged that all the service (whoever may be saying it) is put together in one book; our books are arranged by services, not according to their users. This is the result of our modern Western principle that every one (or at any rate the chief person, the celebrant) says everything, even if it is at the same time said by some one else.

DUCHESNE, *Origines du culte chrétien* (2nd ed., Paris, 1898); PROBST, *Die ältesten römischen Sacramentarien und Ordines* (Münster, 1892); IDEM, *Die abendländische Messe vom 5. bis zum 8. Jahrhundert* (Münster, 1896); CABROL, *Introduction aux Etudes liturgiques* (Paris, 1907); BÄUMER, *Gesch. des Breviers* (Freiburg, 1895); BATIFFOL, *Hist. du Bréviaire romain* (Paris, 1895); WEALE, *Bibliographia liturgica. Catalogus missalium ritus latini* (London, 1886); EBNER, *Quellen u. Forschungen zur Gesch. u. Kunstgesch. des Missale Romanum* (Freiburg, 1896). The modern Roman liturgical books are published in many editions by all the well-known Catholic firms (Desclée, Pustet, Dessain, Mame, etc.). The "typical" editions of the new books with the Vatican chant are issued by the Vatican Press. For the other rites see, besides the editions quoted in the text, the Introduction of BRIGHTMAN, *Eastern Liturgies* (Oxford, 1896). Other works are quoted in the text.

ADRIAN FORTESCUE.

Liturgical Chant.—Taking these words in their ordinary acceptation, it is easy to settle the meaning of "liturgical chant". Just as we say liturgical altar, liturgical vestment, liturgical chalice, etc., to indicate that these various objects correspond in material, shape, and consecration with the requirements of the liturgical uses to which they are put, so also a chant, if its style, composition, and execution prove it suitable for liturgical use, may properly be called liturgical chant. Everything receives its specification from the purpose it is to serve, and from its own greater or less aptitude to serve that purpose; nevertheless, it is necessary to pursue a finer analysis in order to discover the many possible ways in which the words "liturgical chant" may be applied. In the strict sense the word "chant" means a melody executed by the human voice only, whether in the form of plain or harmonized singing. In a wider sense the word is taken to mean such singing even when accompanied by instruments, provided the portion of honour is always retained by the vocal part. In the widest though incorrect sense, the word "chant" is also applied to the instrumental music itself, inasmuch as its cadences imitate the inflexions of the human voice, that first and most perfect of instruments, the work of God Himself. And thus, after the introduction of the organ into churches, when it began to alternate with the sacred singers, we find medieval writers deliberately using the phrase "cantant organa" or even "cantare in organis".

Now, seeing that the Church allows in its liturgical service not only the human voice, but an accompaniment thereof by the organ or other instruments, and even organ and instruments without the human voice, it follows that in the sense in which we are going to use it, liturgical chant means liturgical music, or, to employ the more usual phrase, sacred music. Consequently we may consider sacred music as embodying four distinct, but subordinate elements: (1) plain chant, (2) harmonized chant, (3) one or other of these accompanied by organ and instruments, (4) organ and instruments alone. Wherein these elements are subordinate one to another we have to determine from the greater or less aptitude of each for liturgical purposes, and from the greater or less appropriateness of the adjective "liturgical" when applied to them. We shall start with some general observations, and by elimination attain the end we have in view.

(1) Sacred music is music in the service of worship. This is a generic and basic definition of all such music, and it is both obvious and straightforward. When the worship of the true God is in question, man ought to endeavour to offer him of his very best, and in the way it will be the least unworthy of the Divinity. From this root-idea there spring forth two qualities which sacred music should have, and which are laid down in the papal "Motu Proprio," 22 November, 1903, namely—that sacred music ought to be true art, and at the same time holy art. Consequently we cannot uphold as sacred music and suited for liturgical use, any music lacking the note of art, by reason of its poverty of conception, or of its breaking all the laws of musical composition, or any music, no matter how artistic it may be, which is given over to profane uses, such as dances, theatres, and similar objects, aiming albeit ever so honestly at causing amusement ("Motu Proprio," II, 5). Such compositions, even though the work of the greatest masters and beautiful in themselves, even though they excel in charm the sacred music of tradition, must always remain unworthy of the temple, and as such are to be got rid of as contrary to the basic principle, which every reasonable man must be guided by, that the means must be suited to the end aimed at.

(2) Going a step farther in our argument it must be borne in mind that we are not here dealing with worship of God in general, but with His worship as practised in the True Church of Jesus Christ, the Catholic Church. So that for us sacred music primarily means music in the service of Catholic worship. This wor-

ship has built itself up and has deliberately held itself aloof from every other form of worship; it has its own sacrifice its own altar, its own rites, and is directed in all things by the sovereign authority of the Church. Hence it follows that no music, no matter how much it be employed in other worships that are not Catholic, can, on that account, ever be looked on by us as sacred and liturgical. We meet at times with individuals who remind us of the music of the Hebrews, and quote "Praise him with sound of trumpet: praise him with psaltery and harp. Praise him with timbrel and choir: praise him with strings and organs. Praise him on high sounding cymbals: praise him on cymbals of joy:" and who seek by so doing to justify all sorts of joyousness in church (chants, instrumental music and deafening noises), even going so far as to plead "omnis spiritus laudet Dominum" as though that verse should excuse all and everything their individual "spirit" suggested, no matter how novel and unusual. If such a criterion were to be admitted, there are many other elements of Hebrew worship we should have to accept, but which the Church rejected long ago as unsuited to the sacrifice of the New Testament and to the spirit of the New Law (cf. St. Thomas, II–II, Q. xci, a. 2, ad 4um). The same remarks apply to the music used in Protestant worship. No matter how serious and solemn, even though it belongs to the style of music the Church recognizes as sacred and liturgical, it ought never be used as a pattern or model, at least exclusively for the sacred music of the Catholic Church. The warm and solemn dignity of Catholic worship has nothing in common with the pallid frigidity of Protestant services. Hence our choice ought to be always and solely guided by the specific nature of Catholic worship, and by the rules laid down by the Fathers, the councils, the congregations, and the pope, and which have been epitomized in that admirable code of sacred music, the "Motu Proprio" of Pius X.

(3) Finally, the phrase "Catholic worship" must here be taken in its formal quality of public worship, the worship of a society or social organism, imposed by Divine Law and subject to one supreme authority which, by Divinely acquired right, regulates it, guards it, and through lawfully appointed ministers exercises it to the honour of God and the welfare of the community. This is what is known as "liturgical worship", so styled from the liturgy of the Church. The liturgy has been aptly defined as "that worship which the Catholic Church, through its legitimate ministers acting in accordance with well-established rules, publicly exercises in rendering due homage to God". From this it is clear that the acts and prayers performed by the faithful to satisfy their private devotion do not form part of liturgical worship, even when performed by the faithful in a body, whether in public or in a place of public worship, and whether conducted by a priest or otherwise. Such devotions not being officially legislated for, do not form part of the public worship of the Church as a social organism. Any one can see the difference between a body of the faithful going in procession to visit a famous shrine of the Madonna, and the liturgical processions of the Rogation Days and of Corpus Christi. Such popular functions are not only tolerated, but blessed and fostered by the Church authorities, as of immense spiritual benefit to the faithful, even though not sanctioned as liturgical, and are generally known as extra-liturgical functions. The principal are the Devotion of the Rosary, the Stations of the Cross, the Three Hours Agony, the Hour of the Desolata, the Hour of the Blessed Sacrament, the Month of Mary, the novenas in preparation for the more solemn feasts, and the like. What has been said goes to prove that sacred music may fitly be described as music in the service of the liturgy, and that sacred music and liturgical music are one and the same thing. Pius X has admirably stated the relation between the liturgy of the Church and the music it employs: "It serves to increase the *decor et splendor* of the ecclesiastical ceremonies", not as something accidental that may or may not be present, such as the decorations of the building, the display of lights, the number of ministers, but "as an integrant part of the solemn liturgy", so much so that these liturgical functions cannot take place if the chant be lacking. Further, "since the main office of sacred music is to clothe with fitting melody the liturgical text propounded for the understanding of the people, so its chief aim is to give greater weight to the text, so that thereby the faithful may be more easily moved to devotion, and dispose themselves better to receive the fruits of grace which flow from the celebration of the sacred mysteries" ("Motu Proprio," I, 1).

From this teaching it follows: (a) That no music can rightly be considered as liturgical, which is not demanded by the liturgical function, or which is not an integrant part thereof, but which is only admitted as a discretionary addition to fill in, if we may use the expression, the silent intervals of the liturgy where no appointed text is prescribed to be sung. Under this head would come the motets which the "Motu Proprio" (III, 8) permits to be sung after the Offertory and the Benedictus. Now, seeing that these chants are executed during the solemn liturgy, it follows that they ought to possess all the qualities of sacred music so as to be in keeping with the rest of the sacred function.

(b) Among the various elements admitted in sacred music, the most strictly liturgical is that which more directly than any other unites itself with the sacred text and seems more indispensable than any other. The playing of the organ by way of prelude or during intervals can only be called liturgical in a very wide sense, since it is by no means necessary, nor does it form an integrant part of the liturgy, nor does it accompany any chanted text. But a chant accompanied by organ and instruments may very properly be known as liturgical. Organ and instruments are permitted, however, only to support the chant, and can never by themselves be considered as an integrant part of the liturgical act. As a matter of fact, their introduction is comparatively recent, and they are still excluded from papal functions. Vocal music generally is the most correct style of liturgical music, since it alone has always been recognized as the proper music of the Church; it alone enters into direct touch with the meaning of the liturgical text, clothes that text with melody, and expounds it to the understanding of the people. Now, since vocal music may be either rendered plain or polyphonic, true liturgical music, music altogether indispensable in the celebration of the solemn liturgy, is the plain chant, and therefore, in the Catholic Church, the Gregorian chant. Lastly, since Gregorian is the solemn chant prescribed for the celebrant and his assistants, so that it is never lawful to substitute for it a melody different in composition from those laid down in the liturgical books of the Church, it follows that Gregorian is the sole chant, the chant *par excellence* of the Roman Church, as laid down in the "Motu Proprio" (II, 3). It contains in the highest degree the qualities Pope Pius has enumerated as characteristic of sacred music: true art; holiness; universality; hence he has proposed Gregorian chant as the supreme type of sacred music, justifying the following general law: The more a composition resembles Gregorian in tone, inspiration, and the impression it leaves, the nearer it comes to being sacred and liturgical; the more it differs from it, the less worthy is it to be employed in the church. Since Gregorian is the liturgical chant *par excellence* of the Roman Church, it is equally true that the chant handed down by tradition in other Churches is entitled to be considered as truly liturgical; for instance, the Ambrosian chant in the Ambrosian Church, the Mozarabic in the Mozarabic Church, and the Greek in the Greek Church.

To round off the line of thought we have been pursuing, a few more observations are called for. (a) The music which accompanies non-liturgical functions of Catholic worship is usually and accurately styled extra-liturgical music. As a matter of fact, legislation affecting the liturgy does not *ipso facto* apply equally to legitimate extra-liturgical functions. And consequently the more or less rigid prohibition of certain things during the solemn offices of the Church does not necessarily ban such things from devotions such as the Way of the Cross, the Month of Mary, etc. To take an example, singing in the vernacular is prohibited as part of liturgical functions. As has been pointed out, music in liturgical functions is an integrant and not a purely ornamental part thereof, whereas in extra-liturgical functions it is altogether secondary and accidental, never exacted by the ceremony, and its main purpose is to entertain the faithful devoutly in Church or to furnish them a pleasing spiritual relaxation after the prolonged tension of a sermon, or whatever prayers they have been reciting together. Hence the style of extra-liturgical music is susceptible of greater freedom, though within such limits as are demanded by respect for God's house, and the holiness of the prayer it accompanies. As a sort of general rule it may be laid down that, since extra-liturgical ceremonies ought to partake as much as possible of the externals, as well as of the interior spirit of liturgical ones, avoiding whatsoever is contrary to the holiness, solemnity, and nobility of the act of worship as intended by the Church, so true extra-liturgical music ought absolutely to exclude whatsoever is profane and theatrical, assuming as far as possible the character, without the extreme severity of liturgical music.

(b) Whatever music is not suitable for liturgical or extra-liturgical functions ought to be banished from the churches. But such music is not for that reason to be called profane. There is a distinction to be drawn. There is a style of music that belongs to the theatre and the dance, and that aims at giving pleasure and delight to the senses. This is profane music as distinct from sacred music. But there is another style of music, grave, and serious, though not sacred because not used in worship, yet partaking of some of the qualities of sacred music, and drawing its ideas and inspiration from things that have to do with religion and worship. Such is the music of what are known as sacred oratorios, and other compositions of a religious character, in which the words are taken from the Bible or at times from the liturgy itself. To this class belong the mighty "Masses" of Bach, Haydn, Beethoven, and other classical authors, Verdi's "Requiem", Rossini's "Stabat Mater", etc., all of them works of the highest musical merit, but which, because of their outward vehicle and extraordinary length, can never be received within the Church. They are suited, like the oratorios, to recreate religiously and artistically audiences at great musical concerts. By way of special distinction, music of this nature is usually designated religious music.

DE SANTI, *La musica a servigio del culto* in *Civiltà Cattolica* (September, 1888), 652–671; IDEM, *La Musica a servigio del culto Cattolico*, ibid. (October, 1888), 169–183; IDEM, *La musica a servigio della liturgia*, ibid. (December, 1888), 670–688; GEVAERT, *Les Origines du Chant Liturgique de l'Eglise Latine* (Ghent, 1890); GASTOUÉ, *Les origines du Chant Romain* (Paris, 1907); WYATT, *St. Gregory and the Gregorian Music* (London, 1904).

ANGELO DE SANTI.

Liturgical Colours. See COLOURS, LITURGICAL.

Liturgy.—The various Christian liturgies are described each under its own name. (See ALEXANDRINE LITURGY; AMBROSIAN LITURGY; ANTIOCHENE LITURGY; CELTIC RITE; CLEMENTINE LITURGY, treated in CLEMENT I; CONSTANTINOPLE, RITE OF; GALLICAN RITE; JERUSALEM, LITURGY OF; MOZARABIC RITE; SARUM RITE; SYRIAN RITE; SYRO-JACOBITE LITURGY.) In this article they are considered only from the point of view of their relation to one another in the most general sense, and an account is given of what is known about the growth of a fixed liturgy as such in the early Church.

I. DEFINITION.—Liturgy (λειτουργία) is a Greek composite word meaning originally a public duty, a service to the state undertaken by a citizen. Its elements are λεῖτος (from λεώς = λαός, people) meaning *public*, and ἔργω (obsolete in the present stem, used in future ἔρξω, etc.), *to do*. From this we have λειτουργός, "a man who performs a public duty", "a public servant", often used as equivalent to the Roman *lictor;* then λειτουργέω, "to do such a duty", λειτούργημα, its performance, and λειτουργία, the public duty itself. At Athens the λειτουργία was the public service performed by the wealthier citizens at their own expense, such as the office of *gymnasiarch*, who superintended the gymnasium, that of *choregus*, who paid the singers of a chorus in the theatre, that of the *hestiator*, who gave a banquet to his tribe, of the *trierarchus*, who provided a warship for the state. The meaning of the word liturgy is then extended to cover any general service of a public kind. In the Septuagint it (and the verb λειτουργέω) is used for the public service of the temple (e. g., Ex., xxxviii, 27; xxxix, 12, etc.). Thence it comes to have a religious sense as the function of the priests, the ritual service of the temple (e. g., Joel, i, 9; ii, 17, etc.). In the New Testament this religious meaning has become definitely established. In Luke, i, 23, Zachary goes home when "the days of his *liturgy*" (αἱ ἡμέραι τῆς λειτουργίας αὐτοῦ) are over. In Heb., viii, 6, the high priest of the New Law "has obtained a better *liturgy*", that is a better kind of public religious service than that of the Temple.

So in Christian use liturgy meant the public official service of the Church, that corresponded to the official service of the Temple in the Old Law. We must now distinguish two senses in which the word was and is still commonly used. These two senses often lead to confusion. On the one hand, liturgy often means the whole complex of official services, all the rites, ceremonies, prayers, and sacraments of the Church, as opposed to private devotions. In this sense we speak of the arrangement of all these services in certain set forms (including the canonical hours, administration of sacraments, etc.), used officially by any local church, as the liturgy of such a church—the Liturgy of Antioch, the Roman Liturgy, and so on. So liturgy means rite; we speak indifferently of the Byzantine Rite or the Byzantine Liturgy. In the same sense we distinguish the official services from others by calling them liturgical; those services are liturgical which are contained in any of the official books (see LITURGICAL BOOKS) of a rite. In the Roman Church, for instance, Compline is a liturgical service, the Rosary is not. The other sense of the word liturgy, now the common one in all Eastern Churches, restricts it to the chief official service only—the Sacrifice of the Holy Eucharist, which in our rite we call the Mass. This is now practically the only sense in which λειτουργία is used in Greek, or in its derived forms (e. g., Arabic *al-liturgiah*) by any Eastern Christian. When a Greek speaks of the "Holy Liturgy" he means only the Eucharistic Service. For the sake of clearness it is perhaps better for us too to keep the word to this sense, at any rate in speaking of Eastern ecclesiastical matters; for instance, not to speak of the Byzantine canonical hours as liturgical services. Even in Western Rites the word "official" or "canonical" will do as well as "liturgical" in the general sense, so that we too may use *Liturgy* only for the Holy Eucharist. It should be noted also that, whereas we may speak of our Mass quite correctly as the Liturgy, we should never use the word Mass for the Eucharistic Sacrifice in any Eastern rite. Mass (*missa*) is the name for that service in the Latin Rites only. It has never been used either in Lat-

in or Greek for any Eastern rite. Their word, corresponding exactly to our Mass, is *Liturgy*. The Byzantine Liturgy is the service that corresponds to our Roman Mass; to call it the Byzantine (or, worse still, the Greek) Mass is as wrong as naming any other of their services after ours, as calling their *Hesperinos* Vespers, or their *Orthros* Lauds. When people go even as far as calling their books and vestments after ours, saying Missal when they mean Euchologion, alb when they mean sticharion, the confusion becomes hopeless.

II. The Origin of the Liturgy.—At the outset of this discussion we are confronted by three of the most difficult questions of Christian archæology, namely: From what date was there a fixed and regulated service such as we can describe as a formal Liturgy? How far was this service uniform in various Churches? How far are we able to reconstruct its forms and arrangement?

With regard to the first question it must be said that an Apostolic Liturgy in the sense of an arrangement of prayers and ceremonies, like our present ritual of the Mass, did not exist. For some time the Eucharistic Service was in many details fluid and variable. It was not all written down and read from fixed forms, but in part composed by the officiating bishop. As for ceremonies, at first they were not elaborated as now. All ceremonial evolves gradually out of certain obvious actions done at first with no idea of ritual, but simply because they had to be done for convenience. The bread and wine were brought to the altar when they were wanted, the lessons were read from a place where they could best be heard, hands were washed because they were soiled. Out of these obvious actions ceremony developed, just as our vestments developed out of the dress of the first Christians. It follows then of course that, when there was no fixed Liturgy at all, there could be no question of absolute uniformity among the different Churches.

And yet the whole series of actions and prayers did not depend solely on the improvisation of the celebrating bishop. Whereas at one time scholars were inclined to conceive the services of the first Christians as vague and undefined, recent research shows us a very striking uniformity in certain salient elements of the service at a very early date. The tendency among students now is to admit something very like a regulated Liturgy, apparently to a great extent uniform in the chief cities, back even to the first or early second century. In the first place the fundamental outline of the rite of the Holy Eucharist was given by the account of the Last Supper. What our Lord had done then, that same thing He told His followers to do in memory of Him. It would not have been a Eucharist at all if the celebrant had not at least done as our Lord did the night before He died. So we have everywhere from the very beginning at least this uniform nucleus of a Liturgy: bread and wine are brought to the celebrant in vessels (a plate and a cup); he puts them on a table—the altar; standing before it in the natural attitude of prayer he takes them in his hands, gives thanks, as our Lord had done, says again the words of institution, breaks the Bread and gives the consecrated Bread and Wine to the people in communion. The absence of the words of institution in the Nestorian Rite is no argument against the universality of this order. It is a rite that developed quite late; the parent liturgy has the words.

But we find much more than this essential nucleus in use in every Church from the first century. The Eucharist was always celebrated at the end of a service of lessons, psalms, prayers, and preaching, which was itself merely a continuation of the service of the synagogue. So we have everywhere this double function; first a synagogue service Christianized, in which the holy books were read, psalms were sung, prayers said by the bishop in the name of all (the people answering "Amen" in Hebrew, as had their Jewish forefathers), and homilies, explanations of what had been read, were made by the bishop or priests, just as they had been made in the synagogues by the learned men and elders (e. g., Luke, iv, 16–27). This is what was known afterwards as the Liturgy of the Catechumens. Then followed the Eucharist, at which only the baptized were present. Two other elements of the service in the earliest time soon disappeared. One was the Love-feast (*agape*) that came just before the Eucharist; the other was the *spiritual exercises*, in which people were moved by the Holy Ghost to prophesy, speak in divers tongues, heal the sick by prayer, and so on. This function—to which I Cor., xiv, 1–14, and the Didache, x, 7, etc., refer—obviously opened the way to disorders; from the second century it gradually disappears. The Eucharistic Agape seems to have disappeared at about the same time. The other two functions remained joined, and still exist in the liturgies of all rites. In them the service crystallized into more or less set forms from the beginning. In the first half the alternation of lessons, psalms, collects, and homilies leaves little room for variety. For obvious reasons a lesson from a Gospel was read last, in the place of honour as the fulfilment of all the others; it was preceded by other readings whose number, order, and arrangement varied considerably (see Lessons in the Liturgy). A chant of some kind would very soon accompany the entrance of the clergy and the beginning of the service. We also hear very soon of litanies of intercession said by one person, to each clause of which the people answer with some short formula (see Antiochene Liturgy; Alexandrine Liturgy; Kyrie Eleison). The place and number of the homilies would also vary for a long time. It is in the second part of the service, the Eucharist itself, that we find a very striking crystallization of the forms, and a uniformity even in the first or second century that goes far beyond the mere nucleus described above.

Already in the New Testament—apart from the account of the Last Supper—there are some indexes that point to liturgical forms. There were already readings from the Sacred Books (I Tim., iv, 13; I Thess., v, 27; Col., iv, 16), there were sermons (Act., xx, 7), psalms and hymns (I Cor., xiv, 26; Col., iii, 16; Eph., v, 19). I Tim., ii, 1–3, implies public liturgical prayers for all classes of people. People lifted up their hands at prayers (I Tim., ii, 8), men with uncovered heads (I Cor., xi, 4), women covered (ibid., 5). There was a kiss of peace (I Cor., xvi, 20; II Cor., xiii, 12; I Thess., v, 26). There was an offertory of goods for the poor (Rom., xv, 26; II Cor., ix, 13) called by the special name "communion" (κοινωνία). The people answered "Amen" after prayers (I Cor., xiv, 16). The word Eucharist has already a technical meaning (ibid.). The famous passage, I Cor., xi, 20–9, gives us the outline of the breaking of bread and thanksgiving (Eucharist) that followed the earlier part of the service. Heb., xiii, 10 (cf. I Cor., x, 16–21), shows that to the first Christians the table of the Eucharist was an altar. After the consecration prayers followed (Acts, ii, 42). St. Paul "breaks bread" (= the consecration), then communicates, then preaches (Acts, xx, 11). Acts, ii, 42, gives us an idea of the liturgical Synaxis in order: They "persevere in the teaching of the Apostles" (this implies the readings and homilies), "communicate in the breaking of bread" (consecration and communion) and "in prayers". So we have already in the New Testament all the essential elements that we find later in the organized liturgies: lessons, psalms, hymns, sermons, prayers, consecration, communion. (For all this see F. Probst: "Liturgie der drei ersten christl. Jahrhunderte", Tübingen, 1870, c. i; and the texts collected in Cabrol and Leclercq; "Monumenta ecclesiæ liturgica", I, Paris, 1900, pp. 1–51.) It has been thought that there are are in the New Testament even actual formulæ used in the liturgy. The *Amen*

is certainly one. St. Paul's insistence on the form "For ever and ever, Amen" (*εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων ἀμήν*.—Rom., xvi, 27; Gal., i, 5; I Tim., i, 17; cf. Heb., xiii, 21; I Pet., i, 11; v, 11; Apoc., i, 6, etc.) seems to argue that it is a liturgical form well known to the Christians whom he addresses, as it was to the Jews. There are other short hymns (Rom., xiii, 11–2; Eph., v, 14; I Tim., iii, 16; II Tim., ii, 11–3), which may well be liturgical formulæ.

In the Apostolic Fathers the picture of the early Christian Liturgy becomes clearer; we have in them a definite and to some extent homogeneous ritual. But this must be understood. There was certainly no set form of prayers and ceremonies such as we see in our present Missals and Euchologia; still less was anything written down and read from a book. The celebrating bishop spoke freely, his prayers being to some extent improvised. And yet this improvising was bound by certain rules. In the first place, no one who speaks continually on the same subjects says new things each time. Modern sermons and modern extempore prayers show how easily a speaker falls into set forms, how constantly he repeats what come to be, at least for him, fixed formulæ. Moreover, the dialogue form of prayer that we find in use in the earliest monuments necessarily supposes some constant arrangement. The people answer and echo what the celebrant and the deacons say with suitable exclamations. They could not do so unless they heard more or less the same prayers each time. They heard from the altar such phrases as: "The Lord be with you", or "Lift up your hearts", and it was because they recognized these forms, had heard them often before, that they could answer at once in the way expected.

We find too very early that certain general themes are constant. For instance our Lord had given thanks just before He spoke the words of institution. So it was understood that every celebrant began the prayer of consecration—the Eucharistic prayer—by thanking God for His various mercies. So we find always what we still have in our modern prefaces—a prayer thanking God for certain favours and graces, that are named, just where that preface comes, shortly before the consecration (Justin, "Apol.," I, xiii, lxv). An intercession for all kinds of people also occurs very early, as we see from references to it (e. g., Justin, "Apol.," I, xiv, lxv). In this prayer the various classes of people would naturally be named in more or less the same order. A profession of faith would almost inevitably open that part of the service in which only the faithful were allowed to take part (Justin, "Apol.", I, xiii, lxi). It could not have been long before the archtype of all Christian prayer—the Our Father—was said publicly in the Liturgy. The moments at which these various prayers were said would very soon become fixed. The people expected them at certain points, there was no reason for changing their order, on the contrary to do so would disturb the faithful. One knows too how strong conservative instinct is in any religion, especially in one that, like Christianity, has always looked back with unbounded reverence to the golden age of the first Fathers. So we must conceive the Liturgy of the first two centuries as made up of somewhat free improvisations on fixed themes in a definite order; and we realize too how naturally under these circumstances the very words used would be repeated—at first no doubt only the salient clauses—till they became fixed forms. The ritual, certainly of the simplest kind, would become stereotyped even more easily. The things that had to be done, the bringing up of the bread and wine, the collection of alms and so on, even more than the prayers, would be done always at the same point. A change here would be even more disturbing than a change in the order of the prayers.

A last consideration to be noted is the tendency of new Churches to imitate the customs of the older ones. Each new Christian community was formed by joining itself to the bond already formed. The new converts received their first missionaries, their faith and ideas from a mother Church. These missionaries would naturally celebrate the rites as they had seen them done, or as they had done them themselves in the mother Church. And their converts would imitate them, carry on the same tradition. Intercourse between the local Churches would further accentuate this uniformity among people who were very keenly conscious of forming one body with one Faith, one Baptism, and one Eucharist. It is not then surprising that the allusions to the Liturgy in the first Fathers of various countries, when compared show us a homogeneous rite at any rate in its main outlines, a constant type of service, though it was subject to certain local modifications. It would not be surprising if from this common early Liturgy one uniform type had evolved for the whole Catholic world. We know that that is not the case. The more or less fluid ritual of the first two centuries crystallized into different liturgies in East and West; difference of language, the insistence on one point in one place, the greater importance given to another feature elsewhere, brought about our various rites. But there is an obvious unity underlying all the old rites that goes back to the earliest age. The medieval idea that all are derived from one parent rite is not so absurd, if we remember that the parent was not a written or stereotyped Liturgy, but rather a general *type* of service.

III. The Liturgy in the First Three Centuries.—For the first period we have of course no complete description. We must reconstruct what we can from the allusions to the Holy Eucharist in the Apostolic Fathers and apologists. Justin Martyr alone gives us a fairly complete outline of the rite that he knew. The Eucharist described in the "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles" (most authorities now put the date of this work at the end of the first century) in some ways lies apart from the general development. We have here still the free "prophesying" (x, 7), the Eucharist is still joined to the Agape (x, 1), the reference to the actual consecration is vague. The likeness between the prayers of thanksgiving (ix–x) and the Jewish forms for blessing bread and wine on the Sabbath (given in the "Berakoth" treatise of the Talmud; cf. Sabatier, "La Didache", Paris, 1885, p. 99) points obviously to derivation from them. It has been suggested that the rite here described is not our Eucharist at all; others (Paul Drews) think that it is a private Eucharist distinct from the official public rite. On the other hand, it seems clear from the whole account in chapters ix and x that we have here a real Eucharist, and the existence of private celebrations remains to be proved. The most natural explanation is certainly that of a Eucharist of a very archaic nature, not fully described. At any rate we have these liturgical points from the book. The "Our Father" is a recognized formula: it is to be said three times every day (viii, 2–3). The Liturgy is a eucharist and a sacrifice to be celebrated by breaking bread and giving thanks on the "Lord's Day" by people who have confessed their sins (xiv, 1). Only the baptized are admitted to it (ix, 5). The wine is mentioned first, then the broken bread; each has a formula of giving thanks to God for His revelation in Christ with the conclusion: "To thee be glory for ever" (ix, 1, 4). There follows a thanksgiving for various benefits; the creation and our sanctification by Christ are named (x, 1–4); then comes a prayer for the Church ending with the form: "Maranatha. Amen"; in it occurs the form: "Hosanna to the God of David" (x, 5–6).

The First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians (written probably between 90 and 100) contains an

abundance of liturgical matter, much more than is apparent at the first glance. That the long prayer in chapters lix–lxi is a magnificent example of the kind of prayers said in the liturgy of the first century has always been admitted (e. g., Duchesne, "Origines du Culte", 49–51); that the letter, especially in this part, is full of liturgical forms is also evident. The writer quotes the Sanctus (Holy, holy, holy Lord of Sabaoth; all creation is full of his glory) from Is., vi, 3, and adds that "we assembled in unity cry (this) as with one mouth" (xxxiv, 7). The end of the long prayer is a doxology invoking Christ and finishing with the form: "now and for generations of generations and for ages of ages. Amen" (lxi, 3). This too is certainly a liturgical formula. There are many others. But we can find more in I Clem. than merely a promiscuous selection of formulæ. A comparison of the text with the first known Liturgy actually written down, that of the "Eighth Book of the Apostolic Constitutions" (written long afterwards, in the fifth century in Syria) reveals a most startling likeness. Not only do the same ideas occur in the same order, but there are whole passages—just those that in I Clem. have most the appearance of liturgical formulæ —that recur word for word in the "Apost. Const."

In the "Apost. Const." the Eucharistic prayer begins, as in all liturgies, with the dialogue: "Lift up your hearts", etc. Then, beginning: "It is truly meet and just", comes a long thanksgiving for various benefits corresponding to what we call the preface. Here occurs a detailed description of the first benefit we owe to God—the creation. The various things created—the heavens and earth, sun, moon and stars, fire and sea, and so on, are enumerated at length ("Apost. Const.", VIII, xii, 6–27). The prayer ends with the Sanctus. I Clem., xx, contains a prayer echoing the same ideas exactly, in which the very same words constantly occur. The order in which the creatures are mentioned is the same. Again "Apost. Const.", VIII, xii, 27, introduces the Sanctus in the same way as I Clem., xxxiv, 5–6, where the author actually says he is quoting the Liturgy. This same preface in "Apost. Const." (loc. cit.), remembering the Patriarchs of the Old Law, names Abel, Cain, Seth, Henoch, Noe, Salmon, Lot, Abraham, Melchisedech, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, Josue. The parallel passage in I Clem. (ix–xii) names Enoch, Noe, Lot, Salmon, Abraham, Rahab, Josue: we may note at once two other parallels to this list containing again almost the same list of names—Heb., xi, 4–31, and Justin, "Dialogue", xix, cxi, cxxxi, cxxxviii. The long prayer in I Clem. (lix–lxi) is full of ideas and actual phrases that come again in "Apost. Const.", VIII. Compare for instance I Clem., lix, 2–4, with "Apost. Const.", VIII, x, 22–xi, 5 (which is part of the celebrant's prayer during the litany of the faithful: Brightman, "Eastern Liturgies", p. 12), and xiii, 10 (prayer during the litany that follows the great intercession. Brightman, p. 24). Other no less striking parallels may be seen in Drews, "Untersuchungen über die sogen. clement. Liturgie," 14–43. It is not only with the Liturgy of "Apost. Const." that I Clem. has these extraordinary resemblances. I Clem., lix, 4, echoes exactly the clauses of the celebrant's prayer during the intercession in the Alexandrine Rite (Greek St. Mark. Brightman, 131). These parallel passages cannot all be mere coincidences (Lightfoot realized this, but suggests no explanation. "The Apostolic Fathers", London, 1890, I, II, p. 71).

The question then occurs: What is the relation between I Clement and—in the first place—the Liturgy of "Apost. Const."? The suggestion that first presents itself is that the later document ("Apost. Const.") is quoting the earlier one (I Clem.). This is Harnack's view ("Gesch. der altchristl. Litteratur", I, Leipzig, 1893, pp. 42–43), but it is exceedingly unlikely. In that case the quotations would be more exact, the order of I Clem. would be kept; the prayers in the Liturgy have no appearance of being quotations or conscious compositions of fragments from earlier books; nor, if the "Apost. Const." were quoting I Clem., would there be reduplications such as we have seen above (VIII, xi, 22–xi, 5, and xiii, 10). Years ago Ferdinand Probst spent a great part of his life in trying to prove that the Liturgy of the "Apostolic Constitutions" was the universal primitive Liturgy of the whole Church. To this endeavour he applied an enormous amount of erudition. In his "Liturgie der drei ersten christlichen Jahrhunderte"(Tübingen, 1870) and again in his "Liturgie des vierten Jahrhunderts und deren Reform" (Münster, 1893), he examined a vast number of texts of Fathers, always with a view to find in them allusions to the Liturgy in question. But he overdid his identifications hopelessly. He sees an allusion in every text that vaguely refers to a subject named in the Liturgy. Also his books are very involved and difficult to study. So Probst's theory fell almost entirely into discredit. His ubiquitous Liturgy was remembered only as the monomania of a very learned man; the rite of the "Eighth Book of the Apostolic Constitutions" was put in what seemed to be its right place, merely as an early form of the Antiochene Liturgy (so Duchesne, "Origines du Culte", 55–6). Lately, however, there has come again to the fore what may be described as a modified form of Probst's theory. Ferdinand Kattenbusch ("Das apostolische Symbol", Tübingen, 1900, II, 347, etc.) thought that after all there might be some foundation for Probst's idea. Paul Drews (Untersuchungen über die sogen. clementinische Liturgie, Tübingen, 1906) proposes and defends at length what may well be the germ of truth in Probst, namely that there was a certain uniformity of type in the earliest Liturgy in the sense described above, not a uniformity of detail, but one of general outline, of the ideas expressed in the various parts of the service, with a strong tendency to uniformity in certain salient expressions that recurred constantly and became insensibly liturgical formulæ. This type of liturgy (rather than a fixed rite) may be traced back even to the first century. It is seen in Clement of Rome, Justin, etc.; perhaps there are traces of it even in the Epistle to the Hebrews. And of this type we still have a specimen in the "Apostolic Constitutions". It is not that that rite exactly as it is in the "Constitutions" was used by Clement and Justin. Rather the "Constitutions" give us a much later (fifth century) form of the old Liturgy written down at last in Syria after it had existed for centuries in a more fluid state as an oral tradition. Thus, Clement, writing to the Corinthians (that the letter was actually composed by the Bishop of Rome, as Dionysius of Corinth says in the second century, is now generally admitted. Cf. Bardenhewer, "Gesch. der altkirchl. Litteratur", Freiburg, 1902, 101–2), uses the language to which he was accustomed in the Liturgy; the letter is full of liturgical ideas and reminiscences. They are found again in the later crystallization of the same rite in the "Apostolic Constitutions". So that book gives us the best representation of the Liturgy as used in Rome in the first two centuries.

This is confirmed by the next witness, Justin Martyr. Justin (d. about 164), in his famous account of the Liturgy, describes it as he saw it at Rome (Bardenhewer, op. cit., 206). The often quoted passage is (I Apology): LXV. 1. "We lead him who believes and is joined to us, after we have thus baptized him, to those who are called the brethren, where they gather together to say prayers in common for ourselves, and for him who has been enlightened, and for all who are everywhere. . . . 2. We greet each other with a kiss when the prayers are finished. 3. Then bread and a cup of water and wine are brought to the president of the brethren, and he having re-

ceived them sends up praise and glory to the Father of all through the name of his Son and the Holy Ghost, and makes a long thanksgiving that we have been made worthy of these things by him; when these prayers and thanksgivings are ended all the people present cry 'Amen'. . . . 5. And when the president has given thanks (*εὐχαριστήσαντος*, already a technical name for the Eucharist) and all the people have answered, those whom we call deacons give the bread and wine and water for which the 'thanksgiving' (Eucharist) has been made to be tasted by those who are present, and they carry them to those that are absent. LXVI. This food is called by us the Eucharist" (the well-known passage about the Real Presence follows, with the quotation of the words of Institution). LXVII. 3 "On the day which is called that of the Sun a reunion is made of all those who dwell in the cities and fields; and the commentaries of the Apostles and writings of the prophets are read as long as time allows. 4. Then, when the reader has done, the president admonishes us in a speech and excites us to copy these glorious things. 5. Then we all rise and say prayers and, as we have said above, when we have done praying bread is brought up and wine and water; and the president sends up prayers with thanksgiving for the men, and the people acclaim, saying 'Amen', and a share of the Eucharist is given to each and is sent to those absent by the deacons."

This is by far the most complete account of the Eucharistic Service we have from the first three centuries. It will be seen at once that what is described in chapter lxvii precedes the rite of lxv. In lxvii Justin begins his account of the Liturgy and repeats in its place what he had already said above.

Putting it all together we have this scheme of the service:

1. Lessons (lxvii, 3).
2. Sermon by the bishop (lxvii, 4).
3. Prayers for all people (lxvii, 5; lxv, 1).
4. Kiss of peace (lxv, 2).
5. Offertory of bread and wine and water brought up by the deacons (lxvii, 5; lxv, 3).
6. Thanksgiving-prayer by the bishop (lxvii, 5; lxv, 3).
7. Consecration by the words of institution (? lxv, 5; lxvi, 2–3).
8. Intercession for the people (lxvii, 5; lxv, 3).
9. The people end this prayer with *Amen* (lxvii, 5; lxv, 3).
10. Communion (lxvii, 5; lxv, 5).

This is exactly the order of the Liturgy in the "Apostolic Constitutions" (Brightman, "Eastern Liturgies", 3–4, 9–12, 13, 14–21, 21–3, 25). Moreover, as in the case of I Clement, there are many passages and phrases in Justin that suggest parallel ones in the "Apost. Const."—not so much in Justin's account of the Liturgy (though here too Drews sees such parallels, op. cit., 58–9) as in other works in which Justin, like Clement, may be supposed to be echoing well-known liturgical phrases. Drews prints many such passages side by side with the corresponding ones of the "Apost. Const.", from which comparison he concludes that Justin knows a dismissal of the catechumens (cf. "I Apol.", xlix, 5; xiv, 1; xxv, 2, with "Apost. Const.", VIII, vi, 8; x, 2) and of the Energumens (Dial., xxx; cf. "Apost. Const.", VIII, vii, 2) corresponding to that in the Liturgy in question. From "I Apol.", lxv, 1; xvii, 3; xiv, 3; deduces a prayer for all kinds of men (made by the community) of the type of that prayer in "Apost. Const.", VIII, x. "I Apol.", xiii, 1–3, lxv, 3; v, 2, and Dial., xli, lxx, cxvii, give us the elements of a preface exactly on the lines of that in "Apost. Const.", VIII, xii, 6–27 (see these texts in parallel columns in Drews, "op. cit.", 59–91).

We have, then, in Clement and Justin the picture of a Liturgy at least remarkably like that of the "Apostolic Constitutions". Drews adds as striking parallels from Hippolytus (d. 235), "Contra Noetum", etc. (op. cit., 95–107) and Novatian (third cent.) "De Trinitate" (ibid., 107–22), both Romans, and thinks that this same type of liturgy continues in the known Roman Rite (122–66). That the Liturgy of the "Apostolic Constitutions" as it stands is Antiochene, and is closely connected with the Rite of Jerusalem, is certain. It would seem, then, that it represents one form of a vaguer type of rite that was in its main outline uniform in the first three centuries. The other references to the Liturgy in the first age (Ignatius of Antioch, d. about 107, "Eph.", xiii, xx, "Phil.", iv, "Rom.", vii, "Smyrn.", vii, viii; Irenæus, d. 202, "Adv. hær.", IV, xvii, xviii; V, ii, Clement of Alexandria, d. about 215, "Pæd.", I, vi; II, ii, in P. G., VIII, 301, 410; Origen, d. 254, "Contra Cels.", VIII, xxxiii, "Hom. xix in Lev.", xviii, 13; "In Matt.", xi, 14; "In Ioh.", xiii, 30) repeat the same ideas that we have seen in Clement and Justin, but add little to the picture presented by them (see Cabrol and Leclercq, "Mon. Eccles. Liturg.", I, *passim*).

IV. The Parent Rites, from the Fourth Century.—From about the fourth century our knowledge of the Liturgy increases enormously. We are no longer dependent on casual references to it: we have definite rites fully developed. The more or less uniform type of Liturgy used everywhere before crystallized into four parent rites from which all others are derived. The four are the old Liturgies of Antioch, Alexandria, Rome, and Gaul. Each is described in a special article. It will be enough here to trace an outline of their general evolution.

The development of these liturgies is very like what happens in the case of languages. From a general uniformity a number of local rites arise with characteristic differences. Then one of these local rites, because of the importance of the place that uses it, spreads, is copied by the cities around, drives out its rivals, and becomes at last the one rite used throughout a more or less extended area. We have then a movement from vague uniformity to diversity and then a return to exact uniformity. Except for the Gallican Rite the reason of the final survival of these liturgies is evident. Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch are the old patriarchal cities. As the other bishops accepted the jurisdiction of these three patriarchs, so did they imitate their services. The Liturgy, as it crystallized in these centres, became the type for the other Churches of their patriarchates. Only Gaul and north-west Europe generally, though part of the Roman Patriarchate, kept its own rite till the seventh and eight centuries.

Alexandria and Antioch are the starting-points of the two original Eastern rites. The earliest form of the Antiochene Rite is that of the "Apostolic Constitutions" written down in the early fifth century. From what we have said it seems that this rite has best preserved the type of the primitive use. From it is derived the Rite of Jerusalem (till the Council of Chalcedon, 451, Jerusalem was in the Antiochene Patriarchate), which then returned to Antioch and became that of the patriarchate (see Antiochene Liturgy and Jerusalem, Liturgy of). We have this liturgy (called after St. James) in Greek (Brightman, "Eastern Liturgies", 31–68) and in Syriac (ibid., 69–110). The Alexandrine Rite differs chiefly in the place of the great intercession (see Alexandrine Liturgy). This too exists in Greek (Brightman, 113–43) and the language of the country, in this case Coptic (ibid., 144–88). In both cases the original form was certainly Greek, but in both the present Greek forms have been considerably influenced by the later Rite of Constantinople. A reconstruction of the original Greek is possible by removing the Byzantine additions and changes, and comparing the Greek and Syriac or Coptic forms. Both these liturgies have given

rise to numerous derived forms. The Roman Rite is thought by Duchesne to be connected with Alexandria, the Gallican with Antioch (Origines du Culte, p. 54). But, from what has been said, it seems more correct to connect the Roman Rite with that of Antioch. Besides its derivation from the type represented by the Liturgy of the Apostolic Constitutions there are reasons for supposing a further influence of the Liturgy of St. James at Rome (see CANON OF THE MASS, and Drews, "Zur Entstehungsgesch. des Kanons in der römischen Messe", Tübingen, 1902). The Gallican Rite is certainly Syrian in its origin. There are also very striking parallels between Antioch and Alexandria, in spite of their different arrangements. It may well be, then, that all four rites are to be considered as modifications of that most ancient use, best preserved at Antioch; so we should reduce Duchesne's two sources to one, and restore to a great extent Probst's theory of one original rite—that of the "Apostolic Constitutions".

In any case the old Roman Rite is not exactly that now used. Our Roman Missal has received considerable additions from Gallican sources. The original rite was simpler, more austere, had practically no ritual beyond the most necessary actions (see Bishop, "The Genius of the Roman Rite" in "Essays on Ceremonial", edited by Vernon Staley, London, 1904, pp. 283–307). It may be said that our present Roman Liturgy contains all the old nucleus, has lost nothing, but has additional Gallican elements. The original rite may be in part deduced from references to it as early as the fifth century ("Letters of Gelasius I" in Thiel, "Epistolæ Rom. Pontificum", I, cdlxxxvi, "Innocent I to Decennius of Eugubium", written in 416, in P. L., XX, 551; Pseudo-Ambrose, "De Sacramentis", IV, 5, etc.); it is represented by the Leonine and Gelasian "Sacramentaries", and by the old part of the Gregorian book (see LITURGICAL BOOKS). The Roman Rite was used throughout Central and Southern Italy. The African use was a variant of that of Rome (see Cabrol, "Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne", s. v. Afrique, Liturgie postnicéenne). In the West, however, the principle that rite should follow patriarchate did not obtain till about the eighth century. The pope was Patriarch of all Western (Latin) Europe, yet the greater part of the West did not use the Roman Rite. The North of Italy whose centre was Milan, Gaul, Germany, Spain, Britain, and Ireland had their own Liturgies. These Liturgies are all modifications of a common type; they may all be classed together as forms of what is known as the Gallican Rite. Where did that rite come from? It is obviously Eastern in its origin: its whole construction has the most remarkable conformity to the Antiochene type, a conformity extending in many parts to the actual text (compare the Milanese litany of intercession quoted by Duchesne, "Origines du Culte", p. 189, with the corresponding litany in the Antiochene Liturgy; Brightman, pp. 44–5). It used to be said that the Gallican Rite came from Ephesus, brought by the founders of the Church of Lyons, and from Lyons spread throughout North-Western Europe. This theory cannot be maintained. It was not brought to the West till its parent rite was fully developed, had already evolved a complicated ceremonial, such as is inconceivable at the time when the Church of Lyons was founded (second century). It must have been imported about the fourth century, at which time Lyons had lost all importance. Mgr Duchesne therefore suggests Milan as the centre from which it radiated, and the Cappadocian Bishop of Milan, Auxentius (355–74), as the man who introduced this Eastern Rite to the West (Origines du Culte, 86–9). In spreading over Western Europe the rite naturally was modified in various Churches. When we speak of the Gallican Rite we mean a type of liturgy rather than a stereotyped service.

The Milanese Rite still exists, though in the course of time it has become considerably romanized. For Gaul we have the description in two letters of St. Germanus of Paris (d. 576), used by Duchesne "Origines du Culte", ch. vii: La Messe Gallicane. Original text in P. L., LXXII). Spain kept the Gallican Rite longest; the Mozarabic Liturgy still used at Toledo and Salamanca represents the Spanish use. The British and Irish Liturgies, of which not much is known, were apparently Gallican too (see F. E. Warren, "The Liturgy and Ritual of the Celtic Church", Oxford, 1881; Bäumer, "Das Stowe Missale" in the "Innsbruck Zeitschrift für kath. theol.", 1892; and Bannister, "Journal of Theological Studies", Oct., 1903). From Lindisfarne the Gallican Use spread among the Northern English converted by Irish monks in the sixth and seventh centuries.

V. THE DERIVED LITURGIES.—From these four types—of Antioch, Alexandria, Rome, and the so-called Gallican Rite—all liturgies still used are derived. This does not mean that the actual liturgies we still have under those names are the parents; once more we must conceive the sources as vaguer, they are rather types subject always to local modification, but represented to us now in one form, such as, for instance, the Greek St. James or the Greek St. Mark Liturgy. The Antiochene type, apparently the most archaic, has been also the most prolific of daughter liturgies. Antioch first absorbed the Rite of Jerusalem (St. James), itself derived from the primitive Antiochene use shown in the "Apostolic Constitutions" (see JERUSALEM, LITURGY OF). In this form it was used throughout the patriarchate till about the thirteenth century (see ANTIOCHENE LITURGY). A local modification was the Use of Cappadocia. About the fourth century the great Byzantine Rite was derived from this (see CONSTANTINOPLE, RITE OF). The Armenian Rite is derived from an early stage of that of Byzantium. The Nestorian Rite is also Antiochene in its origin, whether derived directly from Antioch, or Edessa, or from Byzantium at an early stage. The Liturgy of Malabar is Nestorian. The Maronite Use is that of Antioch considerably romanized. The other Eastern parent rite, of Alexandria, produced the numerous Coptic Liturgies and those of the daughter Church of Abyssinia.

In the West the later history of the Liturgy is that of the gradual supplanting of the Gallican by the Roman, which, however, became considerably gallicanized in the process. Since about the sixth century conformity with Rome becomes an ideal in most Western Churches. The old Roman use is represented by the "Gelasian Sacramentary". This book came to Gaul in the sixth century, possibly by way of Arles and through the influence of St. Cæsarius of Arles (d. 542–cf. Bäumer, "Ueber das sogen. Sacram. Gelas." in the "Histor. Jahrbuch der Görres-Gesellschaft", 1893, 241–301). It then spread throughout Gaul and received Gallican modifications. In some parts it completely supplanted the old Gallican books. Charles the Great (768–814) was anxious for uniformity throughout his kingdom in the Roman use only. He therefore procured from Pope Adrian I (772–795) a copy of the "Roman Sacramentary". The book sent by the pope was a later form of the Roman Rite (the "Sacramentarium Gregorianum"). Charles imposed this book on all the clergy of his kingdom. But it was not easy to carry out his orders. The people were attached to their own customs. So someone (possibly Alcuin—cf. Bäumer, loc. cit.) added to Adrian's book a supplement containing selections from both the older Gelasian book and the original Gallican sources. This composition became then the service-book of the Frankish Kingdom and eventually, as we shall see, the Liturgy of the whole Roman Church.

In Spain Bishop Profuturus of Braga wrote in 538 to Pope Vigilius (537–55) asking his advice about

certain liturgical matters. The pope's answer (in Jaffé, "Regest. Rom. Pont.", no. 907) shows the first influence of the Roman Rite in Spain. In 561 the national Synod of Braga imposed Vigilius's ritual on all the kingdom of the Suevi. From this time we have the "mixed" Rite (Roman and Gallican) of Spain. Later, when the Visigoths had conquered the Suevi (577–584), the Church of Toledo rejected the Roman elements and insisted on uniformity in the pure Gallican Rite. Nevertheless Roman additions were made later; eventually all Spain accepted the Roman Rite (in the eleventh century) except the one corner, at Toledo and Salamanca, where the mixed (Mozarabic) Rite is still used. The great Church of Milan, apparently the starting-point of the whole Gallican Use, was able to resist the influence of the Roman Liturgy. But here too, in later centuries the local rite became considerably romanized (St. Charles Borromeo, d. 1584), so that the present Milanese (Ambrosian) use is only a shadow of the old Gallican Liturgy. In Britain St. Augustine of Canterbury (597–605) naturally brought with him the Roman Liturgy. It received a new impetus from St. Theodore of Canterbury when he came from Rome (668), and gradually drove out the Gallican Use of Lindisfarne.

The English Church was very definitely Roman in its Liturgy. There was even a great enthusiasm for the rite of the mother Church. So Alcuin writes to Eanbald of York in 796: "Let your clergy not fail to study the Roman order; so that, imitating the Head of the Churches of Christ, they may receive the blessing of Peter, prince of the Apostles, whom our Lord Jesus Christ made the chief of his flock"; and again: "Have you not plenty of books written according to the Roman use?" (quoted in Cabrol, "L'Angleterre terre chrétienne avant les Normans", Paris, 1909, p. 297). Before the Conquest the Roman service-books in England received a few Gallican additions from the old rite of the country (op. cit., 297–298).

So we see that at the latest by the tenth or eleventh century the Roman Rite has driven out the Gallican, except in two sees (Milan and Toledo), and is used alone throughout the West, thus at last verifying here too the principle that rite follows patriarchate. But in the long and gradual supplanting of the Gallican Rite the Roman was itself affected by its rival, so that when at last it emerges as sole possessor it is no longer the old pure Roman Rite, but has become the gallicanized Roman Use that we now follow. These Gallican additions are all of the nature of ceremonial ornament, symbolic practices, ritual adornment. Our blessings of candles, ashes, palms, much of the ritual of Holy Week, sequences, and so on are Gallican additions. The original Roman Rite was very plain, simple, practical. Mr. Edmund Bishop says that its characteristics were "essentially soberness and sense" ("The Genius of the Roman Rite", p. 307; see the whole essay). Once these additions were accepted at Rome they became part of the (new) Roman Rite and were used as part of that rite everywhere.

When was the older simpler use so enriched? We have two extreme dates. The additions were not made in the eighth century when Pope Adrian sent his "Gregorian Sacramentary" to Charlemagne. The original part of that book (in Muratori's edition; "Liturgia romana vetus", II, Venice, 1748) contains still the old Roman Mass. They were made by the eleventh century, as is shown by the "Missale Romanum Lateranense" of that time, edited by Azevedo (Rome, 1752). Dom Suitbert Bäumer suggests that the additions made to Adrian's book (by Alcuin) in the Frankish Kingdom came back to Rome (after they had become mixed up with the original book) under the influence of the successors of Charlemagne, and there supplanted the older pure form (Ueber das sogen. Sacr. Gelas., ibid.).

VI. Later Medieval Liturgies.—We have now arrived at the present state of things. It remains to say a word about the various medieval uses the nature of which has often been misunderstood. Everyone has heard of the old English uses—Sarum, Ebor, etc. People have sometimes tried to set them up in opposition to what they call the "modern" Roman Rite, as witnesses that in some way England was not "Roman" before the Reformation. This idea shows an astonishing ignorance of the rites in question. These medieval uses are in no sense really independent rites. To compare them with the Gallican or Eastern Liturgies is absurd. They are simply cases of what was common all over Europe in the later Middle Ages, namely slight (often very slight) local modifications of the parent Rite of Rome. As there were Sarum and Ebor, so there were Paris, Rouen, Lyons, Cologne, Trier Rites. All these are simply Roman, with a few local peculiarities. They had their own saints' days, a trifling variety in the Calendar, some extra Epistles, Gospels, sequences, prefaces, certain local (generally more exuberant) details of ritual In such insignificant details as the sequence of liturgical colours there was diversity in almost every diocese. No doubt, some rites (as the Dominican use, that of Lyons, etc.) have rather more Gallican additions than our normal Roman Liturgy. But the essence of all these late rites, all the parts that really matter (the arrangement, Canon of the Mass, and so on) are simply Roman. Indeed they do not differ from the parent rite enough to be called derived properly. Here again the parallel case of languages will make the situation clear. There are really derived languages that are no longer the same language as their source. Italian is derived from Latin, and Italian is not Latin. On the other hand, there are dialectic modifications that do not go far enough to make a derived language. No one would describe the modern Roman dialect as a language derived from Italian; it is simply Italian, with a few slight local modifications. In the same way, there are really new liturgies derived from the old ones. The Byzantine Rite is derived from that of Antioch and is a different rite. But Sarum, Paris, Trier, etc. are simply the Roman Rite, with a few local modifications.

Hence the justification of the abolition of nearly all these local varieties in the sixteenth century. However jealous one may be for the really independent liturgies, however much one would regret to see the abolition of the venerable old rites that share the allegiance of Christendom (an abolition by the way that is not in the least likely ever to take place), at any rate these medieval developments have no special claim to our sympathy. They were only exuberant inflations of the more austere ritual that had better not have been touched. Churches that use the Roman Rite had better use it in a pure form; where the same rite exists at least there uniformity is a reasonable ideal. To conceive these late developments as old compared with the original Roman Liturgy that has now again taken their place, is absurd. It was the novelties that Pius V abolished; his reform was a return to antiquity. In 1570 Pius V published his revised and restored Roman Missal that was to be the only form for all Churches that use the Roman Rite. The restoration of this Missal was on the whole undoubtedly successful; it was all in the direction of eliminating the later inflations, farced Kyries and Glorias, exuberant sequences, and ceremonial that was sometimes almost grotesque. In imposing it the pope made an exception for other uses that had been in possession for at least two centuries. This privilege was not used consistently. Many local uses that had a prescription of at least that time gave way to the authentic Roman Rite; but it saved the Missals of some Churches (Lyons, for instance) and of some religious orders (the Dominicans, Carmelites, Carthusians). What is much more important is that the pope's exception saved the two remnants of a really independent Rite at Milan and

Toledo. Later, in the nineteenth century, there was again a movement in favour of uniformity that abolished a number of surviving local customs in France and Germany, though these affected the Breviary more than the Missal. We are now witnessing a similar movement for uniformity in plainsong (the Vatican edition). The Monastic Rite (used by the Benedictines and Cistercians) is also Roman in its origin. The differences between it and the normal Roman Rite affect chiefly the Divine Office.

7. TABLE OF LITURGIES.—We are now able to draw up a table of all the real liturgies used throughout the Christian world. The various Protestant Prayer-books, Agendæ, Communion-services, and so on, have of course no place in this scheme, because they all break away altogether from the continuity of liturgical development; they are merely compilations of random selections from any of the old rites imbedded in new structures made by various Reformers.

In the First Three Centuries:—

A fluid rite founded on the account of the Last Supper, combined with a Christianized synagogue service showing, however, a certain uniformity of type and gradually crystallizing into set forms. Of this type we have perhaps a specimen in the Liturgy of the second and eighth books of the "Apostolic Constitutions".

Since the Fourth Century:—

The original indetermined rite forms into the four great liturgies from which all others are derived These liturgies are:

I. ANTIOCH.
1. Pure in the "Apostolic Constitutions" (in Greek).
2. Modified at Jerusalem in the Liturgy of St. James.
   a. The Greek St. James, used once a year by the Orthodox at Zacynthus and Jerusalem.
   b. The Syriac St. James, used by the Jacobites and Syrian Uniats.
   c. The Maronite Rite, used in Syriac.
3. The Chaldean Rite, used by Nestorians and Chaldean Uniats (in Syriac).
   a. The Malabar Rite, used by Uniats and Schismatics in India (in Syriac).
4. The Byzantine Rite, used by the Orthodox and Byzantine Uniats in various languages.
5. The Armenian Rite, used by Gregorians and Uniats (in Armenian).

II. ALEXANDRIA.
1. a. The Greek Liturgy of St. Mark, no longer used.
   b. The Coptic Liturgies, used by Uniat and schismatical Copts.
2. The Ethiopic Liturgies, used by the Church of Abyssinia.

III. ROME.
1. The original Roman Rite, not now used.
2. The African Rite, no longer used.
3. The Roman Rite with Gallican additions used (in Latin) by nearly all the Latin Church.
4. Various later modifications of this rite used in the Middle Ages, now (with a few exceptions) abolished.

IV. THE GALLICAN RITE.
1. Used once all over North-Western Europe and in Spain (in Latin).
2. The Ambrosian Rite at Milan.
3. The Mozarabic Rite, used at Toledo and Salamanca.

CABROL AND LECLERCQ, *Monumenta Ecclesiæ Liturgica. I, Reliquiæ Liturgicæ vetustissimæ* (Paris, 1900–2); BRIGHTMAN, *Liturgies Eastern and Western. I. Eastern Liturgies* (Oxford, 1896); DANIEL, *Codex Liturgicus Ecclesiæ universæ* (4 vols., Leipzig, 1847–53); RAUSCHEN, *Florilegium Patristicum*, VII. *Monumenta eucharistica et liturgica vetustissima* (Bonn, 1909); FUNK, *Patres Apostolici* (2 vols., T bingen, 1901), and *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum* (Paderborn, 1905), the quotations in this article are made from these editions; PROBST, *Liturgie der drei ersten christl. Jahrh.* (T bingen, 1870); IDEM, *Liturgie des vierten Jahr. u. deren Reform* (Münster, 1893); DREWS, *Untersuchungen über die sogenannte clementin. Liturgie* (T bingen, 1906); DUCHESNE, *Origines du Culte chrét.* (Paris, 1898); RAUSCHEN, *Eucharistie und Buss-sakrament in den ersten sechs Jahrh. der Kirche* (Freiburg, 1908); CABROL, *Les Origines liturgiques* (Paris, 1906); IDEM, *Introduction aux Études liturgiques* (Paris, 1907). For further bibliography see articles on each liturgy. For liturgical languages, as well as liturgical science, treating of the regulation, history, and dogmatic value of the Liturgy, see RITES.

ADRIAN FORTESCUE.

Liutprand of Cremona (or LUIDPRAND), bishop and historian, b. at the beginning of the tenth century; d. after 970. Liutprand belonged to a distinguished Lombard family in Northern Italy and at an early age went to the Court of Pavia, during the reign of King Hugo of Arles (926–45), whose favour he won by his wonderful voice. He received a sound education at the court school, and became a cleric; later he was deacon of the cathedral of Pavia. At first Liutprand stood in high favour with Berenger II of Ivrea and his consort, Willa. Berenger made him chancellor, and in 949 sent him as ambassador to the Emperor Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus. As both Liutprand's father and stepfather had been sent as ambassadors to the Byzantine capital, and had formed many friendships there, he seemed well fitted for a mission of that kind. He took this opportunity to learn Greek, and made himself familiar with the history, organization, and life of the Byzantine Empire as his writings prove. Shortly after his return he quarrelled with Berenger, and then went to the Court of Otto I of Germany. Otto joyfully took Liutprand into his service, as a most useful agent in carrying out his plans regarding Italy. In 956 Liutprand met Bishop Recemund of Elvira (Spain) at the German Court, and was asked by him to write a history of his time. In 958 he began this work at Frankfort, and though often interrupted by public business was occupied with it until 962. When Otto became King of Lombardy (961) he made Liutprand Bishop of Cremona, as a reward for his services. After Otto had received the imperial crown at Rome (2 February, 962) Liutprand was often entrusted with important commissions, e. g., in 963 when he was sent as ambassador to John XII at the beginning of the quarrel between the pope and the emperor, owing to the former's alliance with Berenger's son Adelbert. Liutprand also took part in the assembly of bishops at Rome, 6 November, 963, which deposed John XII (q. v.). Liutprand describes from his point of view these events of 960–64, and sides entirely with the emperor, condemning the Romans very harshly. After the death of the anti-pope, Leo VIII (965), Liutprand again went to Rome with Bishop Otgar of Speyer, as the emperor's envoy, to conduct the election of a new pope, on which occasion John XIII was chosen. The Bishop of Cremona undertook another mission to Constantinople by order of the emperor in the summer of 968 to ask the Byzantine Emperor to bestow his daughter in marriage on Otto's son, later Otto II.

In the autumn of 969 Liutprand carried letters to a synod at Milan, from the emperor and the Roman synod in May of that year. The last authentic information we have about him is in April, 970; he appears to have been present in Cremona, 15 April, 970 (Hist. patriæ monumenta, XXI, 36). A later account of the transfer of the relics of St. Himerius (Mon. Germ. Hist.: Script., III, 266) makes him take part in an embassy to Constantinople in 971 for the imperial princess, Theophano, bride of Otto II, and says that he died during the journey. This is not very credible. Liutprand wrote three historical works on the occasions already mentioned: (1) "Antapodosis sive Res per Europam gestæ", embracing from 887 till 950, dealing chiefly with Italian history (ed. Pertz, in "Mon. Germ. Hist.: Script.", III, 264–339; P. L., CXXXVI, 787–898). (2) "Historia Ottonis sive Liber de rebus gestis Ottonis imp. an. 960–964" (ed. Pertz, op. cit., 340–46; P. L., CXXXVI, 897–910; Watterich, "Vitæ Roman. Pont.", I, 49–63), an account of the journey of Otto I to Italy, the

imperial coronation, and the deposition of John XII. (3) "Relatio de legatione Constantinopolitana ad Nicephorum Phocam", the account of his mission in 968 (ed. Pertz, op. cit., 347–63; P. L., loc. cit., 909–38). His works were edited by Dümmler, "Liutprandi opera omnia" (Hanover, 1877). Liutprand's writings are a very important historical source for the tenth century, but it is necessary to sift his narratives cautiously; he is ever a strong partisan and is frequently unfair towards his adversaries.

WATTENBACH, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter*, I (Berlin, 1904), 474–80; KOEPKE, *De vita et scriptis Liudprandi* (Berlin, 1842); DÄNDLIKER AND MÜLLER, *Liudprand von Cremona und seine Quellen* in BÜDINGER, *Untersuchungen zur mitteren Geschichte*, I (Leipzig, 1871); DÜMMLER in *Hist. Zeitschrift*, XXVI, 273–81; KOEHLER, *Beiträge zur Textkritik Liudprands von Cremona* in *Neues Archiv Ges. f. ält. d. Gesch.*, VIII (1883), 49–89; HANTZSCH, *Ueber Liudprand von Cremona* (Leoben, 1888); BALZANI, *Le cronache italiane del medio evo* (Milan, 1884), 112–129; COLINI BALDESCHI, *Liudprando vescovo di Cremona* (Giarre, 1889); NOVATI, *L'influsso del pensiero latino sopra la civiltà italiana del medio evo* (Milan, 1899); POTTHAST, *Bibliotheca hist. medii ævi*, I, 742–743; MANN, *History of the Popes in the Early Middle Ages*, IV (London, 1909).

J. P. KIRSCH.

Liverpool (LIVERPOLIUM), DIOCESE OF (LIVERPOLITANA), one of the thirteen dioceses into which Pius IX divided Catholic England, 29 September, 1850, when he re-established the Catholic hierarchy. In addition to the Isle of Man it contains all North Lancashire (Amounderness and Lonsdale Hundreds), and the western portion of South Lancashire (West Derby and Leyland Hundreds), whilst the eastern portion of South Lancashire (Salford and Blackburn Hundreds), constitutes the Diocese of Salford. The diocese at present (1910) has a Catholic population of 366,611 souls. There are 184 public churches and chapels and 172 public elementary schools containing 74,100 children and 1720 teachers. There are 458 priests, 332 secular and 126 regulars including 59 Jesuits, 36 Benedictines, 10 Redemptorists, 7 Passionists, 7 members of St. Joseph's Society for Foreign Missions, 4 Fathers of the Holy Ghost, and 3 Oblates of Mary Immaculate. There are also the Irish Christian Brothers and the Brothers of Charity and in some 70 convents there are 1000 nuns belonging to the various orders or congregations of the Sisters of Mercy, Faithful Companions of Jesus, Sisters of Notre Dame, Good Shepherd Sisters, Sisters of Charity, Little Sisters of the Poor, Sisters of Nazareth, Carmelites, etc. In various institutions provision is made for the blind, the aged poor, unemployed servants, penitents and fallen women, whilst for boys and girls there are orphanages, homes and refuges, poor-law schools, industrial and reformatory schools, etc. The following table contains statistics of the principal towns of the diocese:

	Population 1910	Catholic Population	Priests	Churches	Convents
Liverpool	760,000	143,000	140	39	29
Preston	117,000	34,000	26	7	7
St. Helen's	95,000	24,000	26	9	4
Wigan	89,000	19,000	16	6	2
Warrington	73,000	9,000	9	4	1
Bootle	70,000	21,000	14	4	0
Blackpool	63,000	4,000	6	3	1
Barrow	62,000	5,000	5	3	1
Southport	48,000	2,000	3	2	1
Leigh	45,000	7,000	8	4	0
Lancaster	41,000	4,000	5	2	3
Chorley	30,000	7,000	7	4	0

Education.—Elementary education is provided in 172 Catholic schools attended by 74,000 children. Higher education for girls is given in the convents of the Sisters of Notre Dame in Liverpool, St. Helen's, Birkdale, and Wigan; of the Faithful Companions of Jesus in Liverpool and Preston; of the Sisters of the Sacred Heart of Mary at Great Crosby; of the Sisters of Mercy at Liverpool; and of the Holy Child Jesus at Preston and Blackpool. The great training college of the Sisters of Notre Dame at Mount Pleasant, Liverpool, trains female teachers for all parts of England. For boys there are in Liverpool the Catholic Institute under the Irish Christian Brothers, and St. Francis Xavier's College under the Jesuit Fathers, who have also a Catholic College in Preston, whilst in St. Helen's there is a Catholic Grammar School under the secular clergy and lay masters. St. Peter's College, Freshfield, trains boys in the humanities, before they enter the Foreign Missionary College established by the late Cardinal Vaughan at Mill Hill, London. The ecclesiastical students for the diocese make their preparatory studies at St. Edward's College, Liverpool (established in 1842) and then study philosophy and theology at the diocesan seminary of St. Joseph's, Upholland, near Wigan.

History since 1840.—From 1688 to 1840 Lancashire was subject to the Vicar Apostolic of the Northern District of England. In 1840 the Northern District was divided into three districts: the Northern District (Northumberland, Cumberland, Westmoreland, and Durham, now the Diocese of Hexham and Newcastle), the Yorkshire District, now the Dioceses of Middlesbrough and Leeds, and the Lancashire District containing with all Lancaster, the Isle of Man, and Cheshire. The first Vicar Apostolic of the new Lancashire District was Bishop George Hilary Brown (b. 13 Jan., 1786), who after being for twenty-one years rector of St. Peter's, Lancaster, was consecrated on 24 August, 1840, at Liverpool, by Bishop John Briggs, with the title of Bishop of Bugia *in partibus*, which in 1842 was changed to Bishop of Tloa *in partibus*. In 1843 Dr. James Sharples was consecrated coadjutor, but died in August, 1850. The following month the Lancashire District was broken into three parts, Cheshire became part of Shrewsbury Diocese, South-eastern Lancashire became the Salford Diocese, and the rest of Lancashire with the Isle of Man became the Liverpool Diocese, of which Bishop Brown remained bishop. In 1853 he obtained another coadjutor, Canon Alexander Goss, of St. Edward's College (b. 5 July, 1814, at Ormskirk), who was consecrated by Cardinal Wiseman as Bishop of Gerra. Bishop Brown died, 25 January, 1856, and was succeeded by Bishop Goss, who ruled as ordinary for seventeen years and died, 3 October, 1872. After an interval of five months Canon Bernard O'Reilly (b. 10 January, 1824, at Ballybeg, County Meath, Ireland), was consecrated by Cardinal Manning 19 March, 1873. During his long episcopacy of twenty-one years he opened some twenty-two churches in Liverpool city and the immediate neighbourhood, but his special work was the diocesan seminary of St. Joseph, at Upholland, of which the foundation stone was laid on the feast of the Patronage of St. Joseph, 18 April, 1880, the college being ready to receive the students on 22 September, 1883. Two years later, on Trinity eve, 30 May, 1885, the first body of students were raised to the priesthood within its walls. Its second rector, Mgr John Bilsborrow, was taken from it in 1892 to become Bishop of Salford. Bishop O'Reilly died on 9 April, 1894, and was buried in the seminary.

Canon Thomas Whiteside (b. at Lancaster on 17 April, 1857; ordained priest in Rome, 30 May, 1885), who was the third president of the seminary, was, at the age of thirty-seven years, consecrated fourth Bishop of Liverpool by Cardinal Vaughan. The increase in the number of clergy since his accession has made possible more thorough pastoral work. During the years 1890 to 1905, the number approaching Easter Communion increased from 146,000 to 186,000; those attending Sunday school from 138,000 to 180,000, some 16,000 non-Catholics were received into the Church, whilst about two million communions are received in the course of the year by about 250,000, who have made

their first communion. A very large proportion of the Catholics of the diocese, especially in the towns, are of Irish birth or descent, though in the country parts and in North Lancashire many old Lancashire Catholic families remain which during the ages that have elapsed from the Reformation have never lost the faith.

Originally Lancashire belonged to the Kingdom of Northumbria and the Diocese of York, but in 642 Southern Lancashire became part of Mercia and of the Diocese of Lichfield. Henry VIII, in 1542, made Chester, including South Lancashire, into a separate diocese (see CHESTER). In Queen Elizabeth's time it is the Protestant Bishop of Chester who complains that there is a confederacy of Lancashire Papists, and that "from Warrington all along the sea-coast of Lancashire, the gentlemen were of that faction and withdraw themselves from religion" (i. e., from attending the Protestant service). For this crime fifty Lancashire Catholic gentlemen were arrested in one night, and in 1587 six hundred Catholic recusants were prosecuted. A yearly fine of £260 was the penalty paid in some cases for twenty years for refusing to attend the Protestant service, and after death refusal of Christian burial. At Rossall, in North Lancashire, was born Cardinal Allen, the founder of the Seminary of Douai, which in five years sent a hundred priests to face the martyr's death in England. Amongst the Lancashire martyrs were the Ven. George Haydock, b. 1556 at Cottam Hall, Preston, and martyred in 1589 at the age of 28 at Tyborne; Ven. John Thulis, b. at Upholland, near Wigan, and martyred at Lancaster in 1616, Ven. Edmund Arrowsmith, b. at Haydock, near St. Helens in 1585, and in 1628, at the age of 43, martyred at Lancaster. His "holy hand" is still devoutly kept in the church of Ashton-in-Makerfield.

In addition to the manliness of the Lancashire character and the example of sacrifice given by the Lancashire gentry, the Gerards, Blundells, Molyneuxes, Andertons, Cliftons, Scarisbricks, Gillows, the close connexion which Lancashire has always had with Ireland has done much for this preservation of the faith. Traces of this connexion are seen in the old St. Patrick's Cross of Liverpool which was supposed to mark the spot where St. Patrick preached before sailing to Ireland, and in the pre-Reformation chalice still preserved at Fernyhalgh, near Preston, which bears the date of 1529 and an inscription testifying that it was given by "Dosius Maguire, Chieftain of Fermanagh". Again the Irish famine of 1847 filled the Lancashire towns with Irish exiles so that hardly one can be found without its church of St. Patrick to mark their devotion to him who brought them their Catholic Faith.

The Catholic Directory, 1850–1910; *Liverpool Catholic Annual*, 1880–1910; HUGHES, *Liverpool Quarant' Ore Guide*, 1895–1910; HUGHES, *Catholic Guide to Liverpool*, 1903; *Liverpool Catholic Times* and *Catholic Fireside*; GIBSON, *Cavalier's Note-book; Transactions of the Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire; Cheetham Society.—Norris Papers and Chauntries of Lancashire; Haydock Papers;* BURKE, *History of Catholic Liverpool*, 1910; BLUNDELL, *Crosby Records;* CHALLONER, *Missionary Priests;* CAMM, *English Martyrs; Crosby Records.—Harkirke Burial Register;* FISHWICK, *History of Lancashire;* PICTON, *Memorials of Liverpool and Liverpool Municipal Records;* CAMDEN, *Britannia;* LELAND, *Itinerary;* MUIR, *History of Liverpool*, 1907; BAINES, *Commerce and Town of Liverpool;* BROOKE, *Liverpool as It Was;* DIXON SCOTT, *Liverpool;* GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath., passim.*

JAMES HUGHES.

Livias, a titular see in Palestina Prima, suffragan of Cæsarea. It is twice mentioned in the Bible (Num., xxxii, 36; Jos., xiii, 27) under the name of Betharan. About 80 B. C. Alexander Jannæus captured it from the King of the Arabs (Josephus, "Ant. Jud.", XIV, i, 4); it was then called Betharamphtha. Somewhat later Herod Antipas, Tetrarch of Galilee, fortified it with strong walls and called it Livias after the wife of Augustus; Josephus calls it Julias also, because he always speaks of the wife of Augustus as Julia ("Ant.", XVIII, ii, 1; "Bel. Jud.", II, ix, 1). Nero gave it with its fourteen villages to Agrippa the Younger (Josephus, "Ant. Jud.", XX, viii, 4), and the Roman general Placidus captured it several years later (Josephus, "Bel. Jud.", IV, vii, 6). From the time of Eusebius and St. Jerome the natives always called it Bethramtha. Lequien (Oriens Christ., III, 655) mentions three bishops: Letoius, who was at Ephesus in 431; Pancratius, at Chalcedon in 451; Zacharias, at Jerusalem in 536. To-day Livias is known as Teller-Rameh, a hill rising in the plain beyond Jordan, about twelve miles from Jericho.

RELAND, *Palæstina*, I (Utrecht, 1714), 496; HEIDET in VIGOUROUX, *Dict. de la Bible*, s. v. *Bétharan.*

S. VAILHÉ.

Livonia. See MOHILEFF, DIOCESE OF.

Llancarvan, Glamorganshire, Wales, was a college and monastery founded apparently about the middle of the fifth century. Most Welsh writers assign it to the period of St. Germanus's visit to Britain in A. D. 447, stating further that the first principal was St. Dubric, or Dubricius, on whose elevation to the episcopate St. Cadoc, or Cattwg, succeeded. On the other hand the Life of St. Germanus, written by Constantius, a priest of Lyons, about fifty years after the death of the saint, says nothing at all of any school founded by him or under his auspices, in Britain, nor is mention made of his presence in Wales. The other tradition, supported by the ancient lives of St. Cadoc, assigns the foundation of Llancarvan to that saint, which would place it about a century later than the former date. As, however, these lives confound two, or possibly three, saints of the same name, nothing really certain can be gathered from them. In the "Liber Landavensis" the Abbot of Llancarvan appears not infrequently as a witness to various grants, but none of these is earlier than the latter part of the sixth century. The Abbot of Llancarvan assisted at a council held at Llandaff in 560, which passed sentence of excommunication upon Meurig, King of Glamorgan.

CRESSY, *Church History of Brittany, or England* (Rouen, 1668), 222; USSHER, *Antig. Eccles. Brit.* (Dublin, 1639), 468, 472, 1122; LELAND, *Comment. de Script. Britan.* (Oxford, 1709), 62; TANNER, *Notitia Monastica* (London, 1744), 712; DUGDALE, *Monasticon Anglicanum* (London, 1846), VII, 1629; *Liber Landavensis*, ed. REES (London, 1840); REES, *Essay on the Welsh Saints* (London, 1836), 176; *Lives of the Cambro-British Saints*, ed. REES (London, 1853), 395; WILLIAMS, *Biog. Dict. of Eminent Welshmen* (London, 1852), 69; NEDELEC, *Cambria Sacra* (London, 1879), 376–416.

G. ROGER HUDLESTON.

Llandaff, ANCIENT DIOCESE OF (LANDAVENSIS). —The origins of this see are to be found in the sixth century monastic movement initiated by St. Dubricius, who presided over the monastery of Mochros. The saint made his disciple, St. Teilo, abbot of the daughter monastery of Llandaff, which after the retirement of Dubricius to Bardsey came to be the chief monastery. The abbots of Llandaff were in episcopal orders and SS. Teilo and Dubricius are referred to as archbishops. The territory in which Llandaff was situated belonged to the kings or chiefs of Morganwg or Gwent, who presented gifts of lands to the Church of Llandaff. The early title "archbishop" implied only rule over other monasteries, and as the episcopate became diocesan it gave way to the usual style of bishop. The successors of St. Teilo long maintained absolute independence within their own territories, and the rights and privileges of the Church of Llandaff were extensive. The early history of the see, the chief authority for which is the "Book of Llandaff" (*Llyfr Teilo*, Teilo's book), is very obscure, and the order of the bishops uncertain. When St. Augustine began the conversion of the Saxons in 597 he invited the British bishops to co-operate, but they refused and there was no communication between the Celtic clergy and the Roman missionaries. Unfortunately this resulted in long enmity between the Churches in Wales and in England. It was not till 768 that the Welsh clergy adopted the Roman use of Easter. From this time Welsh bishops and kings went on frequent pilgrimage to Rome, and relations

with the Saxon episcopate became more friendly. After the Conquest the archbishops of Canterbury exercised their jurisdiction over Wales, and St. Anselm placed Bishop Herwald of Llandaff under interdict. Herwald's successor Urban was consecrated at Canterbury, after taking an oath of canonical obedience to the archbishop, and from that time Llandaff became a suffragan of Canterbury. A standing difficulty was the admixture of race and language due to the English settlements, also to the ignorance and incontinence of the Welsh clergy, who had ceased to observe celibacy and gave scandal to the Normans and English. A reform was gradually effected, chiefly by the establishment of new monasteries. The Benedictines had houses at Chepstow, Abergavenny, Goldcliff, Bassaleg, Usk, Llangyran, Ewenny, and Cardiff; the Cistercians, at Neath, Tintern, Margam, Grace Dieu, Caerleon, and Llantarnam; Cluniacs at Malpas; Premonstratensians at St. Kynemark; Dominicans, Franciscans, and Carmelites were settled in Cardiff.

The cathedral, begun in 1120, was enlarged at the close of the twelfth century. It was regarded as a fine specimen of Early English architecture, but after the Reformation was allowed to fall into a ruinous state, from which it was restored during the nineteenth century. In the following list of bishops of Llandaff, the order and dates of all before the tenth century are unknown. St. Dubricius (Dyfrig) is sometimes given as the first bishop, but more correctly the episcopal succession begins with St. Teilo, who was succeeded by Oudoceus. After him came Ubilwynus, Aidanus, Elgistil, Lunapeius, Comegern, Argwistil, Gurvan, Guodloin, Edilbinus, Grecielus, all of doubtful authenticity. More historical are Berthguin, Trychan, Elvog, Catguaret, Edilbiu, Grecielis, Cerenhir, Nobis, and Nud. Cimeilliauc, Libiau, Marchluid, Pater, Gulfrit, Gücaun (consecrated in 982), Bledri (983), Joseph (1022), Herwald (1056), Urban (Worgan) (1107), vacancy (1134), Uchtryd (1140), Nicholas ap Gwrgant (1148), vacancy (1183), William Saltmarsh (1186), Henry of Abergavenny (1193), William of Goldcliff (1219), Elias de Radnor (1230), vacancy (1240), William de Burgh (1245), John de la Ware (1254), William de Radnor (1257), William de Braose (1266), vacancy (1287), John of Monmouth (1296), John de Egleselif (1323), John Pascal (1347), Roger Cradock (1361), Thomas Ruchook (1383), William Bottlesham (1386), Edmund Bromfield (1389), Tideman de Winchcomb (1393), Andrew Barrett (1395), John Burghill (1396), Thomas Peverell (1398), John de la Zouche (1408), John Wells (1425), Nicholas Ashby (1441), John Hunden (1458), John Smith (1476), John Marshall (1478), John Ingleby (1496), Miles Salley (1500), George de Athequa (1517), Robert Holgate (1537), Anthony Kitchin (1545), who alone of the English episcopate fell into schism under Elizabeth and died in 1563. The ancient diocese comprised the Counties of Glamorgan and Monmouth except a few parishes in each. It contained but one archdeaconry (Llandaff). The dedication of the cathedral was to SS. Peter, Andrew, Dubricius, Teilo, and Oudoceus, and the arms of the see were sable, two crosiers in saltire, or and argent, in a chief azure three mitres with labels of the second.

Willis, *A Survey of the Cathedral Church of Llandaff* (London, 1718); Rees, *Liber Landavensis* (Llandovery, 1840); Dugdale, *Monasticon Anglicanum*, VI, pt. iii (London, 1846); Winkle, *Cathedral Churches of England and Wales* (London, 1860); Evans, *The Text of the Book of Llan Dav* (Oxford, 1893); Newell, *Llandaff* in *Diocesan Histories Series* (London, 1902); *Digest of the parish registers within the Diocese of Llandaff* (Cardiff, 1905); Fairbairns, *Cathedrals of England and Wales* (London, 1907); *Acts of the Bishops of Llandaff*, ed. by Bradney (Cardiff, 1908).

Edwin Burton.

Llanthony Priory, a monastery of Augustinian Canons, situated amongst the Black Mountains of South Wales, nine miles north-east of Abergavenny. St. David is said to have lived some time here as a hermit, but the tradition lacks confirmation. The origin of the priory was as follows. About the year 1100 a retainer of the Baron of Herefordshire, named William, whilst hunting in the neighbourhood, discovered the ruins of a chapel and cell, supposed to have been once occupied by St. David, and he thereupon decided to quit the world and become a hermit there himself. He was afterwards joined by Ernisius, chaplain to Queen Maud, wife of Henry I. The fame of the two anchorites reached the ears of William's former lord, Hugh de Lacy, who in 1107 founded and endowed a monastery for them, dedicated to St. John the Baptist. The rule of the Canons Regular of St. Augustine was adopted. In course of time the severity of the climate, the poverty of the soil and the persecution of the Welsh natives combined to make life there impossible. In 1134 the entire community, numbering about forty, abandoned the monastery and took refuge in the palace of Robert, Bishop of Hereford. After two years a new monastery was built for them near Gloucester by Milo, Earl of Hereford, which was called Llanthony Secunda. Only a few canons lived from time to time in the original monastery, and both houses were governed by one prior, who resided at Gloucester.

The buildings at Llanthony fell gradually into decay and passed into private hands at the dissolution in 1539. In 1807 the property was bought by Walter Savage Landor. It still belongs to his descendants, the habitable portion of it having been added to and converted into an inn. The church is in ruins, but the western towers, part of the central one, and some of the nave piers and arches are standing.

Tanner, *Notitia Monastica* (London, 1744); Dugdale, *Monasticon Anglicanum*, VI (London, 1846); Roberts, *Llanthony Priory* (London, 1847).

G. Cyprian Alston.

Lloyd, John, Venerable, Welsh priest and martyr, executed at Cardiff, 22 July, 1679. He took the missionary oath at Valladolid, 16 October, 1649, and was arrested at Mr. Turberville's house at Penllyne, Glamorganshire, 20 November, 1678, and thrown into Cardiff gaol. There he was joined by Father Philip Evans, S. J. This venerable martyr was born in Monmouthshire, 1645, was educated at St-Omer, joined the Society of Jesus, 7 Sept., 1665, and was ordained at Liège and sent on the mission in 1675. He was arrested at Mr. Christopher Turberville's house at Sker, Glamorganshire, 4 December, 1678. Both priests were brought to the bar on Monday, 5 May (not 3 May), 1679, and charged with being priests and coming into the principality contrary to the provisions of 27 Eliz., c. 2. The chief witness against Father Evans was an apostate named Mayne Trott. He was deformed, and had been a dwarf at the Spanish and British Courts, but was at this time in the service of John Arnold of Abergavenny, an indefatigable priest-hunter, who had offered £200 for Father Evans's arrest. Both were found guilty and put to death.

Matthews, *Cardiff Records* (Cardiff, 1898–1905), II, 175–8, IV, 155–9; Gillow, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.*, II, 186; IV, 289; Cooper in *Dict. Nat. Biogr.*, s. v. *Evans, Philip;* Staunton, *Menology* (London, 1887), 351; Challoner, *Memoirs*, II.

John B. Wainewright.

Loaisa, García de, cardinal and Archbishop of Seville, b. in Talavera, Spain, c. 1479; d. at Madrid, 21 April, 1546. His parents were nobles; at a very early age he entered the Dominican convent at Salamanca. Its severe discipline, however, affected his delicate constitution and he was transferred to the convent of St. Paul in Peñafiel where he was professed in 1495. On the completion of his studies in Alcalá, and later at St. Gregory's College, Valladolid, he taught philosophy and theology. About the same time he was appointed regent of studies and for two terms filled the office of rector in St. Gregory's College. In 1518 he represented his province at the general chapter held at Rome where his accomplishments, his sound judgment, and piety secured for him by unani-

mous vote the generalship of the order in succession to Cardinal Cajetan. After visiting the Dominican houses in Sicily and other countries he returned to Spain. Here he made the acquaintance of King Charles V who, recognizing in him a man of more than ordinary ability, chose him for his confessor and later, with papal sanction, offered him the See of Osma, for which he was consecrated in 1524. Subsequently he held several offices of considerable political importance. In 1530 Clement VII created him cardinal and transferred him to the See of Siguenza. The following year he was made Archbishop of Seville, and Commissary-General of the Inquisition. G. Haine found, in the royal library at Simancas, García's letters to Charles V written in the years 1530–32. They contain information of the greatest importance for the history of the Reformation as well as for the religious and political history of Spain during that period. They manifest, moreover, the accomplishments of the author, the honour in which he was held and the unlimited confidence the emperor placed in him. His writings are limited to a few pastoral letters.

QUÉTIF AND ECHARD, *Scriptores Ordinis Prædicatorum*, II, 39; TOURON, *Histoire des hommes illustres de l'ordre de S. Dominique*, IV, 93.

JOSEPH SCHROEDER.

Loanda. See ANGOLA, DIOCESE OF.

Loango, VICARIATE APOSTOLIC OF (LOWER FRENCH CONGO).—Formerly included in the great Kingdom of Congo, Loango became independent towards the end of the sixteenth century, at which time it extended from the mouth of the Kwilou to that of the River Congo. By the treaties of 1885 all this country, over which Portugal had till then exercised a somewhat uncertain sway, became part of French Congo, except the enclave of Cabinda which still remained under Portuguese control. The transference of civil dominion affected the ecclesiastical distribution of the territory. By decree of 24 Nov., 1886, the Vicariate Apostolic of French Congo, or Lower Congo, more properly Loango, was detached from that of Gaboon; and in 1890, as a result of further division, the Vicariate of Upper French Congo, or Ubangi, was erected. The three vicariates which make up French Congo—Gaboon, Loango, Ubangi—embrace an area, approximately, of one million square miles. The official returns (1908) for French Congo and its dependencies are given in the "Annuaire Pontifical Catholique" (1909), 342, note.

The Vicariate Apostolic of Loango lies to the south of that of Gaboon; on the west, it is bounded by the Atlantic; on the south, by the Massabi river, Cabinda, and Belgian Congo; to the east is the Vicariate of Ubangi, from which it is separated by the Djué as far as the upper reaches of that river, and thence onward by a line drawn to meet the head waters of the Alima. The natives are known by the generic appellation of Fiots, i. e. "Blacks", and belong to the great Bantu family. Of the numerous dialects the most important is the Kivili. Amongst those who have contributed to the knowledge of the language are Mgr Carrie, the first Apostolic vicar, and Mgr Derouet, now in charge. The revival of missionary enterprise followed a grievous lapse on the part of the tribes from a relatively high degree of culture; fetichism, in its grossest forms, was everywhere rampant. The work of Christianization has been attended with serious difficulties, but in one year (1901) more than one thousand conversions were registered to the mission of Loango alone. The vicariate, entrusted to the Congregation of the Holy Ghost, numbers about 1,500,000 inhabitants, of whom more than 5,000 are Catholics and 3000 catechumens. There are 24 European missionaries, 1 native priest, 45 catechists, 15 brothers, and 11 sisters. Of the mission stations—8 residental, 62 secondary—Loango, at the head of the Niari-Kwilou portage route, and starting-point of the "route des caravanes" to Brazaville, is the most important. Its fitness for serving as chief French port and railway depot of the territory has received serious attention of late. In this place (now a mere group of factories), which is the residence of the vicar, the fathers have their own printing establishment. The seminary and house of novices are at Mayumba, where P. Ignace Stoffel founded the mission in 1888. There are established in the vicariate 6 parochial schools, with 750 boys; 6 orphanages, with 650 inmates, and 1 religious institute of men, with 6 houses.

The present vicar Apostolic is Mgr Jean Derouet, of the Congregation of the Holy Ghost and of the Immaculate Heart of Mary, titular Bishop of Camachus. He was born at Saint-Denis-de-Villenette, Diocese of Séez, Department of Orne, France, 31 Jan., 1866. Ordained in 1891, he went as missionary to the Congo, and in 1904 was named pro-Vicar Apostolic of Loango. He was chosen bishop on 19 December, 1906; consecrated 3 Feb., 1907, in the chapel of the Holy Ghost, at Paris; preconized on 18 April of the same year; and appointed Vicar Apostolic of Lower French Congo.

Ann. Pont. Cath. (1910); *Missiones Catholicæ* (Rome, 1907); PIOLET, *Les Missions*, V (Paris, 1902), ix, 255–271; *Gerarchia Cattolica* (1910); REINHOLD in BUCHBERGER, *Kirchliches Handlex.*, s. v. *Kongo* (2); DE BÉTHUNE, *Les Missions Catholiques d'Afrique* (Lille, 1889); GUIRAL, *Le Congo Français* (Paris, 1889); RENOUARD, *L'Ouest-Africain et les Miss. Cath.: Congo et Oubanghi* (Paris, 1904). See also LORIN, *Les progrès récents du Congo Français* in *Revue des Deux Mondes* (Aug., 1907); IDEM in *Revue Economique Internat.* (Aug., 1909).

P. J. MACAULEY.

Loaves of Proposition, Heb. לחם הפנם, "bread of the faces", i. e. "bread of the presence [of Yahweh]" (Ex., xxxv, 13; xxxix, 35, etc.), also called לחם קדש, "holy bread" (I Kings, xxi, 6), לחם המערכת, "bread of piles" (I Par., ix, 32; xxiii, 29), לחם התמיד, "continual bread" (Num., iv, 7), or simply לחם, "bread" (Heb. Version, Ex., xl, 23). In the Greek text we have various renderings, the most frequent being ἄρτοι τῆς προθέσεως, "loaves of the setting forth" (Ex., xxxv, 13; xxxix, 35, etc.) which the Latin Vulgate also adopts in its uniform translation *panes propositionis*, whence the English expression "loaves of proposition", as found in the Douay and Reims versions (Ex., xxxv, 13, etc.; Matt., xii, 4; Mark, ii, 26; Luke, vi, 4). The Protestant versions have "shewbread" (cf. *Schaubrot* of German versions), with the marginal "presence-bread".

In the account of David's flight from Saul, as found in I Kings, xxi, 6, we are told that David went to Nobe, to the high priest Achimelech, whom he asked for a few loaves of bread for himself and for his companions. Having been assured that the men were legally clean, the high priest gave them "hallowed bread: for there was no bread there, but only the loaves of proposition, which had been taken away from the face of the Lord, that hot loaves might be set up". The loaves of bread spoken of here formed the most important sacrificial offering prescribed by the Mosaic Law. They were prepared from the finest flour, passed through seven sieves, two-tenths of an ephod (about four-fifths of a peck) in each, and without leaven (Lev., xxiv, 5; Josephus, "Antiq.", III, vi, 6; x, 7). According to Jewish tradition they were prepared in a special room by the priests who were appointed every week. In I Par., ix, 32, we read that some of the sons of Caath (Kohathites) were in charge of preparing and baking the loaves. The Bible gives us no data as to the form or shape of the individual loaves, but, according to the Mishna (Men., xi, 4; Yad, Tamid, v, 9), they were ten fingers in length, five in breadth, and with rims or upturned edges of seven fingers in length. Twelve of these loaves were arranged in two piles, of six loaves each, and while still hot placed on the "table of proposition" (Num., iv, 7) or "most clean table" (Lev., xxiv, 6) made of setim-wood and overlaid with gold. The dimensions of the table were two

cubits (three feet) long, one cubit broad and one and a half cubit high (Ex., xxv, 23. Cf. III Kings, vii, 48; I Par., xxviii, 16; II Par., iv, 19; xiii, 11). The table with the loaves of bread was then placed in the tabernacle or temple before the Ark of the Covenant, there to remain "always" in the presence of the Lord (Ex., xxv, 30; Num., iv, 7). According to the Talmud, the loaves were not allowed to touch one another, and, to prevent contact, hollow golden tubes, twenty-eight in number, were placed between them, which thus permitted the air to circulate freely between the loaves. Together with the loaves of proposition, between the two piles or, according to others, above them, were two vessels of gold filled with frankincense and, according to the Septuagint, salt also (Lev., xxiv, 7; Siphra, 263, 1). The twelve loaves were to be renewed every Sabbath; fresh, hot loaves taking the place of the stale loaves, which belonged "to Aaron and his sons, that they may eat them in the holy place" (Lev., xxiv, 8, 9. Cf. I Par., xxiii, 29; Matt., xii, 4, etc.). According to the Talmud four priests removed the old loaves together with the incense every Sabbath, and four other priests brought in fresh loaves with new incense. The old loaves were divided among the incoming and outgoing priests, and were to be consumed by them within the sacred precincts of the sanctuary. The old incense was burnt. The expense of preparing the loaves was borne by the temple treasury (I Par., ix, 26 and 32). Symbolically, the twelve loaves represented the higher life of the twelve tribes of Israel. Bread was the ordinary symbol of life, and the hallowed bread signified a superior life because it was ever in the presence of Yahweh and destined for those specially consecrated to His service. The incense was a symbol of the praise due to Yahweh.

EDERSHEIM, *The Temple and Its Services* (London, 1874), 152–57; KENNEDY in HASTINGS, *Dict. of the Bible*, s. v. *Shewbread;* LESÊTRE in VIGOUROUX, *Dict. de la Bible*, IV, 1957; GEFFERT in *Jewish Encyclopedia*, s. v. *Shewbread.*

FRANCIS X. E. ALBERT.

Lobbes, BENEDICTINE ABBEY OF, Hainault, Belgium, founded about 650, by St. Landelin, a converted brigand, so that the place where his crimes had been committed might benefit by his conversion. As the number of monks increased rapidly the saintly founder, desiring to consecrate his life to austerities rather than to discharge the duties of abbot, resigned his post. He was succeeded by St. Ursmer, who gave most of his energies to preaching Christianity among the still pagan Belgians. More fortunate than most monasteries, Lobbes preserved its ancient annals, so that its history is known in comparatively minute detail. The "Annales Laubicenses", printed in Pertz, "Mon. Germ. Hist.: Scriptores", should be consulted. The fame of St. Ursmer, his successor St. Ermin, and other holy men soon drew numbers of disciples, and Lobbes became the most important monastery of the period in Belgium, the abbatial school rising to special fame under Anson, the sixth abbot. About 864 Hubert, brother-in-law of Lothair II, became abbot, and, by his dissolute life brought the monastery into a state of decadence, both temporal and spiritual, from which it did not recover until the accession of Francon. By him the Abbacy of Lobbes was united to the Bishopric of Liège, which he already held, and this arrangement continued until 960, when the monastery regained its freedom. The reigns of Abbots Folcuin (965–990) and Heriger (990–1007) were marked by rapid advance, the school especially attaining a great reputation.

From this period, although the general observance seems on the whole to have continued good, the fame of the abbey gradually declined until the fifteenth century, when the great monastic revival, originating in the congregation of Bursfeld, brought fresh life into it. In 1569 Lobbes and several other abbeys, the most important being that of St. Vaast or Vedast at Arras, were combined to form the "Benedictine Congregation of Exempt Monasteries of Flanders", sometimes called the "Congregation of St. Vaast". In 1793 the last abbot, Vulgise de Vignron, was elected. Thirteen months later both abbot and community were driven from the monastery by French troops, and the law of 2 September, 1796, decreed their final expulsion. The monks, who numbered forty-three at that date, were received into various monasteries in Germany and elsewhere; and the conventual buildings were subsequently destroyed, with the exception of the farm and certain other portions that have been incorporated in the railway station.

Annales Laubicenses in PERTZ, *Mon. Germ. Hist.: Script.*, I–IV, XXI; *Breve Chronicon Laubiense* in MARTÈNE, *Thesaurus Nov. Anecd.*, III (Paris, 1717), 1409–1431; *Epistola Lobiensium monachorum* in D'ACHÉRY, *Spicilegium*, VI (Paris, 1664), 598–601; MABILLON, *Annales Bened.* (Paris, 16—), II, V; *Gallia Christiana*, III (Paris, 1725), 79–80; BERLIÈRE, *Monasticon Belge*, I (Bruges, 1890–97), 179–228; LEJEUNE, *Monographie de l'ancienne Abbaye de St. Pierre de Lobbes* (Mons, 1883); VOS, *Lobbes, son abbaye et son chapitre* (2 vols., Louvain, 1865); BERLIÈRE, *Notice sur l'abbaye de Lobbes* in *Revue Bénédictine*, V, 302, 370, 392.

G. ROGER HUDLESTON.

Lobera, ANN (better known as VENERABLE ANN OF JESUS), Carmelite nun, companion of St. Teresa; b. at Medina del Campo (Old Castile), 25 November, 1545; d. at Brussels, 4 March, 1621. The daughter of Diego de Lobera of Plasencia, and of Francisca de Torres of Biscay, Ann was a deaf-mute until her seventh year. Left an orphan, she went to live with her father's relatives. Having made a vow of virginity while in the world, she took the habit in St. Teresa's convent at Avila, in 1570. While still a novice St. Teresa called her to Salamanca and placed her over the other novices. Ann made her profession on 22 October, 1571, and accompanied St. Teresa in 1575 to the foundation of Beas, of which she became the first prioress. Later she was sent by the saint to establish her new convent at Granada. One of the greatest difficulties consisted in a misunderstanding between St. Teresa and Ann, which drew from the former sharp reprimands, in a letter dated 30 May, 1582. With the help of St. John of the Cross, Ann made a foundation at Madrid (1586), of which she became prioress. She also collected St. Teresa's writings for publication. While at Madrid Ann came into conflict with her superior, Nicholas a Jesu-Maria (Doria), who, by rendering the rules stringent and rigid in the extreme, and by concentrating all authority in the hands of a committee of permanent officials (*consulta*), sought to guard the nuns against any relaxation. It was an open secret that the constitutions of the nuns, drawn up by St. Teresa with the assistance of Jerome Gratian (q. v.), and approved by a chapter in 1581, were to be brought into line with the new principles of administration. Ann of Jesus, determined to preserve intact St. Teresa's work, appealed (with the knowledge of Doria) to the Holy See for an Apostolic confirmation, which was granted by Sixtus V by a Brief of 5 June, 1590. But on Doria's complaining that the nuns had been acting over the head of their superiors, Philip II twice forbade the meeting of a chapter for the reception of the Brief, and the nuns, and their advisers and supporters, Luis de León and Dominic Bañez, fell into disgrace. Furthermore, for over a year no friar was allowed to hear the nuns' confessions. At last Philip having heard the story from the nuns' point of view commanded the *consulta* to resume their government, and petitioned the Holy See for an approbation of the constitutions. Accordingly Gregory XIV by a Brief of 25 April, 1591, revoking the Acts of his predecessor, took a middle course between an unconditional confirmation of the constitutions and an approbation of the principles of the *consulta*. These constitutions are still in force in a large number of Carmelite convents.

Doria resumed the government of the nuns, but his

first act was to punish Ann of Jesus severely for having appealed to the Holy See; for three years she was deprived of daily communion, of all intercourse with the other nuns, and of active and passive voice. At the expiration of this penance she went to Salamanca, where she became prioress from 1596 to 1599. Meanwhile a movement had been set on foot to introduce the Teresian nuns into France. Blessed Mary of the Incarnation, warned by St. Teresa and assisted by de Brétigny and de Bérulle (q. v.), brought a few nuns, mostly trained by St. Teresa herself, with Ann of Jesus at their heads, from Avila to Paris, where they established the convent of the Incarnation, 16 October, 1604. Such was the number of postulants that Ann was able to make a further foundation at Pontoise, 15 January, 1605, and a third one on 21 September at Dijon, where she took up her abode; other foundations followed. Nevertheless difficulties arose between her and the superiors in France, who were anxious to authorize certain deviations from the strict rule of St. Teresa; the situation had become strained and painful, when Mother Ann was called to Brussels by the Infanta Isabella and the Archduke Albert, who were anxious to establish a convent of Carmelite nuns. She arrived there on 22 January, 1607, and besides the Brussels house she made foundations at Louvain (4 November), and Mons (7 February, 1608); and helped to establish those at Antwerp, and at Krakow in Poland. She, moreover, obtained leave from the pope for the Discalced Friars to establish themselves in Flanders. The Spanish Carmelites having decided not to spread outside the Peninsula declined the offer, but the Italian congregation sent Thomas a Jesu with some companions, who arrived at Brussels, on 20 August, 1610. On 18 September, Ann of Jesus and her nuns, in the presence of the nuncio, rendered their obedience to the superior of the Italian congregation. She remained prioress at Brussels to the end of her life. Numerous miracles having followed upon her death, the process of canonization was introduced early in the seventeenth century, and in 1878 she was declared Venerable.

MANRIQUE, *Vida de la V. Madre Ana de Jesus* (Brussels, 1632); BERTHOLDE-IGNACE DE STE. ANNE, *Vie de la Mère Anne de Jésus* (Mechlin, 1876).

B. ZIMMERMAN.

Loccum (LUCCA, LOCKEN, LOCKWEEN, LYKE, LYCKO), Cistercian abbey in the Diocese of Minden, formerly in Brunswick but now included in Hanover, was founded by Count Wilbrand von Hallermund in 1163. The first monks under Abbot Eccardus came from Volkenrode in Thuringia, through which house the foundation belongs to the Morimond line of descent from Cîteaux. An ancient writer describes Loccum as being "in loco horroris et vastæ solitudinis et prædonum et latronum commorationis"; and adds that, after suffering much from want and from the barbarity of their neighbours, the monks in time brought the land into cultivation, and the people to the fear of God. The history of the abbey presents nothing to call for special notice. It filled its place in the life of the Church in Brunswick until the tide of Lutheranism swept the Catholic religion from the country. The chief interest of Loccum lies in its buildings, which still exist in an almost perfect state, being now a Protestant seminary of higher studies. The group, which is considered inferior in beauty to Maulbronn and Bebenhausen alone amongst German abbeys, consists of a cruciform church about 218 feet long by 110 feet wide, built between 1240 and 1277, and restored with great care about sixty years ago; a quadrangular cloister of remarkable beauty; the ancient refectory, now used as a library; the chapter-house, sacristy, dormitory, and lay-brothers' wing (*domus conversorum*), all practically in their original state. By an odd survival the title of abbot is given to the head of the present establishment, and the abbatial mitre, crosier, etc., are preserved, and apparently still used on occasion.

JANAUSCHEK, *Originum Cisterc.* (Vienna, 1877), II, 151; LEIBNIZ, *Scriptores Rerum Brunswickarum* (Leipzig, 1710), II, 176; III, 690; MIGNE, *Dictionnaire des Abbayes* (Paris, 1856), 461; AHRENS, *Zur ältesten Geschichte des Klosters Loccum* in *Archiv. d. hist. Ver. für Nieder-Sachsen* (1872), 1; WITTE, *Kloster Loccum* in *Die Katol. Welt* (1904); BRUNNER, *Zisterzienserbuch* (Würzburg, 1881), 32.

G. ROGER HUDLESTON.

Lochleven (from *leamhan*, an elm-tree), a lake in Kinross-shire, Scotland, an island of which, known as St. Serf's Island (eighty acres in extent), was the seat of a religious community for seven hundred years. Brude, King of the Picts, is recorded to have given the island to the Culdees about 840, perhaps in the lifetime of St. Serf (or Servanus) himself, and the grant was confirmed by subsequent kings and by several bishops of St. Andrews. In the tenth century the Culdee community made over their island to the bishop, on condition of their being provided by him with food and clothing. The Culdees continued to serve the monastery until the reign of David I, who about 1145 granted Lochleven to the Canons Regular of St. Andrews, whom he had founded there in the previous year. Bishop Robert of St. Andrews, himself a member of the order, took possession of the island, subjected the surviving Culdees to the canons, and added their possessions to the endowments of the priory at St. Andrews. An interesting list of the books belonging to the Culdees at the time of their incorporation with St. Andrews is preserved in the St. Andrews Register. From the middle of the twelfth century until the Reformation, Lochleven continued to be a cell dependent on St. Andrews. The most noted of the priors was Andrew Wyntoun, one of the fathers of Scottish history, who probably wrote his "Oryginale Cronykil of Scotland" on the island. Patrick Graham, first Archbishop of St. Andrews, died and was buried there in 1478. The property passed at the Dissolution to the Earl of Morton. A few fragments of the chapel remain, and have been used in recent times as a shelter for cattle.

MACKAY, *Fife and Kinross* (Edinburgh, 1896), 12, 82; CHALMERS, *Caledonia* (Paisley, 1887–90), I, 409 etc.; II, 748; VII, 108, 142; LYON, *Hist. of St. Andrews*, I (Edinburgh, 1843), 44; GORDON, *Monasticon* (London, 1875), 90–9; *Ordnance Gazetteer, Scotland*, IV (London, 1874), 320, 321.

D. O. HUNTER-BLAIR.

Lochner, STEPHAN, painter, b. at Meersburg, on the Lake of Constance, date of birth unknown; d. at Cologne, 1452. He came to Cologne about 1430 from Meersburg. His style of painting resembles more that of "Master Wilhelm" of the fourteenth century, than that of the unknown painters who followed him, who, though they lived at Cologne, betray a certain Dutch influence. He seems to have brought with him from his home in Upper Germany, the more vivid realism of Moser and Witz. His principal work was destined for the altar in the town hall, but was removed in 1810 to the choir chapel of the cathedral. This is the brilliant triptych which, in the centre piece, shows in almost life-size figures the worshipping of the Magi, and the side panels of which represent St. Ursula with her companions, and Gereon with his warriors. In the middle, seated on a throne, appears the Madonna with the Child, humble and yet majestic, clad in the traditional ideal garments. The miraculous star shines above, and angels appear overhead. On each side one of the kings prays and tenders his offering, while the third stands beside the throne. To the right and the left their followers crowd into view. A wealth of tone and colour transfigures the scene. The figures, save the Virgin, are all clad in the costumes of the time; their bearing is free and bold, and each individual in the group stands out in marked relief. This is especially true of the warriors of Gereon on the right lateral panel. Their leader is seen, virile and resolute, ad-

vancing with the flag; his costume is richly embroidered, and his armour bears a large cross. His followers are similarly clad and bear battle-axes. On the left side are the women, of delicate mould and somewhat less pronounced individuality; a pope and a bishop appear among them, both of whom play a part in the legend of St. Ursula. The sumptuous garments of the maidens are trimmed with royal ermine, and their long flowing sleeves hang down at their sides. The slender arms and tapering fingers of the Madonna, as well as the somewhat awkward movements of some of the other figures, remind us of an earlier period; but there is a keen sense of nature and an earnest aim at reality in the treatment of the costumes as well as in the expression of the faces, which are finished and life-like.

The Annunciation, done in more subdued tones, is represented at the outer end. Great care is shown in the handling of the room, with its wall-hangings and its compartment ceilings, the desk, chair, and lily. The whole work reminds one of Van Eyck's altar painting at Ghent; the artist has achieved at Cologne a magnificent monument to the patron saint of the city. Similar in technic is the "Virgin among the Rose-bushes" (Maria am Rosenhag) in the Cologne museum. This is an enchanting picture of the Blessed Mother with the Child, surrounded by angels who discourse celestial music. Indeed one might view it as a scene in heaven, a glimpse of which is vouchsafed mortals by the two angels who part the mystic veil. God the Father appears above, His hand raised in benediction, while over them hovers the Dove, symbol of the Holy Ghost. The "Madonna of the Violets" is ascribed to an earlier period of Lochner, and is in the archiepiscopal museum. This charming work is done in the style of "Master Wilhelm". The youthful Mother stands there, more than life-size, with the Infant Jesus on her arm; her left hand holds a bunch of violets; above are seen the Heavenly Father, the Holy Ghost, and an angel; Mother and Child look down upon a woman in prayer, who represents the donor of the painting. The "Last Judgment", which hangs in the museum of Cologne, seems at first glance to be in an entirely different style. Certain experts have contended against Master Stephan's authorship of this work, because of the realistic forms of the damned, and the distorted faces of the demons. Other critics have assumed that his pupils contributed the lost souls, and have recognized in the remainder of the work the hand of Lochner himself. Another painting, which is more likely to have emanated from his brush, is of "The Presentation of Jesus in the Temple", with saints portrayed on the side panels; it is the famous central picture at Darmstadt, so much admired by visitors. The youths standing before Simeon, and the maidens grouped behind Anna, make an array of figures full of grace and charm.

Scheibler and Aldenhoven, *Gesch. der Kölner Malerschule* (Lübeck, 1894); Merlo, Firmenich-Richartz, and Keussen, *Kölnische Künstler in alter und neuer Zeit* (Düsseldorf, 1895).

G. Gietmann.

Loci Theologici, or *loci communes*, are the common topics of discussion in theology. As theology is the science which places in the light of reason the truths revealed by God, its topics are, strictly speaking, coextensive with the whole content of revelation. Usage, however, and circumstance have restricted the *loci* to narrower but ill-defined limits. Melanchthon, the theologian of Lutheran Germany, published in 1521 "Hypotyposes theologicæ seu loci communes", a presentation of the chief Christian doctrines drawn from the Bible as the only rule of faith. His avowed intention was to improve on similar works by John Damascene and Peter Lombard. Leaving aside undisputed dogmas which do not bear directly on the salvation of man, he expounds with scanty commentary, or none at all, the state of fallen man, free-will, sin, the law of God, the law of man, the Gospel, the power of the Law and the power of the Gospel, grace, justification, faith, hope, and charity, the difference between the Old and New Testament, the abolition of the Law through the Gospel, the sacraments of Baptism, Penance, and the Eucharist, authority, and scandal. Melanchthon's "Loci" became the textbook for Lutheran theology and the author has rightly been styled the *præceptor Germaniæ*. Like Peter Lombard, he had his imitators and commentators, who formed a goodly body of Protestant Schoolmen. The greatest work of this kind is "Loci communes theologici", by John Gerard, professor at Jena, published in nine volumes (1610–1622); it is the greatest and also the last. After Gerard the *loci* theology gives place to systematic theology; the unconnected exposition of "topics" in the light of the Bible gradually disappears. On the Catholic side Melanchthon's "Loci" were countered by the "Enchiridion locorum communium" of Johann Eck (q. v.), which between 1525 and 1576 ran through forty-five editions. It was dedicated to Henry VIII of England. The topics which Eck expounds and defends against the Reformers are: the Church and her authority, the councils, the primacy of the Apostolic See, Holy Scripture, faith and works, confirmation, ordination, confession, communion under both kinds, matrimony, extreme unction, human laws, feasts, fasts, the worship of saints and their images, the Mass, vows, clerical celibacy, cardinals and legates, excommunication, wars against the Turks, immunities and temporalities of the Church, indulgences, purgatory, annates, the burning of heretics, discussion with heretics, and infant baptism. Other Catholic writers followed on the track of the Ingolstadt professor; e. g. Franciscus Orantes (d. 1584), Konrad Kling (d. 1566), Joseph V. Zambaldi (d. 1722), and Cardinal Bellarmine (q. v.), whose "Disputationes de controversiis fidei" (1581–92) are still the chief arsenal and stronghold of Catholic controversy. But, whilst Protestants concentrated their best theological effort on the *loci*, Catholics soon returned to the systematic methods of the older *Summæ*.

Cano (d. 1560) applied the term *loci theologici* to a treatise on the fundamental principles or sources of theological science. On the threshold of every science there stands a complex of preliminary principles, postulates, and questions, which must be elucidated before progress is possible. Some are common to all sciences, some are peculiar to each. Before Cano the questions preliminary to theology had never been treated as a science apart, general dialectics being deemed a sufficient introduction. Cano observes that the "Queen of sciences" draws its arguments and proofs chiefly from authority, and only calls in reason as the handmaid of faith. Accordingly he sets up ten *loci*—sources of theology—without, however, pretending to limit them to that number. They are: the authority of Holy Scripture, of Catholic tradition, of general councils, of the Roman Church, of the Fathers, of the Schoolmen; natural reason, the authority of philosophers and doctors in civil law, and the authority of history. The first seven are the proper places in which theology moves, the last three are useful auxiliaries. Melchior Cano's work gave a new turn to theological teaching. Much that before his time had been taken for granted, or, at best, only loosely investigated, became the favourite theme of the schools. The foundations of theology, which had lain embedded in the Christian mind, were laid bare, examined, strengthened, and rendered safe both for the believer inside the Church and against the foe without. The scientific method which takes nothing for granted, but investigates and probes to the very root every item of knowledge, is not a thing of yesterday, much less a child of anti-Catholic tendencies: Bishop Melchior Cano introduced it as the best weapon of offence and defence in religious warfare. The

MADONNA WITH THE VIOLET

STEPHAN LOCHNER, SEMINARY, COLOGNE

"Loci theologici" was first published in 1563, three years after the author's death, by the Grand Inquisitor Valdes. Twenty-six editions followed the first : eight in Spain, nine in Italy, seven in Germany, and two in France. Numerous writers during the following centuries produced works on the same lines: Seraphimus Ractius (Razzi) (d. 1613), Petrus de Lorca (d. 1606), Dominicus a S. Trinitate (d. 1687), Ch. du Plessis d'Argentrée (d. 1740), Franciscus Kranz, and many more. Gradually the subject-matter of the *loci* entered the body of theology under the title of "Prolegomena", general dogmatics, fundamental theology, or apologetics. In "A Manual of Catholic Theology", by Wilhelm and Scannell (London, 1906), the *loci* are treated in the first book under the following headings: the sources of theological knowledge; Divine revelation; transmission of revelation; the Apostolic deposit of revelation; ecclesiastical traditions; the rule of faith; faith; faith and understanding.

The necessity of meeting attacks on the Faith at the precise point on which they are directed has, of recent years, led to a modification in apologetic methods. Existing textbooks draw their proofs from Scripture, tradition and, when possible, from reason. The authority of these *loci*, or sources, having been previously proved, the demonstration is considered complete. But since evolutionism has taken hold of the modern mind and filled it with a never-satisfied desire to know the origin and the growth of all things in the realms of nature and of mind, the *loci* themselves have been submitted to fierce criticism by men who will be convinced by nothing but facts and experiments. They proceed by the positive, or historical, method which eliminates all supernatural factors, and retains only the bare facts linked together in an unbroken chain of causes and effects. The Bible to them is no longer the Word of God, but a mere collection of documents of various merit; the Church is an institution of human origin. It must be confessed that the historical method is fraught with danger even to those who use it in defence of the Church. The danger is real but so is the necessity of facing it, for it is useless to argue from authority with men who acknowledge no authority. What is wanted is that the Catholic apologist keep a steady eye on the landmarks fixed by the Church, and deviate neither to the right nor to the left. With that precaution, the historical method is likely to become an abundant source of light and understanding on points of doctrine and discipline hitherto viewed out of their historical frame and in a borrowed light. Thus the discovery of the Didache (q. v.) has been a revelation which has upset many fond calculations, and the excavations in Palestine, Assyria, Egypt, and other places, where they bear on Bible history, have done more good than harm to the traditional views. The French are at the present day the pioneers of the historical treatment of dogma; one need only point to the splendid series of "Studies in the History of Dogmas" published by Lecoffre in Paris.

WERNER, *Gesch. d. apolog. u. polem. Literatur* (Ratisbon, 1889); GASS, *Gesch. d. prot. Dogmatik* (1854); HEPPE, *Dogmatik d. deutschen Protestantismus* (Gotha, 1857); SCHMID in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.; HURTER, *Nomenclator;* see also bibliography under APOLOGETICS and THEOLOGY.

J. WILHELM.

Locke, MATTHEW, composer; b. at Exeter, in 1629; d. August, 1677. He was a chorister of Exeter Cathedral from 1638 to 1641. His first effort was as part-composer of music for Shirley's masque "Cupid and Death" (26 May, 1653). In 1654, he became a Catholic, and, in 1656, furnished some of the music for Davenant's opera "The Siege of Rhodes". In addition to some minor orchestral works he scored the processional march for the coronation of Charles II, in April, 1661, and was appointed composer to the king's private band at a salary of forty pounds a year. He composed incidental instrumental music for Dryden's and Davenant's version of "The Tempest", produced 7 November, 1667. His "Melothesia" (1673) was a good theoretical treatise. Of greater interest is the "Macbeth" music, composed in 1672, but it is almost certain that the well-known score was really the work of Henry Purcell. The ascription of it to Locke was based on an error due to Dr. Boyce, but it must be noted that Purcell's music—the so-called "Locke's"—was written for a revival of "Macbeth" in 1689. Locke composed the music for Shadwell's "Psyche" in 1673, and several anthems and Latin hymns. From 1672 to 1674 he was engaged in an acrimonious controversy with Thomas Salmon, who advocated the writing of all music on one clef. Locke's views are still upheld, while Salmon's pamphlets are forgotten. He was "Deputy Master of the King's Musick" for the year 1676–77, but his salary at Court was so irregularly paid that on 24 July, 1676, he assigned £174. 10s. 7d. —three years' and three quarters' salary due to him—to one of his creditors. He was buried in the Savoy, in which parish he spent his last years.



MATTHEW LOCK,
COMPOSER IN ORDINARY TO HIS MAJESTY
CHVH

HUSK in GROVE, *Dict. of Music and Musicians* (London, 1906); s. v.; MATTHEW, *Handbook of Musical History* (London, 1898); WALKER, *History of Music in England* (Oxford, 1907); DE LAFONTAINE, *The King's Musick* (London, 1909).

W. H. GRATTAN-FLOOD.

Lockhart, WILLIAM, son of the Rev. Alexander Lockhart of Waringham, Surrey; b. 22 Aug., 1820; d. at St. Etheldreda's Priory, Ely Place, Holborn, London, 15 May, 1892. He was a cousin of J. G. Lockhart, the well-known biographer of Sir Walter Scott. After studying first at Bedford Grammar School and, afterwards under various tutors, he entered Exeter College, Oxford, in 1838. He there made the acquaintance of Edward Douglas, afterwards head of the Redemptorists at Rome, Father Ignatius Grant, the well-known Jesuit, and John Ruskin. Like so many others whose early life has been passed in a purely Protestant atmosphere, Lockhart had hitherto taken it for granted that Protestantism represented the religion of the Apostles, and that to the title *Christian* Catholics could, properly speaking, lay no claim. The reading of Froude's "Remains" and Faber's "Foreign Churches" showed him how mistaken this opinion was. To set his doubts at rest, he visited Manning at Lavington, but felt so awed in the archdeacon's presence that he did not dare to enter into a controversy. Subsequently, Manning urged Lockhart to accept Newman's kind invitation to stay with him at Littlemore and prepare for (Anglican) ordination. After graduating Bachelor of Arts in 1842, he rejoined Newman at Littlemore, and was assigned the task of translating a portion of Fleury's "History of the Church", and of writing a life of St. Gilbert of Sempringham for the Oxford Series (see NEWMAN, JOHN HENRY). In this retirement his weakened faith in the Anglican Church was rudely shaken by the perusal of Milner's "End of Religious Controversy" given him by Grant, who had become a Catholic in 1841. Lockhart now realized for the first time what Catholic doctrine was, and he saw all his doubts confirmed in the irresolution of Newman, at this time

vainly seeking his *Via Media* between Catholicism and Anglicanism. After a few weeks' hesitation, he declared to Newman that he could not go on for Anglican ordination doubting its validity as he did. Newman sent him to W. G. Ward, who persuaded him to return to Littlemore for three years.

About a year later, however, his meeting with Father Gentili of the newly-founded Order of Charity, at Ward's rooms, brought matters to a crisis. In August, 1843, he visited Father Gentili at Loughborough, intending to stay only a few hours, but his visit resulted in a three days' retreat and his reception into the Church. On 29 August he was received into the Rosminian Institute; he made his simple vows on 7 April, 1844, and his solemn profession 8 Sept., 1845. He was the first of the Tractarians to become a Catholic, and his conversion greatly affected Newman, who shortly afterwards preached at Littlemore his last sermon as an Anglican, "The Parting of Friends". All communication between Lockhart and his mother ceased at first, by Manning's orders, but mother and son were soon reconciled, and in July, 1846, Mrs. Lockhart followed her son into the Catholic Church. In November, 1844, he was included in the new community at Calvary House, Ratcliffe—the first Rosminian foundation in England. He was ordained subdeacon at Oscott on 19 December, 1845, and deacon on 5 June, 1846, and on 19 Dec. of the same year was raised to the priesthood at Ratcliffe College. After some months devoted to the preaching of missions, Lockhart was entrusted with the pastoral charge of Shepshed, on 5 June, 1847. He was still occasionally employed for mission work, and in 1850 was definitely appointed for this duty. After some years' successful preaching in various parts of England and Ireland, he was compelled, owing to ill-health, to spend the winter of 1853 at Rome. On his return journey he paid a memorable visit to the celebrated Italian philosopher, Abbate Rosmini, at Stresa. In 1854 he was deputed to select a suitable place in London for the establishment of a house and church of his order. At the suggestion of Manning, he chose Kingsland, and until 1875 had to bear the burden of anxiety in connexion with this foundation. In Dec., 1873, he purchased at his own expense St. Etheldreda's out of Chancery, and thus restored one of London's oldest churches (thirteenth century) to Catholic worship. Removing to St. Etheldreda's in 1879, when the work of repair was completed, he established himself there until his death, although he continued for many years to give missions and retreats. After 1881 he spent the winters in Rome as procurator general of the congregation, and was there frequently called upon to give a series of sermons in English. His death, of syncope, occurred very unexpectedly.

He was perhaps best known as the foremost English disciple of Rosmini, founder of the Institute of Charity. Several volumes of that philosopher's works were translated either by him or under his supervision, and in 1886 he wrote the second volume of the "Life of Antonio Rosmini-Serbati", of which the first volume had been written by G. S. MacWalter in 1883. He was an able polemic and was closely connected with two well-known Catholic periodicals, "Catholic Opinion", which he founded and conducted until it was merged in "The Tablet", and "The Lamp", to which he was for twenty years the principal contributor. Besides his numerous contributions to these papers he wrote: "The Old Religion" (2nd ed., London, 1870); "Review of Dr. Pusey's Eirenicon" (2nd ed., London, 1866), reprinted from "The Weekly Register"; "Communion of Saints" (London, 1868); "Cardinal Newman. Reminiscences of fifty years since by one of his oldest living Disciples" (London, 1891). For some years before his death he had been engaged on a second volume to form a sequel to "The Old Religion", the best-known of his polemical works.

HIRST, *Biography of Father Lockhart* (Ratcliffe College, 1893); *Weekly Register*, LXXXV, 657–58, 691; *Cath. News* (21 May, 1892); *Cath. Times* (20 and 27 May, 1892); *The Times* (London, 18 May, 1892); *The Athenæum* (London, 21 May, 1892); *The Tablet* (21 May, 1892); GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.*, s. v.

THOMAS KENNEDY.

Lockwood, JOHN, VENERABLE, priest and martyr, b. about 1555; d. at York, 13 April, 1642. He was the eldest son of Christopher Lockwood, of Sowerby, Yorkshire, by Clare, eldest daughter of Christopher Lascelles, of Sowerby and Brackenborough Castle, Yorkshire. With the second son, Francis, he arrived at Reims on 4 November, 1579, and was at once sent to Douai to study philosophy. Francis was ordained in 1587, but John entered the English College, Rome, on 4 October, 1595, was ordained priest on 26 January, 1597, and sent on the mission, 20 April, 1598. After suffering imprisonment he was banished in 1610, but returned, and was again taken and condemned to death, but reprieved. He was finally captured at Wood End, Gatenby, the residence of Bridget Gatenby, and executed with Edmund Catherick.

GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.*, s. v.; CHALLONER, *Memoirs of Missionary Priests*, II, No. 168; KNOX, *Diaries of the English College, Douay* (London, 1878), 157; FOSTER, *Visitation of Yorkshire* (London, privately printed, 1875), 61, 549; *Catholic Record Society's Publications* (London, privately printed, 1905, etc.), V, 384.

JOHN B. WAINEWRIGHT.

Lodève. See MONTPELLIER, DIOCESE OF.

Lodi, DIOCESE OF (LAUDENSIS), suffragan of Milan. Lodi, the capital of a district in the Province of Milan, and situated on the right bank of the Adda, is an important commercial centre for silk, wool, majolica ware, and works in cement. Noteworthy among the sacred edifices is the Lombard cathedral, built in 1158 by the Cremonese Tito Muzio de Gata. The interior was restored in the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries. The high altar belongs to the *Seicento*. There is also a subterranean crypt. The pictures are by Campi (the choir), Calisto, Procaccini, etc. A notable monument is that of the Pontani, husband and wife. The cathedral treasure possesses valuable miniature codices, a large silver ostensorium of the *Quattrocento*, and ornaments of the same period. The church of the Incoronata, a gem of Renaissance architecture, was built by the city on the plans of Giovanni Battogia. Other beautiful churches are: S. Francesco (Gothic façade), S. Bassiano, and the Abbey of Cerreto with an octagonal tower. Among the secular buildings are the bishop's residence, the great hospital, and the castle, erected by Barnabo Visconti, and converted into a barrack by Joseph II.

About four miles distant is Lodi Vecchia, the ancient Laus Pompeia, at first a city of the Gauls, and later colonized by the father of Pompey. In the Middle Ages its inhabitants were in frequent conflict with the Milanese, by whom it was destroyed (in 1025 under the Archbishop Ariberto d'Antimiano; again in 1111; also in 1158 for its hostility towards Frederick Barbarossa). The Marchioness Adelaide of Turin captured and burned the city to avenge herself on Henry IV. In 1160 Barbarossa built the modern city, which always remained faithful to him. Under Frederick II, however, Lodi joined the second Lombard League. It was then absorbed in the Duchy of Milan. In 1454 the peace between Milan, Venice, and Florence was confirmed at Lodi. The city is noted for the brilliant cavalry operations of 1796, when Napoleon took the bridge over the Adda, opposed by the Austrians under Beaulieu. Under Diocletian, according to the local legend, 4000 Christians with their bishop, whose name is unknown, were burned alive in their church. St. Bassianus, the patron of the city, was certainly bishop in 378. Other bishops were: Titianus (474), whose relics were discovered in 1640; St. Venantianus, a contemporary of St. Gregory the Great; Olderico (1024); Alberico di Merlino (1160); S. Alberto Quadrelli

(1168); Blessed Leone Palatini (1318), peacemaker between the Guelphs and Ghibellines; Paolo Cadamosto (1354), legate of Urban VI in Hungary; Cardinal Gerardo di Landriana (1419), who discovered the "De Oratore" of Cicero; Cardinal Lodovico Simonetta (1537), who presided at the Council of Trent; Antonio Scarampi (1568), founder of the seminary and friend of St. Charles Borromeo; Carlo Ambrogio Mezzabarba (1725), Apostolic visitor for China and the Indies; Gian Antonio della Beretta (1758), who suffered exile for his opposition to the oath of the Cisalpine Constitution. The diocese has 102 parishes, with 200,000 souls; 4 religious houses of men, and 37 of women; 4 schools for boys, and 23 for girls.

CAPPELLETTI, *Le Chiese d'Italia*, XII (Venice); *Historia rerum Laudensium*, ed. PERTZ in *Mon. Germ. Hist.: Script.*, VIII; VIGNATI, *Codice diplomatico laudense* (2 vols., Milan, 1883–86); *Archivio di Lodi* (1905), XXIV. U. BENIGNI.

Logia Jesu, or "Sayings of Jesus", found partly in the Inspired Books of the New Testament, partly in uninspired writings. The "Sayings" transmitted in works not inspired are also called *Agrapha* (q. v.), i. e. "not written" (under inspiration). The present article is confined to the canonical Logia Jesu. Even this title comprises a larger area than is technically covered by the term *Sayings of Jesus*. Strictly speaking, all the words of Christ contained in the Inspired Books of the New Testament are canonical Logia Jesu, while the technical expression comprises only the "Sayings of Jesus" of which Papias speaks in a passage preserved by Eusebius (Hist. Eccl., III, xxxix, 16).

The question concerning the Logia Jesu, taken in this restricted meaning, has become important on account of its connexion with the so-called "Synoptic Problem". Lessing (Neue Hypothesen über die Evangelisten, ed. Lachmann, XI, § 53) considered the "Gospel of the Hebrews" as the source of the three Synoptic Gospels canonically received. Eichhorn (Einleitung in das Neue Testament, 1804–) admitted a primitive gospel, containing the forty-two sections common to the Synoptics, as their source; composed by the Apostles shortly after Pentecost, in Aramaic, and later on translated into Greek, it gave a summary of Christ's ministry, and served as a guide to the early Evangelists in their preaching. Bleek and de Wette, in their "Introductions", substituted for Eichhorn's "Gospel of the Hebrews" a gospel composed in Galilee which was the source of Matthew and Luke; in our Second Gospel we have, then, a compendium of the First and the Third Gospel. A host of other writers endeavoured to solve the Synoptic Problem by the theory of mutual dependence of the first three Gospels; others again, by a recourse to unwritten traditions. It was at this juncture that Schleiermacher ("Ueber die Zeugnisse des Papias von unseren beiden ersten Evangelien" in "Studien und Kritiken", 1832, iv) tried to show that the texts of Papias concerning Matthew and Mark do not refer to our First and Second Gospels, but to a primitive Matthew and a primitive Mark. Shortly afterwards, Credner (Einleitung, 1836) found in the primitive Mark the source of all the historical matter contained in the Synoptics, and in the primitive Matthew the source of the discourses in the First and Third Gospels. Weisse ("Evangelische Geschichte", 1838; "Die Evangelien-Frage", 1856) agrees with Credner, but substitutes our canonical Mark for Credner's proto-Mark.

Credner's hypothesis was followed with slight modifications by Reuss ("Geschichte der heil. Schrift N. T.", 3rd ed., 1860), Holtzmann ("Die synoptischen Evangelien", 1863), Weizsäcker ("Untersuchungen über die evang. Gesch.", 1864), Beyschlag ("Die apostolische Spruchsammlung" in "Studien und Kritiken", 1881, iv), de Pressensé ("Jésus-Christ, son temps", etc., 7th ed., 1884), and others, all of whom accepted the Logia and the proto-Mark as the sources of the Synoptics. The Logia and our Mark have been considered as the sources of the first three Gospels, though with various explanations, by such scholars as G. Meyer ("La question synoptique", 1878), Sabatier (in Encycl. des sciences religieuses, XI, 781 sq.), Keim (Geschichte Jesu, I, 72, 77), Wendt (Die Lehre Jesu, 1), Nösgen (cf. Stud. u. Krit., 1876–80), Grau (Entwicklungsgeschichte des N. T. Schriftthums, 1871), Lipsius (cf. Feine, "Jahrb. f. prot. Theol.", 1885), and B. Weiss ("Jahrb. f. deutsch. Theol.", 1864; "Das Markusevang. u. seine synopt. Parallelen", 1872; "Das Matthäusevang.", 1876; "Einl. in das N. T.", 1886).

As to the contents of the Logia, the work must have contained most matter common to Matthew and Luke, excluding that which these Gospels share with Mark. This material amounts to about one-sixth of the text of the Third Gospel, and two-elevenths of the text of the First Gospel. In these portions, the First and the Third Evangelists depend neither on Mark nor on each other; they must have followed the Logia, a document now denoted by "Q". When Eusebius (loc. cit.) copied the words of Papias that "Matthew composed the Logia in Hebrew [Aramaic], and each one interpreted them as he was able", he probably understood them as referring to our First Gospel. But the critics insist that Papias must have understood his words as denoting a collection of the "Sayings of Jesus", or the Logia (Q). This hypothetical document Q has been much written about and investigated by Weiss, Holtzmann, Wendt, Wernle, Wellhausen, and recently by Harnack ("New Testament Studies", II: "The Sayings of Jesus", etc.; tr. Wilkinson, New York and London, 1908), and Bacon ("The Beginning of Gospel Story", New Haven, 1909). A reconstruction of the Logia is attempted in Resch's "Die Logia Jesu nach dem griechischen und hebräischen Text wiederhergestellt", 1898 (cf. also his "Aussercanonische Paralleltexte zu den Evangelien" in "Texte und Untersuchungen", X, i–v, 1893–96), and in Harnack's work already quoted.

A number of questions has been raised in this investigation, but no altogether satisfactory answer has been forthcoming. Is it possible to settle the text of the Q source of the First and Third Gospels, seeing that one Gospel may have been corrected from the other? Did St. Matthew and St. Luke use the same translation or recension of Q? Did either Evangelist pay attention to the Aramaic original? In which of the two Gospels is Q best reproduced both in regard to extent and arrangement? How much of the material peculiar to either the First or the Third Gospel has been taken from Q? Again, was the original form of Q a gospel, or was it a collection of real Logia? These are some of the fundamental questions which the critics must answer. Then come the further questions as to the authorship of the Logia, the time and place of their origin, their relation to St. Paul, their influence on St. Mark, the cause, manner, and time of their disappearance, and other similar problems. The answer to many, if not to all, of these questions is thus far not satisfactory.

The student of the Eusebian record of the words of Papias will have his doubts as to the sense of λόγια advocated by the critics. (1) In several other ancient writers the word has not the narrow meaning of mere "sayings": Rom., iii, 2, applies it to the whole Old Testament; Heb., v, 12, to the whole body of Christ's doctrine; Flavius Josephus makes it equivalent to τὰ ἱερὰ γράμματα (Bel. Jud., VI, v, 4); St. Irenæus uses τὰ λόγια τοῦ Κυρίου of the Gospels; other instances of a wider meaning of λόγια have been collected by Funk (Patres Apostol., II, 280), and Schanz (Matthäus, 27–31). (2) The λόγια of Papias at least *may* refer to the Gospel of St. Matthew. Eusebius (Hist. Eccl., III, xxxix, 16) understands the words in this sense. The context of Papias, too, suggests this interpretation;

for, speaking of St. Mark, Papias says that the Evangelist recorded "what had been said and done by Christ", and what he had heard from Peter, and not "as if he were composing an orderly account of the λόγια", so that the λόγια are equivalent to the recorded "words and deeds" of Christ. Again, the title of Papias's work is Λογίων Κυριακῶν Ἐξήγησις, though the writer does not confine himself to the explanation of the "sayings" of the Lord. (3) The λόγια of Papias *must* refer to the Gospel of St. Matthew: (a) No writing of St. Matthew except his Gospel was generally known in the second century; (b) there is no record of a work of the Evangelist that contained the Lord's words only; (c) even Eusebius found no trace of the λόγια κυριακά, though he diligently collected all that had been written about Christ by the Apostles and the disciples; (d) all antiquity could not have remained ignorant of a work of such importance, if it had existed; (e) the First Gospel contains so many discourses of the Lord that it might well be called λόγια κυριακά (cf. Hilgenfeld, "Einl.", 456; Lightfoot in "Contemp. Review", Aug., 1867, 405 sqq.; Aug., 1875, 399 sqq., 410 sq.). The Logia, or the document Q of the critics, rests therefore on no historical authority, but only on critical induction.

See literature under AGRAPHA; also the works quoted in this article. A. J. MAAS.

Logic is the science and art which so directs the mind in the process of reasoning and subsidiary processes as to enable it to attain clearness, consistency, and validity in those processes. The aim of logic is to secure clearness in the definition and arrangement of our ideas and other mental images, consistency in our judgments, and validity in our processes of inference.

I. THE NAME.—The Greek word λόγος, meaning "reason", is the origin of the term *logic*—λογική (τέχνη, πραγματεία, or ἐπιστήμη, understood), as the name of a science or art, first occurs in the writings of the Stoics (see STOIC PHILOSOPHY). Aristotle, the founder of the science, designates it as "analytic", and the Epicureans (see EPICUREANISM) use the term *canonic*. From the time of Cicero, however, the word *logic* is used almost without exception to designate this science. The names *dialectic* and *analytic* are also used.

II. THE DEFINITION.—It is a curious fact that, although logic is the science which treats of definition, logicians are not agreed as to how logic itself should be defined. There are, in all, about two hundred different definitions of logic. It would, of course, be impossible to enumerate even the principal definitions here. It will be sufficient to mention and discuss a few typical ones.

A. *The Port Royal Logic* ("L' Art de penser", published 1662) defines logic as "the art of using reason well in the acquisition of the knowledge of things, both for one's own instruction and that of others". More briefly, "Logic is the art of reasoning". The latter is Arnauld's definition. Definitions of this type are considered too narrow, both because they define logic in terms of art, not leaving room for its claim to be considered a science, and because, by the use of the term *reasoning*, they restrict the scope of logic to one class of mental processes.

B. *Hegel* (see HEGELIANISM) goes to the other extreme when he defines logic as "the science of the pure idea". By *idea* he understands all reality, so that for him logic includes the science of subjective reality (logic of mental concepts) and the science of objective reality (logic of being, metaphysics). In like manner the definitions which fail to distinguish between logic and psychology, defining logic as "the science of mental processes", or "the science of the operations of the mind", are too wide. Definitions which characterize logic as "the science of sciences", "the art of arts", are also too wide: they set up too large a claim for logic.

C. *St. Thomas*, in his commentary on Aristotle's logical treatises ("In Post. Anal.", lect. i, Leonine ed., I, 138), says: "Ars quædam necessaria est, quæ sit directiva ipsius actus rationis, per quam scilicet homo in ipso actu rationis ordinate faciliter et sine errore procedat. Et hæc ars est logica, id est rationalis scientia." Combining those two sentences, we may render St. Thomas's definition as follows: "Logic is the science and art which directs the act of the reason, by which a man in the exercise of his reason is enabled to proceed without error, confusion, or unnecessary difficulty". Taking *reason* in its broadest sense, so as to include all the operations of the mind which are strictly cognitive, namely, the formation of mental images, judgment, and ratiocination, we may expand St. Thomas' definition and define logic as "the science and art which so directs the mind in the process of reasoning and subsidiary processes as to enable it to attain clearness (or order), consistency, and validity in those processes". Logic is essentially directive. Therein it differs from psychology, which is essentially speculative, or theoretical, and which concerns itself only in an incidental and secondary manner with the direction of mental processes. Logic deals with processes of the mind. Therein it differs from metaphysics, which has for its field of inquiry and speculation the whole universe of being (see METAPHYSICS). Logic deals with mental processes in relation to truth or, more particularly, in relation to the attainment and exposition of truth by processes which aim at being valid, clear, orderly, and consistent. Therein it differs from ethics, which treats of human actions, external deeds as well as thoughts, in relation to man's final destiny. Validity, clearness, consistency, and order are logical qualities of thought; goodness and evil are ethical qualities. Finally, logic is not to be confounded with rhetoric. Rhetoric, in the old meaning of the word, was the art of persuasion; it used all the devices, such as emotional appeal, verbal arrangement, etc., in order to bring about a state of mind which had reference to action primarily, and to conviction only in a secondary sense. Logic is the science and art of conviction; it uses only arguments, discarding emotional appeal and employing merely words as the symbols of thoughts.

The question whether logic is a science or an art is now generally decided by asserting that it is both. It is a science, in so far as it not merely formulates rules for right thinking, but deduces those rules from general principles which are based on the nature of mind and of truth. It is an art, in so far as it is directly and immediately related to performance, namely, to the acts of the mind. As the fine arts direct the painter or the sculptor in the actions by which he aims at producing a beautiful picture or a beautiful statue, so logic directs the thinker in the actions by which he aims at attaining truth, or expounding truth which he has attained.

III. DIVISION OF LOGIC.—The traditional mode of dividing logic, into "formal" and "material", is maintained in many modern treatises on the subject. In formal logic the processes of thought are studied independently of, or without consideration of, their content. In material logic the chief question is the truth of the content of mental processes. An example from arithmetic will serve to illustrate the function of formal logic. When we add two and two, and pronounce the result to be four, we are dealing with a process of addition in its formal aspect, without paying attention to the content. The process is valid whatever the content may be, whether the "two and two" refer to books, horses, trees, or circles. This is precisely how we study judgments and arguments in logic. From the judgment "All A is B" we infer "Therefore some B is A"; and the process is valid whether the original proposition be "All circles are round" or "All lions are carnivorous". In material logic, on the contrary,

we inquire into the content of the judgments or premises and endeavour to determine whether they are true or false. Material logic was styled by the old writers "major logic", "critical logic", or simply "criticism". In recent times the word *epistemology* (science of knowledge), meaning an inquiry into the value of knowledge, has come into general use, and designates that portion of philosophy which inquires into the objective value of our concepts, the import and value of judgments and reasoning, the criteria of truth, the nature of evidence, certitude, etc. Whenever this new term is adopted there is a tendency to restrict the term *logic* to mean merely formal logic. Formal logic studies concepts, and other mental images, for the purpose of securing clearness and order among those contents of the mind. It studies judgments for the purpose of showing when and how they are consistent or inconsistent, that is, when one may be inferred from another (conversion), and when they are opposed (opposition). It studies the two kinds of reasoning, deductive and inductive, so as to direct the mind to use these processes validly. Finally, it studies sophisms (or fallacies) and method for the purpose of showing what errors are to be avoided, and what arrangement is to be followed in a complex series of reasoning processes. But, while it is true in general that in all these tasks formal logic preserves its purely formal character, and does not inquire into the content of thought, nevertheless, in dealing with inductive reasoning and in laying down the rules for definition and division, formal logic does take account of the matter of thought. For this reason, it seems desirable to abandon the old distinction between formal and material, to designate as logic what was formerly called formal logic, and to reserve the term *epistemology* for that portion of philosophy which, while inquiring into the value of human knowledge in general, covers the ground which was the domain of material logic.

There remain certain kinds of logic which are not included under the heads *formal* and *material*. Transcendental logic (Kant) is the inquiry into human knowledge for the purpose of determining what elements or factors in human thought are a priori, that is, independent of experience. Symbolic logic (Lambert, Boole) is an application of mathematical methods to the processes of thought. It uses certain conventional symbols to represent terms, propositions, and the relations among them, and then, without any further reference to the laws of thought, applies the rules and methods of the mathematical calculus (Venn, "Symbolic Logic", London, 1881). Applied logic, in the narrower sense, is synonymous with material logic; in the wider sense, it means logic applied to the study of the natural sciences, logic applied to education, logic applied to the study of law, etc. Natural logic is that native power of the mind by which most persons are competent to judge correctly and reason validly about the affairs and interests of everyday life; it is contrasted with scientific logic, which is logic as a science and cultivated art.

IV. History of Logic.—The history of logic possesses a more than ordinary interest, because, on the one hand, every change in the point of view of the metaphysician and the psychologist tended to produce a corresponding change in logical theory and practice, while, on the other hand, changes in logical method and procedure tended to affect the conclusions as well as the method of the philosopher. Notwithstanding these tendencies towards variation, the science of logic has undergone very few radical changes from the beginning of its history.

A. *The Nyaya.*—A system of philosophy which was studied in India in the fifth century B. C., though it is, perhaps, of much older date, takes its name from the word *nyaya*, meaning logical argument, or syllogism. This philosophy, like all the Indian systems, busied itself with the problem of the deliverance of the soul from bondage, and its solution was that the soul is to be freed from the trammels of matter by means of systematic reasoning. This view of the question led naturally to an analysis of the methods of thinking, and to the construction of a type of reasoning which bears a remote resemblance to the syllogism. The *nyaya*, or Indian syllogism, as it is sometimes called, consists of five propositions. If, for instance, one wishes to prove that the hill is on fire, one begins with the assertion: "The hill is on fire." Next, the *reason* is given: "For it smokes." Then comes an instance, "Like the kitchen fire"; which is followed by the application, "So also the hill smokes." Finally comes the conclusion, "Therefore it is on fire." Between this and the clear-cut Aristotelean syllogism, with its major and minor premises and conclusion, there is all the difference that exists between the Oriental and the Greek mode of thinking. It is hardly necessary to say that there is no historical evidence that Aristotle was in any way influenced in his logic by Gotama, the reputed author of the *nyaya*.

B. *Pre-Aristotelean Logic in Greece.*—The first philosophers of Greece devoted attention exclusively to the problem of the origin of the universe (see Ionian School of Philosophy). The Eleatics, especially Zeno of Elea, the Sophists, and the Megarians developed the art of argumentation to a high degree of perfection. Zeno was especially remarkable in this respect, and is sometimes styled the Founder of Dialectic. None of these, however, formulated laws or rules of reasoning. The same is true of Socrates and Plato, although the former laid great stress on definition and induction, and the latter exalted dialectic, or discussion, into an important instrument of philosophical knowledge.

C. *Aristotle, the Founder of Logic.*—In the six treatises which he devoted to the subject, Aristotle examined and analysed the thinking processes for the purpose of formulating the laws of thought. These treatises are (1) "The Categories", (2) "Interpretation", (3) "Prior Analytics", (4) "Posterior Analytics", (5) "Topics", and (6) "Sophisms". These were afterwards given the title of "Organon", or "Instrument of Knowledge"; this designation, however, did not come into common use until the fifteenth century. The first four treatises contain, with occasional excursions into the domain of grammar and metaphysics, the science of formal logic essentially the same as it is taught at the present day. The "Topics" and the "Sophisms" contain the applications of logic to argumentation and the refutation of fallacies. In conformity with the fundamental principle of his theory of knowledge, namely, that all our knowledge comes from experience, Aristotle recognizes the importance of inductive reasoning, that is to say, reasoning from particular instances to general principles. If he and his followers did not develop more fully this portion of logic, it was not because they did not recognize its importance in principle. His claim to the title of Founder of Logic has never been seriously disputed; the most that his opponents in the modern era could do was to set up rival systems in which induction was to supplant syllogistic reasoning. One of the devices of the opponents of scholasticism is to identify the Schoolmen and Aristotle with the advocacy of an exclusively deductive logic.

D. *Post-Aristotelean Logicians Among the Greeks.*—Among the immediate disciples of Aristotle, Theophrastus and Eudemus devoted special attention to logic. To the former is sometimes attributed the invention of the hypothetical syllogism, although the same claim is sometimes made for the Stoics. The latter, to whom, probably, we owe the name *logic*, recognized this science as one of the constitutive parts of philosophy. They included in it dialectic and rhetoric, or the science of argumentation and the science of persuasion. They busied themselves also

with the question of the criterion of truth, which is still an important problem in major logic, or, as it is now called, epistemology. Undoubtedly, they improved on Aristotle's logic in many points of detail; but to what extent, and in what respect, is a matter of conjecture, owing to the loss of the voluminous Stoic treatises on logic. Their rivals, the Epicureans (see EPICUREANISM) professed a contempt for logic — or "canonic", as they styled it. They maintained that it is an adjunct of physics, and that a knowledge of physical phenomena acquired through the senses is the only knowledge that is of value in the pursuit of happiness. After the Stoics and the Epicureans came the commentators. These may, for convenience, be divided into the Greeks and the Latins. The Greeks, from Alexander of Aphrodisias, in the second, to St. John of Damascus in the eighth century of our era, flourished at Athens, at Alexandria, and in Asia Minor. With Photius, in the ninth century, the scene is shifted to Constantinople. To the first period belong Alexander of Aphrodisias, known as "the Commentator", Themistius, David the Armenian, Philoponus, Simplicius, and Porphyry, author of the Isagoge (Εἰσαγωγή), or "Introduction" to the logic of Aristotle. In this work the author, by his explicit enumeration of the five predicables and his comment thereon, flung a challenge to the medieval logicians, which they took up in the famous controversy concerning universals (see UNIVERSALS). To the second period belong Photius, Michael Psellus the younger (eleventh century), Nicephorus Blemmydes, George Pachymeres, and Leo Magentinus (thirteenth century). All these did little more than abridge, explain, and defend the text of the Aristotelean works on logic. An exception should, perhaps, be made in favour of the physician Galen (second century), who is said to have introduced the fourth syllogistic figure, and who wrote a special work, "On Fallacies of Diction".

E. *Latin Commentators.*—Among the Latin commentators on Aristotle we find almost in every case more originality and more inclination to add to the science of logic than we do in the case of the Greeks. After the taking of Athens by Sulla (84 B. C.) the works of Aristotle were carried to Rome, where they were arranged and edited by Andronicus of Rhodes (see ARISTOTLE). The first logical treatise in Latin is Cicero's abridgment of the "Topics". Then came a long period of inactivity. About A. D. 160, Apuleius wrote a short account of the "Interpretation". In the middle of the fourth century Marius Victorinus translated Porphyry's "Isagoge". To the time of St. Augustine belong the treatises "Categoriæ Decem" and "Principia Dialectica". Both were attributed to St. Augustine, though the first is certainly spurious, and the second of doubtful authenticity. They were very often transcribed in the early Middle Ages, and the logical treatises of the ninth and tenth centuries make very free use of their contents. The most popular, however, of all the Latin works on logic was the curious medley of prose and verse "De Nuptiis Mercurii et Philologiæ" by Marcianus Capella (about A. D. 475). In it dialectic is treated as one of the seven liberal arts (see ARTS, THE SEVEN LIBERAL), and that portion of the work was the text in all the early medieval schools of logic. Another writer on logic who exerted a widespread influence during the first period of Scholasticism was Boethius (470–524), who wrote two commentaries on the "Isagoge" of Porphyry, two on Aristotle's "Interpretation", and one on the "Categories". Besides, he wrote the original treatises, "On Categorical Syllogisms", "On Division", and "On Topical Differences", and translated several portions of Aristotle's logical works. In fact, it was principally through his translations that the early Scholastic writers, who as a rule, were entirely ignorant of Greek, had access to Aristotle's writings. Cassiodorus, a contemporary of Boethius, wrote a treatise, "On the Seven Liberal Arts", in which, in the portion devoted to dialectic, he gave a summary and analysis of the Aristotelean and Porphyrian writings on logic. Isidore of Seville (died 636), Venerable Bede (673–735), and Alcuin (736–804), the forerunners of the Scholastics, were content with abridging in their logical works the writings of Boethius and Cassiodorus.

F. *The Scholastics.*—The first masters of the schools in the age of Charlemagne and the century immediately following were not acquainted at first hand with Aristotle's works. They used the works and translations of Boethius, the pseudo-Augustinian treatises mentioned above, and the work by Marcianus Capella. Little by little their interest became centred on the metaphysical and psychological problems suggested in those treatises, especially on the problem of universals and the conflict between Realism and Nominalism. As a consequence of this shifting of the centre of interest, very little was done towards perfecting the technic of logic, and there is a very noticeable dearth of original work during the ninth and tenth centuries. John Scotus Eriugena, Eric and Remi of Auxerre, and the teachers at St. Gall in Switzerland confined their activity to glossing and commenting on the traditional texts, especially Pseudo-Augustine and Marcianus Capella. In the case of the St. Gall teachers we have however, by way of exception, a work on logic (published by Piper, "Die Schriften Notkers", I, Freiburg, 1895), which bears evident traces of the influence of Eriugena, and a collection of mnemonic verses containing the nineteen valid syllogisms (published from ninth-century MS. in the "Philosophical Review", Sept., 1907, XVI, 5).

Roscelin (about 1050–1100), by his outspoken profession of Nominalism, concentrated the attention of his contemporaries and immediate successors on the problem of universals. In the discussion of that problem the art of dialectical disputation was developed, and a taste for argumentation was fostered, but none of the dialecticians of the twelfth century, with the exception of Abelard, contributed to the advancement of the science of logic. This Abelard did in several ways. In his work to which Cousin gave the title "Dialectica", and in his commentaries, he strove to widen the scope and enhance the utility of logic as a science. Not only is it the science of disputation, but also the science of discovery, by means of which the arguments supplied by a study of nature are examined. The principal application of logic, however, is in the discussion of religious truth. Here Abelard, citing the authority of St. Augustine, contends that the methods of dialectic are applicable to the discussion of all truth, revealed as well as rational; they are applicable even to the mysteries of faith. In principle he was right, although in practice he went further than the example of St. Augustine would warrant him in going. His subsequent condemnation had for its ground, not the use of dialectic in theology, but the excessive use of dialectic to the point of rationalism. Abelard, it should be noted, was acquainted only with those treatises of Aristotle which had been translated by Boethius, and which constituted the *logica vetus*. His contemporary, Gilbert de la Porrée (q. v.), added to the old logic a work entitled "Liber Sex Principiorum", a treatise on the last six of the Aristotelean Categories. Towards the middle of the twelfth century the remainder of the Aristotelean "Organon" became known, so that the logic of the schools, thenceforth known as *logica nova*, now contained: (1) Aristotle's "Categories" and "Interpretation" and Porphyry's "Isagoge" (contents of the *logica vetus*); (2) Aristotle's "Analytics", "Topics", and "Sophisms"; (3) Gilbert's "Liber Sex Principiorum". This was the text in the schools when St. Thomas began to teach, and it continued to be used until superseded by the *logica moderna*, which embodied the contributions of Petrus Hispanus. The first writer of importance

who reveals an acquaintance with the Aristotelean "Organon" in its entirety is John of Salisbury (died 1182), a disciple of Abelard, who explains and defends the legitimate use of dialectic in his work "Metalogicus".

The definite triumph of Aristotelean logic in the schools of the thirteenth century was influenced by the introduction into Christian Europe of the complete works of Aristotle in Greek. The occasion of this was the taking of Constantinople by the crusaders in 1204. The Crusades had also the effect of bringing Christian Europe into closer contact with the Arabian scholars who, ever since the ninth century, had cultivated Aristotelean logic as well as the neo-Platonic interpretation of Aristotle's metaphysics. It was the Arabians who distinguished *logica docens* and *logica utens*. The former is logic as a theoretical science; the latter is logic as an applied art, practical logic. To them also is attributed the distinction between first intentions and second intentions. The Arabians, however, did not exert a determining influence on the development of Scholastic logic; they contributed to that development only in an external manner, by helping to make Aristotelean literature accessible to Christian thinkers. St. Thomas Aquinas and his teacher, Blessed Albertus Magnus (Albert the Great), did signal service to Scholastic logic, not so much by adding to its technical rules as by defining its scope and determining the limits of its legitimate applications to theology. They both composed commentaries on Aristotle's logical works and, besides, wrote independent logical treatises. The work, however, which bears the name "Summa Totius Logicæ", and is found among the "Opuscula" of St. Thomas, is now judged to be from the pen of a disciple of his, Hervé of Nedellac (Hervæus Natalis). John Duns Scotus was also a commentator on Aristotle's logic. His most important original treatises on logic are "De Universalibus", in which he goes over the ground covered by Porphyry in the "Isagoge", and "Grammatica Speculativa". The latter is an interesting contribution to critical logic.

The technic of logic received special attention from Petrus Hispanus (Pope John XXI, died 1277), author of the "Summulæ Logicales". This is the first medieval work to cover the whole ground of Aristotelean logic in an original way. All its predecessors were merely summaries or abridgments of Aristotle's works. In it occur the mnemonic lines, "Barbara, Celarent", etc., and nearly all the devices of a similar kind which are now used in the study of logic. They are the first of the kind in the history of logic, the lines in the ninth-century MS. mentioned above being verses to aid the memory, without the use of arbitrary signs, such as the designation of types of propositions by means of vowels. And the credit of having introduced them is now almost unanimously given to Petrus himself. The theory that he borrowed them from a Greek work by Psellus (see above) is discredited by an examination of the MSS., which shows that the Greek verses are of later date than those in the "Summulæ". In fact, it was the Byzantine writer who copied the Parisian teacher, and not, as Prantl contended, the Latin who borrowed from the Greek. William of Occam (1280–1349) improved on the arrangement and method of the "Summulæ" in his "Summa Totius Logicæ". He also made important contributions to the doctrine of supposition of terms. He did not, however, agree with St. Thomas and Bl. Albert the Great in their definition of the scope and application of logic. His own conception of the purpose of logic was sufficiently serious and dignified. It was his followers, the Occamists of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, who, by their abuse of dialectical methods, brought Scholastic logic into disrepute. One of the most original of all the Scholastic logicians was Raymond Lully (1234–1315). In his "Dialectica" he expounds clearly and concisely the logic of Aristotle, together with the additions made to that science by Petrus Hispanus. In his "Ars Magna", however, he discards all the rules and prescriptions of the formal science, and undertakes by means of his "logical machine" to demonstrate in a perfectly mechanical way all truth, supernatural as well as natural.

Scholastic logic, as may be seen from this sketch, did not modify the logic of Aristotle in any essential manner. Nevertheless, the logic of the Schools is an improvement on Aristotelean logic. The Schoolmen made clear many points which were obscure in Aristotle's works: for example, they determined more accurately than he did the nature of logic and its place in the plan of sciences. This was brought about naturally by the exigencies of theological controversy. Moreover, the Schoolmen did much to fix the technical meanings of terms in the modern languages, and, though the scientific spirit of the ages that followed spurned the methods of the Scholastic logicians, its own work was very much facilitated by the efforts of the Scholastics to distinguish the significations of words, and trace the relationship of language to thought. Finally, to the Schoolmen logic owes the various memory-aiding contrivances by the aid of which the task of teaching or learning the technicalities of the science is greatly facilitated.

G. *Modern Logic.*—The fifteenth century witnessed the first serious attempts to revolt against the Aristotelean logic of the Schools. Humanists like Ludovicus Vico and Laurentius Valla made the methods of the Scholastic logicians the object of their merciless attack on medievalism. Of more importance in the history of logic is the attempt of Ramus (Pierre de La Ramée, 1515–72) to supplant the traditional logic by a new method which he expounded in his works "Aristotelicæ Animadversiones" and "Scholæ Dialecticæ". Ramus was imitated in Ireland by George Downame (or Downham), Bishop of Derry, in the seventeenth century, and in the same century he had a most distinguished follower in England in the person of John Milton, who, in 1672, published "Artis Logicæ Plenior Institutio ad Petri Rami Methodum Concinnata". Ramus's innovations, however, were far from receiving universal approval, even among Protestants. Melanchthon's "Erotemata Dialectica", which was substantially Aristotelean, was extensively used in the Protestant schools, and exerted a wider influence than Ramus's "Animadversiones". Francis Bacon (1561–1626) inaugurated a still more formidable onslaught. Profiting by the hints thrown out by his countryman and namesake, Roger Bacon (1214–1294), he attacked the Aristotelean method, contending that it was utterly barren of results in science, that it was, in fact, essentially unscientific, and needed not so much to be reformed as to be entirely supplanted by a new method. This he attempted to do in his "Novum Organum", which was to introduce a new logic, an inductive logic, to take the place of the deductive logic of Aristotle and the Schoolmen. It is now recognized even by the partisans of Bacon that he erred in two respects. He erred in describing Aristotle's logic as exclusively deductive, and he erred in claiming for the inductive method the ability to direct the mind in scientific discovery and practical invention. Bacon did not succeed in overthrowing the authority of Aristotle. Neither did Descartes (1596–1649), who was as desirous to make logic serve the purposes of the mathematician as Bacon was to make it serve the cause of scientific discovery. The Port Royal Logic ("L'Art de penser", 1662), written by Descartes's disciples, is essentially Aristotelean. So, though in a less degree, are the logical treatises of Hobbes (1588–1679) and Gassendi (1592–1655), both of whom underwent the influence of Bacon's ideas. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, Father Buffier, Le Clerc (Clericus), Wolff, and Lambert strove to modify the Aristotelean

logic in the direction of empiricism, sensism, or Leibnizian innatism. In the treatises which they wrote on logic there is nothing that one might consider of primary importance.

Kant and the other German Transcendentalists of the nineteenth century took a more equitable view of Aristotle's services to the science of logic. As a rule, they recognized the value of what he had accomplished and, instead of trying to undo his work, they attempted to supplement it. It is a question, however, whether they did not do as much harm to logic in one way as Bacon and Descartes did in another. By withdrawing from the domain of logic what is empirical, and confining the science to an examination of "the necessary laws of thought", the Transcendentalists gave occasion to Mill and other Associationists to accuse logic of being unreal, and out of touch with the needs of an age which was, above all things, an age of empirical science. Most of the recent German literature on logic is characterized by the amount of attention which it pays either to historical inquiries, or to inquiries into the value of knowledge, or to investigation of the philosophical foundations of the laws of logic. It has added very little to the technical portion of the science. In England, the most important event in the history of logic in the nineteenth century was the publication, in 1843, of John Stuart Mill's "System of Logic". Mill renewed all the claims put forward by Bacon, and with some measure of success. At least, he brought about a change in the method of teaching logic at the great English seats of learning. Carrying Locke's empiricism to its ultimate conclusion, and adopting the association theory of the human mind, he rejected all necessary truth, discarded the syllogism as not only useless but fallacious, and maintained that all reasoning is from particulars to particulars. He did not make many converts to these views, but he succeeded in giving inductive logic a place in every textbook on logic published since his time. Not so successful was the attempt of Sir William Hamilton to establish a new logic (the "new analytic"), on the principle that the predicate as well as the subject of a proposition should be quantified. Nor, indeed, was he quite original in this: the idea had been put forward in the seventeenth century by the Catholic philosopher Caramuel (1606–82). Recent logical literature in English has striven above all things to attain clearness, intelligibility, and practical utility in its exposition of the laws of thought. Whenever it indulges in speculation as to the nature of mental processes, it is, of course, coloured by the various philosophies of the time.

Indeed, the history of logic is interesting and profitable chiefly because it shows how the philosophical theories influence the method and the doctrine of the logician. The empiricism and sensism of the English school, descending from Hobbes through Locke, Hume, and the Associationists, could lead in logic to no other conclusion than that to which it does lead in Mill's rejection of the syllogism and of all necessary truth. On the other hand, Descartes's exaltation of deduction and Leibniz's adoption of the mathematical method have their origin in that doctrine of innatism which is the opposite of empiricism. Again, the domination of industrialism, and the insistence for recognition on the part of the social economist, have had in our own day the effect of pushing logic more and more towards the position of a purveyor of rules for scientific discovery and practical invention. The materialism of the last half of the nineteenth century demanded that logic prove its utility in a practical way. Hence the prominence given to induction. But, of all the crises through which logic has passed, the most interesting is that which is known as the "Storm and Stress of Scholasticism", in which mysticism on the one side rejected dialectic as "the devil's art", and maintained that "God did not choose logic as a means of saving his people", while rationalism on the other side set no bounds to the use of logic, going so far as to place it on a plane with Divine faith. Out of this conflict issued the Scholasticism of the thirteenth century, which gave due credit to the mystic contention in so far as that contention was sound, and at the same time acknowledged freely the claims of rationalism within the limits of orthodoxy and of reason. St. Thomas and his contemporaries looked upon logic as an instrument for the discovery and exposition of natural truth. They considered, moreover, that it is the instrument by which the theologian is enabled to expound, systematize, and defend revealed truth. This view of the theological use of logic is the basis for the charge of intellectualism which Modernist philosophers imbued with Kantism have made against the Scholastics. Modernism asserts that the logical nexus is "the weakest link" between the mind and spiritual truth. So that the contest waged in the twelfth century is renewed in slightly different terms in our own day, the application of logic to theology being now, as then, the principal point in dispute.

In every system of logic there is an underlying philosophical theory, though this is not always formulated in explicit terms. It is impossible to explain and demonstrate the laws of thought without falling back on some theory of the nature of mind. For this reason Catholic philosophers and educators, as well as those who by their position in the Church are responsible for the purity of doctrine in Catholic institutions, have recognized that there is in logic the Catholic and the non-Catholic point of view. Our objection to a good deal of recent logical literature is not based on an unfavourable estimate of its scientific quality: what we object to is the sensism, subjectivism, agnosticism, or other philosophical doctrine, which underlies the logical theories of the author. Works on logic written by Catholics generally adhere very closely to the traditional Aristotelean logic of the schools. Yet, that is not the reason why they are approved. They are approved because they are free from false philosophical assumptions. In many non-Catholic works on logic the underlying philosophy is not only erroneous, but subversive of the whole body of natural spiritual truth which the Catholic Church guards as carefully as she does the deposit of faith.

For Nyaya logic: St-Hilaire in *Mémoires de l'Académie des Sciences Morales et Politiques*, 2nd series, III, 223; Müller, *Six Systems of Indian Philosophy* (London, 1899), 584 sqq. For Aristotelean logic: *Categoriæ*, etc., in Berlin ed. of Aristotle, *Works*, I (Berlin, 1831–1870); translations of the *Organon*, e. g. Owen (2 vols., London, 1853); of *Commentaries*, e. g. Sylvester Maurus, *Aristotelis Opera* (Rome, 1668); Trendelenburg, *Logische Untersuchungen* (2 vols., Leipzig, 1860); St-Hilaire, *La logique d'Aristote* (Paris, 1838). For St. Thomas's logic: *Opera Omnia* (Roman ed., 1570; Venetian, 1592; Paris, 1660; Parma, 1852; and the Leonine edition, Rome, 1882—); Petrus Hispanus, *Summulæ Logicales cum Versorii Parisiensis Expositione* (Venice, 1550).

Modern works on logic.—(1) Catholic: Clarke, *Logic* in *Stonyhurst Series* (London, 1889); Joyce, *Principles of Logic* (London, 1908); Turner, *Lessons in Logic* (Washington, 1910). In all the Latin textbooks of philosophy the traditional logic is taught, e. g. Zigliara, de Maria, Lahousse, Reinstadler, etc. In German, Vogt, *Stundenbilder der philos. Propädeutik*, II (Freiburg, 1909), and in French, Mercier, *Logique* (Louvain, 1902). (2) Non-Catholic: Mill, *System of Logic* (London, 1843); Hamilton, *Lectures on Logic* (London, 1865); Whately, *Elements of Logic* (London, 1840), Jevons, *Lessons in Logic* (London, 1870); Bain, *Logic, Inductive and Deductive* (New York, 1893); Hyslop, *Elements of Logic* (New York, 1892); Minto, *Logic, Inductive and Deductive* (New York, 1894); Creighton, *An Introductory Logic* (3rd ed., New York, 1909); Keynes, *Formal Logic* (New York, 1894); Welton, *Manual of Logic* (2 vols., London, 1904).

The only work which treats the history of logic with any wealth of detail is Prantl, *Gesch. der Logik im Abendlande* (4 vols., Leipzig, 1855—; second ed., Leipzig, 1885). The usefulness of the work is, however, very much impaired by the author's immoderate prejudice against the Catholic Church and everything ecclesiastical. The fourth volume ends with the year 1600.

William Turner.

Logos, The (Gr. Λόγος; Lat. *Verbum*—Word).—The word *Logos* is the term by which Christian theol-

ogy in the Greek language designates the Word of God, or Second Person of the Blessed Trinity. Before St. John had consecrated this term by adopting it, the Greeks and the Jews had used it to express religious conceptions which, under divers titles, have exercised a certain influence on Christian theology, and of which it is necessary to say something.

I. The Logos in Hellenism.—It is in Heraclitus that the theory of the Logos appears for the first time, and it is doubtless for this reason that, first among the Greek philosophers, Heraclitus was regarded by St. Justin (Apol. I, 46) as a Christian before Christ. For him the Logos, which he seems to identify with fire, is that universal principle which animates and rules the world. This conception could only find place in a materialistic monism. The philosophers of the fifth and fourth centuries before Christ were dualists, and conceived of God as transcendent, so that neither in Plato (whatever may have been said on the subject) nor in Aristotle do we find the theory of the Logos.

It reappears in the writings of the Stoics, and it is especially by them that this theory is developed. God, according to them, "did not make the world as an artisan does his work, but it is by wholly penetrating all matter that He is the demiurge of the universe" (Galen, "De qual. incorp." in "Fr. Stoic.", ed. von Arnim, II, 6); He penetrates the world "as honey does the honeycomb" (Tertullian, "Adv. Hermogenem", 44); this God so intimately mingled with the world is fire or ignited air; inasmuch as He is the principle controlling the universe, He is called *Logos;* and inasmuch as He is the germ from which all else develops, He is called the *seminal Logos* (Λόγος σπερματικός). This Logos is at the same time a force and a law, an irresistible force which bears along the entire world and all creatures to a common end, an inevitable and holy law from which nothing can withdraw itself, and which every reasonable man should follow willingly (Cleanthus, "Hymn to Zeus" in "Fr. Stoic.", I, 527–cf. 537). Conformably to their exegetical habits, the Stoics made of the different gods personifications of the Logos, e. g. of Zeus and above all of Hermes.

At Alexandria, Hermes was identified with Thoth, the god of Hermopolis, known later as the great Hermes, "Hermes Trismegistus", and represented as the revealer of all letters and all religion. Simultaneously, the Logos theory conformed to the current Neoplatonistic dualism in Alexandria: the Logos is not conceived of as nature or immanent necessity, but as an intermediary agent by which the transcendent God governs the world. This conception appears in Plutarch, especially in his "Isis and Osiris"; from an early date in the first century of the Christian era, it influenced profoundly the Jewish philosopher Philo.

II. The Word in Judaism.—Quite frequently the Old Testament represents the creative act as the word of God (Gen., i, 3; Ps. xxxii, 9; Ecclus., xlii, 15); sometimes it seems to attribute to the word action of itself, although not independent of Jahveh (Is., lv, 11; Zach., v, 1–4; Ps. cvi, 20; cxlvii, 15). In all this we can see only bold figures of speech: the word of creation, of salvation, or, in Zacharias, the word of malediction, is personified, but is not conceived of as a distinct Divine hypostasis. In the Book of Wisdom this personification is more directly implied (xviii, 15 sq.), and a parallel is established (ix, 1, 2) between wisdom and the Word.

In Palestinian Rabbinism the Word (*Memra*) is very often mentioned, at least in the Targums: it is the Memra of Jahveh which lives, speaks, and acts; but, if one endeavour to determine precisely the meaning of the expression, it appears very often to be only a paraphrase substituted by the Targumist for the name of Jahveh. The Memra resembles the Logos of Philo as little as the workings of the rabbinical mind in Palestine resembled the speculations of Alexandria: the rabbis are chiefly concerned about ritual and observances; from religious scruples they dare not attribute to Jahveh actions such as the Sacred Books attribute to Him; it is enough for them to veil the Divine Majesty under an abstract paraphrase, the Word, the Glory, the Abode, and others. Philo's problem was of the philosophic order; God and man are infinitely distant from each other, and it is necessary to establish between them relations of action and of prayer; the Logos is here the intermediary.

Leaving aside the author of the Book of Wisdom, other Alexandrian Jews before Philo had speculated as to the Logos; but their works are known only through the rare fragments which Christian authors and Philo himself have preserved. Philo alone is fully known to us; his writings are as extensive as those of Plato or Cicero, and throw light on every aspect of his doctrine; from him we can best learn the theory of the Logos, as developed by Alexandrian Judaism. The character of his teaching is as manifold as its sources: sometimes, influenced by Jewish tradition, Philo represents the Logos as the creative Word of God ("De Sacrific. Ab. et Caïn", ed. Cohn and Wendland, 65—cf. "De Somniis", I, 182; "De Opif. Mundi", 13); at other times he describes it as the revealer of God, symbolized in Scripture by the angel of Jahveh ("De Somniis", I, 228–39; "De Cherub.", 3; "De Fuga", 5; "Quis rer. divin. hæres sit", 201, 205). Oftener again he accepts the language of Hellenic speculation; the Logos is then, after a Platonistic concept, the sum total of ideas and the intelligible world ("De Opif. Mundi", 24, 25; "Leg. Alleg.", I, 19; III, 96), or, agreeably to the Stoic theory, the power that upholds the world, the bond that assures its cohesion, the law that determines its development ("De Fuga", 110; "De Plantat. Noe," 8–10; "Quis rer. divin. hæres sit", 188, 217; "Quod Deus sit immut.", 176; "De Opif. Mundi", 143).

Throughout so many diverse concepts may be recognized a fundamental doctrine: the Logos is an intermediary between God and the world; through it God created the world and governs it; through it also men know God and pray to Him ("De Cherub.", 125; "Quis rerum divin. hæres sit", 205–06. In three passages the Logos is called *God* ("Leg. Alleg.", III, 207; "De Somniis", I, 229; "In Gen.", II, 62, cited by Eusebius, "Præp. Ev.", VII, 13); but, as Philo himself explains in one of these texts (De Somniis), it is an improper appellation and wrongly employed, and he uses it only because he is led into it by the Sacred Text which he comments upon. Moreover, Philo does not regard the Logos as a person; it is an idea, a power, and, though occasionally identified with the angels of the Bible, this is by symbolic personification (cf. Drummond, "Philo Judæus", II, London, 1888, 222–73).

III. The Logos in the New Testament.—The term *Logos* is found only in the Johannine writings: in the Apocalypse (xix, 13), in the Gospel of St. John, i, 1–14, and in his First Epistle (i, 1; cf. v, 7–Vulg.). But already in the Epistles of St. Paul the theology of the Logos had made its influence felt. This is seen in the Epistles to the Corinthians, where Christ is called "the power of God, and the wisdom of God" (I Cor., i, 24; cf. Lightfoot, "Notes on Epistles of St. Paul from Unpublished Commentaries", London, 1904, 164), "the image of God" (II Cor., iv, 4); it is more evident in the Epistle to the Colossians (i, 15 sqq.); above all in the Epistle to the Hebrews, where the theology of the Logos lacks only the term itself, that finally appears in St. John. In this epistle we also notice the pronounced influence of the Book of Wisdom, especially in the description which is given of the relations between the Son and the Father: "the brightness of his glory, and the figure of his substance" (cf. Wis., vii, 26). This resemblance suggests the way by which the doctrine of the Logos entered into Christian theology; another clue is furnished by the Apocalypse, where the term *Logos* appears for the first time (xix, 13), and not

à propos of any theological teaching, but in an apocalyptic vision, the content of which has no suggestion of Philo but rather recalls Wisdom, xviii, 15.

In the Gospel of St. John the Logos appears in the very first verse, without explanation, as a term familiar to the readers; St. John uses it at the end of the prologue (i, 14), and does not mention it again in the Gospel. From this Harnack concludes that the mention of the Word was only a starting-point for the Evangelist, and that he passed directly from this Hellenic conception of the Logos to the Christian doctrine of the only Son ("Ueber das Verhältniss des Prologs des vierten Evangeliums zum ganzen Werk" in "Zeitschrift für Theol. und Kirche", II, 1892, 189–231). This hypothesis is proved false by the insistence with which the Evangelist comes back on this idea of the Word; it is, moreover, natural enough that this technical term, employed in the prologue where the Evangelist is interpreting the Divine mystery, should not reappear in the sequel of the narrative, the character of which might thus suffer change.

What is the precise value of this concept in the writings of St. John? The Logos has not for him the Stoic meaning that it so often had for Philo: it is not the impersonal power that sustains the world, nor the law that regulates it; neither do we find in St. John the Platonistic concept of the Logos as the ideal model of the world; the Word is for him the Word of God, and thereby he holds with Jewish tradition, the theology of the Book of Wisdom, of the Psalms, of the Prophetical Books, and of Genesis; he perfects the idea and transforms it by showing that this creative Word, which from all eternity was in God and was God, took flesh and dwelt among men.

This difference is not the only one which distinguishes the Johannine theology of the Logos from the concept of Philo, to which not a few have sought to liken it. The Logos of Philo is impersonal, it is an idea, a power, a law; at most it may be likened to those half-abstract, half-concrete entities, to which the Stoic mythology had lent a certain personal form. For Philo the incarnation of the Logos must have been absolutely without meaning, quite as much as its identification with the Messias. For St. John, on the contrary, the Logos appears in the full light of a concrete and living personality; it is the Son of God, the Messias, Jesus. Equally great is the difference when we consider the rôle of the Logos. The Logos of Philo is an intermediary: "The Father who engendered all has given to the Logos the signal privilege of being an intermediary (*μεθόριος*) between the creature and the creator . . . it is neither without beginning (*ἀγένητος*) as is God, nor begotten (*γενητός*) as you are [mankind], but intermediate (*μέσος*) between these two extremes" (Quis rer. divin. hæres sit, 205–06). The Word of St. John is not an intermediary, but a Mediator; He is not intermediate between the two natures, Divine and human, but He unites them in His Person; it could not be said of Him, as of the Logos of Philo, that He is neither *ἀγένητος* nor *γενητός*, for He is at the same time one and the other, not inasmuch as He is the Word, but as the Incarnate Word (St. Ignatius, "Ad Ephes.", vii, 2).

In the subsequent history of Christian theology many conflicts would naturally arise between these rival concepts, and Hellenic speculations constitute a dangerous temptation for Christian writers. They were hardly tempted, of course, to make the Divine Logos an impersonal power (the Incarnation too definitely forbade this), but they were at times moved, more or less consciously, to consider the Word as an intermediary being between God and the world. Hence arose the subordinationist tendencies found in certain Ante-Nicene writers; hence, also, the Arian heresy (see NICÆA, COUNCIL OF).

IV. THE LOGOS IN ANCIENT CHRISTIAN LITERATURE. —The Apostolic Fathers do not touch on the theology of the Logos; a short notice occurs in St. Ignatius only (Ad Magn., viii, 2). The Apologists, on the contrary, develop it, partly owing to their philosophic training, but more particularly to their desire to state their faith in a way familiar to their readers (St. Justin, e. g., insists strongly on the theology of the Logos in his "Apology" meant for heathens, much less so in his "Dialogue with the Jew Tryphon"). This anxiety to adapt apologetic discussion to the circumstances of their hearers had its dangers, since it was possible that in this way the apologists might land well inside the lines of their adversaries.

As to the capital question of the generation of the Word, the orthodoxy of the Apologists is irreproachable: the Word was not created, as the Arians held later, but was born of the very Substance of the Father according to the later definition of Nicæa (Justin, "Dial.", 128; Tatian, "Or.", v; Athenagoras, "Legat.", x–xviii; Theophilus, "Ad Autolyc.", II, x; Tertullian, "Adv. Prax.", vii). Their theology is less satisfactory as regards the eternity of this generation and its necessity; in fact, they represent the Word as uttered by the Father when the Father wished to create and in view of this creation (Justin, "II Apol.", 6—cf. "Dial.", 61–62; Tatian, "Or.", v, a corrupt and doubtful text; Athenagoras, "Legat.", x; Theophilus, "Ad Autolyc.", II, xxii; Tertullian, "Adv. Prax.", v–vii). When we seek to understand what they meant by this "utterance", it is difficult to give the same answer for all; Athenagoras seems to mean the rôle of the Son in the work of creation, the *syncatabasis* of the Nicene Fathers (Newman, "Causes of the Rise and Successes of Arianism" in "Tracts Theological and Ecclesiastical", London, 1902, 238); others, especially Theophilus and Tertullian (cf. Novatian, "De Trinit.", xxxi), seem quite certainly to understand this "utterance" as properly so called. Mental survivals of Stoic psychology seem to be responsible for this attitude: the philosophers of the Portico distinguished between the innate word (*ἐνδιάθετος*) and the uttered word (*προφορικός*); bearing in mind this distinction, the aforesaid apologists conceived a development in the Word of God after the same fashion. After this period, St. Irenæus condemned very severely these attempts at psychological explanation (Adv. Hæres., II, xiii, 3–10; cf. II, xxviii, 4–6), and later Fathers rejected this unfortunate distinction between the Word *ἐνδιάθετος* and *προφορικός* [Athanasius (?), "Expos. Fidei", i, in P. G., XXV, 201—cf. "Orat.", II, 35, in P. G., XXVI, 221; Cyril of Jerusalem, "Cat.", IV, 8, in P. G., XXXIII, 465—cf. "Cat.", XI, 10, in P. G., XXXIII, 701—cf. Council of Sirmium, can. viii, in Athan., "De Synod.", 27—P. G., XXVI, 737].

As to the Divine Nature of the Word, all apologists are agreed, but to some of them, at least to St. Justin and Tertullian, there seemed to be in this Divinity a certain subordination (Justin, "I Apol.", 13—cf. "II Apol.", 13; Tertullian, "Adv. Prax.", 9, 14, 26).

The Alexandrian theologians, themselves profound students of the Logos doctrine, avoided the abovementioned errors concerning the dual conception of the Word (see, however, a fragment of the "Hypotyposes", of Clement of Alexandria, cited by Photius, in P. G., CIII, 384, and Zahn, "Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutest. Kanons", Erlangen, 1884, xiii, 144) and the generation in time; for Clement and for Origen the Word is eternal like the Father (Clement, "Strom.", VII, 1, 2, in P. G., IX, 404, 409; and "Adumbrat. in Joan.", i, 1, in P. G., IX, 734; Origen, "De Princip.", I, xxii, 2 sqq., in P. G., XI, 130 sqq.; "In Jer. Hom.", IX, 4, in P. G., XIII, 357; "In Jo.", ii, 32, in P. G., XIV, 77; cf. Athanasius, "De decret. Nic. syn.", 27, in P. G., XXV, 465). As to the nature of the Word their teaching is less sure: in Clement, it is true, we find only a few traces of subordinationism ("Strom.", IV, 25, in P. G., VIII, 1365; "Strom.",

VII, 3, in P. G., IX, 421; cf. "Strom.", VII, 2, in P. G., IX, 408); elsewhere he very explicitly affirms the equality of the Father and the Son, and the unity ("Protrept.", 10, in P. G., VIII, 228; "Pædag.", I, vi, in P. G., VIII, 280; I, viii, in P. G., VIII, 325, 337; cf. I, ix, in P. G., VIII, 353; III, xii, in P. G., VIII, 680). Origen, on the contrary, frequently and formally defended subordinationist ideas ("De Princip.", I, iii, 5, in P. G., XI, 150; IV, xxxv, in P. G., XI, 409, 410; "In Jo.", ii, 2, in P. G., XIV, 108, 109; ii, 18, in P. G., XIV, 153, 156; vi, 23, in P. G., XIV, 268; xiii, 25, in P. G., XIV, 441–44; xxxii, 18, in P. G., XIV, 817–20; "In Matt.", xv, 10, in P. G., XIII, 1280, 1281; "De Orat.", 15, in P. G., XI, 464; "Contra Cels.", V, xi, in P. G., XI, 1197); his teaching concerning the Word evidently suffered from Hellenic speculation: in the order of religious knowledge and of prayer, the Word is for him an intermediary between God and the creature.

Amid these speculations of apologists and Alexandrian theologians, elaborated not without danger or without error, the Church maintained her strict dogmatic teaching concerning the Word of God. This is particularly recognizable in the works of those Fathers more devoted to tradition than to philosophy, and especially in St. Irenæus, who condemns every form of the Hellenic and Gnostic theory of intermediary beings (Adv. Hær., II, xxx, 9; II, ii, 4; III, viii, 3; IV, vii, 4; IV, xx, 1), and who affirms in the strongest terms the full comprehension of the Father by the Son and their identity of nature (Adv. Hær., II, xvii, 8; IV, iv, 2; IV, vi, 3, 6). We find it again with still greater authority in the letter of Pope St. Dionysius to his namesake, the Bishop of Alexandria (see Athan., "De decret. Nic. syn.", 26, in P. G., XXV, 461–65): "They lie as to the generation of the Lord who dare to say that His Divine and ineffable generation is a creation. We must not divide the admirable and Divine unity into three divinities; we must not lower the dignity and sovereign grandeur of the Lord by the word creation; but we must believe in God the Father omnipotent, in Christ Jesus His Son, and in the Holy Ghost; we must unite the Word to the God of the universe, for He has said: 'I and the Father are one', and again: 'I am in the Father, and the Father in me'. Thus we protect the Divine Trinity, and the holy avowal of the monarchy [unity of God]." The Council of Nicæa (325) had but to lend official consecration to this dogmatic teaching.

V. Analogy between the Divine Word and Human Speech.—After the Council of Nicæa, all danger of Subordinationism being removed, it was possible to seek in the analogy of human speech some light on the mystery of the Divine generation; the Greek Fathers especially refer to this analogy, in order to explain how this generation is purely spiritual and entails neither diminution nor change: Dionysius of Alexandria (Athan., "De Sent. Dion.", 23, in P. G., XXV, 513); Athanasius ("De decret. Nic. syn.", 11, in P. G., XXV, 444); Basil ("In illud: *In principio erat Verbum*", 3, in P. G., XXXI, 476–77); Gregory of Nazianzus ("Or.", xxx, 20, in P. G., XXXVI, 128–29); Cyril of Alexandria ("Thes.", iv, in P. G., LXXV, 56—cf. 76, 80; xvi, ibid., 300; xvi, ibid., 313; "De Trinit.", dial. ii, in P. G., LXXV, 768–69); John Damasc. ("De Fide Orthod.", I, vi, in P. G., XCIV, 804).

St. Augustine studied more closely this analogy between the Divine Word and human speech (see especially "De Trinit.", IX, vii, 12 sq., in P. L., XLII, 967; XV, x, 17 sq., ibid., 1069), and drew from it teachings long accepted in Catholic theology. He compares the Word of God, not to the word spoken by the lips, but to the interior speech of the soul, whereby we may in some measure grasp the Divine mystery; engendered by the mind it remains therein, is equal thereto, is the source of its operations. This doctrine was later developed and enriched by St. Thomas, especially in "Contra Gent.", IV, xi–xiv, opusc. "De natura verbi intellectus"; "Quæst. disput. de verit." iv; "De potent.", ii; viii, 1; "Summa Theol.", I–I, xxvii, 2; xxxiv. St. Thomas sets forth in a very clear way the identity of meaning, already noted by St. Augustine (De Trinit., VII, ii, 3), between the terms *Son* and *Word:* "eo Filius quo Verbum, et eo Verbum quo Filius" ("Summa Theol.", I–I, xxvii, 2; "Contra Gent.", IV, xi). The teaching of St. Thomas has been highly approved by the Church, especially in the condemnation of the Synod of Pistoia by Pius VI (Denzinger, "Enchiridion", 1460). (See Jesus Christ; Trinity.)

On the Logos theories in general see: Aall, *Geschichte der Logosidee, I: In der griechischen Philosophie; II: In der christlichen Litteratur* (Leipzig, 1896–99); Lebreton, *Les origines du dogme de la Trinité* (Paris, 1910). On the Hellenic theories: Heinze, *Die Lehre vom Logos in der griechischen Philosophie* (Oldenburg, 1872). On the Memra of Palestinian Judaism: Weber, *Jüdische Theologie* (2nd ed., Leipzig, 1897), 180–84; Kohler in *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, s. v. *Memra;* Ginsburger, *Die Anthropomorphismen in den Targumim* (Brunswick, 1891), 7–20. On the Alexandrian and Philonian theory of the Logos: Drummond, *Philo Judæus*, II (London, 1888), 156–273; Bréhier, *Les idées philosophiques et religieuses de Philon d'Alexandrie* (Paris, 1908), 83–112. On the Johannine theory of the Logos: Prat in Vig., *Dict. de la Bible*, s. v.; Calmes, *L'Evangile selon s. Jean* (Paris, 1904), 92–100; Loisy, *Le quatrième Evangile* (Paris, 1903), 98–101; 151–56; Scott, *The Fourth Gospel* (Edinburgh, 1906), 145–75; Grill, *Untersuchungen über die Entstehung des vierten Evangeliums* (Tübingen, 1902), 105–206. On the Ante-Nicene theology of the Logos: Petavius, *Dogmata Theologica*, preface, ii–vi; I, iii–vi; Newman, *Causes of the Rise and Successes of Arianism* in *Tracts theological and ecclesiastical* (London, 1902), 137–300; Feder, *Justins des Märtyrers Lehre von Jesus Christus* (Freiburg im Br., 1906), 79–154; Pommrich, *Des Apologeten Theophilus Gottes- und Logoslehre* (Dresden, 1902); d'Alès, *La Théologie de Tertullien* (Paris, 1905), 67–104; Idem, *La Théologie de s. Hippolyte* (Paris, 1906), 8–35. On the Nicene theology of the Logos: Atzberger, *Die Logoslehre des hl. Athanasius* (Munich, 1880); Zahn, *Marcellus von Ancyra* (Gotha, 1867); de Régnon, *Études de théologie positive sur la sainte Trinité*, III (Paris, 1898), 381–463. On the Augustinian theology of the Logos: Gangauf, *Des hl. Augustinus speculative Lehre von Gott dem dreieinigen* (Augsburg, 1865), 209–95; see also Augustine of Hippo, Saint.

J. Lebreton.

Logroño. See Calahorra and La Calzada, Diocese of.

Logue, Michael. See Armagh, Archdiocese of.

Lohel (Lohelius), Johann, Archbishop of Prague, b. at Eger, Bohemia, 1549; d. 2 Nov., 1622. Of poor parentage, he was piously brought up; at fifteen he was engaged as a domestic in the Norbertine Abbey of Tepl, but was allowed to follow the classes in the abbey school; he soon surpassed his fellow students, and in 1573 received the Norbertine habit. After a two-years novitiate, Lohelius went to study philosophy at Prague. He was ordained in 1576 and was recalled to the abbey. The Lutheran heresy having made inroads into Bohemia, he gave a course of sermons at Tepl, in which he gained the hearts of the heretics, and brought many back to the Church.

In 1579 he became prior of Mount Sion Abbey, at Strahov. The abbot and he strove, with some success, to lift the abbey out of the unfortunate state into which it had fallen; but Lohelius was soon called back to Tepl. However, he was in 1583 allowed to resume the office of prior of Strahov.

Lohelius was elected Abbot of Strahov in 1586. With him a new era of progress and prosperity dawned on the sorely tried Abbey of Strahov. The emperor and the magnates of Bohemia generously assisted him in restoring the church and abbey buildings; the abbot-general, John Despruets, named him his vicar-general and visitor of the circles of Austria, Bohemia, Hungary, and Poland. In 1604 he was consecrated Bishop of Sebaste *in partibus*, as auxiliary to the Archbishop of Prague. During the illness of Archbishop von Lamberg, Paul V created Lohelius coadjutor in May, 1612. At the death of von Lamberg on 18 Sept., 1612, Lohelius became Archbishop of Prague.

The rescript of Rudolph in 1609 had emboldened the Protestants; having gained the upper hand in Prague, they persecuted the clergy and expelled many priests, regular and secular. The cathedral was altered to suit the Calvinistic worship; the altars were demolished, and the paintings and statues destroyed. Lohelius had taken refuge in Vienna, where he remained until 1620. After the battle of the White Mountain, the archbishop and his chapter, as well as the Jesuits and other religious, returned to Prague. The cathedral, cleansed and refurnished, was again consecrated on 28 Feb., 1621. Lohelius died soon after, of a slow fever; he was buried in the church of Strahov.

DLABACZ, *Leben . . . Lohelius . . .* (Prague, 1794); LACHEN, *Laudatio Funebris* (Antwerp, 1625); GOOVAERTS, who gives the best description of letters, etc., printed or MSS., of Lohelius in his *Dictionnaire Bio-bibliographique . . . de l'Ordre de Prémontré*, part I (Brussels, 1901), 523–531; VAN CRAYWINCKEL, *Levens . . . de Witte Orde van den H. Norbertus*, pt. II (Antwerp, 1665), 651–671; *Chorherrenbuch* (Würzburg, 1883), 565 sq., 606 sq.

F. M. GEUDENS.

Lohner, TOBIAS, b. 13 March, 1619, at Neuötting in the Diocese of Salzburg; d. 26 (probably) May, 1697. He entered the Society of Jesus on 30 August, 1637, at Lansberg, and spent his first years in the classroom, teaching the classics. Later at Dillingen he was professor, first of philosophy for seven years, then of speculative theology for four years, and finally of moral theology. He was rector of the colleges of Lucerne and Dillingen and master of novices. His zealous sermons won for him the reputation of a great preacher, and his versatility made him a remarkable man in many ways. His chief claim, however, to the gratitude of his contemporaries and of posterity is based mainly on the many works which he wrote, both in Latin and German, on practical questions, especially of asceticism and moral theology. More than twenty years before he died, his literary activity received flattering recognition in the "Bibliotheca Scriptorum Societatis Jesu", a work begun by Father Peter Ribadeneira, S.J., continued by Father Philip Albegambe, S.J., and brought up to date (1675) by Father Nathanael Sotwel, S.J. Of Father Lohner's many published works, those which have secured him most lasting remembrance are the "Instructissima bibliotheca manualis concionatoria" (4 vols., Dillingen, 1681—), and a series of volumes containing practical instructions, the more important of which are the following: "Instructio practica de ss. Missæ sacrificio"; "Instructio practica de officio divino"; "Instructio practica de conversatione apostolica"; "Instructio practica pastorum continens doctrinas et industrias ad pastorale munus pie, fructuose et secure obeundum"; "Instructio practica de confessionibus rite ac fructuose excipiendis" (complete edition of these instructions, in eleven vols., Dillingen, 1726—). He published many other similar works on preaching, on catechizing, on giving exhortations, on the origin and excellence of the priesthood, on the various states of life, on consoling the afflicted, on questions of polemical, ascetical, speculative, and moral theology, on the means of overcoming temptations, on the foundations of mystical theology. These and other works of like nature testify to his untiring zeal; almost all of them were printed in separate volumes, ran through many editions, and some of them are used and prized even at the present day.

THOELEN, *Lebensbilder aus der Gesch. der deutschen Ordensprovinz der Gesellschaft Jesu;* SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibl. de la C. de J.*, IV (1901); HERDER, *Konversations-Lexikon*, s. v.; HURTER, *Nomenclator.*

J. H. FISHER.

Loja, DIOCESE OF (LOJANA), suffragan of Quito, Ecuador, includes the greater part of the Provinces of Loja and El Oro. It thus occupies the south-western portion of Ecuador, lying between the summit of the Andean Cordilleras and the Pacific Ocean. It has an area of about 10,000 square miles. The city of Loja, which has a population of ten thousand, is situated some 270 miles S.S.W. of Quito, in the Val de Canbamba. It was established about the year 1546 to protect travellers on the royal road from Quito to Peru against the attacks of the Indians, and is thus one of the oldest towns in the state. In 1580 the First Provincial Council of Ecuador was held there; at which time the city contained, in addition to its parish church, a Franciscan convent and a Dominican priory. It was at Loja that the valuable properties of the cinchona-bark, the source of quinine, were first discovered by a Spanish soldier who, having accidentally experienced its antipyretic qualities, by means of it cured the vice-reine of Peru, the Countess of Chinchon (*a quo* cinchona), of a fever, and thus made it known to the world. Loja suffered much from earthquakes and Indian inroads. In 1861 it possessed a Jesuit church, a college, a consistorial house, and an hospital. Five years later a bishopric was erected at Loja, Mgr Checa being the first occupant of the see; he was succeeded by Mgr Riofrio, afterwards Archbishop of Quito; the third prelate was Mgr José Masiá, O.F.M.; born on 14 January, 1815, at Montroig, in Tarragona, Spain, he was consecrated Bishop of Loja on 16 September, 1875. This illustrious prelate died in 1902 in Peru, a glorious exile for the Faith. After an interregnum of several years, Mgr Juan José Antonio Eguiguren-Escudero, the present ordinary, was appointed. Mgr Eguiguren was born at Loja on 26 April, 1867; he studied at the seminary of Quito, where he was ordained on 11 June, 1892. Shortly afterwards he became a professor in his *Alma Mater;* in 1901 he was named an honorary canon, and three years later was made Administrator Apostolic of Loja; on 6 March, 1907, he was elected to fill the vacant see and was consecrated at Quito on 28 July, 1907. The Diocese of Loja contains 61 secular priests, 20 regulars, 84 churches or chapels, and 36 parishes. There are two colleges, and in the town of Loja a convent for the higher education of women. The Catholic population is about 81,000.

With the exception of individual cases, there is no religion professed in the diocese but Catholicism (and paganism among some of the Indians); many of the Catholics, however, are lukewarm and the Church is suffering from the increasing hostility of the advanced Liberal or Radical party at present in power in Ecuador. The following remarks will help to make known the present (1909) position of the Church. The State and the Church have been separated, and all religions are now equal before the law; there is no interference with communications between the clergy and the Holy See. The secular priests were formerly supported by tithes, and later by a percentage of the import duties; now they are entirely dependent on the voluntary contributions of the faithful. Clerics are exempted from military service, but they may not hold any civil public office; they are forbidden to preach against enactments of the legislature, or against the political parties, under a maximum penalty of a fine of 100 sucres (florins) and imprisonment for 30 days. None but a native-born Ecuadorean may be preferred to any ecclesiastical dignity. So far ecclesiastical property has not been confiscated by the secular power, though it is under state control. A religious organization has to obtain permission from the Government before it can legally receive and hold gifts or legacies. Enclosed orders are to disappear gradually, being forbidden to accept any more novices; but teaching and charitable institutes may receive postulants provided they are over eighteen years of age; these bodies, however, are not allowed to found new houses in the State. Civil marriage alone is recognized by the State, and must precede the religious ceremony if there be any. Priests who violate this provision of the law are liable to a fine of 500 sucres and imprisonment for three

months for a first offence, and 1000 sucres and six months for a second. Education, to which the secular authorities were until recently indifferent, and which was therefore provided for by the energy of the clergy, is now compulsory and gratuitous for children between the ages of six and twelve. The Liberal Government testified officially (in 1900) to the great zeal displayed by the religious teachers and the success that attended their efforts; since then, however, the State has established godless schools; yet parents are free to send their children to the church schools. The public authorities are forbidden to contribute to the support of the latter.

Only a very small proportion of the population of the diocese is of pure white origin, the remainder being a hybrid race of mixed Spanish, Indian, and Negro blood, known as cholos, zambos, or mestizos, with many pure-blooded Indians. The climate of the diocese varies from a mean of 18° C. in the higher regions to torrid heat on the slopes of El Oro to the ocean. Trade consists mostly in cereals, coffee, sugar, cinchona, and mules; there is considerable mining at Zaruma. The principal towns are Machala (5000 inhabitants), Santa Rosa, Zaruma, and Loja.

DAGUIN, *Etude sur le régime des cultes dans la république de l'Equateur* in the *Bulletin mensuel de la société de législation comparée* (Paris, August–September, 1907), 465–81; WOLF, *Geografia y geologia del Ecuador* (Leipzig, 1892); BATTANDIER, *Annuaire pontificale* (Paris, 1910); GIRÓN Y ARCAS, *La Situación Juridica de la Iglesia Católica en Europa y América* (Madrid, 1905), 302–25: IZAGUIRRE, *Biografia del Ilustrisimo y Rmo. P. Fr. José Maria Masiá, Obispo de Loja* (Barcelona, 1904).

A. A. MACERLEAN.

Lollards, the name given to the followers of John Wyclif, an heretical body numerous in England in the latter part of the fourteenth and the first half of the fifteenth century. The name was derived by contemporaries from *lollium*, a tare, but it had been used in Flanders early in the fourteenth century in the sense of "hypocrite", and the phrase "Lollardi seu Deum laudantes" (1309) points to a derivation from *lollen*, to sing softly (cf. Eng. *lull*). Others take it to mean "idlers" and connect it with *to loll*. We first hear of it as referring to the Wycliffites in 1382, when the Cistercian Henry Crumpe applied the nickname to them in public at Oxford. It was used in episcopal documents in 1387 and 1389 and soon became habitual. An account of Wyclif's doctrines, their intellectual parentage, and their development during his lifetime will be given in his own biography. This article will deal with the general causes which led to the spread of Lollardy, with the doctrines for which the Lollards were individually and collectively condemned by the authorities of the Church, and with the history of the sect.

Causes of the Spread of Lollardy.—Till the latter part of the fourteenth century England had been remarkably free from heresy. The Manichean movements of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries which threatened the Church and society in Southern Europe and had appeared sporadically in Northern France and Flanders had made no impression on England. The few heretics who were heard of were all foreigners and they seem to have found no following in the country. Yet there was much discontent. Popular protests against the wealth, the power, and the pride of the clergy, secular and regular, were frequent, and in times of disorder would express themselves in an extreme form. Thus, during the revolution which overthrew Edward II in 1327, mobs broke into the Abbey of Bury St. Edmunds and attacked that of St. Albans. As the century proceeded there were many signs of national disorganization and of religious and social discontent. The war in France, in spite of the glories of Crécy and Poitiers, was a curse to the victors as well as to the vanquished. The later campaigns were mere ravaging expeditions and the men who inflicted such untold miseries on the French, whether under the English flag or in the Free Companies, brought home an evil spirit of disorder, while the military system helped to produce an "over-mighty", greedy, and often anti-clerical nobility. In the lower ranks of society there was a similar growth of an intemperate and subversive independence. The emancipation of the peasant class had proceeded normally till the Black Death threw into confusion the relations between landlord and tenant. By giving the labourer an enormous economic advantage in the depopulated country it led the landlords to fall back upon their legal rights and the traditional wages.

In the Church there was nearly as much disorder as in the State. The pestilence had in many cases disorganized the parish clergy, the old penitential system had broken down, while luxury, at least among the few, was on the increase. Preachers, orthodox and heretical, and poets as different in character as Langland, Gower, and Chaucer are unanimous in the gloomy picture they give of the condition of the clergy, secular and regular. However much may be allowed for exaggeration, it is clear that reform was badly needed, but unfortunately the French Avignon popes, even when they were reformers, had little influence in England. Later on, the Schism gave Englishmen a pope with whom their patriotism could find no fault, but this advantage was dearly purchased at the cost of weakening the spirit of authority in the Church. It is to these social and religious distempers that we must look for the causes of the Peasant Revolt and the Lollard movemen. Both were manifestations of the discredit of authority and tradition. The revolt of 1381 is unique in English history for the revolutionary and anarchic spirit which inspired it and which indeed partially survived it, just as Lollardy is the only heresy which flourished in medieval England. The disorganized state of society and the violent anti-clericalism of the time would probably have led to an attack on the dogmatic authority and the sacramental system of the Church, even if Wyclif had not been there to lead the movement.

The Beginnings of Lollardy.—During the earlier part of his public career Wyclif had come forward as an ally of the anti-clerical and anti-papal nobility, and especially of John of Gaunt. He had asserted the right of temporal lords to take the goods of an undeserving clergy and, as a necessary consequence, he had attacked the power of excommunication. He was popular with the people, and his philosophical and theological teaching had given him much influence at Oxford. His orthodoxy had been frequently impeached and some of his conclusions condemned by Gregory XI, but he was not yet the leader of an obviously heretical sect. But about 1380 he began to take up a position of more definite hostility to the Church. He attacked the pope and the friars with unmeasured violence, and it was probably about this time that he sent out from Oxford the "poor priests" who were to carry his teaching to the country folk and the provincial towns. The necessity of giving them a definite gospel may well have led to a clearer expression of his heretical teaching, and it was certainly at this date that he began the attack on transubstantiation, and in this way inaugurated the most characteristic article of the Lollard heresy. Wycliffism was now no longer a question of scholastic disputation or even of violent anti-clericalism; it had become propagandist and heretical, and the authorities both of Church and State were able for the first time to make a successful assault upon it. In 1382 a council in London presided over by Archbishop Courtenay condemned twenty-four of Wyclif's "Conclusions": ten of them as heresies, fourteen as "errors". [For the Acts of this council and the documents connected with the subsequent proceedings at Oxford, see Shirley, "Fasciculus Zizaniorum" (Rolls Series), pp. 272–334.]

Though little was done against Wyclif himself, a

determined effort was made to purge the university. Oxford, jealous as ever of its privileges, resisted, but ultimately the leading Wycliffites, Hereford, Repingdon, and Ashton, had to appear before the archbishop. The two latter made full abjurations, but their subsequent careers were very different. Repingdon became in course of time Abbot of Leicester, Bishop of Lincoln, and a cardinal, while Ashton returned to his heretical ways and to the preaching of Lollardy. Nicholas Hereford must have been a man of an uncommon spirit, for at Oxford he had been much more extreme than Wyclif, justifying apparently even the murder of Archbishop Sudbury by the rebels, yet he went off to Rome to appeal to the pope against Courtenay, was there imprisoned, found himself at liberty again owing to a popular rising, returned to England and preached Lollardy in the West, but finally abjured and died a Carthusian. Though the Wycliffite hold upon Oxford was broken by these measures, the energy of the Lollard preachers, the extraordinary literary activity of Wyclif himself in his last years, and the disturbed conditions of the time, all led to a great extension of the movement. Its chief centres were London, Oxford, Leicester, and Coventry, and in the Dioceses of Hereford and Worcester.

Lollard Doctrines.—In the fourteenth century the word "Lollard" was used in a very extended sense. Anti-clerical knights of the shire who wished to disendow the Church, riotous tenants of an unpopular abbey, parishioners who refused to pay their tithes, would often be called Lollards as well as fanatics like Swynderby, the ex-hermit of Leicester, apocalyptic visionaries like the Welshman, Walter Brute, and what we may call the normal Wycliffite who denied the authority of the Church and attacked the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist. Never was Lollardy so widespread as in its early days; the Leicester chronicles wrote that every second man was a Lollard. But this very extension of the name makes it difficult to give a precise account of the doctrines connected with it, even in their more extreme form. Probably the best summary of Lollardy, at least in its earlier stages, is to be found in the twelve "Conclusions" which were presented to Parliament and affixed to the doors of Westminster Abbey and St. Paul's in 1395 (see for a Latin form "Fasciculus Zizaniorum", pp. 360–8: the original English form is analyzed in Dr. Gairdner's "Lollardy and the Reformation," I, pp. 43–6; see also H. Cronin, "The Twelve Conclusions of the Lollards" in "Eng. Hist. Review", 1907, 292–304). They complain of the corruptions by appropriations etc. from Rome, "a step-mother"; they attack the celibacy of the clergy and the religious orders, the "feigned miracle of the sacrament", the "feigned power of absolution", and "feigned indulgences"; they call the sacramentals jugglery, and declare that pilgrimages are "not far removed from idolatry". Prayers for the dead should not be a reason for almsgiving, and beneficed clergymen should not hold secular offices. There is no allusion in these conclusions to Wyclif's doctrine that "dominion is founded on grace", yet most of the early Lollards taught in some form or another that the validity of the sacraments was affected by the sinfulness of the minister.

This refusal to distinguish the official from the personal character of the priesthood has reappeared at different epochs in the history of the Church. It is to be found, for instance, among the popular supporters of ecclesiastical reform in the time of Pope St. Gregory VII. Reforming councils forbade the faithful to accept the ministrations of the unreformed clergy, but the reforming mobs of Milan and Flanders went much further and treated with contumely both the priests and their sacraments. Wyclif gave some kind of philosophic basis to this point of view in his doctrine of "dominion", though he applied it more to the property and authority of the clergy than to their sacramental powers. To make the validity of baptism or the consecration of the Holy Eucharist depend on the virtue of the priest could only be a stepping-stone to a complete denial of the sacramental system, and this stage had been reached in these conclusions of 1395. Thus the doctrine of transubstantiation became the usual test in trials for Lollardy, and the crucial question was usually, "Do you believe that the substance of the bread remains after consecration?" The heretics were often ready to accept the vaguer expressions of the orthodox doctrine, but at times they would declare quite frankly that "the sacrament is but a mouthful of bread". Pilgrimages and other pious practices of Catholics often came in for very violent abuse, and Our Lady of Walsingham was known among them as the "Witch of Walsingham".

There is at least one striking omission in the "Conclusions" of 1395. Nothing is said of the Bible as the sole rule of faith, yet this doctrine was probably the most original which the movement produced. As the chief opponents of Lollardy in the fifteenth century, Thomas of Walden and Richard Pecock both pointed out that the belief in the sufficiency of Scripture lay at the basis of Wycliffite teaching, for it provided an alternative to the authority of the Church. It occupied, however, a less important position among the earlier than among the later Lollards, for there was at first much confusion of mind on the whole question of authority. Even the most orthodox must have been puzzled at the time of the Schism, as many were later by the struggle between pope and councils. The unorthodox were still more uncertain, and this may partly account for the frequent recantations of those who were summoned by the bishops. In the fifteenth century the Lollards became a more compact body with a more definite creed, or rather with more definite negations, a change which can be explained by mere lapse of time which confirms a man in his beliefs and by the more energetic repression exercised by the ecclesiastical authorities. The breach with the tradition of the Church had now become unmistakable and the Lollard of the second generation looked for support to his own reading and interpretation of the Bible. Wyclif had already felt the necessity of this. He had dwelt in the strongest language on the sufficiency of Scripture, and had maintained that it was the ultimate authority even in matters of civil law and politics. Whatever may have been his share in the work of translating it into English, there is no doubt that he urged all classes to read such translations, and that he did so, partly at any rate, in order to strengthen them in opposition to the Church authorities. Even the pope, he maintained, should not be obeyed unless his commands were warranted by Scripture.

As the Lollards in the course of the fifteenth century became less and less of a learned body we find an increasing tendency to take the Bible in its most literal sense and to draw from it practical conclusions out of all harmony with contemporary life. Objections were made for instance to the Christian Sunday or to the eating of pork. Thus, Pecock urged the claims of reason and common sense against such narrow interpretations, much as Hooker did in a later age against the Puritans. Meanwhile the church authorities had limited the use of translations to those who had the bishop's licence, and the possession of portions of the English Bible, generally with Wycliffite prefaces, by unauthorized persons was one of the accepted evidences of Lollardy. It would be interesting, did space permit, to compare the Lollard doctrines with earlier medieval heresies and with the various forms of sixteenth-century Protestantism; it must, at least, be pointed out that there are few signs of any constructive system about Lollardy, little beyond the belief that the Bible will afford a rule of faith and practice. Much emphasis was laid on preaching as compared with liturgy, and there is evident an inclination

towards the supremacy of the State in the externals of religion.

Outline of the History of the Lollards.—The troubled days of Richard II at the close of the fourteenth century had encouraged the spread of Lollardy, and the accession of the House of Lancaster in 1399 was followed by an attempt to reform and restore constitutional authority in Church and State. It was a task which proved in the long run beyond the strength of the dynasty, yet something was done to remedy the worst disorders of the previous reign. In order to put down religious opposition the State came, in 1401, to the support of the Church by the Act "De Hæretico Comburendo", i. e. on the burning of heretics. This Act recited in its preamble that it was directed against a certain new sect "who thought damnably of the sacraments and usurped the office of preaching". It empowered the bishops to arrest, imprison, and examine offenders and to hand over to the secular authorities such as had relapsed or refused to abjure. The condemned were to be burnt "in an high place" before the people. This Act was probably due to the authoritative Archbishop Arundel, but it was merely the application to England of the common law of Christendom. Its passing was immediately followed by the burning of the first victim, William Sawtrey, a London priest. He had previously abjured but had relapsed, and he now refused to declare his belief in transubstantiation or to recognize the authority of the Church.

No fresh execution occurred till 1410, and the Act was mercifully carried out by the bishops. Great pains were taken to sift the evidence when a man denied his heresy; the relapsed were nearly always allowed the benefit of a fresh abjuration, and as a matter of fact the burnings were few and the recantations many. Eleven heretics were recorded to have been burnt from 1401 to the accession of Henry VII in 1485. Others, it is true, were executed as traitors for being implicated in overt acts of rebellion. Yet the activity of the Lollards during the first thirty years of the fifteenth century was great and their influence spread into parts of the country which had at first been unaffected. Thus the eastern counties became, and were long to remain, an important Lollard centre. Meanwhile the ecclesiastical authorities continued the work of repression. In 1407 a synod at Oxford under Arundel's presidency passed a number of constitutions to regulate preaching, the translation and use of the Scriptures, and the theological education at schools and the university. A body of Oxford censors condemned in 1410 no less than 267 propositions collected out of Wyclif's writings, and finally the Council of Constance, in 1415, solemnly declared him to have been a heretic. These different measures seem to have been successful at least as far as the clergy were concerned, and Lollardy came to be more and more a lay movement, often connected with political discontent.

Its leader during the reign of Henry V was Sir John Oldcastle, commonly known as Lord Cobham, from his marriage to a Cobham heiress. His Lollardy had long been notorious, but his position and wealth protected him and he was not proceeded against till 1413. After many delays he was arrested, tried, and sentenced as a heretic, but he escaped from the Tower and organized a rising outside London early in 1414. The young king suppressed the movement in person, but Oldcastle again escaped. He remained in hiding but seems to have inspired a number of sporadic disturbances, especially during Henry's absence in France. He was finally captured on the west border, condemned by Parliament, and executed in 1417. His personality and activity made a great impression on his contemporaries and his poorer followers put a fanatic trust in him. He certainly produced an exaggerated opinion of the numbers and ubiquity of the Lollards, for Thomas of Walden, who wrote about this time, expected that they would get the upper hand and be in a position to persecute the Catholics. This unquiet condition lasted during the earlier part of the reign of Henry VI. There were many recantations though few executions, and in 1429 Convocation lamented that heresy was on the increase throughout the southern province. In 1413 there was even a small rising of heretics at Abingdon. Yet from this date Lollardy began to decline and when, about 1445, Richard Pecock wrote his unfortunate "Repressor of overmuch blaming the Clergy", they were far less of a menace to Church or State than they had been in Walden's day. They diminished in numbers and importance, but the records of the bishops' courts show that they still survived in their old centres, London, Coventry, Leicester, and the eastern counties. They were mostly small artisans. William Wych, a priest, was indeed executed, in 1440, but he was an old man and belonged to the first generation of Lollards.

The increase in the number of citations for heresy under Henry VII was probably due more to the renewed activity of the bishops in a time of peace than to a revival of Lollardy. There was such a revival, however, under Henry VIII, for two heretics were burnt on one day, in 1511, and ten years later there were many prosecutions in the home counties and some executions. But though Lollardy thus remained alive, "conquered but not extinguished", as Erasmus expressed it in 1523, until the New Learning was brought into the country from Germany, it was a movement which for at least half a century had exercised little or no influence on English thought. The days of its popularity were long passed and even its martyrdoms attracted but little attention. The little stream of English heresy cannot be said to have added much to the Protestant flood which rolled in from the Continent. It did, however, bear witness to the existence of a spirit of discontent, and may have prepared the ground for religious revolt near London and in the eastern counties, though there is no evidence that any of the more prominent early reformers were Lollards before they were Protestants.

The authorities for the life and teaching of Wyclif will be found at the close of his biography; many of the English tracts and sermons attributed to him in *The Select English Works of John Wycliffe*, ed. by Arnold (Oxford, 1869–71), and in *The English Works of John Wycliffe hitherto unprinted* ed. by Matthew, in *Early English Text Society Publications* (1880) were certainly written by his followers, but their authors cannot be identified. The *Fasciculus Zizaniorum*, ed. by Shirley, in *Rolls Series*, collected by Thomas of Walden contains a number of important documents; much information about the Lollards will be found in the chronicles of the time, especially in Thomas of Walsingham, *Chronicon Angliæ* in *Rolls Series*, and in the continuator of Knighton's *Chronicon* in *Rolls Series*. Foxe, *Book of Martyrs* includes the records of a number of Lollard trials, but it must naturally be used with the greatest caution. Of modern works Lechler, *Johann von Wiclif* (2 vols., Leipzig, 1873), contains what is probably the most complete account of the movement, while Gairdner, *Lollardy and the Reformation in England* (2 vols., London, 1908) is an admirable study of its character and aims. Briefer sketches will be found in Poole, *Wycliffe and Movements for Reform* in *Epochs of Church History Series* (London, 1889), and in *Cambridge History of English Literature*, vol. II. Trevelyan, *England in the Age of Wycliffe* (London, 1897) is well written and useful, but it is marked by a frank hostility towards and by a good deal of ignorance of medieval and Catholic ideas and practices. See also Zimmermann in *Kirchenlexicon*, s. v. *Lollarden*; Bonet-Maury, *Les précurseurs de la Réforme* (Paris, 1904); Summers, *Lollards of the Chiltern Hills* (London, 1906).

F. F. Urquhart.

Loman, Saint, Bishop of Trim in Ireland, nephew of St. Patrick, was remarkable as being the first placed over an Irish see by the Apostle of Ireland. This was in the year 433. St. Loman had converted both Fortchern, the Prince of Trim (grandson of Laeghaire, King of Meath), and his father Foidilmid, and was given Trim for an episcopal see. Some say that he was a bishop before he came to Ireland, but this seems unlikely, as he would not accept a gift of Trim unless St. Patrick came to ratify it, and it is expressly stated in the "Tripartite Life", as also by Tirechan, that he was only a simple priest, but consecrated by

St. Patrick for Trim. St. Loman did not long survive his promotion to the episcopate, and after a brief visit to his brother Broccaid at Emlach Ech in Connacht, he resigned his see to his princely convert Fortchern, with the permission of St. Patrick. Fortchern, however, through humility only ruled for three days after the death of St. Loman, and then ceded his office to Cathlaid, another British pilgrim. St. Loman is not to be confounded with St. Loman of Loch Gill, County Sligo, but he is said to have founded Port Loman in County Westmeath.

O'Hanlon, *Lives of the Irish Saints* (Dublin, s. d.); Healy, *Life of St. Patrick* (Dublin, 1905); Stokes, *Tripartite Life of St. Patrick* (London, 1887).

W. H. Grattan-Flood.

Lombard, Peter, Archbishop of Armagh, b. at Waterford, about 1555; d. at Rome, 1625; belonged to a respectable and wealthy family. More than one of his relatives filled the position of mayor of Waterford, and others gained eminence in literature, among the latter being the famous Franciscan, Luke Wadding. After receiving his early education at Waterford, young Lombard was sent to Westminster School, whence, after some years, he went to Oxford. At Westminster School one of his professors was the historian Camden, and pupil and master seem to have got on well together. Camden's learning was great and Lombard was studious and clever and earned the praises of his master for his gentleness and docility. Camden also takes credit for having made his pupil a good Protestant. But the change, if it occurred at all, did not last, and Lombard, after leaving Oxford, went to Louvain, passed through his philosophic and theological classes with great distinction, graduated as Doctor of Divinity, and was ordained priest. Appointed professor of theology at Louvain University he soon attracted notice by the extent of his learning. In 1594 he was made provost of the cathedral at Cambrai. When he went to Rome, a few years later, Clement VIII thought so highly of his learning and piety that he appointed him, in 1601, Archbishop of Armagh. He also appointed him his domestic prelate, and thus secured him an income, which in the condition of Ireland at the time, there was no hope of getting from Armagh.

Peter Lombard
Archbishop of Armagh (1601–25)

Henceforth till his death Lombard lived at Rome. He was for a time president of the "Congregatio de Auxiliis" (q. v.) charged with the duty of pronouncing on Molina's work and settling the controversy on predestination and grace which followed its publication (Schneeman, "Controversiarum de divinæ gratiæ liberique arbitrii concordia initia et progressus", Freiburg, 1881). Lombard was active and zealous in providing for the wants of the exiled Earls of Tyrone and Tyrconnel, and was among those who publicly welcomed them to Rome. He was not however able to go to Ireland, for the penal laws were in force, and to set foot in Ireland would be to invite the martyrdom of O'Devanny and others. This would certainly have been Lombard's fate, for James I personally disliked him and publicly attacked him in the English Parliament. Armagh was thus left without an archbishop for nearly a quarter of a century. There was however an administrator in the person of the well-known David Rothe. He had for a time acted at Rome as Lombard's secretary and the primate appointed him Vicar-General of Armagh. Nor did Rothe cease to act in this capacity even after 1618, when he was made Bishop of Ossory. The Northerns bitterly complained of being left so long without an archbishop. In any case they disliked being ruled by a Munsterman, still more being ruled by one unwilling to face the dangers of his position. At Rome Lombard wrote "De Regno Hiberniæ sanctorum insula commentarius" (Louvain, 1632; re-edited, Dublin, 1868 with prefatory memoir, by Bishop, now Cardinal Moran). This work gave such offence to Charles I that he gave special directions to his Irish viceroy, Strafford, to have it suppressed. Lombard also wrote a little work on the administration of the Sacrament of Penance, and in 1604 a yet unedited work, addressed to James I, in favour of religious liberty for the Irish (Bellesheim, "Gesch. de Kath. Kirche in Irland", II (Mainz, 1890), 323–25, and *passim*.

Stuart, *Historical Memoirs of Armagh*, ed. by Coleman (Dublin, 1900); Meehan, *Earls of Tyrone and Tyrconnell* (Dublin, 1886); *Spicilegium Ossoriense* (Dublin, 1874–84); Renehan, *Irish Archbishops* (Dublin, 1861).

E. A. D'Alton.

Lombard, Peter. See Peter Lombard.

Lombardy, a word derived from *Longobardia* and used during the Middle Ages to designate the country ruled over by the Longobards, which varied in extent with the varying fortunes of that race in Italy. During their greatest power it included Northern Italy, part of Central Italy, and nearly all Southern Italy excepting only Calabria (inaccessible because of its mountainous character), and a narrow strip of land along the west coast including the cities of Naples, Gaeta, Amalfi, and Terracina. Geographically it was divided into eight regions:—Austria, to the north-east; Neustria, to the north-west; Flaminia and a portion of Emilia; Lombard Tuscia; the Duchy of Spoleto; the Duchies of Benevento and Salerno; Istria; the Exarchate of Ravenna, and the Pentapolis, a late conquest which did not remain long in the hands of the Longobards. Sometimes the country was divided into Greater Lombardy, including Northern, or Transtiberine, Italy with Pavia as its capital, and Lesser Lombardy, or Cistiberine Italy, namely the Duchies of Benevento and Spoleto. In the ninth century the name Lombardy was synonymous with Italy. Politically the country was divided into thirty-six duchies, of which we know with any certainty the names of only a few; these are: Pavia, Milan, Brescia, Bergamo, Verona, Vicenza, Treviso, Friuli, Trent, Istria, Asti, Turin, Parma, Piacenza, Chiusi, Reggio, Lucca, Florence, Fermo, Rimini, Spoleto, and Benevento. After the kingdom had passed into the hands of the Franks and the frontier duchies had asserted their independence, and new principalities had been set up, e. g. the Venetian territory in the east, Piedmont in the west, the States of the Church in the south, the old name shrank until it came to signify that extent of country comprised more or less within the Duchy of Milan, bordered on the north by the Swiss cantons; on the west by the River Ticino and Lake Maggiore, which separate it from Piedmont; on the south by the River Po, which separates it from Emilia; and on the east by the River Mincio and Lake Garda, which separate it from the Venetian territory. These are its boundaries at the present time.

Actually, Lombardy is one of the thirteen regions into which Italy is divided and it contains eight provinces: Bergamo, Brescia, Como, Cremona, Mantua, Milan, Pavia, Sondrio. It is the most populous province of Italy, with 4,300,000 inhabitants and an area of 8973 sq. miles. The wealth of the country consists

in the fertility of the soil, which in the main lies within the basin of the Po valley. Only on its northern reaches is it conterminous with the Alpine chain, where the Bernese Alps keep watch over the Provinces of Sondrio and Bergamo, and advance among the wooded valleys of Camonica, Seriana, Brembara, and Valtellina. In these mountains many streams have their sources, the principal ones being the Ticino, the Olona, the Adda, the Oglio, and the Mincio, all tributaries of the Po on its left bank; while the Trebbia, fed from the Appennines, flows in on the right bank. Several of these rivers during their long course spread out into lakes famous for the beauty of their shores, rich in vegetation, and bordered by picturesque villages and lovely villas, the favourite summer haunts of the great and the wealthy. Such for instance is Lake Maggiore, or Verbano, formed by the Ticino; Lake Como, or Lario, formed by the Adda; Lake Isco formed by the Aglio; Lake Garda, or Benaco, from which the Mincio flows. Other similar lakes like Lake Varese and those nestling among the gentle slopes of the Brianza have won for this strip of Lombardy the name of "Garden of Italy".

The climate of Lombardy varies with its elevation; it is cold in the mountain districts, warm in the plains. At Milan, the mean annual temperature is 55° F. The chief products are grain, maize, rice. The pasture lands are many and the flocks numerous. Ever since the fifteenth century the greater part of Lombardy has been artifically irrigated. Innumerable canals branch off from the rivers and carry their waters over the fields on a gentle slope, so skilfully arranged that a thin sheet of water can be made to pass lightly over the surface, fertilizing the soil so that as many as seven crops of hay are taken in one year. Several of these canals, e. g., the Naviglio Grande (known also as the Ticinello, because it flows from the Ticino), the Naviglio della Martesana (so called from the district it passes through), are navigable by means of locks or planes which overcome the differences of level of the country they pass through. The mean annual crop of rice from 1900 to 1905 was 4,615,000 quintals (a quintal is about 220 lbs.). Milk is so plentiful that butter and cheese are among the chief exports: about 230,000 quintals of cheese, and 90,000 of butter are produced annually. The more famous cheeses are the Grana (wrongly called Parmigiano or Parmesan), Gorgonzola, and Stracchini.

With the introduction of the mulberry-tree during the Middle Ages the feeding of silkworms began and has gone on prospering, so that it now forms one of the staple sources of income, the average output per annum being about 15,000,000 kilos of cocoons. The silk is woven on the spot and gives employment (according to statistics for 1906) to 126,000 persons of both sexes who work 1,400,000 spindles for straight and twisted silk, feeding 16,000 looms that turn out 10,000,000 kilos of grey or unbleached silk. There are moreover in activity 36,000 looms, and 900,000 spindles for cotton and 10,000 looms for flax, hemp, jute, etc. Other industries are moulding wood and iron for machinery, carriage-building, railway works, furniture making, bleaching works, tailoring establishments, and printing. The country does not boast of great mineral wealth although there are iron pyrites and copper pyrites in the valleys of Bergamo and Brescia; zincblende and carbonate of zinc in Val Seriana; lignite in the same valley; and peat in the Varese valley and along Lake Garda. There are rich granite quarries at San Fedelino, porphyry in Val Ganna, black marble at Varenna, and limestone at Botticino. There are mineral springs at Trescorre, San Pellegrino, Salice, Bormio, etc. The growth of trade soon caused the need of means of rapid communication to be felt, and besides the public highways, there are about 850,000 miles of splendid roads in Lombardy, railways were soon opened, that from Milan to Monza in 1840 being the second in Italy. At present a network of 1,115,000 miles of railway lines and more than 600,000 miles of steam-tramways cover the surface of Lombardy.

Religious Division.—In its ecclesiastical divisions Lombardy naturally exhibits the influence of its civil history. When the Longobards swarmed down from the Alps the peoples in that region had long been evangelized and the Church had a hierarchy in the chief cities. Among these Milan is certainly the most ancient of all Northern Italy; Aquileia comes next; then Verona and Brescia and the other sees that sprang up rapidly after peace had been given to the Church by Constantine. Milan was the metropolitan see of the region and its bishop took the title of archbishop as early as the middle of the eighth century. Within this jurisdiction were Alba, Alessandria, Asti, Turin, Tortona, Vercelli, Vigevano, Casale, Acqui, Savona, Ventimiglia, Genoa, Novara, Cremona, Como, Bergamo, Brescia, Lodi. It is doubtful whether Pavia belonged



The Iron Crown of Lombardy
Preserved in the cathedral treasury at Monza

to Milan in ancient times, but from a very remote date until the beginning of the nineteenth century it depended directly on the Holy See. In the seventh century Como was separated from Milan and became subject to Aquileia but was joined to Milan when the Patriarchate of Aquileia was suppressed. The jurisdiction of Milan was gradually restricted. Genoa became an archdiocese in 1133 with Savona, Ventimiglia, and Tortona as suffragan sees. Likewise, in 1515 Turin became an archdiocese with Asti, Albi, and Acqui as suffragans. Finally, Vercelli in 1817 was made an archdiocese with Alessandria, Casale, Vigevano, and Novara as suffragans. At the present time Lombardy is divided into nine dioceses: Bergamo, Brescia, Como, Pavia, Cremona, Crema, Lodi, Mantua, under Milan as metropolitan. A noteworthy peculiarity in the liturgy is the special rite in use throughout all the Diocese of Milan with the exception of a few parishes, a rite that goes back to very primitive times, and known as the Ambrosian Rite (q. v.).

History.—When the Longobards are first mentioned by Latin historians they are described as the fiercest of the German barbarians (Velleius Paterculus) while Tacitus praises them for their intrepidity. It would seem their original name was Winnili, and that they were called Longobards from the length of the beards they wore. It is quite true that in German mythology the name Longobard (*longbärtr*) was given to Odin, their chief god. We first meet them along the Elbe near the Baltic; according to Bluhime they came from Jutland. The "Longobard Chronicle" that precedes the edict of King Rotari (636) says "origo gentis nostræ Scandanan", i. e., the North. Their quarrels with the Vandals were of ancient date; afterwards they took possession of the lands of the Heruli when these tribes poured into Italy under Odoacer. Emperor Justinian gave them lands in Pannonia and Noricum on condition that they would

not molest the Empire and that they would assist in the wars against the Gepidæ. They did make war against the Gepidæ, and under Alboin, who wanted to carry off Rosamunda, daughter of Cunimund, King of the Gepidæ, they succeeded with the help of the Avars in completely routing them. Alboin slew Cunimund, and as was the custom of his race, fashioned a drinking cup from the king's skull. Then, gathering together all the barbarians he could muster, Saxons, Suevi, Ostrogoths, the remnant of the Gepidæ, Saramati, Bulgars, and Thuringians, he set out from Pannonia towards Italy on 1 April, 568. Ill-defended, and torn by the rivalries of the Greek leaders or generals, Italy fell an easy prey. Alboin met with no resistance either in Friuli or in Veneta; he advanced as far as the Adda, taking possession of all the towns on his way, with the exception of Padua, Mantua, and Monselice. Many of the inhabitants fled for refuge to the islands in the lagoons. The following year, finding none to bar his progress, he pushed forward, occupied Milan, and invaded Liguria meeting resistance only in Pavia and Cremona. The inhabitants fled, even as far as Genoa. Pavia held out for three years, then fell, and became the capital of Alboin's short-lived kingdom. Rosamunda, whom the barbarian forced to drink out of her father's skull, in revenge had him assassinated, and then fled with her accomplices to Ravenna. The Longobards chose as his successor Clefi, chief of the troops which had remained at Bergamo; he was more cruel even than Alboin in oppressing the conquered, driving them from their lands and putting them to death under any pretext. During all this time the exarch, Longinus, sent from Constantinople to replace Narses, had been unable to defend Italy, and shut himself up in Ravenna, leaving the people to their cruel fate. The Longobard invasion of Italy, the last stage in the Germanic invasion of the West, marks the end of the Roman world and the beginning of a new historical epoch, which was to bring about deep changes in the social life of those peoples, who, hitherto, under the domination of Heruli and Goths, had indeed changed their masters but not their customs or their manner of life.

With the new conquerors it was quite otherwise. At their head was a king usually chosen by the chiefs of the tribe nearly always from the stock of the same family. He was the civil and military head of the nation, but his power was shared with the leaders (*heerzoge*) chosen by him for life, one for each territorial division, and subject to him *de jure*, though *de facto* independent and even hereditary, as was the case in Friuli, Spoleto, and Beneventum. Those nearer at hand, however, found it more difficult to escape his authority, but outbreaks were not infrequent and were the cause of weakness and decay from within. Viceroys pure and simple were the *gastaldi* nominated and dismissed by the king, administering his possessions and representing him in the various territories to which they were appointed. On the other hand the *gasindi* were part of his household and members of his Court. By playing off the one against the other, and by increasing their power the royal authority was augmented and the throne consolidated. Then again the dukes had their *gasindi* and *skuldahis* to assist them, and among those nobles and favourites the conquered lands were distributed. Whether these lands were part of the imperial domain or belonged to private individuals who had been slain or who fled, they were parcelled out in fiefs or given away in freehold. The conquered became tributary, and had to pay thirds of all fruits and in most cases they seem to have been reduced to the state of *aldii*, or villains, who passed from owner to owner with the land. Only one citizenship was recognized, the Longobardic, and all had to belong to it, the barbarian auxiliaries, the Romans who remained freemen, and later the priests and the *guargangi*, or strangers who came to settle in Longobard territory. The quality of being a freeman (*frei*) was inseparable from that of soldier (*heermann: exercitalis*) and the nation itself in the royal edicts is styled the *exercitus*.

We can form an idea of the social and legal condition of the conquered peoples from the *wieder-geld*, or fine imposed for a murder or any damage done by one inhabitant to another. The fine was always increased when a Longobard was the injured party. The Roman was cut off from all government positions and was always looked upon as an inferior. Among the list of offices and honours, and even in the public documents of the Longobards, there never once appears the name of an Italian inhabitant. The main consequence of this antagonism was that the two peoples remained politically apart. In spite of the heavy disadvantages under which they laboured it must not be imagined that the conquered were civilly dead. The Longobards numbered hardly more than 130,000 souls without a code of laws, and without unity of governing methods to oppose to those already in existence, and which it was only natural they should go on using in their dealings with the Italians on all points not foreseen by their own barbarian customs. That this was the case is seen from the fact that hardly had the oppression come to an end when we find the Roman *municipium* once more arising and thriving in the *comune*. But the preservation of the traditions of Rome was due to another cause—religion. The Longobards at the time of the invasion were for the most part pagan; a few had imbibed Arianism, and hence their ferocity against priests and monks whom they put to death. They destroyed churches and monasteries; they hunted and killed many of the faithful who would not become pagan; they laid waste their property, and seized Catholic places of worship, to hand them over to the Arians. The holy pontiff, Gregory the Great, does not cease to lament the desolation caused by the Longobard slaughter throughout Italy. Slowly however the light of faith made way among them and the Church won their respect and obedience. This meant protection for the conquered. Gradually the Church's constitution and customs spread among the barbarians the ideas of Roman civilization, until at last, in defence of her own liberty and that of the people which the Longobards continued to imperil, she was forced to call in the aid of the Franks, and thus change the fate of Italy. This occurred only after two centuries of Longobardic domination. The succession of the Longobard kings is as follows:—Alboin from 561; Clefi, 573; interregnum, 575; Autari from 584; Agilulf, 591; Adaloald, 615; Ariovald, 625; Rothari, 636; Rodoald, 652; Aribert, 653; Gondibert and Pertarit, 661; Grimoald, 662; Garibald, 671; Pertarit (a second time), 671; Cunibert (as co-ruler), 678; Cunibert (alone), 686; Luitpert, 700; Regimbert, 701; Aribert, 701; Ausprand, 702; Liutprand, 712; Hildebrand, 744; Ratchis, 744; Astulf, 749; Desiderius, 756 till 774. In this list of kings prime importance attaches to the civil and religious influence of Queen Theodolinda, a Frank by birth, a Catholic in faith, the wife of Autari, and afterwards of Agilulf whom she won over from barbarism and converted to Christianity. To her is due the foundation of many churches and monasteries, among others St. John's at Monza, where the iron crown was kept and protection granted to the Irishman, St. Columbanus, founder of Bobbio (q. v.), and apostle of the religious life in Gaul, Britain, Switzerland, and Italy. Agilulf had much trouble with his dukes, who had grown haughty in their independence, and were perhaps angered at his conversion to the religion of the conquered.

The son of Adaloald was deposed and his place taken by an Arian, Ariovald, Duke of Turin. Rothari was also an Arian; during his reign the first Lombard code was published. With much carnage and devas-

tation he overthrew Genoa and conquered the Ligurian coast. For sixty years following Rothari and until the time of Liutprand intense anarchy prevailed. During this period control was in the hands of Grimoald, Duke of Beneventum, converted through the zeal of Saint Barbatus, bishop of that town. Grimoald enlarged Rotari's code by the addition of laws concerning prescription and voting, in which the influence of Roman law is manifest, as such ideas were altogether foreign to Teutonic legislation. Liutprand finally overcame this anarchy. He was the greatest and perhaps the best of the Lombard princes. His legislation bears increasing traces of Christian and Roman influences. He totally suppressed paganism, introduced the right of sanctuary in churches, and forbade marriage among blood relations, etc. He was more or less mixed up in the politics of the Greek Empire against Rome; but his moderation was most praiseworthy, and his quarrel was never against the pope as head of the Church, but as head of the government of Rome.

Liutprand and his successor Rachis were sincere and pious Catholics; Rachis even renounced the throne in favour of his brother Astulf and retired as a monk to Monte Cassino. But Astulf was of a different stamp; he seized the exarchate and the Pentapolis, and invaded the Duchy of Rome, whereupon the popes were constrained to seek aid for themselves and for the people who looked to them for protection. Constantinople was appealed to in vain; then the popes turned to the Franks. King Pepin went down into Italy and laid siege to Pavia; Astulf came to terms, but hardly had Pepin retired before Astulf was trying once more a *coup de main* against Rome (755); he besieged the city for two months, putting monks and farm-hands to death until Pepin returned once more (756) and again laid siege to Pavia, forcing the perjured king to pay tribute to Rome and to restore the territory he had invaded. His death forestalled further perjury, but the struggle was continued by his successor Desiderius, who placed more faith in diplomacy than arms, and sought to win the good graces of Charlemagne, Pepin's successor, by giving him in marriage his daughter Desiderata. When she was sent back to him he declared war on the pope, seized Comanchio, and hastened towards Ravenna and Rome. Charlemagne, seeing the evident dishonesty of the Longobards, went down into Italy, captured Chiusi, and besieged Desiderius in Pavia and his son in Verona. Pavia fell after a ten months' siege, Desiderius was sent to France where he was shut up in a monastery, but his son succeeded in making good his escape to Constantinople. Thus ended the Longobard Kingdom in 774. Barbarous and daring by nature, their government always remained barbarous, even after Christianity had taught their rulers some gentleness.

Treacherous and overbearing towards those they conquered the fierce warrior Longobards never united with the Italians until both had to bear together a common yoke. The popes did all they could to prevent their domination so as to rescue what remained of liberty and the culture of Rome; to them it is due that in this period Italy did not utterly perish. Charlemagne took the crown and the title of King of the Longobards, and later at the division of his empire he assigned their kingdom to his eldest son, Pepin. In the constitutions he drew up each nation or people was left the use of its own laws; gradually the duchies were divided into countships, the counts being vassals of the king, and having in turn valvassori (*vassi-vassorum*) who looked up to them as liege-lords, while ranking over all were the *missi dominici* who in the king's name saw to it that justice was meted out to everyone. Such was the feudal hierarchy. The government of the towns was in the hands of the local count, who exercised it through his representatives, to whom were added later *scabini*, or assessors, chosen from among the more worthy citizens. The old Lombard law, set down originally in the edict of King Rothari (636) and enlarged under later kings, was later known as the "Liber Langobardorum" or "Liber Papiensis", and eventually as "Lombarda" (*Lex*) was taught and commented at Bologna. The bishops ranked as vassals of the king, by reason of the church fiefs (*weichbild*) they held from him, but they were exempt from any other subjection.

For two centuries Lombardy followed the fortunes of the Carlovingian Empire, and eventually under Otho (964) it fell under the direct sway of the Saxon emperors. The Lombard Duchy of Beneventum, after various divisions, was conquered by the Normans in the eleventh century, while the city of Beneventum passed (1051–52) under papal sway. During this long lapse of time, however, and throughout all the struggles that marked that epoch, the sap of a new life was working in the cities of Lombardy, destined before long to take their fitting place in the story of Italy. Two main forces were at work; one the prerogative of honour that by universal consent the bishops enjoyed over the laity. When fiefs began to become hereditary in families it was to the emperor's interest to increase the number of ecclesiastical lords, seeing that they could not assert independence and that the imperial authority had some weight in the selection of their successors. The other cause was frequency of immunities and franchises. In the long struggle between the Church and the Empire concerning investitures, and during the disputed elections of popes and bishops, the opposing parties were liberal in concessions to win over the various towns to their side, and the towns were not slow in claiming payment for the obedience and loyalty they rendered to a master sometimes absent and often doubtful. At times too, the emperors, detained by affairs in Germany, did not concern themselves with Italy, and the cities drew up their own code of laws, without, however, shaking off the imperial yoke; the emperors, either through love or necessity, when they could not do otherwise, remained satisfied. Thus the cities multiplied their privileges and their population increased with the privileges on account of the security they afforded over the less protected country. In this way the *comune* took the place of the countship of the feudal lord. It is only too true that the communes made bad use of their early liberty, and of their budding civil and commercial life, waging war against one another through sheer greed of power, until they mutually destroyed their power.

The part played by Milan in these troubles was the most important of all. Its conflicts with Como, Pavia, and Lodi furnished pretext for the intervention of Frederick I who led two expeditions into Italy. The first brought about the destruction of Asti, Chieri, and Tortona; in the second Milan itself was besieged, forced to surrender and to renounce its claims over Lodi and Como, and to submit the names of its consuls for approval to the emperor, to whom they had to take an oath of fealty. In the Diet of Roncaglia (1158) Frederick constrained the Bolognese jurisconsults to acknowledge his supreme authority over the empire. This autocracy which destroyed the constitutions of the communes rallied the towns of Lombardy for a life and death struggle: Milan was again besieged, razed to the ground, and its inhabitants dispersed throughout the neighbouring villages (1161). But while Frederick persisted in making war on Rome, and creating antipopes, Verona, Vicenza, and Padua in 1163 formed what is known as the League of Venice, and in 1167 the Lombard League, or the League of Pontida, was set on foot between Bergamo, Brescia, Cremona, and Mantua to oppose the inroads of Germany and to defend their own civil and religious liberties, as well as to assert their loyalty to the legitimate pope. Milan was rebuilt and in 1168, Alessandria (called after Alexan-

der III) was founded in opposition to Pavia, which persistently sided with the emperor. Finally in 1176 at Legnano, the Milanese assisted by the Brescians, Novarese, Vercellese, and Piacentians, defeated the imperial troops; and Frederick was glad to make peace with the pope and the Lombards. At Venice a truce of six years was concluded, and confirmed by the Treaty of Constance (1183), which recognized the franchises of the communes, their right to free election of consuls, to administer justice according to their own laws, and to assess taxes, so that they came to be as it were vassal states, which recognized the supreme overlordship of the emperor. Once the struggle for freedom was over, the communes began once more their unfortunate rivalries, and they found only too ready an occasion in the endless struggles between Guelphs and Ghibellines. Milan, Brescia, and nearly all the communes in which the burghers held control, were on the Guelph side; those wherein the nobles and the classes privileged by the emperors had the upper hand, like Pavia and Cremona, declared for the Ghibellines. From these civil dissensions a few changes in the constitution of the communes arose, the principal one being the creation of the podesta, or chief magistrate, necessitated by the urgency of putting an end to the dispute arising from the political and judicial powers exercised by the consuls.

The podesta was elected by the general assembly of the people, and had to be a foreigner, that is, a citizen from some other commune; he belonged to the same political colour and had to be of knightly family. He sat in judgment in all criminal cases, saw that sentences were carried out, commanded the army, and declared war or peace. Hence arose the prominence of certain families, especially when the same citizen was chosen by more than one town, and this led to dictatorships which gave rise to the *signorias*, to be found in the towns of Lombardy and elsewhere. The league of the communes was a thorn for the empire and in 1220 Frederick II tried once more to break it and to conquer the Guelph republics of Lombardy. To prevent assault, when Frederick came in 1225 to hold a diet at Cremona, the cities of Lombardy formed another league at San Zeno di Mosio in the neighbourhood of Mantua. The emperor placed the confederate towns under a ban, and with the help of a Saracen army, which he brought from Sicily, and of the troops of the Ghibelline cities, despite the interposition of Honorius III and Gregory IX, he laid waste the country of the League, and in 1247 defeated it at Cortenova. But his victory was of small avail. In vain did he besiege Brescia; Genoa and Venice rallied to the League, which had its revenge at Parma and elsewhere, until Frederick died excommunicated in 1250, and the Lombards could draw breath. In the period that follows we find the more powerful families quartering themselves in the various cities. The Torriani and the Visconti at Milan; the San Bonifacios and the Scaligers at Verona; the Vitali and the Rusconi at Como; the Este at Ferrara; the Bonaccolsi at Mantua; the Correggeschi at Parma, etc.

Among these the Visconti quickly became the most powerful and for two centuries were lords of Lombardy. At first they sought to have themselves appointed imperial vicars whenever the emperors were formidable or were coming into Italy, as did Henry VII and Louis the Bavarian; but afterwards they cared little for the emperor and acted as though independent lords. Matthew I, styled the Great, was created lord in perpetuity in 1295, had himself made count in 1311, placed himself at the head of the Ghibellines and added to his dominions Pavia, Bergamo, Piacenza, and Tortona. Seventy years later Gian Galeazzo ruled over the whole of Lombardy including Parma and Riggio, to which he added Verona and Vicenza which he took from the Scaligers, and Bologna, Siena, and Pisa, and then he purchased from the Emperor Wenceslaus the title of duke. He gave his daughter, Valentina, in marriage to Louis I, Duke of Orléans, brother of Charles VI of France, and as a dowry he gave her the cities of Asti and Cherasco, which later formed the basis of the pretensions of France to rights over the country around Milan. At the death of Filippo-Maria in 1447 without heirs other than a daughter, married to Sforza, a condottiere of mercenary troops, of whom there were many in Italy, Sforza succeeded him in 1450 and thus began a new dynasty that lasted nearly a century. About this time France began to assert its claims. Louis XII and Francis I occupied the duchy, driving out Ludovico il Moro and Maximilian his son. Emperor Charles V drove back France at the battle of Pavia, and restored Milan to the Sforzas, but only for a short time, as Francis, the last son of Ludovico, died without issue in 1535. Then the duchy became a fief of Spain, and as such it remained till 1706 when it passed to Austria, which took possession of it during the War of Succession, at the death of Charles II. A few years later the death of Emperor Charles VI of Austria reopened the War of Succession, and Milan fell into the hands of the Spaniards (1745); at the peace of 1748 it was given back to Austria, which held it until the outbreak of the French Revolution, when Bonaparte established there the Cisalpine Republic and later the Kingdom of Italy. At the fall of Napoleon it went back to Austria and together with the territory of the Venetian Republic it made up what was known as the Lombardo-Venetian Kingdom. The wars of Piedmont, allied with France in 1859 and with Prussia in 1866, took away Lombardy and Venice from Austria, and helped to make the present Kingdom of Italy.

The earliest historian of Lombardy is PAULUS WARNEFRID (730–797), known as Paulus Diaconus, a Benedictine of Monte Cassino, and chancellor of King Desiderius. His *Historia Langobardorum* is an important authority for the traditions, customs, and political history of his people to the end of the eighth century (*P. L.*, XCV; *Mon. Ger. Hist.: Script. Rer. Langob.*, Berlin, 1878). See also TROYA, *Codex diplom. Langobard.* (Naples, 1852), and besides the histories of LEO, HARTMANN, CANTÙ, SCHMIDT, and others, the valuable work of HODGKIN, *Italy and her Invaders*, V–VI (London, 1895); POUPARDIN, *Hist. des principautés lombardes de l'Italie mérid.* (Paris, 1907); IDEM, *Instit. polit. et adm. des princip. lombardes* (Paris, 1907). For the relations of the Roman Church with the Lombards see *Liber Pontificalis*, ed. DUCHESNE (Paris, 1885), passim, and DUCHESNE, *Les évêchés d'Italie et l'invasion lombarde* in *Mélanges d'archéol. et d'hist.*, XXIII, XXIV (Paris, 1903); also CRIVELLUCCI, *Le chiese cattoliche ed i Lombardi ariani* in *Studi Storici*, IV (6), XIII. On the Lombard communes see DANTIER in *Revue Européenne*, 1859, III–IV, and WILLIAMS, *The Communes of Lombardy, VI to X century*, in *John Hopkins Univ. Hist. Studies* (Baltimore, 1891). The medieval chroniclers of Lombardy are to be found in MURATORI, *Script. rer. ital.* (1725), 28 vols., folio, passim; see also the *Mon. Germ. Hist.*, the *Hist. Patriæ Monumenta*, and the *Archivio Storico Lombardo-Veneto* (Milan, 1874, sqq.). For Lombard art see MALVEZZI, *Le glorie dell' arte Lombarda* (Milan, 1892), 590–1850, also the histories of ecclesiastical art by KRAUS, KUHN, and others. On the medieval financial operations of the Lombards see PITOU, *Les Lombards en France et à Paris* (1892), and all economical histories of the Middle Ages, e. g., CUNNINGHAM, *Western Civilization*.

PAOLO SILVA.

Loménie de Brienne, ETIENNE-CHARLES DE, French cardinal and statesman, b. at Paris, 1727; d. at Sens, 1794. He was of noble lineage, studied at the Collège d'Harcourt and then at the Sorbonne, where, in spite of certain suggestions of unorthodoxy, he was given the doctorate of theology. Ordained priest in 1752, he became successively Vicar-General of Rouen (1752), Bishop of Condom (1760), and Archbishop of Toulouse (1762). Forced by the philosophers upon Louis XVI, who feared his ambition and despised his private life, he was made in 1788 *ministre principal* and Archbishop of Sens, the second richest see in France. As a minister, he was popular with the Assembly of the Notables, but failed to win the Parlement over to his financial schemes, and fell after announcing the convocation of the States General for

1 May, 1789. In order to offset his downfall, he succeeded by clever intrigue in gaining for himself the cardinal's hat, and in having his nephew, Martial de Loménie, appointed coadjutor of Sens. The influence and wealth attached to his see he used to have Sens made the seat of the new ecclesiastical department of Yonne—instead of Auxerre, the natural metropolis. Having taken the constitutional oath on 30 Jan., 1791, he drew after him a large portion of his clergy, submitted to popular election, and, being returned both in Toulouse and Sens, chose the latter place because of its being near the French capital.

When Pius VI, by a Brief of 23 Feb., 1791, severely rebuked him for his disloyalty, he replied by renouncing the cardinalate, and was formally deposed at the Consistory of 26 Sept., 1791. He then retired with his family to St.-Pierre-le-Vif, a confiscated abbey which he had purchased from the spoliators and shamefully desecrated, and there awaited events. Owing to his nobility, wealth, and ecclesiastical rank, he was naturally made the object of denunciations. For a time his prodigality in bribing the local authorities saved him from harm. On 15 November, 1793, when the Convention was at its fiercest, and denunciations meant imminent danger, he apostatized for safety's sake, but was nevertheless arrested on 18 Feb., 1794. The following day he was found dead in his prison—some say from suicide, and some from a stroke of apoplexy. His nephew and former coadjutor, Martial de Loménie, who had also apostatized, was sentenced to death on 10 May, 1794, but the Christian fortitude of Madame Elisabeth and the warm exhortations of the dean of Sens, both of whom were in the same van with him, softened his heart, and he died repentant. Loménie de Brienne was a member of the French Academy. The "Canal de Brienne" which connects the river Garonne with the Canal du Midi, is called after him. He wrote the "Oraison funèbre du Dauphin" (Paris, 1776), "Compte rendu au Roi" (Paris, 1788), and, in collaboration with Turgot, "Le Conciliateur" (Paris, 1754).

ETIENNE-CHARLES LOMÉNIE DE BRIENNE

PERRIN, *Le card. Loménie de Brienne* (Sens, 1896); FISQUET in *France pontificale: Métropole de Sens* (Paris, s. d.); PISANI in *Répertoire biographique de l'épiscopat constitutionnel* (Paris, 1907), s. v.; MONIN in *La Grande Encyclopédie*, s. v.

J. F. SOLLIER.

London, the capital of England and chief city of the British Empire, is situated about fifty miles from the mouth of the Thames, Lat. 51° 30′, Long. 0° 5′. The word London is used in widely different senses for administrative purposes:— (i) The City of London, with a population of 26,923, occupying an area of 668 statute acres, little more than one square mile. (ii) London, as defined by the Metropolis Local Management Act, now the County of London, with a population (last census 1901) of 4,536,541 and an area of 75,462 statute acres, or about 117 square miles. London district as referred to in the Registrar-General's Tables of Mortality coincides very nearly with this. (iii) London, in reference to the Parliamentary Boroughs, has a population of about 4¼ millions and an area of 80,126 statute acres, or 125 square miles. (iv) London, as the Metropolitan Police District, together with the City has a population of 6,581,372 and an area of nearly 700 square miles. It extends over a radius of 15 miles from Charing Cross. (v) London, as an Anglican diocese, comprises Middlesex, Essex, and part of Hertfordshire. London will here be treated under the following heads: I. General History. II. Ancient Catholic Diocese. III. London Catholics after the Reformation. IV. Modern Civil Administration.

I. GENERAL HISTORY.—*Pre-Norman Times.*—The origins both of the name and the very existence of the "great burh, Lundunaborg, which is the greatest and most famous of all burhs in the northern lands" (Ragnar Lodbrog Saga) lie hidden in antiquity. Both name and town alike are popularly accounted for in the wonderful legend of Geoffrey of Monmouth which found wide credence in the Middle Ages. According to this, Brutus, a descendant of Æneas who was the son of Venus, founded this city after the fall of Troy, eleven hundred years before Christ came, and called it Troynovant, or New Troy. And after a thousand years there reigned King Lud who built walls and towers to his city, and whose name yet lives in Ludgate; so that the town was called Câer Lud. Thus Lud's-Town became London. But in the light of topography this legendary explanation must give way to the natural derivation from *Llyn-din*, the Lake-fort. For the nucleus of London, the ground which the city proper still occupies, was composed of two hills rising with steep sloping sides from the north bank of the Thames, separated from each other by the stream known later as Walbrook, and shut in on the north by the great moor and fen the memory of which survives in the names Moorfields and Finsbury.

The river Fleet bounded the western hill on its western side, and all around lay the marshes through which the Thames flowed, not shut in by embankments, but at high water flooding all the low lying land and making it one vast lake. From this lake rose a few islets known still to us by place-names in "ey" or "ea" such as Bermondsey, Thorney, Battersea, and Chelsea. The western island, that between the rivers Walbrook and Fleet with the eminence now crowned by St. Paul's cathedral, was the site of a British settlement which existed before the coming of the Romans. The discovery of prehistoric remains and some inscribed coins of Cymbeline have established the fact of this pre-Roman city against the theories of J. R. Green (Making of England), Dr. Guest (Origines Celticæ), and some others. It probably was a collection of round thatched cottages built of clay and branches and surrounded by an earthwork which enclosed about one hundred acres. In time the Thames brought the boats of traders and it became a place of primitive trade and commerce. This was probably its condition when the Romans arrived in A. D. 43. Unless it had already been established as a known mart it is difficult to believe that by the year A. D. 61 when it finds its first mention in history in the "Annals" of Tacitus it could be described as "Londinium, not dignified with the name of a colony but celebrated for the gathering of dealers and commodities". (Annals, A. D. 61.)

The Roman settlement seems to have been first made on the eastern hill, to the east of Walbrook. Here they built their fortress, a walled enclosure such as that still surviving at Richborough. Under the protection of this the town grew in size and became a busy mercantile centre, with the villas of its wealthier citizens, traces of which are still discovered, lying round its citadel. For nearly four hundred years it formed the Roman city of Augusta, though the old Celtic name still survived. During this period it was captured by Boadicea who massacred the inhabitants (A. D. 61), was restored by the Romans, was the scene of

the successive usurpations of Carausius (286) and Allectus (293), and of the defeat in battle of the last named. During the latter part of the Roman occupation it was Christianized. The fact that all the churches in Thames Street, the oldest part of the city, were dedicated to the Apostles and not to later saints, suggests that they occupied the sites of early Christian churches. In 314 Restitutus, Bishop of London, was present at the Council of Arles, and legend purports to have preserved the names of several of his predecessors and successors (Geoffrey of Monmouth), a claim which the modern historian, Dr. Stubbs (Episcopal Succession), treats with respect.

When the Saxons drove out the Romans and Britons during the fifth century, London was one of the few places which preserved a continuous existence. Probably it had fallen into the hands of the East Saxons before 571 (Lethaby, op. cit. inf., 29–31). In 604 St. Mellitus was sent by St. Augustine to be the first Bishop of London of the restored hierarchy, and with him begins the line of bishops that lasted nearly a thousand years (see list of bishops below). In the time of St. Mellitus the cathedral church of St. Paul and the abbey church of St. Peter at Westminster were founded. But little is known of London during early Saxon times. It suffered much from fires and much from the Danes, being sacked by the latter in 839 and again in 895. Under Alfred however the Londoners defeated the Danes and enjoyed a period of prosperous tranquillity, so that by the time of Athelstan, his grandson, London required as many as eight moneyers, to produce the necessary coinage. But in the eleventh century the Danes again harassed it and it suffered much in the struggle between Canute and Edmund Ironside, though it retained its wealth, as during the reign of Canute one-seventh of his entire revenue came from London. From this time it disputed with Winchester the priority among English cities. St. Edward the Confessor during his reign (1042–1066) resided chiefly at Westminster where he rebuilt Westminster Abbey, in which his relics are still enshrined. In this minster the coronation of all English sovereigns takes place, and it is the national burying place for great men, statesmen and warriors lying in the north transept, "Poets' corner" occupying the south transept, while nearly thirty kings and queens rest in the choir and side chapels.

London under the Normans.—After the Battle of Hastings the citizens of London, after an indecisive engagement with the troops of William the Conqueror in Southwark, submitted to him at Berkhamstead (Herts), and he was crowned in Westminster Abbey. In a charter of four and a half lines addressed to the bishop, the portreeve, and the burgesses, he declared that: "I grant them all to be law-worthy as they were in the days of King Edward, and I grant that every child shall be his father's heir after his father's days and I will not suffer any man do you wrong." Not trusting the citizens, however, William built the White Tower, the keep of the Tower of London, to overawe them, and also Baynard's Castle at the western extremity of the city. London at this time consisted of a collection of low wooden houses thatched with reeds or straw, thus affording combustible material for the numerous and destructive fires which frequently broke out, as in 1087 when the greater part of the city, including St. Paul's, was burnt. Bishop Maurice immediately began a new cathedral which was one of the largest churches in Europe being 600 feet long. It contained the shrine of St. Erconwald to which great crowds of pilgrims journeyed, reaching the cathedral by the thoroughfare still called Pilgrim Street.

At this time a period of building activity set in during which London was enriched with many churches, religious houses and public buildings erected in stone. William Rufus built Westminster Hall, the Tower ramparts and a new London Bridge to replace that which was washed away by the great floods in 1091. In 1100 the citizens obtained a new charter from Henry I, which was confirmed by Stephen in 1135. In Henry's reign many religious houses were built, including the Priory of St. John of Jerusalem at Clerkenwell, and the Priory of St. Bartholomew founded by Rahere in Smithfield, the noble church of which still survives. The Knights Templars established themselves in Holborn in 1118, removing to Fleet Street later in the century, where the Temple church (consecrated 1185) yet remains. Another great fire broke out in 1136, destroying the city from Ludgate, then the west end of the town, to St. Paul's. The Civil War between Stephen and Matilda with which the Norman period was brought to a close marked the epoch at which London rose to the position of a capital. For unlike Winchester it did not suffer in the war, and when Matilda deprived it of its charters the citizens rose and drove her from their city.

London under the Plantagenets.—Under Henry II, who viewed the Londoners with disfavour owing to their repulse of his mother, we have our first contemporary account of London, the vivid description of Fitzstephen, monk of Canterbury, and friend and biographer of St. Thomas. He tells us of a city walled round with the White Tower on the east and Montfichet and Baynard's Castle on the west where Blackfriars now is. There are seven double gates, Aldgate, Bishopsgate, Cripplegate, Aldersgate, Newgate, Ludgate, and the Bridge. Two miles up the river lay the Royal Palace and Abbey of Westminster connected with the city by the riverside thoroughfare called the Strand. He describes the wealth and power of the citizens, and grows enthusiastic over the plenty in the markets, the Chepe—now Cheapside—Eastcheap, Billingsgate, and Dowgate. The various trades were assigned their own localities as the ancient surviving names tell us,—Milk Street, Bread Street, Wood Street, Fish Street, Poultry Street, and others. Friday Street was the market for Friday fare—dried fish. In the Chepe were the mercers, goldsmiths, armourers, glovers, and many others. He lingers with delight on the sports of the young citizens, hunting in Middlesex Forest, wrestling, leaping, and playing at ball; and in winter skating and sliding on frozen Moorfields. He describes the beautiful garden and houses occupied by the prelates and barons when they were summoned to great councils by the king. Above all he bears witness to the orderly government and careful social observance practised. "I do not think that there is any city with more commendable customs of church attendance, honour to God's ordinances, keeping sacred festivals, almsgiving, hospitality, confirming, betrothals, contracting marriages, celebration of nuptials, preparing feasts, cheering the guests, and also in care for funeral and the interment of the dead. The only pest of London are the immoderate drinking of fools and the frequency of fires" ("Descriptio nobilissimæ civitatis Londiniæ" in preface to "Vita St. Thomæ").

The city then contained thirteen larger conventual churches and one hundred and twenty-six parish churches. In 1176 Peter of Colechurch, a priest, began the rebuilding of London Bridge with stone. It took thirty-three years to build and lasted for seven hundred years. At this time the city was governed by a portreeve, two sheriffs, and the aldermen of the various wards. In 1189 Henry Fitz-alwyne became the first Mayor of London under the title of "bailiff" and he held the office till 1212. During his tenure of office the citizens obtained from King John a charter empowering them to elect a lord mayor annually. They had previously obtained from Richard I jurisdiction over and conservancy of the Thames. In 1189 the court of aldermen decreed that in future houses should be built of stone instead of wood so as to check the disastrous fires, but wooden houses continued to be built,

though by this time they were plastered and whitewashed. During the thirteenth century the conventual establishments were increased by the coming of the friars, who unlike the Benedictines and Augustinians, preferred to live in the midst of cities. The Dominicans established themselves in Holborn (1221), and in the district still bearing their popular name, Blackfriars (1276), on which occasion the city boundaries were enlarged so as to include their property. The Franciscans (Grey friars) settled in Farringdon Without in 1224; the Carmelites (White Friars) near Fleet Street (1241); the Austin friars in Broad Street Ward (1253); the Crutched friars (1298). The same period witnessed the rebuilding of Westminster Abbey, begun by Henry III in 1245 and finished in 1295, and of St. Paul's where a new Gothic choir was begun in 1240, and other additions including a tower were made till in 1315 the cathedral was complete. Another noteworthy church of this period was St. Saviour's, Southwark (1250). In 1285 the citizens were deprived by Edward I of their right of electing the lord mayor and they did not regain it till 1297. In 1290 the Jews, who since the time of William the Conqueror had lived in what is still called Old Jewry, were expelled from England.

The fourteenth century was signalized by the great plague of 1349 which carried off one-half of the entire population of England. Close to the spot where many of the victims were buried Sir Walter Manny built the Charterhouse in 1371. The remains of this Carthusian house are the only extensive monastic buildings of medieval London which have survived the Reformation and the Great Fire. In 1381 the peace of London was disturbed by Wat Tyler's rebellion when much damage was done in the city till the citizens arrayed themselves in arms against the rebels and for the defence of the king. The close of the century witnessed the first mayoralty of Sir Richard Whittington, the popular hero of London and a munificent benefactor to the city. He filled the office three times (1397, 1406 and 1419) and built Newgate, Christ's Hospital and a considerable part of St. Bartholomew's hospital as well as the chapel and library at the Guildhall. Contemporary with him was one of London's greatest sons, Geoffrey Chaucer, who died at Westminster (1400). The fifteenth century witnessed little development in London. Repeated attacks of plague, especially that in 1407, checked the growth of the population. In 1411 the Guildhall was rebuilt, and during the century the walls and gates were strengthened. That this was a wise precaution in a disturbed age is shown by the failure of the attack on London during the Wars of the Roses when Thomas Neville assaulted each gate in succession and was repulsed at every one. In 1473 Caxton set up the first English printing press at Westminster, and was soon followed by Wynkyn de Worde, Pynson, and other great printers. The usurpation of Richard III and the murder of Edward V and his brother in the Tower (1483) were the last events in the history of London under the Plantagenets.

London under the Tudors.—The opening of this period was marked by repeated outbreaks of the "sweating sickness" which was so common in England that it was known as the *Sudor Anglicanus*. This first appeared in 1485 and broke out again in 1506, 1517, 1528, and 1551, carrying off thousands at each visitation; while in 1500 thirty thousand Londoners fell victims to the plague. Nevertheless the city continued to prosper under the firm Tudor rule, and frequent royal pageants were seen in its streets. Henry VII added to Westminster Abbey the finest building in the Perpendicular Style in England. His chapel was begun in 1502 and finished in 1517. In 1512 the royal palace at Westminster was burnt, and Henry VIII was left without a London residence until in 1529 he took possession of Wolsey's palace, York Place, and renamed it Whitehall. In 1530 he began to build St. James's Palace.

And now a great change was in store for London, though it came about little by little. In 1534 Henry obtained the schismatical Act of Parliament abolishing the authority of the pope, and in the following year the Act of Supremacy gave him the title "Supreme Head of the Church in England." London was reddened with the blood of martyrs; the Carthusians of the London Charterhouse, Blessed John Fisher and Blessed Thomas More suffered in the summer of 1535. Others followed in succeeding years. In 1536 the smaller religious houses were suppressed; in 1539 the greater monasteries fell. The Benedictine Abbeys of Westminster and Bermondsey; the Cistercians of St. Mary Graces; the Augustinians of the Priories of St. Bartholomew, Smithfield, Holy Trinity, Aldgate, and



THE TOWER OF LONDON
Copper engraving by Wenzel Hollar (1607–1677)

St. Mary Overy, Southwark; the convents at Clerkenwell, Holywell, St. Helen's Bishopsgate, Kilburn, and Stratford, and all the houses of the friars were seized by the king and the religious were dispersed. On Henry's death (1547) things went from bad to worse. Protector Somerset and the Reformation party were in the ascendant, the substitution of English for Latin was ordered in all the churches, and crucifixes and images were pulled down. All property belonging to colleges and chantries was seized for royal uses, and even the great city guilds, which held lands for the purposes of providing stipends for priests, obits, and lights, had to redeem such lands at a total cost of £20,000, and to apply the rents arising therefrom to other charitable purposes.

The Catholic life of London thus received blow after blow. There can be little doubt moreover that a considerable section of the populace was in sympathy with the Reformers, a fact which was largely due to the frequent communication between London and the Continent. The brief Catholic revival under Mary met with considerable opposition in London, and comparatively little had been done in the way of restoration when the accession of Elizabeth, in 1558, led to the complete overthrow of the Catholic religion. From the feast of St. John Baptist on 24 June, 1559 the Mass was forbidden and the Holy Sacrifice ceased to be offered in London churches; St. Paul's cathedral under the energetic influence of Bishop Bonner being one of the last where Mass was said. The bishop himself and many of his clergy were imprisoned and after the excommunication of Elizabeth, in 1570, the martyrdoms began again, reaching their height in point of numbers in 1588, the year of the Spanish Armada. From this time forward London became a Protestant city and the history of the dwindling number of Catholics will be described later.

It is at this time that the first maps of London were produced. Anthony van den Wyngaerde produced his panorama between 1543 and 1550. Probably the first actual map is that of Hoefnagel, sometimes known as Braun and Hogenberg's map from the work in which it appeared. It is dated 1572. Others give priority to the undated map, attributed to Agas, which must have been made between 1570 and 1600. The city at this time was at the height of its prosperity. The brilliant Court of Elizabeth attracted men of action and men of letters, so that there never was a time when London held more distinguished Englishmen. Theatres now began to be built, though always outside the city boundaries: the "Theatre" and the "Curtain" at Shoreditch; the "Globe", "Rose" and "Hope" on the Bankside. There was also a theatre at Blackfriars. In 1566 the Royal Exchange was founded by Sir Thomas Gresham, receiving its name from Elizabeth in 1571. Attempts were now made to restrict the growth of London, but in vain, for its ever-increasing material prosperity made it a centre which drew men from all sides. Moorfields was drained and laid out as a pleasure-ground. The wealthier citizens began to build country houses, while courtiers built mansions in the neighbourhoods of Westminster, Whitehall, The Strand, and Lincoln's Inn Fields. This extension of the city led to the beginnings of a regular water-supply, the water being conveyed from the Thames in leaden pipes. The river itself was then the great highway of London, the streets being unmade and often foul and muddy. Drainage and refuse alike poured into the river and the question of a fresh water supply became an urgent one, especially in view of the rapid growth of London. To meet the want, Sir Hugh Myddleton devised and executed a wise scheme by which he provided London with a canal which brought water from Hertfordshire. This was completed in 1613. The population of London in the last years of Elizabeth was estimated at 145,000.

London under the Stuarts.—Between 1603 and 1714 a very great change came over London, for during this period the centre of social life slowly passed from the City to the west end of the town, leaving the City as the centre of municipal and commercial life only. The suburbs grew until they became a vast town encircling this centre, and many times larger and more populous. Little by little the old walls were pulled down and many of the open spaces were covered with a network of streets many houses in which were now built of brick. Pavements for foot-passengers were also introduced. During the Civil War, London was the strength and mainstay of the Parliamentarians, and new fortifications consisting chiefly of earthworks were necessary. The execution of Charles I, which took place at the banqueting hall of the royal palace of Whitehall, in presence of vast crowds of Londoners, was a memorable event in London history. It was followed by the Commonwealth, during which Jews were allowed by Cromwell to return to London, and in 1660 by the Restoration when the separation between the fashionable court life of the West End and the commercial life of the City was completed. In 1664 London was stricken by the Great Plague, last and worst of the pestilences, which raged with increasing violence throughout the following year. The number of victims is not known for certain. Nearly 70,000 deaths from plague were actually registered, but in this time of horror the registers could not be efficiently kept, and it is probable that at least 100,000 persons perished. A year after the plague had ceased, in 1666, the Great Fire occurred when for three days the whole city was in flames. It is not easy to overestimate the damage caused by this conflagration in which almost all the remains of medieval London were destroyed. The great Gothic cathedral and eighty-six of the old Catholic churches perished, together with the palaces and mansions of the City and the dwellings of the citizens. One good result ensued: the seeds of the plague were destroyed and the old insanitary streets were no more. In rebuilding the City a great opportunity was lost. For Wren's noble plan was not adopted and the old lines of streets were adhered to, though the new houses were all of brick. Owing to this decision, many of the ancient topographical and historical associations have been preserved, it is true, but at the cost of both appearance and convenience.

In 1675 Wren began the rebuilding of St. Paul's which was not finally completed till 1711. Built in the classical style its beauty lies in its proportions and in the noble and massive simplicity of the great dome which lifts the cross 404 feet above the pavements of London. In it lie buried Nelson, Wellington, and others chiefly of military and naval renown, though many famous painters and musicians are also interred there. Besides this masterpiece Wren designed thirty-five of the new City churches all distinguished by their fine steeples or towers and the harmonious proportions of their interiors, enriched as they are also by the noble carving of Grinling Gibbons. In 1671 the Monument was erected to commemorate the fire; it is a noble column 202 feet high, originally disfigured by an inscription explaining that the fire was "begun and carried on by the treachery and malice" of the Catholics, a calumny which was deservedly pilloried in Pope's lines:—

"Where London's column, pointing to the skies,
Like a tall bully lifts its head, and lies."

The offensive inscription was removed during the reign of James II, but having been replaced after the Revolution was finally obliterated in 1831, consequent on the passing of the Catholic Emancipation Act of 1829. By the time of the Revolution London was acknowledged as the greatest capital in Europe and boasted half a million inhabitants. In 1694 the Bank of England was founded, and in 1698 the old palace of Whitehall was burnt down. The rebuilding of London was still proceeding when the century drew to a close.

London in the Eighteenth Century.—London under the Hanoverian kings lost the beauty it formerly had and became a vast collection of houses, plain but comfortable, a condition from which it is only now successfully emerging. There was a great extension of building in the West end and in the neighbourhoods of Bloomsbury, Marylebone, and May Fair, but unfortunately the architecture of the period was heavy and tasteless. At this time many hospitals were founded or rebuilt to meet the wants of the increasing numbers of the poor. Among these were Westminster Hospital (founded 1719), Guy's (1725), St. Bartholomew's (rebuilt 1730–1733), St. Thomas's (1732), the London Hospital (instituted 1741), and the Middlesex Hospital (1745). Besides these, that noble charity the Found-

Old St. Paul's Cathedral

ling Hospital, was instituted in 1738 and was moved to the present building in 1754.

Till this time London had only one bridge, but in 1738 Westminster Bridge was begun and in 1750 it was opened. Blackfriars Bridge followed in 1769. In 1758 the houses on London Bridge had been demolished and shortly after, five of the old city Gates, Moorgate, Aldersgate, Aldgate, Cripplegate, and Ludgate, were pulled down. The Westminster Paving Act, passed in 1762, introduced many improvements in the thoroughfares; pavements were laid, and obstructions removed from the streets. About this time people commenced to place their names on their doors and the system of numbering houses began. There was, however, indescribable squalor and filth in many parts of the town, as may be seen in the pictures of Hogarth, and the moral corruption of the people was indescribable. The term "Rookery" was by no means unapt. The city had many troubles to encounter during the latter part of the century, such as the Silk-weavers riots (1765); the quarrel with the Court and Parliament about the election of John Wilkes (1768), and the terrible Gordon Riots (1780) [q. v.] which were the outcome of the first Catholic Relief Act (1778). During the same period newspapers began to appear, several of which still exist: the "Morning Post" (1772), "Times" (1788), "Observer" (1791), "Morning Advertiser" (1794), and "Globe" (1803). This century also witnessed the rise of the British Museum (1753), the Royal Academy (1768), and the Royal Institution (1799).

London in the Nineteenth Century.—In 1801 the first census was taken and showed that the total population of London was 900,000 and of the city, 78,000. As the population in 1901 was returned as $4\frac{1}{4}$ millions it will be seen how rapid has been the growth of London during the past hundred years. Another fact illustrating this is that during the period 1879–1909 more than 1500 miles of new streets were built. It is clearly impossible within these limits to give any but the most salient facts. In 1801 the first attempts at steam navigation were made on the Thames. The London docks were begun four years later. They cover an area of 120 acres and cost four million pounds. In 1806 three great funerals took place in London, Nelson being buried in St. Paul's, Pitt and Fox in the Abbey. In 1807 gas was first used to light the public streets, and five years later a charter was granted to the Gas Light and Coke Company, the oldest of the lighting companies. Once more there was activity in bridge building; Old Vauxhall Bridge was opened in 1811, Waterloo Bridge in 1817, Southwark Bridge in 1819, and new London Bridge, a little farther west than its predecessor, was begun in 1825 and finished in 1831. The bridges at Westminster and Blackfriars have since been rebuilt, and the magnificent Tower-Bridge was opened in 1894, so that the seven chief London bridges are of nineteenth-century construction. Among the new buildings of this period were the Mint (1811), Regent Street (1813), the British Museum (1823), General Post Office (1824), while others were necessitated by the fires which destroyed the Old Houses of Parliament in 1834 and the Royal

Exchange in 1838. The new Houses of Parliament, designed by Barry with much assistance from the Catholic architect Pugin, were begun in 1840, the House of Lords being opened in 1847, the House of Commons in 1852.

In the great revolutionary year of 1848 London was threatened by the Chartists, and extensive preparations were made for defence, but the movement came to nothing. Two great international exhibitions took place in the years 1851 and 1862 with useful results to the commerce of the capital. This was further helped by the development of the railways, which brought about further alterations in London and necessitated the erection of the great terminal railway stations: Euston, L. & N.W.R.; King's Cross, G.N.R.; St. Pancras, M.R.; Paddington, G.W.R.; Marylebone, G.C.R.; Waterloo, L. and S.W.R.; Liverpool St., G.E.R.; Holborn, S.E. and C.R.; Cannon St., S.E. and C.R.; Charing Cross, S.E. and C.R.; Victoria, S.E. and C.R., and L.B. and S.C.R.; London Bridge, L.B. and S.C.R.; Fenchurch St., London, Tilbury and Southend Railway. One of the immediate results of the facilities offered by railways has been the desertion of the City as a residential quarter, and the growth of the suburbs in which most business people now live, going into town daily for business and returning home at night. This separation of the commercial man's home from his business has considerably altered the nature of London family life. New inventions also helped in accentuating this change. The first London telegraph from Paddington to West Drayton was opened in 1839, and a year later penny postage was introduced. In 1843 the Thames tunnel from Wapping to Rotherhithe was opened. In 1860 the volunteer movement arose under public apprehension of a French invasion. Many other additions to the buildings and thoroughfares of London were made during Queen Victoria's reign, among them being South Kensington Museum and the Public Record Office (1856); the Holborn Viaduct (1869); the Thames Embankment (1870); the Albert Hall and Burlington House (1871); the New Law Courts (1882); the Imperial Institute (1893) and the National Portrait Gallery (1896). The important changes which took place during this time in the administration of London, the formation first of the Metropolitan Board of Works and then of the London County Council, and the creation of numerous boroughs will be described later (see MODERN CIVIL ADMINISTRATION). Since the death of Queen Victoria, in 1901, London has added but little to its history, though street improvements, such as the opening of Kingsway and Aldwych and the widening of the Strand, continue to add to the convenience and beauty of the metropolis. The opening of the cathedral at Westminster in 1903 was not only noteworthy to Catholics, but has enriched London with one more impressive architectural feature, remarkable as being the only building in the Byzantine style in the capital.

Some few historical notes on matters which have not been included in this outline of London's history may here be added, as falling more conveniently under separate heads.

The City Corporation and Guilds.—In the Middle Ages the Merchant Guilds and Craft Guilds (see GUILDS, IN ENGLAND) were numerous and powerful in London. By a law of Edward III membership in a guild was a necessary condition for obtaining the freedom of the city. Thus everyone belonged to a guild, and the guilds governed the city, even electing the lord mayor. The city was divided into twenty-six wards, which still exist: Aldersgate, Aldgate, Bassishaw, Billingsgate, Bishopsgate, Bread Street, Bridge, Bridge Without, Broad Street, Candlewick, Castle Baynard, Cheap, Coleman Street, Cordwainer, Cornhill, Cripplegate, Dowgate, Farringdon Within, Farringdon Without, Langbourn, Lime Street, Portsoken, Queenhithe, Tower, Walbrook, and Vintry. Each of these wards was and is represented by an alderman originally elected annually, but since the year 1394 for life. Each alderman is, by virtue of his office, a judge and magistrate for the whole city. The aldermen were assisted by common councillors, who were first appointed in the reign of Edward I, and in 1384 they were formed into the common council. Originally each ward elected two councillors, but the number has been increased and now the wards elect various numbers from four to sixteen. In 1840 the number of common councilmen was fixed at 206. They are elected annually.

THE GUARD ROOM, LAMBETH PALACE
From a drawing in the British Museum

Though the common council has succeeded to the powers of the ancient "Folk Mote", that assembly is also represented by the Court of Common Hall, composed of the lord mayor, four aldermen and the liverymen of the city guilds. This body formerly elected the sheriffs of London and Middlesex, but since 1888 the election of the sheriff of Middlesex has been vested in the London County Council, and the Corporation elects two sheriffs of London. The Court of Common Hall also annually elects two aldermen who have served as sheriffs from whom the Court of Aldermen chooses the lord mayor for the coming year. Thus even now some power remains vested in the members of the guilds or, as they are now called, City Companies. Twenty-six of these companies still survive. They have but little connection with the crafts or trades whose names they bear, but they meet for social and ceremonial purposes, and for the administration of their charities, for many of them are very wealthy and contribute largely to benevolent objects, technical instruction and the like. Twelve of these guilds are known as the Greater Companies. They are:—Goldsmiths (founded in 1327), Skinners (1327), Grocers (1345), Vintners (1363), Fishmongers (1363), Drapers (1364), Mercers (1393), Haberdashers (1448), Ironmongers (1464), Merchant Taylors (1466), Clothworkers (1480), and Salters (1530). Other important companies are Saddlers (1364), Cordwainers (1410), Armourers (1452), Barbers (1462), Stationers (1556), and Apothecaries (1615). Of these the Mercers, the first in order of civic precedence, have an income of £111,000 a year, and fifteen of the companies have over £10,000 a year.

The city meetings are held in the Guildhall (erected 1411, rebuilt 1789, with a Gothic façade added in 1867). It contains the great hall used for banquets and other ceremonial occasions, the common council chamber and some courts of justice. The official residence of the lord mayor, known as the Mansion House, was built in 1740. The chief civic officials are the recorder (first appointed in 1298), the chamberlain or treasurer, the town clerk, and the common serjeant. The jurisdiction and administration of the corporation is restricted to the ancient limits of the City of London which cover about one square mile. As London grew beyond these in the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries, the corporation made no effort to extend its activites. So greater London has now its own

Bastion of the City Wall, St. Giles's, Cripplegate
From a drawing in the British Museum

government, and the "City of London" is a city within a city, retaining its autonomy, but in no way controlling the rest of the metropolis. The arms of the city are argent, a cross gules charged on the first quarter, with a sword erect gules.

The Trained-bands of London.—The lord mayors as heads of the corporation from the earliest days of their office exercised military command, and the corporation has always been ready to contribute grants of ships, men and money in moments of national emergency. The trained-bands formed for the defence of the city were originally divided into six regiments consisting of eight companies each. These regiments known as the Blue, Yellow, Green, Orange, White, and Red regiments, included at their full strength ten thousand men. From them emanated five regiments which hold the privilege of marching through the city with "the pomp of war", colours flying and bayonets fixed. These were 3rd Battalion Grenadier Guards, 3rd East Kent (Buffs), Royal Marines, Royal West London Militia, and Royal East London Militia. The two last named were united in 1820 as the Royal London Militia which about 1880 was made the 4th Battalion Royal Fusiliers.

II. Ancient Catholic Diocese.—The consecration of St. Mellitus as Bishop of London by St. Augustine in 604 has already been mentioned. Venerable Bede adds that "when this province received the word of truth by the preaching of Mellitus, King Ethelbert built the church of St. Paul in the city of London where he and his successors should have their episcopal seat" (H. E., II, iii). Unfortunately we do not know whether this cathedral was built on the site of the ancient church in which the Romano-British bishops of London had previously had their seat. Of those bishops nothing is known but the list of names already referred to. Theanus, Eluanus, Cadar, Obinus, Conanus, Palladius, Stephanus, Iltutus, Theodwinus, Theodredus, and Hilarius are said by vague tradition to have been predecessors of Restitutus who attended the Council of Arles in 314, while he, it is said, was succeeded by Guitelinus, Fastidius, Wodinus, and Theonus. A century and a half had elapsed between the flight of the last British bishop and the coming of Mellitus, and after his death nearly half a century elapses before we find the name of St. Cedd (q. v.) as Bishop of the East Saxons exercising episcopal jurisdiction, though he does not seem to have been called Bishop of London. After him the line is unbroken:—

Wine, 666
St. Erkenwald, 675
Waldhere, 693
Ingwald, 705
Eggwulf, 745
Sighaeh, 772
Eadbert, 774
Eadgar, 785 or 789
Coenwalh, 789 or 791
Eadbald, 793
Heathobert, 794
Osmund, 802
Æthilnoth, 811
Coelberht, 824
Deorwulf, 860
Swithwulf, 861
Heahstan, 898
Wulfsige, 898
Theodred, 926
Byrrthelm, 953
St. Dunstan, 958
Ælstan, 961
Wulfstan, 996
Ælfhun, 1004
Ælfwig, 1014
Ælfward, 1035
Robert, 1044
William the Norman, 1051
Hugh de Orivalle, 1075
Maurice, 1085
Richard de Belmeis I, 1108
Gilbert the Universal, 1128
vacancy, 1135
Robert de Sigillo, 1141
Richard de Belmeis II, 1152
Gilbert Foliot, 1163
Richard de Ely (Fitzneale), 1189
William de S. Maria, 1198
Eustace de Fauconberg, 1221
Roger Niger, 1229
Fulk Basset, 1242
Henry de Wingham, 1259
Henry de Sandwich, 1263
John de Chishul, 1274
Richard de Gravesend, 1280
Ralph de Baldock, 1306
Gilbert de Segrave, 1313
Richard de Newport, 1317
Stephen de Gravesend, 1319
Richard de Bentworth, 1338
Ralph de Stratford, 1340
Michael de Northburg, 1354
Simon de Sudbury, 1362
William Courtenay, 1375
Robert Braybrooke, 1381
Roger Walden, 1405
Nicholas Bubbewich, 1406
Richard Clifford, 1407
John Kempe, 1422
William Grey, 1426
Robert Fitzhugh, 1431
Robert Gilbert, 1436
Thomas Kempe, 1450
Richard Hill, 1489
Thomas Savage, 1496
William Wareham, 1501
William Barnes, 1504
Richard Fitz James, 1506
Cuthbert Tunstall, 1522
John Stokesley, 1530
Edmund Bonner, 1539 schismatical
Nicholas Ridley, 1550 schismatical
Edmund Bonner, 1553, with whose death on 5 Sept., 1569, the line of Catholic bishops of London ended.

Of this long list two stand out as canonized saints, St. Erkenwald (14 Nov.), whose shrine was the centre of devotion in the cathedral, and St. Dunstan (19 May). Another, Roger Niger, was popularly venerated as a saint. Six of the bishops became archbishops of Canterbury; St. Dunstan, Robert of Jumièges, Simon de Sudbury, Courtenay, John Kempe, and Wareham. The Saxon cathedral was burnt in 962 and rebuilt to be destroyed again in the fire of 1087. Bishop Maurice then erected a great Norman cathedral, served like its predecessors by secular canons. By the end of the twelfth century there were 30 endowed prebends and the chapter held 24,000 acres of land as its corporate property. The Norman nave was again rebuilt after the fire of 1136. Here it was that John resigned his kingdom to the pope and received it back from Pandulph as a vassal. In St. Paul's, too, the

nobles offered the kingdom to Louis the Dauphin in 1216. In 1232 the Council of St. Paul's was held, when Otho, the papal legate, published the Constitutions which formed so important a part of English ecclesiastical law until the Reformation. During this time the new choir was being built and this was consecrated in 1240 in the presence of King Henry III, St. Edmund, Archbishop of Canterbury, and Cardinal Otho the Legate. The cathedral was completed early in the fourteenth century by the erection of a very high steeple surmounted by a cross containing relics of the saints. In 1262 a long-standing dispute between the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Chapter of St. Paul's concerning jurisdiction *sede vacante* was settled, the agreement being that the archbishop should appoint one out of certain canons presented by the chapter to rule the diocese till the election of the new bishop. In the fourteenth century Bishop Braybrooke vainly endeavoured to suppress the abuse by which the nave of St. Paul's was used as a market and common resort for business and even for amusements. Abundant references in English literature show that this evil practice continued till the destruction of the cathedral in 1666.

Up to the early years of the fifteenth century St. Paul's had preserved its own liturgical use, known as *Usus Sancti Pauli*, but on 15 Oct., 1414, the Sarum Rite, then commonly used through the greater part of England, was substituted for it, and remained in use till the Reformation.



London Bridge and the Tower
From a MS. in the British Museum

The bishop presided at the greater festivals, the dean on ordinary days. The dean with the precentor, the treasurer, the chancellor, and the prebendaries formed the chapter. Next came the twelve petty canons and six vicars choral, while there were fifty chantry priests attached to the cathedral. The diocese, divided into the four archdeaconries of London, Essex, Middlesex, and Colchester, included the counties of Middlesex, Essex, and part of Hertfordshire. The foundation of St. Paul's School by Dean Colet, in 1512, was the only other important event concerning the cathedral church of London until the reign of Henry VIII. When the religious troubles began none of the cathedral clergy made any stand against the king. In August, 1538, the Great Rood and the statue of Our Lady of Grace were removed; in 1547 all the altars were demolished and the church plate and vestments were sold by the Protestant Dean May. Under Mary, Bishop Bonner was restored to his see and the Mass was again celebrated till the first year of Elizabeth. With the imprisonment of the Bishop and the deprivation of the London clergy who remained faithful to the Holy See the history of London as a Catholic diocese closes.

III. London Catholics after the Reformation.—For the first few years of Elizabeth's reign the existing clergy, who became known as "Marian" priests, administered to the needs of the Catholics, saying Mass and giving the sacraments in secret. When they began to die out their numbers were reinforced by the "seminary priests" sent from the college founded by Cardinal Allen at Douai (1568), from the English College at Rome and from later foundations at Valladolid, Seville, Lisbon, and elsewhere. Under Elizabeth more than eighty priests and laymen went to martyrdom in London alone, and a far larger number perished in the various prisons. After the death of Bishop Bonner as a prisoner in 1569 there was no episcopal government, and the priests did as best they could, not only in London but throughout England. In 1598 the Holy See appointed an archpriest, George Blackwell, with jurisdiction over all England. He was succeeded in turn by George Birkhead (1608–1614) and William Harrison (1615–1621). During this period a fierce controversy divided English Catholics, some desiring and others opposing the appointment of a bishop as vicar Apostolic. The pope decided this in 1623 by appointing Dr. William Bishop (q. v.) as vicar Apostolic of England. In that same year there occurred in London the "Fatal Vespers", when a large body of Catholics and others, who were assembled at the French Embassy to hear a sermon by Father Drury, S.J., were precipitated from the upper floor to the ground, and very many of them killed. About the same time an apostate named Gee published a pamphlet, "The Foot out of the Snare", in which he gave a list of 263 priests then secretly resident in London. As there were probably others he knew nothing of, the number of Catholics must still have been very considerable, though we have no means of estimating their numbers at this period.

In 1624 Dr. Bishop died and was succeeded by Dr. Richard Smith, Bishop of Chalcedon, but his position became so difficult that in 1631 he withdrew to Paris, where he lived till his death in 1655. From that time till the accession of James II no vicar Apostolic was appointed and jurisdiction continued to be exercised by the chapter, a body appointed by Dr. Bishop and which was chosen from the most experienced priests from all parts of England. The chapter held deliberative assemblies from time to time in London. In the reign of Charles I martyrdoms had ceased altogether in London, though after the king's departure they again commenced and fourteen priests were executed then and under the Commonwealth. The Restoration brought another respite, but the Titus Oates Plot of 1678 caused a fresh outbreak of persecution and fourteen more priests and

laymen were martyred at Tyburn or Tower Hill, including Ven. William Howard, Viscount Stafford, and Ven. Oliver Plunket, Archbishop of Armagh, who was the last martyr to suffer in London (1 July, 1681). The accession of James II raised new hopes among the Catholics of the metropolis and the presence of a papal envoy, Mgr d'Adda, and the public attendance of the king and queen at Mass were evident signs of toleration. Chapels and schools were opened and Catholic writers and printers readily seized the opportunity of producing devotional and controversial works in increased numbers. Once more the Holy See appointed a vicar Apostolic of England, Bishop John Leyburn (q. v.), who was consecrated 9 Sept., 1685.

Two years later the jurisdiction was divided between him and Bonaventure Giffard, but almost immediately a fresh arrangement was made and on 30 Jan., 1688, Pope Innocent XI created four vicariates, London, Midland, Northern and Western. Bishop Leyburn became the first vicar Apostolic of the London District, which included the counties of Kent, Middlesex, Essex, Surrey, Sussex, Hants, Berks, Bedford, Bucks, and Hertford, and the islands of Wight, Jersey, and Guernsey; while in process of time they acquired jurisdiction over all British possessions in North America, of which Maryland and Pennsylvania and some of the West Indian islands contained most Catholics. Unfortunately the Revolution in the same year put a sudden and complete end to the short-lived hopes of Catholics. Chapels and schools were closed, one chapel and a printing-press were wrecked by the mob, and Catholics had to withdraw once again into concealment. A penal system was now devised to crush Catholicism without bloodshed by civil and political disabilities. With this aim fresh persecuting statutes were passed under William and Mary, under which common informers were entitled to a reward for procuring convictions, a provision which was a fruitful source of trouble for nearly a century to come. One of these laws (I William & Mary, c. 9, s. 2) required all Catholics, with certain exceptions, to take the oath of allegiance, which was so phrased as to be unlawful in conscience, or in default to be convicted of recusancy. This act, however, was not very rigorously enforced, but the penal code as a whole weighed heavily on Catholics, especially after the abortive Stuart rising in 1745.

The vicars Apostolic of the London District during the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries were:—

John Leyburn	1688–1702
Bonaventure Giffard	1703–1734
Benjamin Petre	1734–1758
Richard Challoner	1758–1781
James Talbot	1781–1790
John Douglass	1790–1812
William Poynter	1812–1827
James Yorke Bramston	1827–1836
Thomas Griffiths	1836–1847
(Nicholas Wiseman, pro-vicar-Apostolic	1847–1848)
Thomas Walsh	1848 1849
Nicholas Wiseman	1849–1850,

when he became first Archbishop of Westminster.

The chief events concerning London Catholics during the eighteenth century were the long episcopate of the Venerable Bishop Challoner (q. v.); the petty persecution carried on by common informers (1767–1778); the First Catholic Relief Act (1778), and the Gordon Riots which broke out in consequence thereof (1780); the Second Catholic Relief Act (1791); the dissensions arising from the action of the Catholic Committee, and the influx of French *émigré* clergy and laity during the French Revolution. Chapels and schools now began to be opened without concealment. The refugees from Douai went to Old Hall, in Hertfordshire, where a small school had secretly existed since 1769, and there Bishop Douglass established St. Edmund's College as the place of education for the clergy of the London District. His successor opened the large church at Moorfields, which long served as the Pro-cathedral of London (1820–1865). In 1829 the Catholic Emancipation Act removed from Catholics nearly all their remaining restrictions and since then they have taken their places in Parliament, on the judicial bench, and at the bar. Among ministers of the Crown there have been Sir Charles Russell (afterwards Lord Russell of Killowen), Attorney General (1892–1894), Mr. Henry Matthews, now Lord Llandaff, Home Secretary (1885–1892), the Duke of Norfolk, Postmaster General (1885–1900), and the

Westminster Abbey (West Front) and St. Margaret's

Marquess of Ripon, Viceroy of India (1880–1884), First Lord of Admiralty (1886), Secretary for the Colonies (1892–1895), Lord Privy Seal (1905–1908). In the High Court of Justice there have been five Catholic judges:—Sir William Shee (1863–1868), Sir James Mathew (1881–1906), Sir John Day (1882–1901), Lord Russell of Killowen, Lord Chief Justice of of England (1895–1900), and Sir Joseph Walton (1901). Two Catholics, father and son, have attained the position of Lord Mayor of London, Sir Stuart Knill (1892–1893) and Sir John Knill (1909–1910). Since the Emancipation Act there has been an extraordinary development of Catholic life in every direction, greatly helped by two movements, the large Irish immigration in 1847 and the conversions resulting from the Oxford Movement. The increase in numbers is shown by the episcopal reports to Propaganda previous to the restoration of the hierarchy.

In 1840 Pope Gregory XVI redistributed England into eight vicariates, on which occasion the London District lost Bedfordshire and Buckinghamshire. Ten years later Pope Pius IX restored the hierarchy; the London District ceased to exist and its place was taken by the new Dioceses of Westminster and South-

wark, the former including all London north of the Thames and the counties of Middlesex, Essex, and

Date	Total Catholics in the London District	Catholics in London	Priests	Source
1746	25,000	.....	60	Bp. Petre's Report.
1773	24,450	20,000	120	Bp. Challoner's ,,
1814	68,776	49,800	104	Bp. Poynter's ,,
1837	157,314	146,068	126	Bp. Griffiths's ,,

Hertford, the latter embracing London south of the Thames and the rest of the old vicariate. The progress of Catholicism since 1850 will be found under

The Guildhall, London

Westminster and Southwark. The prelates having jurisdiction over London since that date have been:—*Archbishops of Westminster:*—Cardinal Nicholas Wiseman, 1850–1865; Cardinal Henry Edward Manning, 1865–1892; Cardinal Herbert Vaughan, 1892–1903; Francis Bourne, 1903. *Bishops of Southwark:*—Thomas Grant, 1851–1870; James Danell, 1871–1881; Robert Coffin, C.SS.R., 1882–1885; John Butt, 1885–1897; Francis Bourne, 1897–1903; Peter Amigo, 1904. The following figures refer to London itself, including only the postal district:—

	No. of churches and chapels (excluding convent chapels)	No. of priests
Westminster	92	367
Southwark	64	166
Total	156	533

There are no means of ascertaining even approximately the total number of Catholics now in London, but it is estimated variously from 300,000 to 400,000. All other particulars will be found under Westminster and Southwark.

IV. Modern Civil Administration.—*Local Government.*—It has already been seen that the extent of the city of London, properly so-called, was limited by the ancient walls, and that there grew up a vast new city surrounding the ancient one and gradually absorbing all the outlying villages. Until 1855 the city itself was governed by ancient charters, and the rest of the metropolis by parochial systems under various Acts of Parliament. The Metropolis Local Management Act of 1855 created the Metropolitan Board of Works, the 45 members of which were elected by thirty-nine vestries, or district boards. Originally established for the construction of sewers, it was entrusted by later Acts with very many other duties and powers, including all street improvements, the care of parks and open spaces, and the maintenance of the fire-brigade. But this new body in no way affected the City corporation, which preserved all its original rights within the City boundaries. This state of things continued until 1889, when the Local Government Act of 1888 came into operation. This Act created an administrative county of London, which covers an area of 121 square miles. The City of London was very slightly affected by the Act and is still governed by the City corporation. For non-administrative purposes, such as quarter-sessions and justices, the City and the rest of the metropolis form two counties, known respectively as the County of the City of London and the County of London.

(a) The City of London.—The government of the City proper by the lord mayor, aldermen and common councilmen has already been described. The lord mayor is elected annually on 29 Sept. from the aldermen who have served as sheriffs. The electors are the "livery" consisting of the freemen of London. The new lord mayor is sworn into office on 8 Nov., and on the following day makes his final declaration of office before the Lord Chief Justice of England. The state procession on this occasion is popularly known as the Lord Mayor's Show. The City corporation retains within its proper limits its civil and criminal jurisdiction and full rights of local government. It returns two members to Parliament.

(b) The London County Council.—The County of London consists of twenty-eight boroughs, each of which is ruled by a mayor and corporation—Battersea; Bermondsey; Bethnal Green; Camberwell; Chelsea; Deptford; Finsbury; Fulham; Greenwich; Hackney; Hammersmith; Hampstead; Holborn; Islington; Kensington; Lambeth; Lewisham; Paddington; Poplar; St. Marylebone; St. Pancras; Shoreditch; Southwark; Stepney; Stoke Newington; Wandsworth; Westminster, City of; Woolwich. These boroughs form the local administrative authorities, and act as local sanitary authorities, are the overseers of the poor, collect the rates, are responsible for making, lighting, and regulating the streets, and providing public baths and libraries. But the central administration remains in the London County Council, consisting of 138 members, viz., a chairman, 19 aldermen, and 118 councillors. The powers of this council are very wide, including all duties formerly belonging to the Metropolitan Board of Works in connexion with drainage, parks and open spaces, fire-brigades, street improvements, tramways, artisans' dwellings, infant life protection, etc. Secondly, those transferred from the former county-justices with regard to reformatory and industrial schools, lunatic asylums, music and dancing licences, coroners, etc. Thirdly, powers as to highways, supervision of common lodging-houses and licensing of slaughter-houses. Fourthly, new powers conferred by recent Acts of Parliament as to registration of electors, public health, historic buildings and monuments, suppression of nuisances, reformatories for inebriates, and the administration of Acts such as the Shop Hours Act, Employment of Children Act, and Midwives Act. Fifthly, under the Education (Lon-

don) Act 1903, the Council became the authority for all public education in the county. Sixthly, powers connected with the raising and loaning of money and the sanctioning of loans required for all the local authorities in the county. Most of the business is done by committees and the Council meets weekly to consider their reports. Its annual expenditure is about £16,000,000, of which £5,000,000 are spent on education. The outlay is met by two main sources of supply, capital money raised by the issue of stock, and current income raised by a county rate. The rating for the year 1908–9 amounts to three shillings in the pound (15 per cent), and the assessable value of the County of London, on 6 April, 1908, was £44,332,025.

Education.—(a) London University.—This university was instituted in 1836 as an examining body for conferring degrees, and was reconstituted in 1900. Since then it has possessed an "academic" department for the organization and control of higher education, and an "external" department for continuing its former functions of examining students and conferring degrees. Its teaching is conducted (i) by the University itself; (ii) by the several "Schools of the University"; (iii) at other institutions in which there are "Recognized Teachers of the University". In 1900 University College (Gower Street), an institution founded in 1828 on undenominational principles, was made a "School of the University" in the faculties of arts, law, medicine, science, engineering, and economics, and on 1 Jan., 1907, it was transferred to the university of which it is now an integral part. The university also maintains the Physiological Laboratory at South Kensington and Goldsmiths' College at New Cross.

(b) Higher Education. — Other institutions for higher education are King's College, founded as a Church of England establishment in 1828, also a "School of the London University", in the same faculties as University College, with the addition of theology, and Gresham College, founded in 1597 by Sir Thomas Gresham, where lectures are given in divinity, law, science, music, and medicine. Professional education is afforded in connexion with various bodies; medical schools are attached to all the great hospitals; lectures in law are given at the Inns of Court and the Incorporated Law Society; music is taught at the Royal Academy of Music (founded 1822), Royal College of Music (1883), Guildhall School of Music and elsewhere; art at the Royal Academy Schools of Painting, Sculpture, and Architecture, as also at the London University.

(c) Secondary Education. — The chief London schools are St. Paul's and Westminster. The former was established by Dean Colet in 1512, and was removed about 1880 from St. Paul's church-yard to Hammersmith. The latter was endowed by Queen Elizabeth in 1560, and provides for forty king's scholars on the foundation in addition to the day boys. Christ's Hospital, the Blue Coat School, founded by Edward VI in 1533 with nearly 1200 children on the foundation, is now situated at Horsham; and the Charterhouse School, established by Sir Thomas Sutton in 1611, has been removed to Godalming, the site of the old school being now occupied by the Merchant Taylors School, a medieval foundation. Mention must also be made of the City of London School (founded 1835), University College School, King's College School, Dame Owen's School, Islington, the Mercers' Grammar School, and St. Olave's School, Southwark. Catholic schools include the college of the Brothers of Mercy at Highgate, the Benedictine School at Ealing, St. Ignatius's College, Stamford Hill, and the Sacred Heart College at Wimbledon, both conducted by the Jesuits and the Salesian school at Battersea.

(d) Elementary Education.—Until 1870, when a School Board for London was instituted, the only organizations for educating the poorer classes were the British and Foreign School Society (founded 1808) and the National Society (1811). Under the Education Act 1903, the London County Council became the authority for all public education, both secondary and elementary. The Education committee consists of thirty-eight members of the council and twelve co-opted members. The estimates for the year 1908–9 amounted to £5,437,908, of which £4,442,007 is for

The Tower Bridge, London

elementary and £995,901 for higher education. In addition to the council schools there are a large number of "provided" schools established by Catholics or by the Church of England. In 1905 there were 554,646 scholars in the council schools, 205,323 in the "provided" schools.

Civil and Criminal Jurisdiction.—The High Court of Justice for the whole of England is situate in The Strand. It includes the Appeal Court and the Chancery, King's Bench, and Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty Divisions. For the special requirements of London there is the Central Criminal Court at the Old Bailey, the Court of Quarter Sessions held at Newington and Clerkenwell, the Police Courts presided over by metropolitan police magistrates, and for civil causes of minor importance the County Courts. The City of London has its own Court of Quarter Sessions, and the Lord Mayor, sitting at the Mansion House or Guildhall, has the powers of justices in petty session of a police magistrate.

Trade and Commerce.—The position of London and its intercourse with every part of the world have combined to make it financially rather than commercially the world's metropolis. Being a market far removed from any great manufacturing centre, there is a great excess of imports over exports. The port of London in spite of some drawbacks is still the greatest port in the world in respect of the amount of shipping and goods which enter it. In 1907 the tonnage of British and foreign vessels engaged in the foreign trade entered and cleared was 11,160,367 tons entered and 8,598,979 tons cleared, as against Liverpool's record of 8,167,419 tons entered and 7,257,869 tons cleared. The total shipping entering it is about one-fifth of the total shipping of the United Kingdom; the value of imports one-third, and the value of exports one-fourth of the total value of the national imports and exports. Steps are now being taken for dock extension and a reconstitution of the port and dock authorities.

London Charities.—Even a bare enumeration of the various charitable agencies which labour for the relief of distress in London would be beyond the limits of this article. For detailed information reference should be made to the "Annual Charities Register and Digest", which is a classified register of charities in or available for the metropolis, together with a digest of information respecting the legal, voluntary, and other means for the prevention and relief of distress, and the improvement of the condition of the poor. For Catholic charities see the "Catholic Social Year Book", and the "Handbook of Catholic Charitable and Social Works", both published by the Catholic Truth Society. As, in addition to non-sectarian organizations, every religious body has its own agencies, and the public authorities are now empowered by statute to exercise responsibilities which narrow the field of charity, there is considerable overlapping. At the present moment there is a crying need for systematic co-ordination among the various charities, and could this be effectually arranged, efficiency and economy would gain alike. Turning first to statutory provision for charitable relief, this is divided among various bodies. The administration of Poor Law relief is vested in the Board of Guardians, subject to the direction and control of the Local Government Board; the Metropolitan Asylums Board is responsible for the insane, and some classes of the sick, and the London County Council has also certain duties, especially with regard to the suitable housing of the poor. The Charity Commissioners have large statutory powers over endowed charities, but much remains to be done in the direction of remodelling some of these charitable trusts on wise principles.

Turning to voluntary charities, a very important part is played by the London Charity Organisation Society, a federation of thirty-eight district committees, and a central council. Its object is to direct into the most effectual channels the forces of benevolence. All agencies and persons interested in charity in each Poor Law Union are invited to the local district committee. These committees form centres of information, and investigate and deal with cases brought before them on the twofold principle that thorough investigation should precede relief, and that relief given should be suitable and adequate. Cases to which adequate relief cannot be supplied are left to the Poor Law. The various organizations which, in co-operation with this society, or independently, relieve distress may be divided into several classes: (1) *Relief in affliction*, involving the care of the blind, deaf, dumb, cripples, lunatics, inebriates, idiots, imbeciles, the mentally defective, epileptics, and incurables. (2) *Relief in sickness*, which embraces the work of the general hospitals, special hospitals, surgical aid societies, medical and surgical homes, convalescent homes, dispensaries, and nursing institutions. (3) *Relief in permanent distress*, which includes homes for the aged and incapacitated, pensions, homes for the employed (working boys, etc.), homes for children, and day nurseries. (4) *Relief in temporary distress*, affording shelter of various kinds, relief in money, and relief in kind. (5) *Reformatory relief*, including reformatories, certified industrial schools, prisoners' aid societies, and institutions for fallen women. (6) *Miscellaneous relief*, under which head may be grouped the various emigration societies, life protection societies, training farms for the unemployed, and social and physical improvement societies.

Purely Catholic charities are very numerous. The Aged Poor Society (founded in 1708), and the Benevolent Society for the Aged and Infirm Poor (established 1761) both give pensions. At Nazareth House, Hammersmith, and the convent of the Little Sisters of the Poor at Notting Hill, there are homes for the aged poor. There are almshouses at Brook Green, Chelsea, and Ingatestone. Homes and orphanages for boys and girls are very numerous, and a great work is done by the "Crusade of Rescue and Homes for Destitute Catholic Children", which now maintains over a thousand children. The visiting and relief of the poor is chiefly in the hands of two societies, the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, and the Ladies of Charity. There are four Catholic hospitals: that of St. John and St. Elizabeth, in St. John's Wood, under the Sisters of Mercy; the French hospital, under the Servants of the Sacred Heart; the Italian hospital, under the Sisters of Charity; and the Hospital for the Dying, at Hackney, under the Irish Sisters of Charity. There is a home for epileptic children, under the Daughters of the Cross, at Much Hadham. There are industrial schools for boys at Manor Park; for girls, at Isleworth; a reformatory school for boys at Walthamstow; and the Prisoners' Aid Society visits Catholic prisoners and helps them on release. The charitable clubs for Catholics are too numerous to recapitulate.

The books written about London, its institutions, buildings, interests and many-sided life are without number. Only some of the more important and more recent works are mentioned here. The divisions of the above article are repeated and all books here named were published in London, except where otherwise stated. Ample though not exhaustive lists of books about London are given in Lowndes, *Bibliographers' Manual* (1860); Anderson, *Book of British Topography* (1881), and the *Subject Index of the London Library* (1909).

History of London.—Fitzstephen, *Description of London* (temp. Henry II): first detailed account reprinted in Stow, *Survey of London* (the first history:—1598; continued by Munday, 1618, 1633; and by Strype, 1720, 1755. New editions, 1842 and 1890); Hatton, *New View of London* (1708); Maitland, *History of London* (1 vol., 1739; 2 vols., 1756, 1760, 1769, 1775); Entick, *A History and Survey of London* (1766); Noorthouck, *A New History of London* (1773); Pennant, *London* (1st edition, 1790; frequently reprinted); Hunter, *History of London* (1811); Allen, *History and Antiquities of London, Westminster, and Southwark* (1827–1829); Knight, *London* (1841–1844; revised by Walford, 1875–1877); Cunningham, *Handbook of London: Past and Present* (2 vols., 1849); Loftie, *History of London* (1884); Wheatley, *London Past and Present* (3 vols., 1891); Besant, *London* (1892); Idem, *History of London* (1893); Idem, *Survey of London* (1902–1908); Sharpe, *Lon-*



SHRINE OF EDWARD THE CONFESSOR—WESTMINSTER ABBEY

don (1894); THORNBURY, *Old and New London* (1898); JONSON, *London Historical and Descriptive* (1906) LETHABY, *London before the Norman Conquest* (1902); BENHAM AND WELCH, *Medieval London* (1901); NICOLAS AND TYRREL, *A Chronicle of London from 1089 to 1483* (1827); RILEY, *Chronicle of the mayors and sheriffs (1188–1274)* (1863); *Annales Londinienses; Annales Paulini* (temp. Edward I and Edward II) (1882); RILEY, *Memorials of London and London Life in the thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, etc.* (1868); *Liber Albus of the City of London, fifteenth cent.* (1861); the Camden Society has included in its publications many London chronicles. *Munimenta Gildhallæ Londiniensis* in *Rolls Series* (4 vols., 1859–1862); SHARPE, *Calendar of Wills proved in the Court of Hustings 1258–1688* (1889–90); SHARPE, *Calendar of City of London Letter books from 1275* (8 vols., 1900–1908, in progress); IDEM, *Calendar of Letters from the mayor and corporation of the City of London 1350–1370* (1885); BESANT, *London in the Time of the Tudors* (1904); IDEM, *London in the Time of the Stuarts* (1903); IDEM, *London in the Eighteenth Century* (1902); GOMME, *London in the Reign of Victoria* (1898); KINGSFORD, *Chronicles of London* (1905); HARE, *Westminster* (1894); BESANT, *Westminster* (1895); IDEM, *South London* (1899); IDEM, *East London* (1901); IDEM, *Holborn and Bloomsbury* (1903); IDEM, *The Thames* (1903); BESANT AND MILTON, *Westminster* (1902); IDEM, *Strand District* (1902); LYSONS, *Environs of London* (1792–96); IDEM, *Parishes in Middlesex not included in the Environs* (1800); HOWITT, *The Northern Heights of London* (1869); THORNE, *Handbook to the Environs of London* (1876); WALFORD, *Greater London* (1901); WYLLIE, *London to the Nore* (1905); SMITH, *Antiquities of London and its Environs* (1791–1800); IDEM, *Antiquities of the City of Westminster* (1807); IDEM, *Ancient Topography of London* (1815); MALCOLM, *Londinium Redivivum* (1803–7); IDEM, *Anecdotes of the Manners and Customs of London from the Roman Invasion to the year 1700* (London, 1811); IDEM. *Anec. of the Man. and Cust. of London during the 18th Cent.* (ibid.. 1807); WILKINSON, *Londina Illustrata* (1819); CLARKE, *Architectura Eccles. Londini* (1820); THOMSON, *Chronicles of London Bridge* (1827); BRAYLEY, *Londiniana* (1829); LEIGH HUNT, *The Town* (1848); THORNBURY AND WALFORD, *Cassell's Old and New London* (1873–78); HARE, *Walks in London* (1878; 7th ed., 1901); BIRCH, *Historical charters and constitutional documents of the City of London* (1884; revised ed., 1887); HUTTON, *Literary Landmarks of London* (1892); WELCH, *History of the London Monument* [containing a bibliography of the Great Fire] (1893); BIRCH, *London on Thames in Bygone Days* (1903); BARTON, *Familiar London* (1904); NORMAN, *London Vanished and Vanishing* (1905); BLACK, *Maps of Old London* (1908); *Transactions of the London and Middlesex Archæological Society* (1860–90); London Topographical Society, *London Topographical Record* (5 vols., 1901–1908, in progress), also annual publications of old maps and surveys; DICKENS, *Dictionary of London* (1880).

ANCIENT CATHOLIC DIOCESE.—GAMS, *Series Episcoporum* (Ratisbon, 1873); BRADY, *Episcopal Succession in England etc. 1400–1875* (Rome, 1877); WHARTON, *Historia de Episcopis et Decanis Londiniensibus* (1695); ANON, *London parishes, containing the situation, antiquity and rebuilding of the churches* (1824); GODWIN, *The Churches of London* (1839); WOOD, *Ecclesiastical Antiquities of London and its Suburbs* (1874); HENNESSEY, *Novum Repertorium Ecclesiasticum Parochiale Londinense*, giving the London diocesan clergy succession from the earliest time to the year 1898 (1898); Bibliography of London Churches in *Notes and Queries*, 9th series, vol. IV. (1899); DIMOCK, *The Cathedral Church of St. Paul* (1900); BENHAM, *Old St. Paul's Cathedral* (1902); DANIELL, *London City Churches* (1907); SINCLAIR, *Memorials of St. Paul's Cathedral* (1909).

LONDON CATHOLICS AFTER THE REFORMATION.—Besides the usual works dealing with the martyrs and the persecution the following are useful:—GEE, *A Foot out of the Snare* (1624); SERGEANT, *An Account of the Chapter* (1706; reprinted 1853); DODD, *Church History* (Brussels, 1739–1742); BERINGTON, *State and Behaviour of English Catholics from the Reformation to the Year 1781* (1st ed., 1780; 2nd, 1781); IDEM, *Memoirs of Panzani* (1793); BUTLER, *Historical Memoirs of English Catholics* (2 vols., 1819; 4 vols., 1822); ANSTEY, *A Guide to the Laws of England affecting Roman Catholics* (1842); MADDEN, *The History of the Penal Laws* (1847); FLANAGAN, *History of the Catholic Church in England* (1857); MORRIS, *Troubles of our Catholic Forefathers* (3 vols., 1872–77); FOLEY, *Records of English Province S.J.*, especially vols. I and V (series XII, 1877–83); BIRT, *The Elizabethan Religious Settlement* (1907); COURSON *Condition of English Catholics under Charles II* (1899); KIRK, *Biographies of English Catholics in the Eighteenth Century* (1909); BURTON, *Life and Times of Bishop Challoner, 1691–1781* (1909); WARD, WILFRID, *The Dawn of the Catholic Revival, 1781–1803* (1909); WARD, BERNARD, *The Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman* (1897); MURPHY, *Position of the Catholic Church in England during the last two Centuries* (1892); MORRIS, *Catholic England in modern times* (1892); HARTING, *Catholic London Missions* (1903); WARD, *Catholic London a Century ago* (1905); *Catholic Record Society's Publications* (1905–1909, in progress); *The Catholic Directory* (1773 to present date).

MODERN CIVIL ADMINISTRATION.—FIRTH, *Municipal London* (1876); WEBB, *The London Programme* (1891); HAKE, *Suffering London* (1892); JAY, *A Story of Shoreditch* (1896); HUNT, *London Local Government* (1897); SHERWELL, *Life in West London* (1897); RICHARDS AND PAYNE, *London Water Supply* (1899); SEAGER, *Government of London under the London Government Act 1899* (1899); BOOTH, *Life and Labour of the People in London* (9 vols., 1889–1897); IDEM, *Summary of "Life Labour, etc.": Religious Influences* (1902); HOPKINS, *The Boroughs of the Metropolis* (1900); NÈVE, *L'administration d'une grande ville* (Louvain, 1901); PHILPOTT, *London at School* (1904); GOMME, *The Governance of London* (1907); *Whitaker's Almanack* (annual publication); *The London Manual* (annual publication).

MISCELLANEOUS. — HERBERT, *History of the Twelve Great Livery Companies of London* (1837); LARWOOD, *The Story of the London Parks* (1872); HAZLITT, *London Livery Companies* (1890); MARSHALL, *London Libraries* (1890); CRIPPS, *Position of the London Water Companies* (1892); WHITTEN, *London in Song* (1898); HUDSON, *Birds in London* (1898); MARSHALL AND MITTON, *Scenery of London* (1905); HUEFFER, *The Soul of London* (1905).

EDWIN BURTON.

London, DIOCESE OF (LONDINENSIS), in Canada, established, 21 February, 1855; see transferred to Sandwich, 2 February, 1859, transferred back to London, 3 October, 1869; comprises Middlesex, Elgin, Norfolk, Oxford, Perth, Huron, Lambion, Kent, and Essex Counties in the south-western section of Ontario, Canada. The incorporation of the city of London and its selection as the see of a new diocese in 1856 were almost contemporaneous. It then had a population of about 10,000, a fifth of whom were Catholics. As first bishop the Rev. Pierre-Adolphe Pinsonnault, a Sulpician, was chosen. He was born at Saint-Philippe, Quebec, 23 November, 1815, made his studies in Montreal and in Paris, and was ordained in the latter city in 1840. He was consecrated in Montreal, 13 May, 1856. On 2 February, 1859, he procured a pontifical Brief altering the title of the diocese to Sandwich, and authorizing the change of residence to that location. He resigned the see on 18 December, 1866, and died at Montreal, 30 January, 1883. As his successor, the Very Reverend John Walsh, V.G., Toronto, was chosen and consecrated on 10 November, 1867. Born in Mooncoin, Co. Kilkenny, Ireland, 24 May, 1830, he was ordained priest on 1 November, 1854, and spent the years previous to his elevation to the episcopate in parish work. He was promoted to the Archbishopric of Toronto (q. v.), 25 July, 1889, and died there on 31 July, 1898. In October, 1869, he transferred his residence from Sandwich to London, and on 15 November procured from Rome a decree making London once more the name of the diocese. He began the erection of a new cathedral May, 1881, and largely increased the number of churches and institutions throughout the diocese.

The third bishop was the Rev. Denis O'Connor, a Basilian, and superior of the Assumption College, Sandwich, consecrated on 19 October, 1890. He was born at Pickering, Ontario, 28 March, 1841, and ordained priest on 8 December, 1863. Like his predecessor, he was elevated to the Archbishopric of Toronto, 24 January, 1899. To fill the vacancy thus created the Rev. Fergus Patrick McEvay, Vicar-General of the Diocese of Hamilton, was named and consecrated on 6 August, 1899. Bishop McEvay was born at Lindsay, Ontario, on 8 December, 1852, and ordained priest on 9 July, 1882. Again, Toronto made a vacancy in the See of London, for Archbishop O'Connor resigned and Bishop McEvay was transferred to Toronto, and took possession on 17 June, 1908. As fifth Bishop of London, the pope appointed on 14 December, 1909, the Very Rev. Michael M. F. Fallon, provincial of the American province of the Oblates of Mary Immaculate. He was born at Kingston, Canada, 17 May, 1867, and entered the Oblate congregation at the conclusion of his course at Ottawa University. His theological studies were completed at Rome, after which he became professor and vice-rector of his Alma Mater. At the end of three years he began parish work at Ottawa continuing it at Buffalo. In 1903 he was chosen provincial of the Oblates.

The religious communities now established in the diocese are:—*men:* Basilians, Franciscans; *women:* Religious of the Sacred Heart, Sisters of the Holy Names of Jesus and Mary, Sisters of Loretto (Institute

of the Blessed Virgin Mary), Sisters of St. Joseph, Ursulines, Hospitaller Nuns of St. Joseph at Hotel Dieu, Windsor. Statistics: Priests 70 (religious 18); there are 45 churches with resident priests, and also 29 missions with churches, total number of churches 78; 1 college, 150 students; 4 academies, 470 pupils; 85 parochial schools, 11,500 pupils; 1 orphan asylum, 75 inmates; 3 hospitals. Catholic population 60,000.

COFFEY, *The City and Diocese of London, Ontario* (London, Ontario, 1885); *Catholic Record* (London), files; *Le Canada Ecclésiastique* (Montreal, 1910); *Catholic Directory* (Milwaukee, 1910).

THOMAS F. MEEHAN.

Longinus, SAINT. See LANCE, THE HOLY.

Longstreet, JAMES, soldier, convert, b. 8 January, 1821, at Edgefield, South Carolina, U. S. A.; d. at Gainesville, Georgia, 2 January, 1904. In 1831 he moved to Alabama with his parents, and was thence appointed to the U. S. Military Academy at West Point, where he graduated in 1842. For his services in the Mexican War he was brevetted major and in 1852 was commissioned captain. At the outbreak of the Civil War he resigned his commission in June, 1861, and entered the Confederate service, in which he afterwards attained the distinction of being one of its greatest fighters and of winning the unbounded confidence and affection of his soldiers. He received at once the rank of brigadier-general, and participated with distinction in the first battle of Bull Run, after which he was made a major-general in 1862. At Antietam (17 Sept., 1862) he commanded the right wing of Lee's army, and with the rank of lieutenant-general he was at the head of a corps at Gettysburg (2–3 July, 1863). In the battle of the Wilderness on 6 May, 1864, he was severely wounded, but resumed his command during the siege of Petersburg. At the close of the war he engaged in business in New Orleans, and accepted the political situation, becoming a republican in politics. President Grant appointed him surveyor of customs at New Orleans, and later he was made supervisor of internal revenue and postmaster. In 1875 he removed to Georgia, and in 1880–81 was sent as U. S. Minister to Turkey. In 1898 he was appointed U. S. railway commissioner. He left a valuable chapter of war history in "From Manasses to Appomattox" (Philadelphia, 1904). He became a Catholic in New Orleans, 7 March, 1877.

GENERAL JAMES LONGSTREET

LONGSTREET, *Longstreet and Lee at High Tide* (Gainesville, Georgia, 1904); *Dict. Am. Biog.*, s. v.; *Morning Star* files (New Orleans).

THOMAS F. MEEHAN.

Lope de Vega Carpio, FÉLIX, poet and dramatist, b. at Madrid, 1562; d. 23 Aug., 1635. With Lope de Vega begins the era of dramatic glory in Spanish literature of the Golden Age. He seems to have been an extraordinarily precocious child, whence the term "monstruo de la naturaleza", "freak of nature", which clung to him throughout his life. At the age of fourteen he wrote a play. Like Cervantes, he saw service in the Spanish navy, and even took part in the disastrous expedition of the Armada against England. While aboard of his vessel, he spent his spare time composing his poem "Angélica", a continuation of the adventures of that capricious lady already related by the Italian poet Ariosto in his "Orlando Furioso". Married by 1590 to Isabel de Urbina, he returned to the service of the Duke of Alba, with whom he had been prior to the time of the Armada. His first wife died in 1597, and then, after some amorous adventure, he contracted a second marriage, about 1600, with Juana del Guardo. By this time he had become the acknowledged arbiter of the Spanish stage, and such he remained until shortly before his death. His second wife died in 1612 or 1614, greatly saddened, doubtless, by the immorality of her husband, constantly intriguing with this or that actress. The result of one of these liaisons, that with María de Luján, was the birth of a son, Lope Félix, who bade fair to become a good poet. About 1610 Lope had made his home at Madrid. For some time before that year, he had led a wandering life, in Valencia, Toledo, Seville, etc., everywhere stimulating dramatic composition. This roving was in part due to a decree of banishment issued against him in punishment of a base libel published by him upon a certain actress and her family.

After the death of his second wife, Lope became a priest, with the express purpose of correcting the disorders of his life. Unfortunately it cannot be said that the taking of Holy orders led to improvement; his aberrations continued, and he intensified his baseness by playing the part of a poetical panderer for his patron, the Duke of Sessa. Lope was well aware of the vileness of his own behaviour, as his correspondence clearly shows; but he was too weak to reform. Retribution, however, came upon him before his end, for his heart was broken by the early death of his brilliant son Lope and the elopement of his daughter Antonia Clara with a court noble. His magnificent funeral cortège was so directed as to pass before the windows of the convent in which another daughter of his was a nun.

The fertility of Lope de Vega as an author almost surpasses belief. Practically all forms of literary composition were attempted by him. In the epic he tried his fortunes with the "Angélica", already mentioned; he repeated the experiment in "Jerusalen Conquistada", in which he sought to rival Tasso as previously he had emulated Ariosto. More successful than these attempts was the "Gatomaquia", which revives the spirit of the ancient "Battle of the Frogs and Mice", and therefore belongs to the category of the mock-heroic. The mythological prevails in five poems: "Circe", "Andromeda", "Philomela", "Orfeo", and "Proserpina". He wrote several historical poems, among them the "San Isidro Labrador", celebrating the patron saint of Madrid, and the "Dragontea", an attack on the English adventurer, Sir Francis Drake. He essayed the didactic in an *ars poetica*, or code of literary principles, which he entitled the "Arte nueva de hacer comedias". In this he reveals his acquaintance with the strict Aristotelean rules of dramatic composition, the unities, etc., but acknowledges that, in order to cater to the popular craving of his time, he disregards those classic precepts. Furthermore, we have from him a mass of sonnets, romances (lyrics in the ballad metre), odes, elegies, verse epistles, and so on, of which some are religious in their inspiration and others profane. Thus it is that in 1602 there appeared, as part of his "Rimas", some two hundred sonnets, a number of which give expression to the poet's genuine sentiments. In 1612 there was published the "Quatro Soliloquios", full of devout expressions in verse which contrast sharply with the author's mode of life. To that same year belongs the publication of his beautiful sacred pastoral, perhaps his most finished work in point of style, the "Pastores de Belén". Of this he himself said: "I have written a book, which I call the 'Shepherds of Bethlehem', in

sacred prose and verse, after the plan of the 'Arcadia.'" The last-named is his particular contribution to the output of pastoral romances, which had begun in Spain with the "Diana" of Montemayor, and had been carried on by Cervantes in his "Galatea". Like all the pastoral romances, the "Arcadia" of Lope harks back eventually to the "Arcadia" of the Neapolitan Sannazzaro, which established the fashion of combining prose and verse. The pastoral loves celebrated in the works of this category are conventional: the shepherds and shepherdesses are gentlemen and ladies of fashion masquerading. The whole genre is very artificial, and Lope's work is certainly so. The "Pastores de Belén" has in it the beautiful lullaby to the Infant Jesus, "Pues andais en las palmas"; the whole work was dedicated to his son Carlos, who soon died. Of Lope's other compositions, besides his plays, there may be mentioned the "Filomena" (1621), the "Triunfos divinos" (religious lyrics), the "Corona trágica" (1627—an epic in five cantos celebrating Mary, Queen of Scots), the "Laurel de Apolo" (1630—a rhymed review and eulogy of about three hundred poets, like Cervantes's "Viage del Parnaso", uncritical and partisan), and the "Rimas de licenciado Tomé de Burguillos" (1634). The "Filomena", the first of the works just mentioned, is in part Lope's poetic defence of himself and his methods against the attacks of a certain Torres Rámila. The defence occupies its second part; the first contains, in three cantos of octaves, the fable of Filomena. Among other compositions incorporated into the volume is the prose tale, "Las fortunas de Diana". This tale was followed later by three others: "La desdicha por la honra", "La prudente venganza", and "Guzmán el Bueno", all published in 1624, along with the poem "Circe and Ulysses". Certain "Epístolas" found in the "Filomena" give information regarding Lope's life and work, and also give utterance to an attack upon the school of Gongora.

LOPE DE VEGA

Among the prose works, besides the tales already listed, are the "Peregrino en su patria" (1604), the "Triunfo de la fe en el Japón" (1618), and the "Dorotea" (1632). The "Peregrino" is a somewhat tedious romance of adventurous travel. It is interesting, however, for the lyrics and *autos* (religious plays) contained in it, and also for the list of over two hundred of his plays which the author indicates as already composed. The "Triunfo" deals with the Xaverian missions in Japan, and is devout in tone. The "Dorotea" is a dramatic novel in form. Begun in Lope's early years, it was kept by him throughout his life, and received final embellishments in his old age. It is practically an autobiography.

The real Lope of fame, however, is the dramatist, for it was as dramatist that he dominated the whole Golden Age (sixteenth and seventeenth centuries). According to his own account, he composed 1500 *comedias*, i. e., more than 5,000,000 verses of assonance and rhyme in all the native and the borrowed Italian measures. Besides the *comedias* he wrote hundreds of *autos*, *loas* (prologues, curtain-raisers), and *entremeses* (interludes). Of the *comedias* some 500 remain, and they are made the subject of treatment in the great edition published under the auspices of the Spanish Academy by Menéndez y Pelayo. Among the convenient groupings devised by this eminent scholar are these: plays based upon matters of the Old and the New Testament; plays on lives of the saints; plays dealing with legends or devout traditions; mythological plays; plays treating of classical history; plays treating of foreign history; plays dealing with the national history; pastoral plays; chivalrous plays; romantic plays; and plays of manners. No attempt may here be made to give an idea of the nature and subject-matter of even the more striking among Lope's dramatic masterpieces. It may be said definitively that in qualities of style his dramas are deficient; they lack the finish and the evenness that only deliberation and slowly matured execution can give to a work of art. Lope's theatre is mainly one of improvisation. He wrote hastily, to answer an imperious and never sated popular demand for something new. It is remarkable that he remained ever inventive. His dramatic imagination was a gift of nature, and did not fail him no matter how much he abused it. In depth of thought he is all too often lacking; and with good sense he avoided philosophical themes, for he would have failed in the treatment of them. Lope had the people at large in mind when he wrote. This is seen especially in his plays of manners and intrigue (*Comedias de capa y espada*), which represent his best dramatic achievement. The peculiarly Spanish punctilio, or point of honour, receives full consideration in these. To the part of the clown he gives great prominence. But it is the woman that becomes all important in Lope's plays; as Fitzmaurice-Kelly has said: "He placed her in her true setting, as an ideal, as the mainspring of dramatic motive and of chivalrous conduct." As leading examples of Lope's skill in the tragedy there may be mentioned "El Castigo sin Venganza" (on the same subject as Byron's "Parisina"), and "Porfiar hasta Morir"; in the historical drama, "La Estrella de Sevilla" and "El mejor Alcalde el Rey"; in the use of the old Spanish heroic legend, "La fuerza lastimosa"; and in the comedy of manners, "El Acero de Madrid", "Amar sin Saber á Quien", "La Moza del Cántaro", etc. Lope has had many imitators. Those who imitated him in Spain are legion. Among the foreigners who drew from him there may be recorded especially the Frenchmen Hardy and Rotrou, and, in more recent times, the Austrian Grillparzer.

Obras, ed. MENÉNDEZ Y PELAYO for the Academia Española (Madrid, 1890—); *Comedias escogidas* in *Biblioteca de autores españoles*, XXIV, XXXIV, XLI, LII, LVIII; *Obras sueltas* (21 vols., Madrid, 1776–9); *Obras no dramáticas* in *Biblioteca de autores españoles*, XXXVIII; *Poesías*, ibid., XVI, XXXV, XXXVI, and LII; TOMILLO AND PÉREZ PASTOR, *Proceso de Lope de Vega;* PÉREZ PASTOR in *Homenaje á Menéndez y Pelayo*, I (Madrid, 1899), 589; IDEM, *Nuevos datos* (Madrid, 1901)—Pérez Pastor remains one of the best authorities on the life and works of Lope de Vega—RENNERT, *The Life of Lope de Vega* (Glasgow, London, and Philadelphia, 1904); IDEM, *The Spanish Stage in the Time of Lope de Vega* (The Hispanic Society, New York, 1910); FITZMAURICE-KELLY, *Littérature espagnole* (Paris, 1904), especially 250 sqq. and the full bibliography on pages 478–80.

J. D. M. FORD.

Lopez-Caro, FRANCISCO, Spanish artist, b. at Seville in 1598; d. at Madrid in 1662; he was a pupil of Juan de Las Roelas, the painter of the great altarpiece in the church of St. Isidore in Seville, of the "Martyrdom of St. Andrew" in the museum at Seville, and of the pictures in the university chapel. Of his pupil we know exceedingly little, save that with indifferent success he practised the art of painting in Seville until about 1660, when he went to Madrid where he spent the remainder of his life, and died in 1662. His works were mainly portraits, some of which are in private collections in Madrid, Salamanca,

Granada, and Seville, but none of them is now considered of specially high merit.

FRANCISCO CARO, his son and pupil, b. at Seville in 1627; d. at Madrid in 1667; he entered the studio of Alonzo Cano in Madrid, and considerably surpassed his father in ability and skill. His most important works are those representing scenes from the life of Our Lady, which adorn the chapel of St. Isidore in St. Andrew's church in Madrid; but his largest work refers to the indulgence of the Portiuncula and the jubilee of its grant. It was painted for the Franciscan convent at Segovia, and contains the portraits of the donor of the picture and of his wife, Señor and Señora de Contreras. Both father and son are spoken of in Palomino's work with high praise on account of their devotion to their faith and the serious way in which they made use of their artistic abilities.

PALOMINO DE CASTRO Y VELASCO, *El Museo Pictorico y Escala* (Madrid, 1715); MAXWELL, *Annals of the Artists of Spain* (London, 1848); QUILLIET, *Dictionnaire des Peintres Espagnols* (Paris, 1816); HUARD, *Vie Complète des Peintres Espagnols* (Paris, 1839).

GEORGE CHARLES WILLIAMSON.

Lord's Prayer.—Although the Latin term *oratio dominica* is of early date, the phrase "Lord's Prayer" does not seem to have been generally familiar in England before the Reformation. During the Middle Ages the "Our Father" was always said in Latin, even by the uneducated. Hence it was then most commonly known as the Pater noster. The name "Lord's prayer" attaches to it not because Jesus Christ used the prayer Himself (for to ask forgiveness of sin would have implied the acknowledgment of guilt) but because He taught it to His disciples. Many points of interest are suggested by the history and employment of the Our Father. With regard to the English text now in use among Catholics, we may note that this is derived not from the Rheims Testament but from a version imposed upon England in the reign of Henry VIII, and employed in the 1549 and 1552 editions of the "Book of Common Prayer". From this our present Catholic text differs only in two very slight particulars: "Which art" has been modernized into "who art", and "in earth" into "on earth". The version itself, which accords pretty closely with the translation in Tyndale's New Testament, no doubt owed its general acceptance to an ordinance of 1541 according to which "his Grace perceiving now the great diversity of the translations (of the Pater noster etc.) hath willed them all to be taken up. and instead of them hath caused an uniform translation of the said Pater noster, Ave, Creed, etc., to be set forth, willing all his loving subjects to learn and use the same and straitly commanding all parsons, vicars and curates to read and teach the same to their parishioners". As a result the version in question became universally familiar to the nation, and though the Rheims Testament, in 1581, and King James's translators, in 1611, provided somewhat different renderings of Matt., vi. 9–13, the older form was retained for their prayers both by Protestants and Catholics alike.

As for the prayer itself the version in St. Luke, xi, 2–4, given by Christ in answer to the request of His disciples, differs in some minor details from the form which St. Matthew (vi, 9–15) introduces in the middle of the Sermon on the Mount, but there is clearly no reason why these two occasions should be regarded as identical. It would be almost inevitable that if Christ had taught this prayer to His disciples He should have repeated it more than once. It seems probable, from the form in which the Our Father appears in the "Didache" (q. v.), that the version in St. Matthew was that which the Church adopted from the beginning for liturgical purposes. Again, no great importance can be attached to the resemblances which have been traced between the petitions of the Lord's prayer and those found in prayers of Jewish origin which were current about the time of Christ. (See on this Goltz, "Das Gebet", 40–41, and Chase, "Lord's Prayer", 31.) There is certainly no reason for treating the Christian formula as a plagiarism, for in the first place the resemblances are but partial and, secondly we have no satisfactory evidence that the Jewish prayers were really anterior in date.

Upon the interpretation of the Lord's Prayer, much has been written, despite the fact that it is so plainly simple, natural, and spontaneous, and as such preeminently adapted for popular use. In the quasi-official "Catechismus ad parochos", drawn up in 1564 in accordance with the decrees of the Council of Trent, an elaborate commentary upon the Lord's Prayer is provided which forms the basis of the analysis of the Our Father found in all Catholic catechisms. Many points worthy of notice are there emphasized, as, for example, the fact that the words "On earth as it is in Heaven" should be understood to qualify, not only the petition "Thy will be done", but also the two preceding, "hallowed be Thy name" and "Thy Kingdom come". The meaning of this last petition is also very fully dealt with. The most conspicuous difficulty in the original text of the Our Father concerns the interpretation of the words ἄρτος ἐπιούσιος, which in accordance with the Vulgate in St. Luke we translate "our daily bread", St. Jerome, by a strange inconsistency, changed the pre-existing word *quotidianum* into *supersubstantialem* in St. Matthew but left *quotidianum* in St. Luke. The opinion of modern scholars upon the point is sufficiently indicated by the fact that the Revised Version still prints "daily" in the text, but suggests in the margin "our bread for the coming day", while the American Committee wished to add "our needful bread". Lastly may be noted the generally received opinion that the rendering of the last clause should be "deliver us from the evil one", a change which justifies the use of "but" in stead of "and" and practically converts the two last clauses into one and the same petition. The doxology "for Thine is the Kingdom", etc., which appears in the Greek *textus receptus* and has been adopted in the later editions of the "Book of Common Prayer", is undoubtedly an interpolation.

In the liturgy of the Church the Our Father holds a very conspicuous place. Some commentators have erroneously supposed, from a passage in the writings of St. Gregory the Great (Ep., ix, 12), that that doctor believed that the bread and wine of the Eucharist were consecrated in Apostolic times by the recitation of the Our Father alone. But while this is probably not the true meaning of the passage, St. Jerome asserted (Adv. Pelag., iii, 15) that "our Lord Himself taught His disciples that daily in the Sacrifice of His Body they should make bold to say 'Our Father' &c." St. Gregory gave the Pater its present place in the Roman Mass immediately after the Canon and before the fraction, and it was of old the custom that all the congregation should make answer in the words "Sed libera nos a malo". In the Greek Liturgies a reader recites the Our Father aloud while the priest and the people repeat it silently. Again in the ritual of baptism the recitation of the Our Father has from the earliest times been a conspicuous feature, and in the Divine Office it recurs repeatedly besides being recited both at the beginning and the end.

In many monastic rules, it was enjoined that the lay brothers, who knew no Latin, instead of the Divine office should say the Lord's Prayer a certain number of times (often amounting to more than a hundred) *per diem*. To count these repetitions they made use of pebbles or beads strung upon a cord, and this apparatus was commonly known as a "pater-noster", a name which it retained even when such a string of beads was used to count, not Our Fathers, but Hail Marys in reciting Our Lady's Psalter, or in other words in saying the rosary.

SCHROD, in *Kirchenlexikon* s. v. *Vaterunser;* ERMONI, *Jésus et la prière* in *Science et Religion*, 404 (Paris, 1906); CHASE, *Lord's Prayer in the Early Church* (Cambridge, 1891); VON DER GOLTZ, *Das Gebet in der ältesten Christenheit* (Leipzig, 1901); LIGHTFOOT, *On a Fresh Revision*, 3rd ed. (Lon., 1891); SCUDAMORE in *Dict. of Christ. Antiquities;* ZAHN, *Die Anbetung Jesu* (Stuttgart, 1885); THALHOFER, *Liturgik*, I (Freiburg, 1883), 478 seq.

HERBERT THURSTON.

Lord's Supper. See EUCHARIST.

Lorea, titular see in the province of Arabia, suffragan of Bostra. The city figures in the different manuscripts of the "Notitiæ episcopatuum" of Antioch in the tenth century under the names of Lourea, Dourea, and Lorea (Echos d'orient, II, 170; X, 95). This is all that is known concerning the city, which is not mentioned by any geographer, and the location of which is unknown.

S. VAILHÉ.

Lorenzana, FRANCISCO ANTONIO DE, Cardinal, b. 22 Sept., 1722, at Leon in Spain; d. 17 April, 1804, at Rome. After the completion of his studies at the Jesuit College of his native city, he entered the ecclesiastical state and was appointed, at an early date, to a canonry in Toledo. In 1765 he was named Bishop of Plasencia (not Palencia, as sometimes erroneously stated). The following year he was called upon to assume the difficult charge of the vast Archdiocese of Mexico. He displayed great energy in advancing not only the religious, but also the scientific and social interests of the new district confided to his care. As a monument of his beneficence may be mentioned an asylum for foundlings which he established at his own expense. He collected and published the acts of the first three provincial councils of Mexico held respectively in 1555, 1565, and 1585: "Concilios provinciales, I, II, III, de Mexico" (Mexico, 1769–70). In 1771 he himself held the fourth Mexican provincial synod. Unfortunately its decrees, which he forwarded to Madrid for confirmation, were buried in the royal archives. He also brought together valuable historical documents relating to the profane and religious history of Mexico and published them in a richly illustrated work under the title, "Historia de Nueva España" (Mexico, 1770). In 1772 the indefatigable archbishop was recalled to Spain and placed at the head of the Archdiocese of Toledo. He built a great library for this city and collected the works of the principal writers of the Church of Toledo. These writings appeared in a magnificent edition, "SS. Patrum Toletanorum opera" (Madrid, 1782–93). He likewise published a new and very beautiful edition of the Gothic or Mozarabic Breviary, "Breviarium Gothicum" (Madrid, 1775), and Mozarabic Missal, "Missale Gothicum" (Rome, 1804). In the introductions to these publications he discussed with great erudition the Mozarabic liturgy. Editions of Spanish conciliar decrees, the Roman Catechism, and the Canons of the Council of Trent also engaged his attention, and the works of Isidore of Seville were published at his expense by the Spanish Jesuit, Arévalo: "S. Isidori Hispalensis Opera Omnia" (Rome, 1797–1803).

Along with these scientific pursuits he actively carried on social work, founding hospitals and asylums and extending a helping hand to the needy. During the French Revolution he was a generous benefactor of the exiled French clergy, over five hundred of whom he received into his own diocese. In 1789 he was created cardinal by Pius VI, and in 1797 was appointed envoy extraordinary from Spain to the Holy See. In this capacity he supported the pope in the difficulties attendant on the French invasion. On the death of Pius VI he made possible the holding of the conclave at Venice (1 Dec., 1799) by providing travelling expenses for some of the cardinals who were utterly penniless. He accompanied the newly elected pope, Pius VII, to Rome and in order to remain at his side resigned in 1800 his archiepiscopal see. No less active at Rome than at Mexico or Toledo, he was in 1801 one of the founders of a new Catholic Academy in the Eternal City. An inheritance of 25,000 scudi which fell to him he assigned to the poor, whom he designated as his heirs.

STREBER in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.; HURTER, *Nomenclator*, 2nd ed., III, 608–610.

N. A. WEBER.

THE DESCENT FROM THE CROSS
Pietro Lorenzetti, Lower Church of San Francesco, Assisi

Lorenzetti, PIETRO AND AMBROGIO, Sienese painters. The time of their birth and death is not known. Their dated works extend over a period of thirty years, from 1316 to 1348. Pietro was the elder. He was the pupil of Simone di Martino, some of whose formulæ he has preserved faithfully; but he was profoundly influenced by Giotto. He introduced the dramatic into the Sienese school. Unfortunately he could not control his wonderful feeling for the lifelike and in the end he sometimes failed to distinguish history from the passing events of everyday life. His first known work is the "History of St. Humilitas", a religious of Vallombrosa (d. 1310). The picture dated 1316 at the Academy of Florence bears the impress of the liveliest sense of reality. It abounds in small, but often delightful genre scenes. In his Assisi frescoes, where he continued Giotto's "Life of Jesus", this realism strangely loses tone. In the "Cenacle", for example, Pietro devotes an entire piece to a kitchen interior where lads wash the dishes while a dog licks the plates. This lack of dignity is perhaps mere familiarity coupled with good humour. Fondness for this sort of picture is in part the cause of our liking for the creations of the Dutch school; it cannot even be said that details of this kind may not be impressive as is seen in Veronese's "Marriage at Cana". But Pietro, like most of the artists of the Middle Ages, is too lacking in style and in art. Or rather he has only an intermittent sense of them. Some of his pieces at least show of what he was capable; such as the admirable painting at Assisi, which represents the Blessed Virgin in half-life size between St. John and St. Louis, and in which the fresco work attains the beauty of enamelling and of the goldsmith's art, while the countenance of the Virgin, tearfully regarding the Divine Child, expresses most beautifully maternal anguish, remind-

ing us of the δακρυόεν γελάσασα of Homer. In presence of such a canvas it is impossible not to deplore the frivolity of a master who sacrificed his lofty plastic faculties and gift of moral expression to the painting of so many trivial realities and insignificant emotions.

Though still more gifted than his brother, Ambrogio also wasted his talents, but owing to a different error, viz., a craze for the allegoric and didactic. He was however one of the most delicately poetic minds of his generation, and no one at Florence could rival the serious and dreamy beauty of his female faces, as in the "St. Dorothy" of the Academy of Siena (1326), in which seems to be revived the soul of the adorable saints of Simone di Martino. There is not in the art of the fourteenth century a more impressive canvas than that of the Academy of Florence in which St. Nicholas of Bari, on the shore of a cliff-bordered sea, contemplates the sunset (1332). He excelled in lyric subjects but he attempted painting in a grand philosophical manner. His most important work is that at the Palazzo della Signoria of Siena, the allegory of "Good and Evil Government" (1338–40). The taste of the Middle Ages for these "moralities" and psychomachies is well-known. There is hardly a French cathedral in which we do not find sculptured representations of the contest between vice and virtue, allegories of the virtues, the parable of the wise and foolish virgins, the figures of the Church and the Synagogue. Already Giotto had painted at Assisi the allegories of the Franciscan virtues, and Petrarch was soon to compose his "Triumphs" of Love, Glory, Time, and Eternity.

Boniface VIII receiving the Novice Lodovico
Ambrogio Lorenzetti, Church of San Francesco, Siena

For the past sixty years the Republic of Siena had been at the summit of its fortunes. It was desirous of immortalizing the memory of its greatness. From this point of view the frescoes of Ambrogio are of great interest; this is perhaps the first example of lay painting and of art used to represent ideas and life, without any religious conception. It was a course in Aristotelean philosophy and at the same time a hymn to the city. The composition is developed on three walls, forming a sort of triptych. The middle fresco displays under a dogmatic form the ideal of democracy. The Virtues which direct the State are seated on a platform; this is the tribunal or the legislative assembly. The most famous of these figures is that of Peace, which, reclining on her throne in magnificent drapery and resting on her arms, is certainly imitated from an antique medal or statue (such imitations are not rare in the thirteenth century: cf. the sculptures of Capua, the work of Giovanni Pisano, and some statues at Reims). But the other figures are little more than abstractions and can be identified only with the adventitious aid of a multitude of inscriptions, devices, and phylacteries.

On the other two walls are similarly developed the effects of good or evil social hygiene. After the theory follows the application. The left wall (Evil Government) is unfortunately almost ruined. But the opposite one, which is more intelligible, suffices to convey an idea of the painter's method. The length of the painting is divided into two halves, one of which shows the city and the other the country. And in each of these parts is a host of episodes, a great collection of little pictures of manners, which analyse in a thousand ways the condition of a happy society. The general idea is resolved into a multitude of anecdotes. We see dances, banquets, children at school, weddings, some peasants leading their asses to market while others are tilling the ground; in the distance is a port whence vessels are sailing away. All these various scenes are most entertaining and furnish much information about Sienese life and customs in the Middle Ages. But one is lost in the complexity of this chronicle and the confusion of this journal. The result is an extremely curious work, though one almost devoid of artistic value.

To sum up, Ambrogio remains one of the most interesting minds of his time by the very variety of his contradictory talents and the turn of mind at once idealistic and realistic which he displayed, without, unfortunately, succeeding in bringing them into unity. As a whole the work of the Lorenzetti (starting from very different points of view) consists in an attempt to reconcile art with observation and familiar reality. Pietro's aim is to move, Ambrogio's rather to instruct. The former is a dramatist, the latter a moralist. Both tend equally to genre painting. Unfortunately fresco, especially in their day, was the mode of expression least suited to this. They required the miniature, or German engraving, or the small familiar picture of the Flemish or the Dutch. Their talent remained isolated and their premature attempt was doomed to failure. In spite of everything they remain the most lifelike painters of their generation; and some fifteenth-century painters, such as Sassetta or Sano di Pietro, owe them much in this respect. Besides, Ambrogio, was the first who attempted in Italy philosophic painting and the picturesque expression of general ideas. His "Sermons" in pictures have not been lost. He created a tradition to which we owe two of the most important works of the fourteenth century, the anonymous frescoes of the "Anchorites" and of the "Triumph of Death" at the Campo Santo of Pisa and those of the "Militant and the Teaching Church" in the Spanish chapel. In fact it is from these that the finest conceptions of the Renaissance are derived, and the honour of having indirectly inspired Raphael with the "Camera della Segnatura" cannot be disputed with Ambrogio Lorenzetti. It is a glory which the greatest artists may well envy him.

Crowe and Cavalcaselle, *History of Italian Painting*, III (London, 1864–66); Milanesi, *Documenti per la storia dell' arte senese*, I (Siena, 1854); Borghese e Bianchi, *Nuovi documenti*, etc. (Siena, 1898); Douglas, *History of Siena* (London, 1902); Rothes, *Die Blüthezeit der sienesischen Malerei* (Strasburg, 1904); Thode, *Pietro Lorenzetti* in *Repertor. für Kunstwissenschaft* (1888); Meyenburg, *Ambrogio Lorenzetti* (Zurich, 1903); Schubring, *Das gute Regiment* in *Zeitschrift für Bildenden Kunst;* Perkins, *The Masterpieces of Ambrogio Lorenzetti*

in *Burlington Magazine* (London, before 1904); VENTURI, *Storia dell' arte italiana*, V (Milan, 1907).

LOUIS GILLET.

Lorenzo da Brindisi, SAINT, b. at Brindisi in 1559; d. at Lisbon on 22 July, 1619. In baptism he received the names of Julius Cæsar. Guglielmo de Rossi—or Guglielmo Russi, according to a contemporary writer—was his father's name; his mother was Elisabetta Masella. Both were excellent Christians. Of a precocious piety, Lorenzo gave early evidence of a religious vocation. The Conventuals of Brindisi were intrusted with his education. His progress in his studies was very rapid, and, when barely six, he had already given indication of his future success in oratory. Consequently, he was always the one chosen to address, in accordance with the Italian custom, a short sermon to his compatriots on the Infant Jesus during the Christmas festivities. When he was twelve years of age his father died. He then pursued his studies at Venice with the clerics of St. Mark's and under the supervision of one of his uncles. In 1575 he was received into the Order of Capuchins under the name of Brother Lorenzo, and, after his profession, made his philosophical and theological studies at the University of Padua. Owing to his wonderful memory he mastered not only the principal European languages, but also most of the Semitic tongues. It was said he knew the entire original text of the Bible. Such a knowledge, in the eyes of many, could be accounted for only by supernatural assistance, and, during the process of beatification, the examiners of the saint's writings rendered the following judgment: "Vere inter sanctos Ecclesiæ doctores adnumerari potest."

Such unusual talents, added to a rare virtue, fitted Brother Lorenzo for the most diverse missions. When still a deacon he preached the Lenten sermons in Venice, and his success was so great that he was called successively to all the principal cities of the peninsula. Subsequently, thanks to his numerous journeys, he was enabled to evangelize at different periods most of the countries of Europe. The sermons he left fill no less than eight folio volumes. He adopted the method of preaching in favour with the great Franciscan missionaries, or rather with apostolic workers of all times, who, aiming primarily to reach men's hearts and convert them, always adapt their style of discourse to the spiritual needs of their hearers. Brother Lorenzo held successively all the offices of his order. From 1596 to 1602 he had, as general definitor, to fix his residence in Rome. Clement VIII assigned him the task of instructing the Jews; thanks to his knowledge of Hebrew and his powerful reasoning, he brought a great number of them to recognize the truth of the Christian religion. His saintliness, combined with his great kindliness, completed the preparing of the way for the grace of conversion. His success in Rome caused him to be called to several other cities, where he also baptized numerous Jews. At the same time he was commissioned to establish houses of his order in Germany and Austria. Amid the great difficulties created by the heretics he founded the convents of Vienna, Prague, and Graz, the nuclei of three provinces. At the chapter of 1602 he was elected vicar-general. (At that time the Order of Capuchins, which had broken away from the Observants in 1528 and had an independent constitution, gave its first superior the title of vicar-general only. It was not until 1618 that Pope Paul V changed it to that of minister general.) The very year of his election the new superior began the visitation of the provinces. Milan, Paris, Marseilles, Spain, received him in turn. As his coming was preceded by a great reputation for holiness, the people flocked to hear him preach and to receive his blessing. His administration, characterized by wise firmness and fatherly tenderness, was of great benefit to the order. At the Chapter of 1605 he refused to undertake for a second term the government of his brethren, but until his death he was the best adviser of his successors.

It was on the occasion of the foundation of the convent of Prague (1601) that St. Lorenzo was named chaplain of the Imperial army, then about to march against the Turks. The victory of Lepanto (1571) had only temporarily checked the Mussulman invasion, and several battles were still necessary to secure the final triumph of the Christian armies. Mohammed III had, since his accession (1595), conquered a large part of Hungary. The emperor, determined to prevent a further advance, sent Lorenzo of Brindisi as deputy to the German princes to obtain their cooperation. They responded to his appeal, and moreover the Duke of Mercœur, Governor of Brittany, joined the imperial army, of which he received the effective command. The attack on Albe-Royal (now Stuhlweissenburg) was then contemplated. To pit 18,000 men against 80,000 Turks was a daring undertaking and the generals, hesitating to attempt it, appealed to Lorenzo for advice. Holding himself responsible for victory, he communicated to the entire army in a glowing speech the ardour and confidence with which he was himself animated. As his feebleness prevented him from marching, he mounted on horseback and, crucifix in hand, took the lead of the army, which he drew irresistibly after him. Three other Capuchins were also in the ranks of the army. Although the most exposed to danger, Lorenzo was not wounded, which was universally regarded as due to a miraculous protection. The city was finally taken, and the Turks lost 30,000 men. As however they still exceeded in numbers the Christian army, they formed their lines anew, and a few days later another battle was fought. It was always the chaplain who was at the head of the army. "Forward!" he cried, showing them the crucifix, "Victory is ours". The Turks were again defeated, and the honour of this double victory was attributed by the general and the entire army to Lorenzo.

Having resigned his office of vicar-general in 1605, he was sent by the pope to evangelize Germany. He here confirmed the faith of the Catholics, brought back a great number to the practice of virtue, and converted many heretics. In controversies his vast learning always gave him the advantage, and, once he had won the minds of his hearers, his saintliness and numerous miracles completed their conversion. To protect the Faith more efficaciously in their states, the Catholic princes of Germany formed the alliance called the "Catholic League". Emperor Rudolph sent Lorenzo to Philip III of Spain to persuade him to join the League. Having discharged this mission successfully, the saintly ambassador received a double mandate by virtue of which he was to represent the interests of the pope and of Madrid at the court of Maximilian of Bavaria, head of the League. He was thus, much against his wishes, compelled to settle in Munich near Maximilian. Besides being nuncio and ambassador, Lorenzo was also commissary general of his order for the provinces of Tyrol and Bavaria, and spiritual director of the Bavarian army. He was also chosen as arbitrator in the dispute which arose between the princes, and it was in fulfilment of this rôle that, at the request of the emperor, he restored harmony between the Duke of Mantua and a German nobleman. In addition to all these occupations he undertook, with the assistance of several Capuchins, a missionary campaign throughout Germany, and for eight months travelled in Bavaria, Saxony, and the Palatinate.

Amid so many various undertakings Lorenzo found time for the practices of personal sanctification. And it is perhaps the greatest marvel of his life to have combined with duties so manifold an unusually intense

inner life. In the practice of the religious virtues St. Lorenzo equals the greatest saints. He had to a high degree the gift of contemplation, and very rarely celebrated Holy Mass without falling into ecstasies. After the Holy Sacrifice, his great devotion was the Rosary and the Office of the Blessed Virgin. As in the case of St. Francis of Assisi, there was something poetical about his piety, which often burst forth into canticles to the Blessed Virgin. It was in Mary's name that he worked his miracles, and his favourite blessing was: "Nos cum prole pia benedicat Virgo Maria". Having withdrawn to the monastery of Caserta in 1618, Lorenzo was hoping to enjoy a few days of seclusion, when he was requested by the leading men of Naples to go to Spain and apprise Philip III of the conduct of Viceroy Ossuna. In spite of many obstacles raised by the latter, the saint sailed from Genoa and carried out his mission successfully. But the fatigues of the journey exhausted his feeble strength. He was unable to travel homeward, and after a few days of great suffering died at Lisbon in the native land of St. Anthony (22 July, 1619), as he had predicted when he set out on his journey. The process of beatification, several times interrupted by various circumstances, was concluded in 1783. The canonization took place on 8 December, 1881. His feast is kept on 6 July. The known writings of St. Lorenzo of Brindisi comprise eight volumes of sermons, two didactic treatises on oratory, a commentary on Genesis, another on Ezechiel, and three volumes of religious polemics. Most of his sermons are written in Italian, the other works being in Latin. The three volumes of controversies have notes in Greek and Hebrew.

Annales Min. Capuc., III (Lyons, 1676); *Anal. Ord. Min. Capuc.*, III, IX, XII sq.; *Acta SS.*, 6 July; ERARDO DA RADKERSPURGO, *Vita del beato Lorenzo da Brindisi* (Rome, 1783); NORBERT STOCK, *Lorenz von Brindisi*, Fr. tr. RUNGO (Paris, 1881). Cf. *Œuvres de S. Fr. de Sales: Eloge funèbre du Duc de Mercœur.*

F. CANDIDE.

Loreto. See RECANATI AND LORETO, DIOCESE OF.

Loreto, HOLY HOUSE OF. See SANTA CASA.

Lorette, full name, Notre-Dame de la Jeune Lorette, "Our Lady of New Loreto"; an Indian village occupied by the principal remnant of the ancient Huron tribe on the east bank of Saint Charles River, about eight miles north-west from the city of Quebec in Canada. Population in 1908, not including fifty-five Indians of other tribes under the same agency jurisdiction, four hundred and seventy-four souls. According to Father Jones, the historiographer of the Huron missions, the Indians of Lorette are the true representatives of the original Hurons, while the modern Wyandot of Ontario and Oklahoma are descended from the kindred Tionontati, or Petuns.

On the dispersion of the Hurons and their allies by the Iroquois in 1648–9 a considerable body of fugitives was gathered by the missionaries upon St. Joseph, now Christian, Island, off the shore of Nottawasaga Bay. Wasted by famine and the lurking Iroquois their stay here was short, and in the summer of 1650, to the number of about three hundred Indians, besides sixty French, including the missionaries and their assistants, they removed to Quebec and were quartered by the Jesuits at Beauport adjoining the city, where other Huron refugees had been settled the previous year. In the spring of 1651 they removed to Orleans Island, near Quebec, where they were joined by other fugitives, including a large party of Huron exiles from the distant western Island of Manitoulin. In 1656 they numbered altogether between five hundred and six hundred, but in July of that year, in consequence of a sudden destructive inroad of the Mohawk, they again fled to Quebec, whence they sent deputies to the Mohawk begging for peace. This was granted on condition that the Hurons would remove to the Mohawk country and incorporate with that or some other Iroquois tribe, as a considerable part of the Hurons had already done in the earlier wars. Of the three Huron sub-tribes then represented at Quebec, two, the Rock and the Bear, accepted the terms and were incorporated with the Iroquois. The third sub-tribe, the Cord, of the old mission town of Teananstayaé, or Saint Joseph, refused to leave the French and continued at Quebec. In 1659 a party of forty of their warriors together with twenty-three French and Algonkin, was cut off by an overwhelming force of Iroquois, after holding out for ten days, at the Long Sault of Ottawa River, above Montreal. In 1666 peace came for a time and the distressed Hurons once more ventured outside the walls of Quebec. In 1669 they were established by Father Chaumonot in a new mission settlement which received the name of Notre-Dame de Foye (now Sainte Foye) about five miles outside the city. The mission itself was dedicated to the Annunciation. The village grew, being now considerably recruited by Christian Iroquois, until, finding themselves cramped for both land and timber, they removed in 1673 to a new site about nine miles west of Quebec. Here was built a chapel modelled after the Holy House of Loreto and the village took the name of Notre-Dame de (Vieille) Lorette. In 1697 the final remove was made to their present location.

In 1794 the last Jesuit missionary in charge died and was succeeded by a secular priest. In 1829 the last full-blood Indian died and a few years later the language itself became extinct in the settlement, all the inhabitants now speaking French. The population for 1870, 1880, 1890, 1900, and 1908 was officially reported respectively at 329, 280, 293, 449, and 474. Of their present condition the agent in charge reports (1908): The special industry of the Hurons, that is to say, the making of snow-shoes and moccasins, during the first part of the twelve months just passed was not flourishing. The demand has decreased and the trade this year is almost nil. The heads of families on the reserve are obliged in order to support their families to go off to a distance in order to earn money in the surrounding towns. The Indians engage but little in fishing, as fish have not been abundant. On the other hand they have done a good deal of hunting and this has been both successful and remunerative. The prices of fur are very high. The Hurons cannot be reproached with uncleanliness. Nothing but praise can be given in regard to temperance. As for morality, I observe that the Hurons do not deserve any reproach. (The preceding is a condensation of the report.) An efficient and appreciated school is in charge of the Sisters of Perpetual Help. All but seven are Catholic. (See HURONS.)

Canadian Indian Reports (Ottawa); *Jesuit Relations* (French ed., Quebec; English ed., THWAITES, Cleveland); SHEA, *Cath. Ind. Missions* (New York, 1855).

JAMES MOONEY.

Loretto, SISTERS OF, AT THE FOOT OF THE CROSS.— The Sisters of Loretto at the Foot of the Cross were founded in Kentucky, in 1812, by Father Charles Nerinckx, who first called them "The Little Society of the Friends of Mary at the Foot of the Cross of Jesus". The Holy See approved the institute under the title: The Sisters of Loretto at the Foot of the Cross. The special work to which the Sisters devote their lives is Christian education. Amid the rude conditions of life in Kentucky during the first decade of the nineteenth century, the pioneer missionaries, Fathers Stephen Theodore Badin and Charles Nerinckx, realized the necessity for schools conducted by trained Christian teachers. It was practically impossible for them to bring such teachers from Europe or elsewhere, but the possibility remained of finding the means to establish such schools without going abroad. The Catholic colonists in Kentucky were in general good people, some of them eminently virtuous. Strong practical

faith and unwavering attachment to Catholic truth marked their earnest religious character and sustained their solicitude for the Christian training of their children. Noting these traits Fathers Badin and Nerinckx cherished hopes of establishing a religious community. In 1812 their hopes were realized when Loretto sprang into existence with no other provision for its subsistence than an abiding trust in Divine Providence.

Miss Mary Rhodes, educated in Baltimore, opened a school in a log cabin near St. Charles's church. Two companions, Miss Christina Stewart and Miss Anne Havern, soon joined her. Father Nerinckx, seeing a ray of promise for realizing the hope he had cherished so long, encouraged their desire to dedicate themselves to the service of God and instructed them in the duties of the religious life. With the approval of the Right Rev. Benedict Joseph Flaget, first Bishop of Bardstown, he clothed them with the religious habit on 25 April, 1812. This date is, therefore, commemorated by the sisters as their foundation day. Two other young ladies, Miss Anne Rhodes and Miss Sarah Havern, then asked for the habit and received it on 29 June, 1812. The little society then organized and Miss Anne Rhodes was chosen the first superioress. They were soon joined by Miss Nellie Morgan who had been a successful teacher. She received the habit on 12 August, 1812. The health of Mother Anne soon failed; she pronounced her vows on the Feast of the Immaculate Conception, and died on 11 December, 1812. Mary Rhodes was then chosen superioress. Mother Mary and her four companions pronounced their vows of perpetual poverty, chastity, and obedience on 15 August, 1813. Postulants continued to seek admission and Father Nerinckx watched over and encouraged the first efforts of the aspirants and directed them till his death (12 August, 1824) in the practices of the spiritual life and in their efforts to acquire greater proficiency as teachers. The life of the sisters edified all who knew them. Their austere rule breathed the purest spirit of Christian perfection, and though some of the regulations were found by experience to be too rigid for observance in this country and were subsequently omitted, the spirit has been fully preserved and still animates the society. After the death of Father Nerinckx, Bishop Flaget moved Loretto from the place of its first foundation to St. Stephen's, so called from the fact that Father Badin had built a small log church near his residence and dedicated it to St. Stephen. The convent and church erected here by the sisters, dedicated in 1826 and destroyed by fire in 1858, have been replaced by more spacious buildings, and here the mother house of the Sisters of Loretto at the Foot of the Cross still remains.

In the transfer of Loretto to this new location, nothing was lost of the primitive spirit of the society. The growth of the society rendered branch establishments necessary during the first decade of its existence. The first was founded in 1816, near Holy Mary's church; the second, in 1818, at the place where the great Cistercian Abbey of Gethsemani now stands; three others in Kentucky, and one in Missouri were founded before the death of Father Nerinckx. His zeal animated the sisters and led them westward to labour and establish schools among the Indians and pioneers, where no provision had been made for their support; these early foundations were for education what the early missionary churches were for religion. Incorporated by Act of the Legislature of Kentucky, in 1829, under the title, "The Loretto Literary and Benevolent Institution", the Sisters of Loretto at the Foot of the Cross have maintained their academic courses abreast with current progress in education, and when the episcopate advocated the establishment of parochial schools, they were among the first to support the movement and devote themselves to the work. In 1816 Father Nerinckx submitted their rules and constitutions to Pius VII for approval. The Holy Father, well pleased with its spirit, placed the new institute under the protection of the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda and granted it many favours. Again in 1851, Right Rev. Martin John Spalding, afterwards Archbishop of Baltimore, presented the constitutions to the Holy See for the encouragement and blessing of Pius IX. At the beginning of the twentieth century the Sisters of Loretto at the Foot of the Cross turned again to the Holy See for guidance. In 1904 Mother Praxedes Carty presented the constitutions which Pius X fully and finally confirmed in 1907.

The general government of the society is vested in the mother general and her councillors residing at the mother house. Each establishment is presided over by a local superior and her two assistants. The society is composed of but one class of sisters, no distinctions being made in the manner of training to the practice of religious virtues, all are subject to the same regulations of the religious state. The novitiate lasts one full year, at the completion of which the sisters pronounce the three simple vows which they renew annually, until at the expiration of the fifth year, they make perpetual vows. The young professed sisters pass an examination and those having proper qualifications for teachers are placed in the normal training school of the society. Whatever educational advantages a sister may have had before entering the society, she is required to apply herself to the special line of studies chosen by her superiors and to follow a course of pedagogical training in the normal school. In 1909 the Sisters of Loretto at the Foot of the Cross conducted schools in the Archdioceses of St. Louis and Santa Fé, and in the Dioceses of Louisville, Covington, Columbus, Cleveland, Mobile, Bellville, Kansas City, Lincoln, Denver, Tucson, and Dallas.

The Archives of the Society.

EDWIN DRURY.

Loriti, HEINRICH. See GLAREAN, HENRY.

Lorrain, CLAUDE DE (CLAUDE GILLÉE or GELLÉE), French painter and etcher, b. in 1600 at Chamagne on the banks of the Moselle in Lorraine; d. in Rome, 21 Nov., 1681 (or 23 Nov., 1682). His parents, Jean Gellée and Anna Padose, poor and with a large family, gave Claude little schooling. Left an orphan at the age of twelve, he lived with an elder brother, a wood carver, at Freiburg, and there learned to draw ornaments and arabesques. Sandrart, a writer on art and Claude's friend, says that the boy was apprenticed to a pastry-cook; but *pistori* may have been a misprint for *pictori* (a painter). About 1613 a relative took Claude to Rome, where he appears to have abandoned the boy. Claude wandered to Naples seeking Gottfried Wals, a Cologne artist, whose pictures he greatly admired. For two years Wals taught him architectural perspective and landscape painting. In 1615 Claude returned to Rome, and became a member of the household of Agostino Tassi, who was painting a series of decorations for Pope Paul V. Claude was half domestic servant and half artistic assistant to Tassi, who mentions him as a co-worker in decorating Cardinal Montalto's palace. In 1625 Claude went to Venice, a city which deeply impressed him and his future work, and made a pilgrimage to the Holy Virgin of Loretto for devotion and meditation. He then roamed through the Tyrol, Bavaria, the Black Forest, and to Nancy where he worked for a year on architectural painting. These wanderings impoverished his purse and his health, and he longed for Rome, to which he returned in 1627 to reside there until his death. The Eternal City welcomed him, and commissions from the illustrious of all Europe poured in upon him. Among them were Popes Innocent X, Urban VIII, Clement IX (Cardinal Rospigliosi), and Alexander VII, Emperor Leopold I, Philip IV of Spain, the

Duke of Bouillon (commander of the papal forces), the Constable Colonna (Claude's patron of later years), and Cardinals Crescenzio, Poli, Giorio, and Spada.

Claude was not only a faithful and absorbed student of nature but a tireless and rapid worker; in 1644 he completed seventeen important canvases. It is told that he took extraordinary care in painting one picture composed of trees of many kinds, a study he always kept beside his easel, and that he refused to sell it even to his best friend, Cardinal Rospigliosi, who offered to cover its surface twice over with gold pieces. Claude was the first original French painter, the first original modern painter, and the first to paint effects instead of things. While his landscapes are thoroughly classic, they are above all ideal: "there are no landscapes in Nature like those of Claude" (Goethe). He would contemplate for hours—even days—one subject in nature, to which he would return in other weathers and conditions. Herein he resembled the modern Impressionists, one of whom, Pissaro, regards Claude as the forerunner of their school. Claude "effected a revolution in art by setting the sun in the heavens" (Ruskin); and in the pictorial treatment of aerial perspective, in depth of background, and in delicate colour-tones reflecting sunlight's myriad effects, he is unsurpassed. His earlier painting was cool, bluish, and silvery; but he soon abandoned these tones for a rich, warm, and golden treatment of both landscape and marine. In figure painting he did not excel; he sold his landscapes, he said, and gave away his figures.

CLAUDE DE LORRAIN

Claude united the lofty poetic feelings of the Italians with a Flemish correctness and mastery of perspective; his compositions are symmetrical, yet free; and if he had a fault it was exaggerated gracefulness. Inspired by Callot, whom perhaps he knew, Claude began etching about 1629, and within a decade wrought the greater number of his (forty-two) plates. These are freely needled, carried to completeness, full of wonderful atmosphere, and suggestive of the colour and light pervading his oil paintings. Hamerton says that "there is an ineffable tenderness in his handling", and that his "Herdsman" is "the finest landscape etching in the world for technical quality". In 1662 Claude's interest in etching revived, and he executed two large plates, "Mercury and Argus" and "Time, Apollo, and the Seasons". Claude was one of the few great artists to be appreciated during his life; and such a demand arose for his paintings that numerous forgeries of them were passed off as "Claudes". To frustrate such frauds he made drawings, washed with sepia or bistre, of all his paintings; and these, about two hundred in all, constitute the "Liber Veritatis" (a treasure now possessed by the Duke of Devonshire). This collection, however, is far from containing all of Claude's drawings. Claude was of a reserved, contemplative, and religious temperament, kindly in disposition and generous. His favourite relaxation was music. During the last twenty years of his life he was in precarious health and tormented with attacks of gout. At his death he provided liberally for his nephew and his ward, Agnes, and bequeathed noble pictures to various Roman churches, also to his friend and patron Cardinal Rospigliosi "for the good advice he has always given me". Claude was buried in the church of Trinità dei Monti; but, on the recommendation of M. Thiers, his remains were transported to the French church of San Luigi in 1840.

Of the one hundred and seventy-five canvases in England, the "Bouillon Claudes", "Nuptials of Isaac and Rebecca", and "Embarcation of the Queen of Sheba" are world-famed, and became conspicuous under the terms of Turner's will. The Hermitage possesses twelve fine examples, among them the great series: "Morning", "Noon", "Evening", and "Night". Rome has seventeen, Munich six, and the Vanderbilt collection four fine canvases. In Dresden is the "Dido and Æneas". His best-known etchings are the "Herdsman", the "Ford", and the "Firework" series.

BROWNELL, *French Art* (New York, 1908); PATTISON, *Claude Lorraine, sa Vie et ses Œuvres* (Paris, 1884); LUBKE, *History of Art* (2 vols., New York, 1904); HIND, *History of Engraving and Etching* (London, 1908); DULLEA, *Claude Gellée le Lorrain* (New York, 1887); SANDRART, *Academia Nobilissimæ Artis Pictoriæ* (Nuremburg, 1683).

LEIGH HUNT.

Lorrain, NARCISSE ZEPHYRIN. See PEMBROKE, DIOCESE OF.

Lorraine. I. ORIGIN—By the Treaty of Verdun, in 843, the empire of Charlemagne was divided in three parts: Ludwig the German received Eastern Franconia; Charles the Bald, Western Franconia; and Lothair I, the strip of land lying between the two and reaching from the North Sea to the Rhone, with Italy in addition. After the death of Lothair I, in 855, Italy passed to his son Lothair II, who gave his name to the district henceforth known as *Lotharii Regnum*—Lotharingen, Lothringen, or Lorraine. Lorraine did not form a geographical unit, like the two great neighbouring kingdoms, complete in themselves and by their natural formation. Its boundaries were uncertain for though the Meuse was on the west, the Rhine on the east, and the sea on the north, yet to the south it was completely exposed. The population, which in the eastern kingdom was Germanic, and in the western Roman, here combined both elements. Lorraine, moreover, included within its boundaries the original home of the Austrasian dynasty, with Aachen, Charlemagne's capital, and the most important centres of ancient culture: two archbishoprics (Cologne and Trier), many bishoprics (Metz, Toul, Verdun, etc.), abbeys and royal castles. From the beginning it was coveted by the neighbouring princes, who succeeded, one after another, in seizing parts or the whole of its territory. The composite character of its origin also led to endless internal wars.

The territory afterwards known as Lorraine was converted to Christianity while still under Roman domination. Missionaries came thither from Trier whose first bishop was St. Eucharius (about 250). One of his successors, Maternus (313–14), founded the See of Cologne. About 811 Trier became an archbishopric, the episcopal Sees of Metz, Toul, and Verdun being suffragan to it. From 511 Metz was the capital of Austrasia, and became a bishopric in the sixth century, one of its first bishops being St. Chrodegang (742–66). Toul and Verdun have been bishoprics since the fourth century. Under Bishop Hildebold, in 799, Cologne received from St. Boniface metropolitan jurisdiction over Liège and Utrecht. The two great archbishoprics early became temporal lordships. Trier obtained its temporal power in 898, under Radbod, through Duke Zuentebulch of Lorraine; Bruno, Archbishop of Cologne (953–65), himself obtained the dignity of Duke of

Lorraine. Both archbishoprics became imperial principalities. Metz and Verdun were later raised to the same dignity. With the close of the sixth century began the foundation of the numerous monasteries which spread from the Vosges, and to which Lorraine owed its advanced culture. Its people were remarkable through the Middle Ages for their religious zeal. The most ancient of these monasteries is Luxeuil founded by St. Columba, whose example was followed by Amatus, Romarich, Deodatus, Godelbert, Hidulf, and Chrodegang, who founded the abbeys of Remiremont, St. Die, Senones, Moyen-Moutier, St. Michiel, and Gooze. There were other famous monasteries in the different bishoprics, such as those of St. Maximinus at Trier, St. Epure of Toul, Symphorian, Glossinda, and St. Peters at Metz. Under the Carlovingians the number increased. Richilde, wife of Charles the Bald, founded Juvigny near Stenay about 874; Bishop Adventius of Metz, Neumünster; while St. Germain, St. Martin on the Meuse, and Gellamont near Dieulouard also date back to this period. In these ecclesiastical abodes and in the bishops' residences celebrated schools flourished, among which St. Mathias near Trier, the Abbey of Prüm, famous for the historian Regino, and Verdun with its Bertarius attained great prominence. The councils of Meaux, in 845, of Valence, in 855, and of Savonnières, near Toul, in 859 improved these schools and founded new ones.

For political reasons, Lothair II ceded small portions of his domains to his neighbours: to his brother Charles, the Diocese of Belley and Moutiers; to Louis of Italy, provinces in the Upper Jura and the Vaud; to Louis the German, Alsace. After his death, in 869, war immediately broke out, as almost always occurred upon the death of a ruler of Lorraine. The Kings of France and Germany, as well as Louis of Italy, wished to seize the country; Louis the German was victorious, and, by the Treaty of Meersen, in 870, far the greater part was awarded to him—all the territory east and north of the Meuse and the territory and cities on the Moselle, on both sides of the Rhine, and in Jura, that is to say Friesland, the country of the Ripuarian Franks the original lands of the House of Lorraine, Alsace, and a part of Burgundy. Charles the Bald received the countries on the left bank of the Meuse and the Moselle. After the death of Louis the German (876) Charles tried, but failed, to reconquer Lorraine. Louis the Younger, in 879, after the death of Louis the Stammerer, repossessed himself of the French, western, half of Lorraine, and thus once more united the entire *Regnum Lotharii* under German rule. Under Charles the Fat, a natural son of Lothair II named Hugo disturbed the peace by calling in to his aid the Norman Godfrey, who acquired Friesland as a fief. Both, however, were severely defeated in 888. King Arnulf (887–99) expelled the Normans, gaining a victory at Louvain (891), and improved the religious situation by summoning the great Council of Tibour (895). At the same time, in order to secure Lorraine as a part of Westmark, he gave it to his natural son, Zuentebulch, who surrendered the management of state affairs to Archbishop Radbod of Trier, as his chancellor. Zuentebulch was overthrown in an insurrection raised by the mightiest nobles of the country, Gerard, Matfried, and Reginar, on 13 August, 900. Gradually the supremacy passed over to Reginar of Hainault and Haspengau, who, after the death of Louis the Child (912), brought Lorraine under the allegiance of Charles the Simple of France and in return received from him the dignity of margrave (Lord of the Marches) and duke. To these titles his son Giselbert succeeded in 915. Under Giselbert, the disputes about the succession to the throne of France gave rise to internal divisions among the people of Lorraine. Henry I (919–36) was called by one party to its assistance and, after repeated invasions, recovered all of Lorraine for Germany (925). He confirmed Giselbert in the Duchy, and, in 928, gave him his own daughter Gerberga in marriage. In spite of this, Giselbert once more allied himself with the King of France, Louis IV, against the German Emperor Otto I (936–73). But when Giselbert was drowned near Andernach in 933, during his flight from the loyal Counts Udo and Conrad, Otto once more obtained the upper hand and gave Lorraine to his brother Henry. The latter was driven out by the people of Lorraine, and Otto made Count Otto of Verdun, son of Richwin, duke. In 943 he constrained Louis IV of France to make a final renunciation of the rights of the Carlovingians over Lorraine. After Count Otto's death (944), the lordship passed to Count Conrad the Red of Franconia, who had married the emperor's daughter Liutgarde. But Conrad, too, was faithless, and, while Otto I was absent on an expedition to Italy (953), he called in the Hungarians. He was deposed, however, and replaced by St. Bruno, Archbishop of Cologne (953–65).

Bruno was the first to succeed in placing German supremacy on the firm basis which lasted until the twelfth century. This he accomplished by training an austere and learned clergy, whom he deeply imbued with the national sentiment to such an extent that the bishops whom he appointed (such as Heino of Verdun, Adalbero of Metz, Hegelo and Bruno of Toul, Wazo of Liège) became the principal supports of the imperial power. In order to control its continual unrest, he divided the country. The northern part (Lower Lorraine), from the Ardennes to the sea, comprised the Archbishopric of Cologne with the Bishoprics of Utrecht and Liège. The southern part, Upper Lorraine, or the Land of the Moselle, extended to the south-east of the Vosges and to the Sichelberg, with the Archbishopric of Trier and the Bishoprics of Metz, Toul, and Verdun. Subject to the supreme direction of Bruno, Lower Lorraine was assigned to Count Gottfried, Upper Lorraine to Count Friedrich, brother of Bishop Adalbero of Metz. The German Emperor exercised suzerainty over both. Aachen became the capital in 965.

II. Lower Lorraine.—The history of Lower Lorraine is connected with that of Upper Lorraine for only a few more centuries. In 977 Emperor Otto II granted it to Charles, brother of Lothair of France, as a German fief. Lothair's subsequent invasion was repelled by Otto's famous march to Paris (978). After Charles's son Otto had died childless, the dukedom passed to Godfrey of Verdun, whose son Gozelo I reunited the upper and lower duchies under his rule in 1033. Of his sons, the elder, Godfrey the Bearded, succeeded him in Upper Lorraine and Gozelo II (d. 1046) in Lower Lorraine. After the latter's death, Lower Lorraine was conferred upon Count Frederick of Luxemburg and, immediately after, upon Godfrey the Bearded (1065–69). His son Godfrey the Hunchback was the last ruler of this district who was loyal to the empire. As the bishops, after the triumph of the Cluniac Reform and the struggle over investitures, ceased to support the German emperors, the province soon resolved itself into small feudal estates. These gradually withdrew from the German allegiance. Part of the country became known as the Netherlands, or Low Countries, and in 1214 reverted finally to France, whilst the remainder took the name of Brabant. Godfrey adopted his nephew Godfrey de Bouillon, who was enfeoffed in 1088 by Henry IV. Upon his death at Jerusalem Henry V gave the duchy to Godfrey the Bearded, Count of Brabant. In 1155 the Lords of Limburg severed themselves from Lower Lorraine and became independent dukes. After Henry V (1186–1235) the dukes of Lower Lorraine were known as dukes of Brabant. In 1404 the duchy was united to Burgundy.

III. Upper Lorraine.—After Lower Lorraine received the name of Brabant, Upper Lorraine became known simply as Lorraine. The latter was split up among numerous small countships and the dioceses of Metz, Toul, and Verdun, which from early times had been immediate fiefs of the empire. The history of these bishoprics is the history of the Church in Lorraine, Metz being the centre and head of the whole ecclesiastical organization. The larger, southern, half was under the jurisdiction of the See of Toul. The secular power was conferred by Emperor Henry III, in 1048, upon the wealthy Count Gerhard of Alsace, whose descendants reigned there for seven hundred years. Under Emperor Otto I the monasteries were reformed by Bishop Albero I (928–63). Stephen, of the powerful house of Bar, Bishop and Cardinal of Metz 1120–63, brought the newly-founded Premonstratensian and Cistercian Orders into the country. Complete political rest never really existed. When not repelling the attacks of France, Lorraine was occupied with intestine wars, either among the spiritual principalities mentioned above or among the Counts of Bar, Bitsch, Vaudemont, and other temporal lords. Besides, the dukes were, as a rule, involved in the quarrels of the German suzerain and also took part in the Crusades; for piety and devotion to the Church distinguished most of them, in spite of their warlike character.

Duke Theobald II (1304–12) at a meeting of the Diet settled the rights of inheritance upon his female as well as male descendants. Isabella, daughter of Charles I, accordingly mounted the throne in 1431, and, with her, her consort René of Anjou and Bar, who brought the last-named duchy to Lorraine. When this female line became extinct in 1473 the male line of Vaudemont succeeded under René II (1473–1508). He successfully defended his country against Charles the Bold of Burgundy (1477), and to his maternal inheritance of Lorraine, Bar, Pont-à-Mousson, and Guise he united the dignities received from his father—Vaudemont, Joinville, Aumale, Mayenne, and Elbœuf—and kept up Anjou's pretensions to Naples and Sicily. René II, by forcing the election of his uncle Henry II as bishop in 1484, brought the administration of the See of Metz to the House of Lorraine, and Bishop John IV of Vaudemont (1518–43 and 1548–50), as Cardinal of Lorraine and papal legate for that country, united in his own hands Bar and the principalities of Metz, Toul, and Verdun, the episcopal power over Toul, Terouanne, Narbonne, Die-Valence, Verdun, Luçon, Reims, Alby, Lyons, Agen, and Nantes; and was Abbot of Goze, Fécamp, Cluny, Marmoutier, Saint-Ouen, and Saint-Mansuy.

The Reformation, after being forcibly averted by Duke Anton (1508–44), obtained a transitory foothold only in a few of the eastern districts, and in the seventeenth century it was constrained to give way entirely to Catholicism. In 1552 the great French encroachments recommenced, when Henry II, as the ally of the German Protestant princes, annexed Metz, Toul, and Verdun, and Lorraine itself was occupied until 1559. At that time the spiritual life received a new stimulus under Bishop Henry III of Metz (1612–52) through the erection of monasteries of Benedictines at Saint-Barbe; Carmelites at Metz; Minims at Dieuze, Nomeny, and Bassing; Capuchins at Vic, Diedenhofen, Saarburg, and Bitsch; and Jesuit houses at Metz and Buckenheim. St. Vincent de Paul interested himself in the districts which suffered so severely in the Thirty Years' War. By the Peace of Westphalia, in 1648, Metz, Toul, and Verdun were formally ceded to France, which had re-occupied the Duchy of Lorraine in 1632, and by the Treaty of 1661 territory was ceded to Louis XIV, which thus secured to him a passage across Lorraine to Alsace. In 1697, by the Peace of Ryswick, he gave the duchy to Duke Leopold Joseph (1697–1729). In 1738, by the Peace of Vienna, it was granted to the former King of Poland, Stanislaus Leczinski, after whose death in 1766 it reverted to France. In the ecclesiastical jurisdiction a series of changes took place. In 1598 Duke Charles had tried to erect a bishopric at Nancy for his duchy; but in 1602 only a collegiate chapter was established there. In 1778 the episcopal See of Nancy was really founded, and the bishop received the title of Primate of Lorraine. At the same period the See of Saint-Die was founded, while that of Toul was abolished in 1790. By the division of France into departments, in 1790, the "Province of the Three Bishoprics", as it had been known since 1552, with the Provinces of Lorraine and Bar, were divided into the departments of Moselle, Meurthe, Vosges, and Meuse. The jurisdictions of Saarwerden, Herbitzheim, and Diemeringen, for the most part Protestant, became incorporated with the departments of the Lower Rhine in 1793.

IV. After 1871.—By the Peace of Frankfort, 10 May, 1871, France was obliged to cede to Germany from this Province the Department of Meurthe and the arrondissements of Saarburg and Château Salins. The German Lorraine of to-day comprises, of the old province of that name: Metz, with the Pays Messin, the temporal possessions of the old Bishopric of Metz; parts of the Duchy of Luxemburg; parts of the upper Rhine district; the former imperial Margravates of Pont-à-Mousson and Nomency; the imperial Principalities of Pfalzburg and Lixheim; half of the Countship of Salm; the jurisdiction of the Abbey of Gorze; the Lordship of Bitsch; further, the royal fiefs acquired from the See of Metz; Blamont, Saarburg, Saareck, Saaralben, Homburg, etc. In order to bring the ecclesiastical into harmony with the political boundaries, Nancy, in 1874, surrendered eighty-three parishes of the district of Château-Salins and one hundred and four of the Saarburg district (aggregating 106,027 souls) to the Diocese of Metz. In 1871 the new limits of Lorraine included 451,633 Catholics, 13,407 Protestants, 176 other Christians, and 529 who profess other religions.

Chevrier, *Histoire de Lorraine* (Brussels, s. d.); Calmet, *Histoire ecclésiastique de Lorraine* (4 vols., Cowes, 1728, 7 vols., Ryde, 1745–47); Durival, *Description de la Lorraine et du Barrois* (4 vols., Nancy, 1779–83); Willlich, *Die Entstehung des Herzogtums Lothringen* (Göttingen, 1862); Benoît, *Les Protestants du duché de Lorraine* in *Rev. d'Alsace* (1885), 35–59, 186–209, 400–24, 513–39; (1886), 56–80; Begin, *Histoire de Lorraine et des trois évêchés* (Nancy, 1883); Haussonville, *Histoire de la réunion de la Lorraine à la France* (6 vols., Paris, 1854); Fitte, *Das staatsrechtliche Verhältnis des Herzogtums Lothringen zum deutschen Reiche seit 1542* (Strasburg, 1891); Sauerland, *Vatikanische Regesten zur Geschichte Deutsch-Lothringens* in *Jahrbuch d. Gesellschaft f. lothring. Geschichte*, X (1898), 195–235; Idem, *Vatikanische Urkunden u. Regesten Quellen zur lothring. Gesch.*, I (Metz, 1900–); Derichsweiler, *Geschichte Lothringens* (2 vols., Wiesbaden, 1901).—Periodicals: *Annales de l'Est* (Nancy and Paris, 1887—); *L'Austrasie* (Metz, 1837—); *Jahrbuch der Ges. f. lothr. Geschichte* (Metz, 1888—); *Journal de la Société d'Archéol. Lorraine* (Nancy, 1853—); *Mémoires et Documents de la Soc. d'Arch. Lorr.* (Nancy, 1849–73); *Revue ecclésiastique de Metz* (Metz, 1890—).

See also bibliographies under Alsace-Lorraine; Metz; Toul, etc.

Otto Hartig.

Lorsch Abbey (Laureshamense Monasterium), called also Laurissa and Lauresham, one of the most renowned monasteries of the old Franco-German Empire, is situated about ten miles east of Worms in the Grand Duchy of Hesse, Germany. This abbey was founded in 764 by Count Cancor and his widowed mother Williswinda. Having built a church and monastery on their estate, Laurissa, they entrusted its government to the care of Chrodegang, Archbishop of Metz. This well-known and saintly prelate dedicated the church and monastery in honour of St. Peter the Apostle, and became its first abbot. The pious founders enriched the new abbey by further donations. In 766 Chrodegang resigned the office of abbot owing to his other important duties as Archbishop of Metz. He then sent his brother Gundeland to Lorsch as his successor, with fourteen Benedictine monks. To

make the abbey popular as a shrine and a place of pilgrimage, Chrodegang obtained from Pope Paul I the body of St. Nazarius, who with three other Roman soldiers had won the crown of martyrdom under Diocletian. On 11 July, 765, the sacred relics arrived, and were with great solemnity deposited in the basilica of the monastery. The abbey and basilica were then named in honour of St. Nazarius, instead of St. Peter as heretofore. Many miracles were wrought through the intercession of St. Nazarius, and from all parts of Europe pilgrims in large numbers came to visit the shrine. Having grown into prominence as a nursery of learning and culture, the monastery became no less celebrated as a centre of virtue and piety. Popes and

St. Michael's Chapel, Lorsch
Oldest architectural monument in Germany

emperors repeatedly favoured the abbey with special privileges. The transfer of many estates and the addition of small towns to its possessions soon raised the abbey to the position of a principality, so that in a short time it became not only immensely rich, but also a seat of political influence.

It was, however, this very influence of its wealth and political ascendency that caused its decline and final ruin. The abbey, enjoying state rights, became implicated in several local feuds and in a number of wars. After forty-six abbots of the Order of St. Benedict had governed the abbey more or less successfully, Conrad, the last of the abbots, was deposed by Pope Gregory IX in 1226, and through the influence of the German Emperor Frederick II, Lorsch came into the possession of Archbishop Siegfried III of Mainz. In 1248 Premonstratensian monks were given charge of the monastery with the sanction of Pope Celestine IV, and they remained there till 1556, when, after a glorious existence of 800 years, Lorsch and the surrounding country passed into the hands of Lutheran and Calvinistic princes. The princes allowed the religious a pension for life, and then sent them adrift in the world. In Lorsch itself, first the Lutheran, and later the Calvinistic religion was introduced. During the Thirty Years War Lorsch and its neighbourhood suffered greatly, but, having again come into the possession of Mainz, it returned to the Catholic Faith. The most dreary period for Lorsch was during the war between France and Germany from 1679 and 1697. Whole villages were laid in ruins, the homes of the peasantry were destroyed by fire, and the French soldiers burned the old buildings whose associations had made them sacred to the inhabitants. One portion, which was left intact, now serves as a tobacco warehouse. The ancient entrance hall, built in the ninth century by Emperor Ludwig III, is the oldest and probably the most beautiful monument of Franconian architecture. This hall, though the property of the Grand Duchy of Hesse, is now used as a chapel where Mass is occasionally celebrated.

Codex diplomaticus Monasterii Laurisensis, ed. Klein (Tegerns, 1766); Dahl, *Historisch-topographisch-statistische Beschreibung des Fürstenthums Lorsch* (Darmstadt, 1812); *Archiv für hessische Gesch. u. Alterthumskunde* (Darmstadt, 1835); Falk, *Gesch. des ehemaligen Klosters Lorsch an der Bergstrasse* (Mainz, 1866).

Leander M. Roth.

Loryma, a titular see of Caria, small fortified town and harbour on the coast of Caria, not far from Cape Cynossema, at the western extremity of Rhodian Chersonesus, opposite to and twenty Roman miles from Rhodes (Strabo, XIV, 652, Ptolemy, V, 2, 8; Tit. Liv., XXXVII, 17; XLV, 10). Nothing is known of its history, but Leake (Asia Minor, 223) mentions its ruins: towers, tombs, and ramparts, west of Port Aplothiki, vilayet of Smyrna. The "Notitiæ episcopatuum" mentions Loryma among the suffragan sees of Stauropolis up to the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Lequien (Oriens christianus, I, 915) names three bishops: George, present at the Council of Constantinople, 680, Anthimus at Nicæa, 787, and Joseph at Constantinople, 879.

Smith, *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Geography.*

S. Pétridès.

Los Angeles. See Monterey, Diocese of.

Lossen, Karl August, German petrologist and geologist, b. at Kreuznach (Rhine Province), 5 January, 1841; d. at Berlin, 24 February, 1893. After finishing his studies at the gymnasium of Kreuznach in 1859 Lossen became a mining engineer; he began by two and a half years of practical work, then studied at the Universities of Berlin and Halle, where he graduated in 1866; in the same year he became assistant geologist of the Prussian national geological survey and as such began immediately his famous petrolographic studies of the Harz Mountains, which lasted till his death. In 1870 he became instructor in petrology at the Berlin mining academy, and at the same time lecturer at the university; in 1873 he was made a member of the newly founded Prussian National Geological Institute, and in 1882 received the title of professor; he was a fellow of the Görres Society from its foundation. In 1886 he became extraordinary professor in the university. He published the results of his investigation in over one hundred treatises and notices which appeared for the most part in the "Zeitschrift der deutschen geologischen Gesellschaft" of 1867–1891 and were much valued by his fellow scientists. The work of his youth, "De Tauni montis parte transrhenana" (Halle, 1867), appeared independently; then in 1877 followed the maps of the geological survey of the Harz Mountains and later many special maps of the Harz district, and the exhaustive work, "Boden der stadt Berlin". Of great importance are his papers on the contact and dynamometamorphosis of minerals. So highly was Lossen considered as an authority on this subject that the committee in charge of the programme for the International Geological Congress in London requested him to present a paper on the origin of crystallized slate (printed in 1888). He was made a member of Belgian, French, and English learned societies. The mineral lossenite is named after him; it is a hydrated lead-iron sulpharsenate from the mines of Laurion in Attica. Lossen was a man of noble character, loyal, dutiful, kind-hearted, full of good humour and universally popular, notwithstanding his increasing deafness. As a Catholic he united a childlike piety with very strong convictions of faith and decided views for church authority.

Kayser in *Neues Jahrbuch für Mineralogie, Geologie und Palaeontologie*, II (Stuttgart, 1893); von Hertling in *Jahres-*

bericht der Görresgesellschaft für 1895 (Cologne, 1896); KNELLER, *Das Christentum und die Vertreter der neuern Naturwissenschaft* (Freiburg, 1904).

J. H. ROMPEL.

Lot (Heb. לוֹט; Sept. Λώτ), son of Abraham's brother Aran (Gen., xi, 27), therefore Abraham's nephew (his "brother": xiii, 8, 11; xiv, 14, 16) and grandson of Thare, father of Abraham (xi, 31). Lot was among those whom Thare took with him out of Ur of the Chaldees, to go to the land of Chanaan. When Thare died in Haran, Lot continued the journey with Abraham. It may be inferred that Lot accompanied his uncle to Sichem, to the mountain between Bethel and Hai, and then to the south (xii, 6, 8, 9). Whether Lot went to Egypt with Abraham at the time of the famine (xii, 10–20) is not explicitly stated, but is implied in xiii, 1: "And Abraham went up out of Egypt, he and his wife, and all that he had, and Lot with him into the south." After their return, they once more settled between Bethel and Hai (xiii, 3). Lot and Abraham had numerous flocks and herds, so numerous that the pasture and watering places proved insufficient for them. Strife ensued between the herdsmen of Abraham and of Lot. Abraham, in the interest of peace, proposed to his nephew that they should live apart, and even allowed Lot to take his choice of the surrounding country. Lot chose the watered and fertile region "about the Jordan" (Kikkar), and fixed his abode in the city of Sodom, whereas Abraham dwelt in the land of Chanaan (xiii, 6–12). The next incident in the life of Lot is related in connexion with the expedition of Chodorlahomor against the five cities "about the Jordan", including Sodom (xiv, 1 sqq.). The kings of the Pentapolis were defeated, their cities pillaged, and among those carried away by the victorious kings was Lot, who lost all his possessions (xiv, 12). Lot's predicament was made known to Abraham, who at once chose three hundred and eighteen of his best men and set out in pursuit of the retreating victorious kings. He overtook them in Dan, where he surprised them at night, and routed them completely. Lot and his possessions were rescued by Abraham, who brought all back safely to Sodom (xiv, 13–16; see ABRAHAM).

Again we read of Lot in connexion with the mission of the angels who had been sent by God to destroy the five cities in the valley of the Jordan. These angels, three in number, were first entertained by Abraham in the vale of Mambre (Gen., xviii, 2 sqq.), and then two of them made their way towards Sodom, where they arrived in the evening (xix, 1). Here they met Lot, who, sitting in the gateway of the city—a common place of meeting in the East—arose and greeted the strangers, at the same time offering them the hospitality of his house. The strangers at first refused, but finally accepted the pressing invitation of Lot, who then prepared a feast for them (xix, 2, 3). That night the men of Sodom revealed their degradation by, attacking Lot's house and demanding his two guests for their vile purpose (4, 5). Lot interceded in behalf of his guests in accordance with his duties as host, which are most sacred in the East, but made the mistake of placing them above his duties as father by offering his two daughters to the wicked designs of the Sodomites (6–8). The latter, however, refused the substitution, and just as they were about to inflict violence upon Lot the two angels intervened, drawing Lot into the house and striking the men outside with blindness, thus preventing them from finding the door of the house (9–11). The angels then made known to Lot the object of their visit to Sodom, which they were sent to destroy, and advised him to leave the city at once with his family and belongings. Lot imparted the news to his prospective sons-in-law, who, however, refused to consider it seriously. The next morning, the angels once more admonished Lot to leave Sodom, and when he still hesitated they took him, his wife, and two daughters, and brought them out of the city, warning them not to look back nor to remain in the vicinity of the doomed city, but to flee into the mountains (12–17). The mountains, however, seemed too far distant to Lot, and he requested to seek shelter in a small city nearer by. The request was granted, and Lot fled to Segor (Heb. *Zo'ar*), which is also promised protection (18–23). Sodom, Gomorrha, and the other cities of the Pentapolis were then destroyed. Lot's wife, disregarding the injunction of the angels, looked back, and was converted into a pillar of salt (24–26). Lot, seeing the terrible destruction of the five cities, feared for his own safety in Segor, and therefore fled with his two daughters into the mountains, where they dwelt in a cave (30). It was here, according to the Sacred Text, that Lot's two daughters were guilty of incestuous intercourse with their father, the outcome of which was the birth of Moab and Ammon, the fathers of Israel's future most bitter enemies (31–38). This last incident also closes the history of Lot. His name, however, occurs again in the expression "the children of Lot", meaning the Moabites (Deut., ii, 9), and the Ammonites (Deut., ii, 19), and both (Ps., lxxxii, 9). In the New Testament, Christ refers to the destruction of Sodom "in the days of Lot" (Luke, xvii, 28, 29), and St. Peter (II Pet., ii, 6–8) speaks of the deliverance of the "just Lot". The fate of Lot's wife is referred to in Wis., x, 7; Luke, xvii, 32. According to Jewish and Christian tradition, the pillar of salt into which she was converted was preserved for some time (Josephus, "Antiq.", I, xi, 4; Clement of Rome, "I Cor.", xi, 2; Irenæus, "Adv. Haer.", IV, xxxi). Various explanations are given of this phenomenon. According to von Hummelauer ("Comment. in Gen.", Paris, 1895, 417), Lot's wife could easily have been overtaken by the salty waters of the Dead Sea and literally covered with salt. Kaulen had already advanced a similar explanation, accounting for the coating of salt by the heat of the flames releasing the salt fumes from the soil.

F. X. E. ALBERT.

Lottery is one of the aleatory contracts and is commonly defined as a distribution of prizes by lot or by chance. Each person who joins in the lottery buys a numbered ticket and at a certain fixed time lots are cast by some method, as by drawing the numbers out of a hollow wheel, to decide to what numbers the prize or prizes are to be assigned. Some winners get much more than they contributed, some less, while others get nothing. It is obviously a kind of gambling if considered from the point of view of the contributories; by the directors it is sometimes used as a means of raising money. Morally it is objectionable if carried to excess as it tends to develop the gambling spirit and distract people from earning a livelihood by honest work. However, if there is no fraud of any sort in the transaction, and if there is some sort of proportion between the price of a ticket and the value of a chance of gaining a prize, a lottery cannot be condemned as in itself immoral. In the United States they were formerly permitted, but in 1890 Congress forbade the mails to be used to promote any lottery enterprise, and now they are generally prohibited by state legislation. In England lotteries have long been forbidden by law unless conducted by art unions carrying on business by royal charter or under a constitution and rules approved by the Privy Council.

BALLERINI, *Opus Morale*, III (Prato, 1892); GÉNICOT, *Theologia Moralis* (Brussels, 1909); SLATER, *A Manual of Moral Theology*, I (New York, 1908).

T. SLATER.

Lotti, ANTONIO, composer, b. at Venice in 1667; d. there, 5 January, 1740, and studied under Legrenzi, producing an opera, "Il Giustino", in his sixteenth year. On 31 May, 1692, he was appointed second organist of St. Mark's, and on 17 August, 1704, he suc-

ST. PETER MARTYR

LORENZO LOTTO, ALZANO MAGGIORE, ITALY

ceeded Spada as first organist. On 2 April, 1736, he was elected *maestro di cappella*, though Pollarolo, Porpora, and Porta were formidable rivals for the much-coveted post, with a salary of 400 ducats. Between the years 1703 and 1730 he composed numerous masses and motets, especially his "Miserere", which supplanted the version of Legrenzi and is still sung at St. Mark's on Holy Thursday. Lotti also composed twenty-seven operas (1693–1717), and he spent two years at Dresden, producing various works. After his return to Venice, in November, 1719, he gave up secular writing, and devoted himself solely to church and chamber music. Had he continued at operatic writing his financial success would have been considerable, but he preferred his post as *maestro* at St. Mark's. One incident in his career was the controversy over a madrigal which Bononcini claimed and which, it is said, led to that eminent composer leaving London, but it is now generally believed that Bononcini was wronged in the matter, as really there was no need for a man of his powers borrowing from Lotti. Moreover the incident occurred in 1731, and Bononcini remained in London for over a year receiving royal patronage. Lotti was an excellent teacher, as is evident from his many famous pupils, e.g., Marcello, Alberti, Bassani, Gasparini, and Galuppi. He was taken seriously ill in 1736, but lingered until 5 January, 1740, and was interred in the church of St. Geminiano. The monument to his memory was destroyed with the church in 1851.

THE THREE AGES
Lorenzo Lotto, Pitti Palace, Florence
(Attributed by Morelli to Giorgione and by Berenson to Morto da Feltre)

GROVE, *Dict. of Music and Musicians*, new ed. (London, 1906); EITNER, *Quellenlexikon* (1900–04); BURNEY, *General History of Music* (London, 1789).

W. H. GRATTAN-FLOOD.

Lotto, LORENZO, Italian portrait painter, b. at Venice, 1480; d. at Loreto, 1556. This eminent artist was one of the best portrait painters who ever lived, and occupies an almost unique position, especially amongst Italian artists, for his extraordinary skill in detecting the peculiarities of personal character and his power of setting them forth in full accord with the temperament and mood of his sitters. He was a great colourist, and possessed of a passionate admiration for the beautiful, with a somewhat definite tendency towards the ecstatic and mystical, in religion. He appears to have been a man of strong personal faith, and had a sincere devotion to Loreto and its great relic, the Holy House, spending his final years in that city, and devoting himself very largely to its interests. His early works were painted at Treviso, and from that place he went to Recanati in 1508 to paint an important altar-piece. We do not know who was his master, but his work reveals affinity with that of Alvise Vivarini. He is believed to have painted some frescoes in the upper floor of the Vatican in 1509, but, whether or not these were executed, he evidently studied the work of Raphael when in Rome, as in his own paintings from 1512 to 1525 there are many Raphaelistic characteristics. He first reached Bergamo, the place with which his name is so closely connected, in 1513, spent some five years there, and, after a visit to Venice in 1523, returned again to the same place. In 1512 and in 1526 he was painting at Jesi, the two works executed in the latter year being of high importance. A wonderful picture is the great "Crucifixion", painted at Monte San Giusto in 1531. In the following year he was in Venice, and a couple of years afterwards again in Bergamo. Many of his finest pictures were painted for small rural towns, such as Cingoli, Mogliano, Trescorre, and Jesi. Fortunately most of his works are dated, and he left behind him an account book, which he commenced in 1539, and in which he records the names of his later pictures. This book he kept down to within a few months of his death. There are a few of his drawings in existence, notably at Chatsworth, Wilton House, the Uffizi, and Vienna. Almost all his latest productions are at Loreto, but during the last three years of his life, he appears to have laid aside his brush.

He has been the subject of a monumental book by BERNHARD BERENSON (London, 1901), an essay in constructive art criticism that is not only the standard work on Lotto, but is also a psychological romance evolved out of the minutest criticism, and is the representative and classic work for all followers of Morellian analysis. To this work and to the detached *Essays* of GRONAU and MARY LOGAN the student must be referred. For earlier information, see TASSI, *Le Vite de' Pittori Bergamaschi* (Bergamo, 1793); VASARI, *Vite de' piu eccelenti pittori* (Florence, 1550), ed. MILANESI (Florence, 1878–85).

GEORGE CHARLES WILLIAMSON.

Loucheux, the would-be Kuchin of some ethnologists, and the Tukudh of the Protestant missionaries; Richardson called them Quarrellers. They call themselves generally Dindjye (men) and form an aggregate of closely related tribes, a sort of ethnographic confederation, the most north-western of all the Déné divisions. Their habitat extends from Anderson River in the east to the western extremity of Alaska. East of the Rocky Mountains their southern frontier is to-day about 67° N. lat., and west of that range their territory reaches somewhat more to the south. Practically the whole interior of Alaska is claimed by them. In the north they have for neighbours the Eskimos. They are, or were originally, divided into fourteen tribes, viz. the 'Kaiyuh-kho-'tenne, or People of the Willow River, conterminous with the Eskimos of Norton Sound, an important subdivision of more or less mixed blood more commonly known by its Eskimo name, Ingalete; the Koyu-kukh-o'tenne, or Coyukons, farther up the great Alaskan stream and along the Coyukuk River; the Yuna-kho'-tenne, still higher up on the left bank of the Yukon, as far as Tanana River; the Tanana, along the river called after them; the Kut'qa-kut'qin, at the confluence of the Porcupine; the *Gens du Large*, or Natce-kut'qin, from the Porcupine to the Romanoff Mountains; the Voenkut'qin, or People of the Lake; the Tza-'ke-kut'qin,

or Cross-Eyed Ones, being the particular tribe, between the headwaters of the Porcupine and Fort McPherson, which gave rise to the French name of Loucheux now applied to all those related Arctic aborigines; the Han-kut'qin, or River People, above the Kotlo River, on both banks of the Yukon; the utsone-kut'qin, or Crow People, from the sources of the Porcupine and the Peel to those of the Liard; the Tehanin-kut'qin, from the upper branches of the Yukon almost to the Pacific coast; the Thet'let-kut'qin, on Peel River; the Nakotco-ondjig-kut'qin, or People of the Mackenzie, and the Kwit'qa-kut'qin, who inhabit the dreary steppes bordering on the Arctic Ocean, barring a strip of land along the coast between the Mackenzie and the Anderson Rivers. The desinence *-kut'qin* in these tribal names means inhabitants of (as well as *'tenne* in other Déné denominations) and not men, as American ethnologists have freely stated.

The total population of the Loucheux tribes is today about 5500 souls. They are as a rule superior, physically and mentally, to the majority of the northern Dénés. Tall and of a rather pleasing appearance, they are more manly than their southern neighbours. Owing to the large extent of their habitat, their manners and customs cannot be represented as uniform. East and west of the Rocky Mountains they were originally remarkable for their fine beaded and befringed leather costume, the most conspicuous part of which was a coat with a peaked appendage in front and behind. Their footgear was made of one piece with the leggings, the counterpart among most American aborigines of the white man's trousers. During the winter they lived in semi-spherical skin lodges, not unlike those of the Tuskis of the eastern Asiatic coast, and in summer they replaced these by shelters usually made of coniferous boughs, generally erected in pairs of face to face dwellings so that a single fire on the outside served for both. Their tribal organization varies according to their environment. While east of the Rocky Mountains they have preserved the original patriarchy of the Dénés in all its primitive simplicity, some of the western tribes have adopted a sort of matriarchy, with chiefs, clans, totems and other consequent institutions. Their religion originally consisted in the shamanism common to all the northern Dénés, and their traditions clearly point to the west, that is, Asia, as the region whence they migrated. Their wars were, as usual, series of ambuscades and massacres, of which the Eskimos were often the victims. Several of these are on record, as for instance the treacherous slaying of five or six Eskimos on the Lower Mackenzie, in the spring of 1850, and, in October of the same year, the murder by the Coyukons of Lieutenant Barnard with his body servant, and then the destruction by fire and arrows of an almost entire village of the Nulato Indians, on the Yukon. Early the following spring the same party likewise encompassed the death of the Russian commander with one of his men, whereby we see that the assertion of Father Petitot that "the Loucheux never imbrued their hands in the blood of Europeans" (Traditions Indiennes du Canada Nord-Ouest, p. 14) is unreliable.

The Loucheux are of all the northern Déné tribes that which has been the least influenced by Catholicism. The Catholic missionaries had secured a firm footing among their neighbouring congeners when the Protestant preachers reached the Mackenzie and directed their steps towards the Loucheux, especially those whose habitat lay west of the Rocky Mountains, who had not as yet been visited. There being no priests to oppose them, they practically had the field to themselves. East of that range, the Oblate Fathers Seguin and Petitot, hailing from the Missions of Good Hope and Fort McPherson, long devoted themselves to the salvation of the Loucheux, not without success. But the fanaticism of those who had embraced Protestantism eventually resulted in the Catholic Loucheux having to leave Fort McPherson (where the priest's house was burnt down by their Protestant compatriots) for the environs of the Arctic Red River, where a Catholic mission was built for Loucheux and Eskimos. An Episcopalian clergyman, Rev. W. W. Kirkby, had already crossed the Rockies to proselytize among the western Loucheux. In 1862 and 1870 respectively, Fathers Seguin and Petitot followed him thither, going as far as Fort Yukon, but without any appreciable results, owing to the calumnies disseminated by the minister, who had preceded them in every village. Two years later, Bishop Clut, O.M.I., accompanied by Father Lecorre, walked in their footsteps and reached the Pacific, meeting along the Yukon with some slight success. Father Lecorre even remained on that stream until 1874, when he learned that Alaska had been entrusted to the Bishop of Vancouver Island. The latter advanced in 1877 as far as Nulato from the coast, but in Nov., 1886, he was murdered in the course of another apostolic tour in the valley of the Yukon (see SEGHERS, CHARLES). Nevertheless the efforts of the two bishops had not been in vain. They paved the way for the establishment by the Jesuits of a mission in 1887 among the westernmost Loucheux. The following year a little band of Sisters of St. Anne arrived there, who immediately opened a school for the Loucheux and Eskimo girls, while lay brothers of the Society of Jesus were doing the same on behalf of the boys of both nations. Most of the eastern Loucheux are now excellent Catholics.

RICHARDSON, *Arctic Searching Expedition*, 2 vols. (London, 1851); HOOPER, *Ten Months among the Tents of the Tuski* (London, 1853); WHYMPER, *Travel and Adventure in the Territory of Alaska* (London, 1868); PETITOT, *op. cit.*, and *Monographie des Déné-Dindjié* (Paris, 1876); DALL, *Tribes of the Extreme North-west* (Washington, 1877); SCHWATKA, *Along Alaska's Great River* (New York, 1885); MORICE, *The Western Dénés; their Manners and Customs* (Toronto, 1890); *The Great Déné Race* (in course of publication, Vienna, Austria); DEVINE, *Across Widest America* (New York, 1906).

A. G. MORICE.

Louis IX, SAINT, King of France, son of Louis VIII and Blanche of Castile, b. at Poissy, 25 April, 1215; d. near Tunis, 25 August, 1270. He was eleven years of age when the death of Louis VIII made him king, and nineteen when he married Marguerite of Provence by whom he had eleven children. The regency of Blanche of Castile (1226–1234) was marked by the victorious struggle of the Crown against Raymond VII in Languedoc, against Pierre Mauclerc in Brittany, against Philip Hurepel in the Ile de France, and by indecisive combats against Henry III of England. In this period of disturbances the queen was powerfully supported by the legate Frangipani. Accredited to Louis VIII by Honorius III as early as 1225, Frangipani won over to the French cause the sympathies of Gregory IX, who was inclined to listen to Henry III, and through his intervention it was decreed that all the chapters of the dioceses should pay to Blanche of Castile tithes for the southern crusade. It was the legate who received the submission of Raymond VII, Count of Languedoc, at Paris, in front of Notre-Dame, and this submission put an end to the Albigensian war and prepared the union of the southern provinces to France by the Treaty of Paris (April, 1229). The influence of Blanche de Castile over the government extended far beyond St. Louis's minority. Even later, in public business and when ambassadors were officially received, she appeared at his side. She died in 1253. In the first years of the king's personal government, the Crown had to combat a fresh rebellion against feudalism, led by the Count de la Marche, in league with Henry III. St. Louis's victory over this coalition at Taillebourg, 1242, was followed by the Peace of Bordeaux which annexed to the French realm a part of Saintonge.

SAINT LOUIS

RELIEVING THE NEEDY
V. H. LESUR (1887)

RULING HIS SUBJECTS
A. CABANEL—PANTHÉON

WITH HIS MOTHER BLANCHE OF CASTILE
A. CABANEL—PANTHÉON

A CRUSADER IN PALESTINE
A. CABANEL—PANTHÉON

It was one of St. Louis's chief characteristics to carry on abreast his administration as national sovereign and the performance of his duties towards Christendom; and taking advantage of the respite which the Peace of Bordeaux afforded, he turned his thoughts towards a crusade. Stricken down with a fierce malady in 1244, he resolved to take the cross when news came that the Turcomans had defeated the Christians and the Moslems and invaded Jerusalem. (On the two crusades of St. Louis [1248–1249 and 1270] see CRUSADES.) Between the two crusades he opened negotiations with Henry III, which, he thought would prevent new conflicts between France and England. The Treaty of Paris (28 May, 1258) which St. Louis concluded with the King of England after five years' parley, has been very much discussed. By this treaty St. Louis gave Henry III all the fiefs and domains belonging to the King of France in the Dioceses of Limoges, Cahors, and Périgueux; and in the event of Alphonsus of Poitiers dying without issue, Saintonge and Agenais would escheat to Henry III. On the other hand Henry III renounced his claims to Normandy, Anjou, Touraine, Maine, Poitou, and promised to do homage for the Duchy of Guyenne. It was generally considered, and Joinville voiced the opinion of the people, that St. Louis made too many territorial concessions to Henry III; and many historians held that if, on the contrary, St. Louis had carried the war against Henry III further, the Hundred Years' War would have been averted. But St. Louis considered that by making the Duchy of Guyenne a fief of the Crown of France he was gaining a moral advantage; and it is an undoubted fact that the Treaty of Paris, was as displeasing to the English as it was to the French. In 1263, St. Louis was chosen as arbitrator in a difference which separated Henry III and the English barons: by the "Dit d'Amiens" (24 January, 1264) he declared himself for Henry III against the barons, and annulled the Provisions of Oxford, by which the barons had attempted to restrict the authority of the king. It was also in the period between the two crusades that St. Louis, by the Treaty of Corbeil, imposed upon the King of Aragon the abandonment of his claims to all the fiefs in Languedoc excepting Montpellier, and the surrender of his rights to Provence (11 May, 1258). Treaties and arbitrations prove St. Louis to have been above all a lover of peace, a king who desired not only to put an end to conflicts, but also to remove the causes for fresh wars, and this spirit of peace rested upon the Christian conception,

St. Louis's relations with the Church of France and the papal Court have excited widely divergent interpretations and opinions. However, all historians agree that St. Louis and the successive popes united to protect the clergy of France from the encroachments or molestations of the barons and royal officers. It is equally recognized that during the absence of St. Louis at the crusade, Blanche of Castile protected the clergy in 1251 from the plunder and ill-treatment of a mysterious old maurauder called the "Hungarian Master" who was followed by a mob of armed men—called the "Pastoureaux". The "Hungarian Master" who was said to be in league with the Moslems died in an engagement near Villaneuve and the entire band pursued in every direction was dispersed and annihilated. But did St. Louis take measures also to defend the independence of the clergy against the papacy? A number of historians once claimed he did. They attributed to St. Louis a certain "pragmatic sanction" of March, 1269, prohibiting irregular collations of ecclesiastical benefices, prohibiting simony, and interdicting the tributes which the papal Court received from the French clergy. The Gallicans of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries often made use of this measure against the Holy See; the truth is that it was a forgery fabricated in the fourteenth century by jurisconsults desirous of giving to the Pragmatic Sanction of Charles VII a precedent worthy of respect. This so-called pragmatic of Louis IX is presented as a royal decree for the reformation of the Church; never would St. Louis thus have taken upon himself the right to proceed authoritatively with this reformation. When in 1246, a great number of barons from the north and the west leagued against the clergy whom they accused of amassing too great wealth and of encroaching upon their rights, Innocent IV called upon Louis to dissolve this league; how the king acted in the matter is not definitely known. On 2 May, 1247, when the Bishops of Soissons and of Troyes, the archdeacon of Tours, and the provost of the cathedral of Rouen, despatched to the pope a remonstrance against his taxations, his preferment of Italians in the distribution of benefices, against the conflicts between papal jurisdiction and the jurisdiction of the ordinaries, Marshal Ferri Pasté seconded their complaints in the name of St. Louis. Shortly after, these complaints were reiterated and detailed in a lengthy memorandum, the text of which has been preserved by Mathieu Paris, the historian. It is not known whether St. Louis affixed his signature to it, but in any case, this document was simply a request asking for the suppression of the abuses, with no pretensions to laying down principles of public right, as was claimed by the Pragmatic Sanction.

Documents prove that St. Louis did not lend an ear to the grievances of his clergy against the emissaries of Urban IV and Clement IV; he even allowed Clement IV to generalize a custom in 1265 according to which the benefices the titularies of which died while sojourning in Rome, should be disposed of by the pope. Docile to the decrees of the Lateran Council (1215), according to which kings were not to tax the churches of their realm without authority from the pope, St. Louis claimed and obtained from successive popes, in view of the crusade, the right to levy quite heavy taxes from the clergy. It is again this fundamental idea of the crusade, ever present in St. Louis's thoughts, that prompted his attitude generally in the struggle between the empire and the pope. While the Emperor Frederick II and the successive popes sought and contended for France's support, St. Louis's attitude was at once decided and reserved. On the one hand he did not accept for his brother Robert of Artois, the imperial crown offered him by Gregory IX in 1240. In his correspondence with Frederick he continued to treat him as a sovereign, even after Frederick had been excommunicated and declared dispossessed of his realms by Innocent IV at the Council of Lyons, 17 July, 1245. But on the other hand, in 1251, the king compelled Frederick to release the French archbishops taken prisoners by the Pisans, the emperor's auxiliaries, when on their way in a Genoese fleet to attend a general council at Rome. In 1245, he conferred at length, at Cluny, with Innocent IV who had taken refuge in Lyons in December, 1244, to escape the threats of the emperor, and it was at this meeting that the papal dispensation for the marriage of Charles Anjou, brother of Louis IX, to Beatrix, heiress of Provence was granted, and it was then that Louis IX and Blanche of Castile promised Innocent IV their support. Finally, when in 1247 Frederick II took steps to capture Innocent IV at Lyons, the measures Louis took to defend the pope were one of the reasons which caused the emperor to withdraw. St. Louis looked upon every act of hostility from either power as an obstacle to accomplishing the crusade. In the quarrel over investitures, the king kept on friendly terms with both, not allowing the emperor to harass the pope and never exciting the pope against the emperor. In 1262 when Urban offered St. Louis, the Kingdom of Sicily, a fief of the Apostolic See, for one of his sons, St. Louis refused it, through consideration for the Swabian dynasty then reigning; but when Charles of Anjou accepted Urban IV's offer and went

to conquer the Kingdom of Sicily, St. Louis allowed the bravest knights of France to join the expedition which destroyed the power of the Hohenstaufens in Sicily. The king hoped, doubtless, that the possession of Sicily by Charles of Anjou would be advantageous to the crusade.

St. Louis led an exemplary life, bearing constantly in mind his mother's words: "I had rather see you dead at my feet than guilty of a mortal sin." His biographers have told us of the long hours he spent in prayer, fasting, and penance, without the knowledge of his subjects. The French king was a great lover of justice. French fancy still pictures him delivering judgments under the oak of Vincennes. It was during his reign that the "court of the king" (*curia regis*) was organized into a regular court of justice, having competent experts, and judicial commissions acting at regular periods. These commissions were called parlements and the history of the "Dit d'Amiens" proves that entire Christendom willingly looked upon him as an international justiciary. It is an error, however, to represent him as a great legislator; the document known as "Etablissements de St. Louis" was not a code drawn up by order of the king, but merely a collection of customs, written out before 1273 by a jurist, who set forth in this book the customs of Orléans, Anjou, and Maine, to which he added a few ordinances of St. Louis. St. Louis was a patron of architecture. The Sainte Chappelle, an architectural gem, was constructed in his reign, and it was under his patronage that Robert of Sorbonne founded the "Collège de la Sorbonne", which became the seat of the theological faculty of Paris. He was renowned for his charity. The peace and blessings of the realm come to us through the poor he would say. Beggars were fed from his table, he ate their leavings, washed their feet, ministered to the wants of the lepers, and daily fed over one hundred poor. He founded many hospitals and houses: the House of the Filles-Dieu for reformed prostitutes; the Quinze-Vingt for 300 blind men (1254), hospitals at Pontoise, Vernon, Compiègne.

The "Enseignements" (written instructions) which he left to his son Philip and to his daughter Isabel, the discourses preserved by the witnesses at judicial investigations preparatory to his canonization, and Joinville's anecdotes show St. Louis to have been a man of sound common sense, possessing indefatigable energy, graciously kind and of playful humour, and constantly guarding against the temptation to be imperious. The caricature made of him by the envoy of the Count of Gueldre: "worthless devotee, hypocritical king" was very far from the truth. On the contrary, St. Louis, through his personal qualities as well as his saintliness, increased for many centuries the prestige of the French monarchy (see FRANCE). St. Louis's canonization was proclaimed at Orvieto in 1297, by Boniface VIII. Of the inquiries in view of canonization, carried on from 1273 till 1297, we have only fragmentary reports published by Delaborde (Mémoires de la société de l'histoire de Paris et de l'Ile de France", XXIII, 1896) and a series of extracts compiled by Guillaume de St. Pathus, Queen Marguerite's confessor, under the title of "Vie Monseigneur Saint Loys" (Paris, 1899).

Historiens de la France, XX–XXIII. GUILLAUME DE NANGIS, *Vie de St. Louis*, ed. GÉRAUD (Paris, 1843); JOINVILLE, *Vie de St. Louis*, ed. DE WAILLY (Paris, 1874); *Etablissement de St. Louis*, ed. VIOLLET (Paris, 1881–86); LE NAIN DE TILLEMONT, *Vie de St. Louis* (Paris, 1847–51); FAURE, *Histoire de St. Louis* (Paris, 1865); WALLON, *St. Louis et son temps* (Paris, 1875); LECOY DE LA MARCHE, *La France sous St. Louis* (Paris, 1894); BERGER, *Histoire de Blanche de Castille* (Paris, 1895); SEPET, *Saint Louis* (Paris, 1898); PERRY, *St. Louis, the most Christian King* (New York, 1901); BERGER, *St. Louis et Innocent IV. étude sur les rapports de la France et du Saint Siège* (Paris, 1893); DAVIS, *The Invasion of Egypt by Louis IX of France, and a History of the Contemporary Sultans of Egypt* (London, 1898); LONGNON, *Documents parisiens sur l'iconographie de St. Louis* (Paris, 1882); CHEVALIER, *Biobibl.* 2873–83.

GEORGES GOYAU.

Louis XI, King of France, eldest son of Charles VII and Marie of Anjou, b. at Bourges 3 July, 1423; d. at Plessis-les-Tours, 30 August, 1483. Having married Margaret of Scotland in June, 1436, he took part in two intrigues against his father, Charles VII, the first in 1440, when he organized the revolt of the Praguerie, the second in 1446, when he withdrew into Dauphiny and later to the Court of the Duke of Burgundy. Succeeding to the throne, 21 July, 1461, he had to make large concessions, by the Treaties of Conflans and Saint-Maur (1465), to the feudal lords, who had organized against him the League of the Public Weal (*Ligue du Bien public*). But his revenge was swift; he imposed a humiliating peace on the Duke of Brittany (1468). Louis looked upon Charles the Bold, Duke of Burgundy, as the head of the feudal organization; he had to treat with him or subdue him. The Conference of Péronne (1468) ended with an act of treachery on the part of Charles, who retained Louis a prisoner, forced him to sign a disadvantageous treaty, and took the king with him on an expedition against the revolted burghers of Liège. But on the return of Louis to France preparations were begun for a decisive struggle between the king, who, in 1474, had formed an alliance with the Swiss cantons, and the duke, who was an ally of the King of England. Charles the Bold having fallen at Nancy, 5 January, 1477, Louis took possession of the Duchy of Burgundy, of Artois, and of Hainaut. Margaret, daughter of Charles the Bold, married Maximilian of Austria, in August, 1477; the result of this marriage would have been to place Burgundy and Artois in the hands of Philip the Handsome, grandson of Charles, and it was to provide against such an undesirable eventuality that Louis affianced his son Charles (afterwards Charles VIII) to the daughter of Margaret and Maximilian. (The marriage of Charles VIII to Anne of Brittany, in 1491, after Louis's death, frustrated this precaution.) Louis passed his last years in his castle of Plessis-les-Tours, surrounded by persons of low estate, very suspicious, very irascible. His character was contemptible, though he was a clever politician; he was fond of pilgrimages and pious practices, but he had a narrow idea of God; his religion was based on morbid fear, his Christianity never displayed itself in kind deeds. His perfidy and cruelty were notorious; he kept Cardinal Balue (q. v.) a prisoner for eleven years in an iron cage.

The relations of Louis XI with the Holy See are worthy of special study, for they definitely shaped the religious policy of the French monarchy. From the beginning of his reign there were two questions that necessitated continued communication between Louis and the pope: the question of the Pragmatic Sanction and the Italian question. Pius II, at the Council of Mantua, in 1459, had protested once more against the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges, and the Bull "Execrabilis" (18 June, 1460), by which Pius II condemned appeals to future councils, was directed against it. Again, Louis was always anxious to form an offensive and defensive alliance with the smaller Italian States, to reduce the revolted Genoese, and bring the north of the peninsula under his sway by means of the possessions of the house of Orléans in Lombardy, to bring under his control the house of Anjou in Naples, to marry the Duke of Calabria to a daughter of Francis Sforza, and gradually to obtain a kind of hegemony in Italy.

He began his reign by suppressing the Pragmatic Sanction (27 November, 1461). In this way he set himself in opposition to the policy of his father—an attitude which he was anxious to emphasize—and at the same time he took away from the episcopal aristocracy, the feudalism of the Church, a weapon which they very much desired to keep. And thus the same measure which won him the favour of Rome

also entered into the plan of his campaign against feudalism. He even restored the Duchies of Die and Valentinois to Pius II. But when he saw that the pope was unwilling to aid him in recapturing Genoa, and supported the Neapolitan claims of Ferrante, the candidate hostile to the House of Anjou, Louis changed his attitude, and, in 1463, began a religious war. It was marked by the ordinance of Paris (17 February, 1463) which forbade the giving of any of the property of deceased ecclesiastics to the pontifical collectors; by the ordinances of Muret (24 May, 1463) and Luxieu (19 June, 1464), by which the king claimed the disposal of all vacant benefices as a right of the Crown (*régale*) and revived the Pragmatic Sanction in Dauphiny by the ordinance of Dampierre (June, 1464), which prohibited the raising of "undue subsidies" established by Rome; by the ordinance of Rue (7 September, 1464), which suppressed the *grâces expectatives* (reversionary rights to benefices). These ordinances were so displeasing to the Holy See that Pius II, a little before his death (15 August, 1464), threatened Louis with excommunication. Moreover, Louis, at the beginning of the reign of Paul II, refused to allow the collection of tithes for the crusades, and entertained the proposals of Podiebrad of Bohemia, for assembling an anti-papal council. But the discontent of the clergy with Louis helped to develop the League of the Public Weal (1465), the members of which asked Paul II to release them from their oath of fidelity to the king.

Louis XI
French School, circa 1490

Louis then adopted, from 1465 to 1468, a more friendly policy towards Rome; he sent thither as his ambassador, Balue, Bishop of Angers, and by the ordinance of Etampes (24 July, 1467) revoked the edicts curtailing the papal authority. But when, in 1468, the king wished to try Cardinal Balue for treason, a conflict arose between Louis and Paul II, who did not wish the cardinal to be tried by civil judges. During the three years' struggle, Louis could not induce the Holy See to recognize the supremacy of the lay magistracy. He imprisoned Balue and the other prelates, for whose liberty the Holy See was contending. There seemed to be no way of coming to terms, when, in 1471, Paul II was succeeded by Sixtus IV. The new pope sent Cardinal Bessarion to France to preach the crusade against the Turks. Louis sent Gérard de Crussol, Bishop of Valence, to Rome. This mission resulted in the Concordat of Amboise (31 October, 1472), by the terms of which the pope agreed that no priest should be raised to any dignity until he had first obtained royal letters attesting that he was *persona grata* to the king. The alternative system was to be adopted in bestowing benefices: the pope was to dispose of them only during six months of the year. Of the reversionary rights reserved to the pope, two out of six were to be at the disposal of the royal family and the parliamentary courts. The pope made other concessions in matters of taxation and jurisdiction. This concordat marks the first successful attempt on the part of the French kings to acquire the right of interfering in the nomination to ecclesiastical offices. Soon both parties were dissatisfied with the concordat. Moreover, the political sympathies of the pope and his legates with the cause of Charles the Bold irritated Louis, who revenged himself by occupying Avignon, by ordering (8 January, 1475) pontifical Bulls to be verified before being published in France, and by convoking a general council at Lyons.

Louis, however, did not wish to go the length of causing a schism; his policy from that time was directed against the pope as a temporal sovereign. The conspiracy of the Pazzi (1478) gave him an opportunity. Lorenzo de' Medici asked his help; he intervened, and charged Commines with diplomatic missions to Florence and Rome. Soon he became the undisputed arbiter of Italy. The pope's attempt to win the support of Austria was unsuccesful. On the other hand, as Louis needed the help of the pope to bring about peace with Maximilian, he and Sixtus IV were reconciled, thanks to the diplomatic skill of the legate, Giuliano della Rovere, later Julius II, who also obtained the release of Balue. A certain amount of coquetting between France and the papacy marked the last months of Louis's life. Sixtus IV offered the Dauphin of France the investiture of Naples; and Louis, who acted as arbiter between the pope and Venice, decided in favour of the Holy See. The results of this reign were twofold: on the one hand, the moral hegemony which France had gained in Italy, and which made Louis XI in the words of the Florentine Government "the preserver of peace in Italy", inaugurated the policy that gave rise to the wars of Italy; on the other hand, the manifold negotiations between the king and the pope, and the concordat of 1472, had prepared for the Church of France the coming of a regime in which the pope and the king, without consulting the bishops and the clergy, divided between them the government of the Church. This regime, begun by the Concordat of 1516, lasted till the Revolution. Louis XI died in the arms of St. Francis of Paula, and was buried in the church of Notre-Dame-de-Cléry, near Orléans, whither he had frequently gone as a pilgrim.

Basin, *Histoire de Charles VII et de Louis XI*, ed. Quicherat (Paris, 1854–9); Commines, *Mémoires*, ed. Dupont (Paris, 1840–7); Voesen et Charavay, *Lettres de Louis XI* (Paris, 1885–1900); Duclos, *Histoire de Louis XI* (Paris, 1745); Thibault, *La jeunesse de Louis XI* (Paris, 1908); Combet, *Louis XI et le Saint-Siège* (Paris, 1903); Rey, *Louis XI et les états pontificaux de France au XV^e siècle* (Grenoble, 1899); Pastor, *History of the Popes from the Close of the Middle Ages*, III, IV (St. Louis, 1902).

Georges Goyau.

Louis XIV, King of France, b. at Saint-Germain-en-Laye, 16 September, 1638; d. at Versailles, 1 September, 1715; was the son of Louis XIII and Anne of Austria, and became king, upon the death of his father, 14 May, 1643. Until 1661 the real master of France was Cardinal Mazarin (q. v.), under whose government his country, victorious over Austria (1643–48) and Spain (1643–59), acquired by the Treaties of Westphalia (1648) and the Pyrenees (1659) Alsace, Artois, and Roussillon, which had already been occupied by French troops since the days of Richelieu. As a result of the marriage between Louis XIV and Maria Theresa of Austria, Louis XIV also acquired rights over the Low Countries. When Louis's personal government began (1661) France

was the arbiter of Europe: she had re-established peace among the Powers of the North (Sweden, Brandenburg, Denmark, and Poland); she protected the League of the Rhine, and her authority in Germany was greater than the emperor's. At that period the power of France, established upon the firmest foundations, was perhaps less imposing, but was assuredly more solid, than it became during the most glorious days of Louis XIV's personal government.

The memory of those dangers with which the parliamentary Fronde and the Fronde of the nobles (1648–53) had threatened the power of the Crown persuaded the young king that he must govern in absolute fashion, regardless of the still existing provincial relics and local rights. The nobility became a court nobility and, the nobles instead of residing on their estates where they were influential, became mere ornaments of the Court. The Parliaments, which had hitherto used their right of registration (*droit d'enregistrement*) of edicts to revise, to some extent, the kings decrees, were trained to submission. The whole power of the State, represented in the provinces by intendants at once docile and energetic, was gathered up in the hands of the king, who consulted, in his council, certain assistants chosen by himself—Colbert, for finance and justice; Louvois, for war; Lionne, for foreign affairs. Colbert (q. v.) desired that France should rule the sea. He did much to develop French colonial power; but before the end of the reign that power was to enter upon its period of decadence. Colbert's plans, were indeed, constantly embarrassed by the Continental wars which Louis undertook. No doubt, the king was forced into some of these wars: it was necessary to strengthen the French frontier at certain points. But his lust of fame, the flattery of his courtiers, and his desire to humiliate Europe led him to prefer the glories of warfare to the wiser and more durable triumphs which a great maritime development would have secured for France. His European policy continued those of Richelieu and of Mazarin in the struggle against the House of Austria, but it differed, too, from the policies of the two cardinals in being a policy of religious creed, confronting Protestantism in Holland and England.

The war against Spain (1667–68) undertaken to enforce the claim of the queen, Maria Theresa, to the sovereignty of the Low Countries (*guerre de dévolution*), in which the king in person accomplished the conquest of Flanders and made a military promenade in Franche-Comté; the Dutch War (1672–78), in which Louis distinguished himself by that passage of the Rhine, of which contemporary poets sang, by the siege of Besançon, the definitive conquest of Franche-Comté (1674), and two campaigns in Flanders (1676–78); the judiciary and police measures by virtue of which, without any declaration of war, he occupied Strasburg (1681), a free and imperial city, as well as several other places on the banks of the Rhine—all these brought Louis XIV to the apogee of his glory, the date of which is commonly assigned as the year 1685. But these very successes, the king's habit of not considering himself bound by treaties, and the pride which led him to commemorate by insulting medals his triumphs over various nations, combined to arouse in Europe a sort of uprising against France which found expression in numerous pamphlets, on the one hand, and, on the other, in diplomatic coalitions. The soul of these coalitions was the Protestant William of Orange. The League of Augsburg, formed in 1688 between the emperor, Spain, Holland, and Savoy, set on foot a war during which Louis himself, in 1691 and 1692, made two campaigns in Flanders. In spite of the victories of Luxembourg and Catinat the war was ruinous for Louis XIV, and ended in a peace less glorious than those which had preceded it (Peace of Ryswick, 1697), forcing him to restore Lorraine and all the cities of the empire outside of Alsace, and to recognize William as King of England. Thus, at the opening of the eighteenth century, Louis stood face to face with England, a Protestant power, a power in which instead of the monarchy or Divine right the Parliament held sway, and, lastly, a power already stronger on the sea than France was—three circumstances which made the prestige of that nation all the more galling to the King of France.

In consequence of the testament of Charles II, King of Spain, the Spanish Throne passed from the Habsburgs to the Bourbons. The Duke of Anjou, the king's grandson, became Philip V of Spain. Hence resulted the War of the Spanish Succession, a long and ruinous war, and yet glorious, thanks to the triumphs of Vendôme and Villars, though it brought France to the brink of destruction. At one time, in 1712, the king thought of placing himself at the head of his brave nobility, and burying himself beneath the ruins of his throne. The victory of Villars at Denain (1712) saved the country. The Treaties of Utrecht and Baden (1713 and 1714) maintained Philip V on the throne of Spain, but gave to the emperor Spain's ancient possessions in Italy, doomed the maritime power of France to destruction, and made a breach in her colonial power by the cession of Newfoundland and Acadia to England, thus firmly establishing England in North America at the same time that she was established, at Gibraltar, in the Mediterranean.

The close of his reign, saddened by these reverses and by financial catastrophes, also brought a series of personal griefs to Louis XIV: the death of the Dauphin (1711), of the Duke of Burgundy, the king's grandson, and the Duchess of Burgundy (1712), of their eldest son (1712), and of his other grandson, the Duke of Berry (1714). He left his throne to Louis XV, then five years of age, the son of the Duke of Burgundy. Thus did all the glories of the reign end in the dangers of a regency. Such as he was, Louis XIV left a great memory in the soul of France. Voltaire calls the seventeenth century the Age of Louis XIV. Warriors like Turenne, Condé, Luxembourg, Catinat, Vendôme, and Villars, navigators like Duquesne, Trouville, and Duguay-Trouin, preachers like Bossuet, Bourdaloue, and Massillon, engineers like Vauban, architects like Perrault and Mansart, painters like Poussin, Le Sueur, and Le Brun, sculptors like Puget, writers like Corneille, Racine, Molière, Boileau, La Fontaine, La Bruyère, Fénelon, Madame de Sévigné, gave to France a glory by which Louis XIV profited, and the "Mémoires" of Saint-Simon, in which the reverse of that glory is often exhibited, have rather enriched the history of the reign than damaged the prestige of the king.

Louis XIV and Religion.—Louis XIV was much occupied with religion and religious questions. His reign is generally considered as divided into two periods: (1) that of libertinage, during which his heart was ruled by Mlle de la Vallière, Madame de Montespan, and other favourites; (2) that of devotion, coinciding with the influence of Madame de Maintenon, the widow of Scarron, who, when Maria Theresa died (31 July, 1683), secretly married the king, and who, for a quarter of a century assisted him in ruling the kingdom. The second of these two periods was also that of the influence of Père Le Tellier (q. v.). This division is natural and accounts for certain developments of religious policy; but it must not be exaggerated. Even during his period of libertinage, Louis XIV took a passionate interest in religious questions; and during his devout period, he never altogether abandoned those Gallican principles which incessantly exposed him to conflicts with Rome. Certain pamphlets, published in the days of the Fronde, opposed to the doctrines of royal absolutism the old theological doctrine of the origin and the responsibilities of power. "Le Théologien Politique" declares that obedience is due only to

those kings who demand what is just and reasonable; the treatise "Chrétien et Politique" asserts that kings do not make peoples, but that peoples have made kings. But the doctrine of the Divine right of kings succeeded in establishing itself upon the ruins of the Fronde; according to that doctrine Louis XIV had to reckon only with God, and the same doctrine served as one of the supports of the dictatorship which he pretended to exercise over the Church of France.

In the "Mémoires" of Louis XIV a whole theory of the relations between Church and State is expounded. He sets forth that the king is the proprietor of the Church's wealth, in virtue of the maxim that there is no other proprietor in the kingdom but the king. He holds that all the faithful, "whether lay or tonsured", are the sovereign's subjects; that the clergy are bound to bear their part pecuniarily in the public burdens, and that they "should not excuse themselves from that obligation by alleging that their possessions are for a particular purpose, or that the employment of those possessions must be regulated by the intention of the donors". The assemblies of the clergy, which discuss the amounts to be contributed by the clergy, are, in the eyes of Louis XIV, only tolerated; he considers that, as sovereign, he would be within his rights in laying imposts upon the clergy, and that "the popes who have wished to contest that right of royalty have made it clearer and more incontestable by the distinct withdrawal of their ambitious pretensions which they have been obliged to make"; he declares it to be inadmissible that ecclesiastics, "exempt from the dangers of war and the burden of families", should not contribute to the necessities of the State. The Minims of Provence had dedicated to Louis XIV a thesis in which they compared him to God; Bossuet declared that the king could not tolerate any such doctrine, and the Sorbonne condemned it. But at Court the person of the king was the object of a sort of religious worship, in which certain courtier bishops too easily acquiesced, and the consequence of which became perceptible in the relations between the Church and the State.

From these principles resulted his attitude towards the assemblies of the clergy. He shortened the duration of their sessions and caused them to be watched by his ministers, while Colbert, who detested the financial autonomy enjoyed by the clergy, went so far as to say that it would be well "to put a stop to these assemblies which the wisest politicians have always considered diseases of the body politic". From these principles, too, arose the fear of everything by which churchmen could acquire political influence. Unlike his predecessors, Louis XIV employed few prelates in the service of the State.

The Concordat of Francis I placed a large number of benefices at the disposal of Louis XIV; he felt that the appointment of bishops was the most critical part of his kingly duty, and the bishops whom he appointed were, in general, very well chosen. He erred, however, in the readiness with which he dispensed them from residence in their dioceses, while, as to abbacies, he too often availed himself of them to reward services rendered by laymen, and gave them as means of support to impoverished nobles. To the Comte du Vexin, his son by Madame de Montespan, he gave the two great Abbacies of Saint-Denis and Saint-Germain-des-Prés.

Louis XIV was particularly fond of taking a hand in doctrinal matters; and those who surrounded him ended by believing that the king could supervise the Church and supply it with information on religious questions. Daguesseau, on 14 August, 1699, went so far as to proclaim that the King of France ought to be both king and priest. Thus it was that, for example, in the midst of the war of the League of Augsburg, Louis was careful to have a report prepared for him on a catechism which was suspected of Jansenism; and so, again, in 1715, he caused a lieutenant of police to be reprimanded for neglecting to report three preachers of Paris who were in the habit of speaking of grace in a Jansenistic manner.

Louis XIV and the Papacy.—There was always a certain inconsistency in Louis's policy towards the Holy See. On the one hand, he called forth the intervention of Alexander VII against the Jansenists (see below), which would have been anomalous if the king had believed that the Bishop of Rome was no more in the Church than any other bishop. On the other hand, he set himself up as the head of his Church (though, at the same time, not wishing to be schismatical), and the Gallicanism of his magistrates and some

Louis XIV, King of France

of his bishops found support in him. Full submission to Rome and rupture with Rome were equally distasteful to him. The humiliation which he inflicted on Alexander VII when Créqui, his ambassador, had to complain of the pope's Corsican guard (August, 1662) was inspired rather by the need of displaying his unlimited power than by any feeling of hostility to the Holy See (see Alexander VII). In 1665, a papal Bull having condemned the censure which the Sorbonne had passed against the doctrine of infallibility, Louis, after inviting the procurator-general to appeal against it *comme d'abus*, desisted from further action. In 1666, when Colbert, in order to diminish the number of priests and monks, wished to put back the legal age for ordination, the nuncio declared to Père Aunat, the king's confessor, that there would be a schism if the king continued to consult only laymen on spiritual affairs; Louis thought these words "horrible", and Colbert's project was abandoned. In short, Louis XIV held that, as he expressed it, it was "an advantage that the Roman Curia should be favourable to him rather than unfavourable".

In 1673 the conflict of the *régale* broke out. The

term *régale* was applied to that right by which the king upon the death of a bishop, drew the revenues of the see and made appointments to benefices until the new bishop had registered his oath in the Court of Exchequer (*Chambre des comptes*). Louis XIV claimed, in 1673 and again in 1675, that the right of *régale* was his in all the bishoprics of the kingdom. Pavillon, Bishop of Alet, and Caulet, Bishop of Pamiers, refused to submit. These prelates, both Jansenists, alleged that the Jesuits had stretched the right of *régale* so as to increase the number of benefices in the collation of which Père La Chaise, the king's confessor, might exert his influence. In 1677, Caulet, having refused to give the cure of souls within his diocese to priests whom the king had nominated in virtue of the *régale*, was deprived of his temporalities. Three Briefs of Innocent XI (March, 1678, and January and December, 1679) sustained Caulet and threatened Louis with the pains of conscience before God's tribunal and the rumour was current that the king was about to be excommunicated.

In July, 1680, the assembly of the clergy, in a letter to the king, identified themselves with the king and threatened the pope. Upon the death of Caulet, the Diocese of Pamiers was contested between the vicar capitular nominated by the chapter, who was hostile to the *régale*, and another vicar capitular, nominated by the Archbishop of Toulouse and installed by the royal officers. The former of these two vicars was removed by the king's order, the latter was excommunicated by the pope. A third vicar capitular, nominated by the chapter, remained in hiding while he administered the diocese, was condemned to death, and was executed in effigy by the king's command. A rupture between Louis and the Holy See appeared to be imminent; the king, in convoking the assembly of the clergy for November, 1681, threw out some hints of a schism. This was an attempt to frighten the pope. In fact, neither side wished for any schism. Louis made the concession that priests provided by him in virtue of his right of *régale* should be obliged to first receive canonical mission, and this concession was offset by the passage of the Declaration of the Four Articles, which showed the "wish to humilate Rome". The very animated correspondence between the pope and the assembly was a disquieting circumstance, but Louis prorogued the assembly on 29 June, 1682 (see Bossuet; Assemblies of the French Clergy). In this way he made his escape from the advisers who, to use his own words, would have liked to "invite him to don the turban". He had, in the words of the Jesuit Avrigny, "a foundation of religion which would not allow him to face these divisions without emotion".

Again, when Innocent XI steadfastly refused to accept bishops, who, as priests, had participated in the assembly of 1682, Louis went through a series of manœuvres which had the appearance of acts of contrition. Innocent remained insensible to all this and, on the other hand, refused to maintain the right of asylum and the franchises which the ambassador of France claimed at Rome. This new incident made an immense stir in Europe; there was talk of the conquest of Avignon and Civitavecchia by France; the Bull of 12 May, 1687, excommunicating the ambassador and his accomplices, was pronounced abominable by the *parlementaires* of Paris, who had in view the assembling of a national council and declared that the pope, by reason of his infirmities, could no longer support the weight of the papacy. Alexander VIII (1689–91), during his short pontificate, induced Louis to surrender his claim in the matter of the franchises and also published a Bull, until then reserved, by which Innocent XI had condemned the Declaration of 1682. Innocent XII (1691–1700) made but one concession to Louis XIV: he declared his readiness to grant Bulls without delay to all bishops nominated by the king, provided they had taken no part in the assembly of 1682, and provided that they made a profession of faith before the nuncio. Louis, on 14 September, 1693, declared that, to show his veneration for the pope, he ordered the declaration of 1682 to be held without effect in regard to religious policy. The Gallicans in France and the Protestants abroad pointed to this decision of the king as a desertion of his principles.

The good understanding between Louis and the papacy, while they fought side by side against Jansenism (see below), was again momentarily clouded during the War of the Spanish Succession. In a very long and very cordial Brief dated 6 February, 1701, Clement XI had recognized Philip V as King of Spain. Political conditions, threats made against him by the Emperor Joseph I, brought the pope to recognize Charles III as king, 10 October, 1709. The diplomatic representatives of Louis XIV and Philip V at Rome had done everything to prevent this; the extremely reserved tone and the laconic style of the Brief addressed to Charles III did not sufficiently console them and Cardinal de la Trémouille, on 13 October, 1709, protested in the name of Louis XIV against the public recognition of Charles III, which was to take place in Consistory on the next day.

Louis XIV and the Heresies.—His care to maintain a certain orthodoxy, and the conception which he had formed of the religious unity of his kingdom, expressed themselves in his policy towards the Jansenists, the Quietists, and the Protestants.

A. *Louis XIV and Jansenism.*—Since the days of Mazarin Louis had felt "that the Jansenists were not well-disposed towards him and the State". A certain number of them had been implicated in the Fronde; they wished to obtain, in spite of Mazarin, the recall of Cardinal de Retz, Archbishop of Paris, who had escaped from his prison at Nantes and gone to Rome; some of them applauded the triumphs over Louis's armies won by Condé, who was in alliance with the Spaniards. Louis, in September, 1660, caused the "Provinciales" of Pascal to be examined by a commission, and the book was burned. His desire, expressed in December, 1660, to the president of the assembly of the clergy, induced that body to draw up, in February, 1661, a formula condemning "the doctrine of the five propositions of Jansenius contained in the "Augustinus", which formula was to be signed by all ecclesiastics; and the superiors of the two monasteries of Port-Royal received orders to dismiss their pupils and their novices. Mazarin, on his death-bed, in March, 1661, told the king that he must not "tolerate either the sect of the Jansenists or even so much as their name". The vicars-general, who governed the Diocese of Paris in the absence of de Retz, explained, in a charge published in May, 1661, that the signature required was compatible with reserves on the question of fact—i. e., the question whether the five propositions were in fact contained in the "Augustinus". The royal council and the pope condemned this charge, and in 1664, Archbishop Hardouin de Péréfixe made two visits to Port-Royal (9 June and 21 August) and demanded of the religious their signatures without reserve. The religious of Port-Royal refused, and thereupon, on 26 August, the police expelled those of Port-Royal de Paris, and, in November, those of Port-Royal des Champs. Later, in 1665, lest they might have a disturbing effect on the various convents in which they had found shelter, they were all collected in the des Champs convent and placed under a police guard.

The concern felt by Louis on the subject of Jansenism was so great that, in 1665, he appealed to Pope Alexander VII to break down the opposition of Pavillon, Bishop of Alet, who did not recognize the right of assembly of the clergy to legislate for the Church, and was carrying on a campaign against the formula drawn up by that assembly and against the obligation to sign it. France was presented with the spectacle of a joint effort of the pope and the king; the royal coun-

cil annulled a charge in which Pavillon, after having given the required signature to another formula drawn up by the pope, developed some new Jansenistic theories on grace; the pope, without arousing any feeling on the king's part, himself appointed a commission of French bishops to try Pavillon and three other bishops who refused to make the unreserved submission. Presently, in December, 1667, nineteen bishops wrote to the king that the appointment of such a commission by the pope was contrary to the Gallican liberties. The difficultics appeared insurmountable; but the nuncio, Bargellini, and the foreign secretary, Lionne, found a way. The four bishops signed the formulary and caused it to be signed, at the same time explaining their action in a letter expressed with such intentional ambiguity that it was impossible to make out whether their signatures had been given *pure et simpliciter* or not; the pope, in his reply to them took care not to repeat the words *pure et simpliciter* and spoke of the signatures which they had given *sincere*. It was Lionne who had suggested to the pope the employment of this word *sincere*. And thanks to these artifices, "the peace of the Church" was restored.

The question of Jansenism was revived, in 1702, by the case of conscience which the Jansenists presented to the Archbishop of Paris: "Is a respectful and silent submission to the decision of the Church sufficient in regard to the attribution of the five propositions to Jansenius?" Again the pope and the king were unanimous against Jansenism. In February and April, 1703, Clement XI called upon Louis XIV to intervene, and in June, 1703, Louis XIV asked Clement XI for a Bull against Jansenism. To keep peace with the Jansenists, however, the king at the same time begged the pope to particularly mention in the Bull that it was issued at the instance of the French Court. Clement, not wishing to yield to this Gallican suggestion, temporized for twenty-six months, and the Bull "Vineam Domini" (15 July, 1705) lacked the rhetorical precautions desired by Louis. The king, nevertheless, was glad to take it as it was. He hoped to make an end of Jansenism. But Jansenism from that time forward maintained its resistance on the ground not of dogma but of ecclesiastical law; the Jansenists invoked Gallican liberties, asserting that the Bull had been issued in contravention of those liberties. More and more plainly the king saw in Jansenism a political danger; he thought to destroy the party by razing the convent of Port-Royal des Champs, dispersing the religious and disinterring the buried Jansenists (1709–11); and he sacrificed his Gallican ideas to the pope when he forced an extraordinary assembly of the clergy, in 1713, and the parliament, in 1714, to accept the Bull "Unigenitus" which Clement XI had published against Quesnel's book. But at the time of his death he wished to assemble, for the trial of Noailles, Archbishop of Paris, and the bishops who resisted the Bull, a national council to which he was to dictate, and Cement XI, naturally, scouted this idea, as bearing the marks of Gallicanism. Thus was Louis XIV ever anxious for an understanding with Rome against Jansenism, and in this alliance it was he who displayed the greater fury against the common enemy. At the same time, he brought to his warfare against Jansenism a Gallican spirit, making concessions and displays of politeness to the Holy See when the conduct of the struggle required, but on other occasions using methods and terms to which Rome, rightly impatient of Gallican pretensions, was obliged to take exception (see JANSENIUS AND JANSENISM).

B. *Louis XIV and Quietism.*—His personal interest in the question of Quietism was shown in 1694, when, at the suggestion of Madame de Maintenon, he ordered three commissioners—Noailles, Bossuet, and Tronson—to draw up the Issy articles for the signature of Madame Guyon and Fénelon. In July, 1697, he asked the pope, in a personal letter, to pronounce as soon as possible upon the book "Maximes des Saints" (see FÉNELON); in 1698 he again insisted, threatening that, if the condemnation were deferred, the Archbishop of Paris, who was already causing the "Maximes" to be censured by twelve professors of the Sorbonne—should take action. Here again, as in the matter of Jansenism, Louis evinced a great zeal for correctness of doctrine and, on the other hand, an obstinate Gallicanism ready at every moment to prosecute a doctrine apart from and without the pope, if the pope himself hesitated to proceed against it.

C. *Louis XIV and Protestants.*—Strict justice, strict application of the Edict of Nantes, but no favour—such was Louis's policy towards the Protestants after 1661. It was a policy based on the hope that the union of all his subjects in one faith would sooner or later be easily accomplished. From 1661 to 1679 means were sought to limit as much as possible the application of those concessions which Henry IV had made to the Protestants by the famous Edict, and Pellisson, a convert from Protestanism, organized a fund to aid Huguenots who should come over to the Catholic Church. From 1679 to 1685 a more active policy was followed: Protestants were excluded from public office and from the liberal professions, while the police penetrated into Protestant families in order to keep watch upon them. Louvois's idea of quartering soldiers in Protestant households to bring them to reason was applied, after 1680, in Poitou by the intendant Marillac in the cruel fashion which has remained famous under the name of *dragonnades*. The king blamed Marillac, but in 1684, at the instigation of Louvois, the *dragonnades* recommenced in Poitou, Béarn, Guyenne, and Languedoc, with more excesses than the king knew of. Misled by the letters of Louvois and the intendants (see LAMOIGNON), Louis believed that there were no more Protestants in France, and the Edict of 18 October, 1685, revoked the Edict of Nantes and ordered the demolition of places of worship, the closure of Protestant schools, the exile of pastors who refused to be converted, and the baptism of Protestant children by Catholic parish priests. On the other hand, article xii of the edict provided that subjects could not be molested in their liberty or their property on account of the "alleged reformed" religion, so that, in theory, it was still permitted to anyone to be individually a Protestant. By these measures Louis imagined himself to be only registering an accomplished fact—the extinction of the heresy. Innocent XI, while praising the king's zeal, in the consistorical allocution of 18 March, 1686, expressed satisfaction with those French prelates who had censured the *dragonnades*, and begged James II to use his good offices with Louis to obtain gentler treatment for the Protestants.

The fugitive and proscribed Protestants thought of returning to France, even in spite of Louis. Jurieu, in his "Avis aux Protestants de l'Europe" (1685–86) and Claude in his "Plaintes des Protestants" (1686), gave utterance to the idea of a union of all the Protestant powers to force upon the King of France the return of the exiles. In the success of William of Orange, in 1688, Jurieu saw an indication that England would soon reinstate Protestanism in France, and that an aristocratic government would be substituted there for the monarchical. These prognostications were developed in the "Soupirs de la France esclave", which was issued in parts by subscription. In 1698, when the peace of Ryswick was being negotiated between Louis and William, two Protestant committees, at the Hague, made an attempt to commit Holland and England to the demand of liberty for French Protestants, but William confined himself to vague and politic approaches to the question in his dealings with Louis, and these were ill received. In a letter to Cardinal d'Estrées (17 January, 1686),

Louis had flattered himself that, out of from 800,000 to 900,000 Protestants, only from 1200 to 1500 remained. The collective abjurations were generally far from sincere; the new converts were not practising Catholics, and the policy of the authorities, in regard to those new converts who remained too tepid, varied strangely in the several provinces. Was it still lawful in France for an individual, as an individual, to remain a Protestant? Article xii of the edict of revocation implicitly said "Yes"; Louis and Louvois, in their letters, said "No", explaining that all, even to the very last individual, must be converted, and that there ought no longer to be any religion but one in the kingdom.

In 1698 intendants and bishops were consulted as to the measures to be taken in regard to the Protestants. Bossuet, Archbishop Noailles, and almost all the bishops of northern and central France declared for a purely spiritual propaganda animated by a spirit of gentleness; Bossuet maintained that Protestants must not be forced to approach the sacraments. The bishops of the South, on the contrary, leaned to a policy of constraint. As a result of this consultation the edict of 13 December, 1698, and the interpreting circular of 7 January, 1699, inaugurated a milder regime and, in particular, forbade anyone to compel Protestants to approach the sacraments. Lastly, at the end of his reign, Louis ordered a new inquiry into the causes and the persistence of the heresy, and decreed, by the declaration of 8 March, 1715, that all Protestants who had continued to reside in the kingdom since 1685 were liable to the penalties of relapsed heretics unless they became Catholics. This amounted to an implicit admission that the edict of 1685 had meant to command all Protestants to embrace Catholicism. The alliance between the revolted Protestants of the Cevennes (the Camisards, 1703–06) and England, the enemy of France, had driven Louis to adopt this policy of sternness.

The attitude of Innocent XI in regard to the persecution of Protestants and the grave and mature deliberation with which Clement XI proceeded against the Jansenists prove that, even at those very moments when the religious policy of Louis XIV was resting upon, or was invoking, Rome, the full responsibility for certain courses of precipitancy, of violence, and of cruelty must rest with the king. Aspiring to be master in his Church, he chastised Protestants and Jansenists as disobedient subjects. Though there may have been a parallelism of action and a reciprocity of services between Louis and the Holy See, still the ideas which inspired and guided the religious policy of the king were, in fact, always unlike those of the contemporary popes. "Louis XIV", says the historian Casimir Gaillardin, "assumed to direct the conversion of his subjects at the whim of his pride, and by ways which were not those of the Church and the sovereign pontiff."

DOCUMENTS:—*Œuvres de Louis XIV*, ed. GRIMOARD ET GROUVELLE (Paris, 1806); *Mémoires de Louis XIV pour l'instruction du Dauphin*, ed. DREYSS (Paris, 1860); DEPPING, *Correspondance administrative sous le règne de Louis XIV* (Paris, 1850–52); HANOTAUX, *Recueils des Instructions aux ambassadeurs à Rome* (Paris, 1888); VAST, *Les grands traités du règne de Louis XIV* (Paris, 1898); MENTION, *Documents relatifs aux rapports du clergé avec la royauté de 1682 à 1705* (Paris, 1893); LEMOINE, *Mémoires des évêques de France sur la conduite à tenir à l'égard des réformés en 1698* (Paris, 1903); DANGEAU, *Journal (1684–1720)*, (Paris, 1854–61); DE SOURCHES, *Mémoires sur le règne de Louis XIV (1681–1712)*, ed. COSNAC; SAINT-SIMON, *Mémoires*, ed. BOISLISLE (Paris, 1871–1909); SPANHEIM, *Relation de la cour de France en 1690*, ed. BOURGEOIS (Paris, 1900); DE MAINTENON, *Correspondance générale*, ed. LAVALLÉE (Paris, 1865–1866); *Correspondance de la Princesse Palatine*, trad. JAEGLÉ (Paris, 1890); the numerous *Mémoires* included in the collection of MICHAUD AND POUJOULAT should be consulted.

B. HISTORICAL WRITINGS.—VOLTAIRE, *Siècle de Louis XIV*, ed. RÉBELLIAU, (Paris, 1894); GAILLARDIN, *Histoire du règne de Louis XIV* (Paris, 1877–79); PHILIPPSON, *Das Zeitalter Ludwigs des Vierzehnten* (Berlin, 1879); HASSALL, *Louis XIV and the Zenith of the French Monarchy* (New York, 1895); LAVISSE, *Histoire de France*, VII–VIII (Paris, 1907–08); CHÉROT, *La première jeunesse de Louis XIV* (Lille, 1892); LACOUR-GAYET, *L'éducation politique de Louis XIV* (Paris, 1898); CHÉRUEL, *Histoire de France pendant la minorité de Louis XIV* (Paris, 1879–80); REYNOLD, *Louis XIV et Guillaume III* (Paris, 1883); VALFREY, *Hugues de Lionne* (Paris, 1877 and 1881); DE BOISLISLE, *Les Conseils sous Louis XIV* (Paris, 1891); HAGGARD, *Louis XIV in Court and Camp* (London, 1904); FARMER, *Versailles and the Court under Louis XIV* (London, 1906); DE MOÜY, *L'Ambassade du duc de Créqui* (Paris, 1893); MICHAUD, *Louis XIV et Innocent XI* (Paris, 1882–83); GÉRIN, *Recherches sur l'assemblée de 1682* (Paris, 1870); IDEM, *Louis XIV et le Saint Siège* (Paris, 1894); IDEM, *Le pape Innocent XI et la révocation de l'Édit de Nantes* in *Revue des Questions historiques*, *XXIV* (1878); DOUEN, *La Révocation à Paris, et dans l'Ile de France* (Paris, 1894); LANDAU, *Rom, Wien und Neapel während des spanischen Erbfolgekriegs* (Leipzig, 1885); D'HAUSSONVILLE, *La duchesse de Bourgogne* (Paris, 1898–1908); LE ROY, *La France et Rome de 1700 à 1715* (Paris, 1892).

GEORGES GOYAU.

Louis Allemand, BLESSED, Cardinal, Archbishop of Arles, whose name has been written in a great variety of ways (Alamanus, Alemanus, Almannus, Alamandus, etc.), was born at Arbent in the Diocese of Belley in 1380 or 1381 (Beyssac, p. 310); d. 16 September, 1450. Through the influence of a relative, François de Conzié, who was papal chamberlain, Allemand soon became prominent in the ecclesiastical world. He was named Bishop of Maguelonne in 1418 by Martin V, who entrusted him with important missions, regarding for example the transference from Pavia to Siena of the council which was convoked in 1423. In December, 1423, he was made Archbishop of Arles and in 1426 Cardinal. Later on and especially after 1436 he began to play a most important part in the Council of Basle, where he made himself the head of the party which maintained the supremacy of the council over the pope (a doctrine already much ventilated at Constance where Allemand had been present), and which eventually proceeded to the deposition of Eugenius IV.

In 1439 Allemand was primarily responsible for the election of Felix V, the antipope, and it was Allemand who, sometime later, consecrated him bishop and crowned him as supreme pontiff. During the continuance of the assembly at Basle the cardinal showed heroic courage in tending the plague-stricken. He was also a diligent promoter of the decree passed by the council in favour of the Immaculate Conception of Our Lady. In the years which followed Allemand discharged several diplomatic missions in behalf of Felix V, while he openly disregarded the decrees of Eugenius IV, which pronounced him "excommunicated" and deprived him of his dignity as cardinal. After the resignation of Felix V, brought about by the assembly of bishops which met at Lyons in 1449, Allemand was reinstated in his dignities by Nicholas V. His violent action at Basle seems to have resulted from an earnest desire for the reform of the Church, and having made his submission to Nicholas V, he is believed to have done penance for his former disloyal and schismatical conduct. He died shortly after in the odour of sanctity. His private life had always been a penitential one, and many miracles were reported to have been worked at his tomb. In 1527 a Brief of Clement VII permitted him to be venerated as Blessed.

Acta SS., Sep., V; SCHMID in *Kirchenlexicon* s. v. *Aleman, Ludwig;* BEYSSAC in the *Revue du Lyonnais*, Nov., Dec., 1899; ALBANÈS AND CHEVALIER, *Gallia Christiana Novissima* (Arles, 1901), 787–830, 1312–79; PASTOR, *History of the Popes*, I (tr. London, 1891); HEFELE, *Conciliengeschichte*, VII, 603; SAXIUS, *Pontificium Arelatense* (Aix, 1629), and, most important of all, PEROUSE, *Le Cardinal Louis Aleman*, (Paris, 1904).

HERBERT THURSTON.

Louis Bertrand, SAINT, b. at Valencia, Spain, 1 Jan., 1526; d. 9 Oct., 1581. His parents were Juan Bertrand and Juana Angela Exarch. Through his father he was related to the illustrious St. Vincent Ferrer, the great thaumaturgus of the Dominican Order. The boyhood of the saint was unattended by any of the prodigies that frequently forecast heroic sanctity. At an early age he conceived the

idea of becoming a Friar Preacher, and despite the efforts of his father to dissuade him, was clothed with the Dominican habit in the Convent of St. Dominic, Valencia, 26 Aug., 1544. After the usual probation, in which he distinguished himself above all his associates in the qualities of an ideal religious, he pronounced the vows that irrevocably bound him to the life of perfection. The profound significance of his religious profession served as a stimulus to the increase of virtues that already gave evidence of being cast in heroic mould. In demeanour he was grave, and apparently without any sense of humour, yet withal possessed of a gentle and sweet disposition that greatly endeared him to those with whom he came in contact. While he could lay no claim to the great intellectual gifts and ripe scholarship that have distinguished so many of the saints of the Dominican Order, he applied himself assiduously to study, and stored his mind with the sacred truths expounded in the pages of the "Summa". In 1547 he was advanced to the priesthood by the Archbishop of Valencia, St. Thomas of Villanova.

The extraordinary sanctity of the young Dominican's life, and the remarkable influence he exercised on those about him, singled him out as one peculiarly fitted to lead others along the path of perfection. Consequently, he was appointed to the most responsible office of master of novices, in the convent at Valencia, the duties of which he discharged at different intervals for an aggregate of thirty years. The plague that decimated the inhabitants of Valencia and the vicinity in 1557, afforded the saint an excellent opportunity for the exercise of his charity and zeal. Tirelessly he ministered to the spiritual and physical needs of the afflicted. With the tenderness and devotion of a mother he nursed the sick. The dead he prepared for burial and interred with his own hands. When the plague had subsided, the zeal of the holy novice-master sought to extend the scope of his already large ministry into the apostolate of preaching. Though possessed of none of the natural qualities deemed essential for a successful career in the pulpit, he immediately attracted attention as a preacher of great force and far-reaching influence. The cathedral and most capacious churches were placed at his disposal, but proved wholly inadequate to accommodate the multitude that desired to hear him. Eventually it became necessary for him to resort to the public squares of the city. It was probably the fame of his preaching that brought him to the attention of St. Teresa, who at this time sought his counsel in the matter of reforming her order.

Unknown to his brethren, St. Louis had long cherished the desire to enter the mission fields of the New World. The hope that there he might find the coveted crown of martyrdom contributed not a little to sharpening the edge of his desire. Possessed of the necessary permission he sailed for America in 1562, and landed at Cartagena, where he immediately entered upon the career of a missionary. The work thus begun was certainly fruitful to an extraordinary degree, and bore unmistakably the stamp of Divine approbation. The process of his canonization bears convincing testimony to the wonderful conquest which the saint achieved in this new field of labour. The Bull of canonization asserts that, to facilitate the work of converting the natives to God, the apostle was miraculously endowed with the gift of tongues. From Cartagena, the scene of his first labours, St. Louis was sent to Panama, where in a comparatively short time he converted some 6,000 Indians. His next mission was at Tubera, situated near the sea-coast and midway between the city of Cartagena and the Magdalena River. The success of his efforts at this place is witnessed by the entries of the baptismal registers, in the saint's own handwriting. These entries show that all the inhabitants of the place were received into the Church by St. Louis. Turon places the number of converts in Tubera at 10,000. What greatly enhances the merit of this wonderful achievement is that all had been adequately instructed in the teachings of the Church before receiving baptism, and continued steadfast in their faith.

From Tubera the Apostle bent his steps in the direction of Cipacoa and Paluato. His success at the former place, the exact location of which it is impossible to determine, was little inferior to that of Tubera. At Paluato the results of his zealous efforts were somewhat disheartening. From this unfruitful soil the saint withdrew to the province of St. Martha, where his former successes were repeated. This harvest yielded 15,000 souls. While labouring at St. Martha, a tribe of 1500 Indians came to him from Paluato to implore the grace of baptism, which before they had rejected. The work at St. Martha finished, the tireless missionary undertook the work of converting the warlike Caribs, probably inhabitants of the Leeward Islands. His efforts among these fierce tribesmen seem not to have been attended with any great success. Nevertheless, the apostolate among the Caribs furnished the occasion again to make manifest the Divine protection which constantly overshadowed the ministry of St. Louis. A deadly draught was administered to him by one of the native priests. Through Divine interposition, the virulent poison failed to accomplish its purpose, thus fulfilling the words of St. Mark: "If they shall drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them" (xvi, 18). Teneriffe next became the field of the saint's apostolic labours. Unfortunately, however, there are no records extant to indicate what was the result of his preaching. At Mompox, thirty-seven leagues south-east of Carthagena, we are told, rather indefinitely, that many thousands were converted to the Faith. Several of the West India islands, notably those of St. Vincent and St. Thomas, were visited by St. Louis in his indefatigable quest for souls.

After an apostolate the marvellous and enduring fruits of which have richly merited for him the title of Apostle of South America, he returned under obedience to his native Spain, which he had left just seven years before. During the eleven remaining years of his life many offices of honour and responsibility were imposed upon him. The numerous duties that attached to them were not permitted to interfere with the exacting regime of his holy life. The ever increasing fame of his sanctity and wisdom won the admiration and confidence of even the officials of the Government, who more than once consulted him in affairs of State. With the heroic patience that characterized his whole life he endured the ordeal of his last sickness. He was canonized by Clement X in 1671. His feast is observed on 10 October.

WILBERFORCE, *The Life of St. Lewis Bertrand* (London, 1882); TOURON, *Histoire des Hommes Illustres de l'Ordre de Saint Dominique* (Paris, 1747), IV, 485–526; ROZE, *Les Dominicains en Amérique* (Paris, 1878), 290–310; BYRNE, *Sketches of illustrious Dominicans* (Boston, 1884), 1–95.

JOHN B. O'CONNOR.

Louis de Blois. See BLOSIUS, FRANÇOIS-LOUIS.

Louise, SISTER, educator and organizer, b. at Bergen-op-Zoom, Holland, 14 Nov., 1813; d. at Cincinnati, Ohio, 3 Dec., 1886. Josephine Susanna Vanderschriek was the tenth of the twelve children of Cornelius Vanderschriek, advocate, and his wife Clara Maria Weenan. Soon after her birth her father removed with his family to Antwerp, gave up the practice of the law, and engaged in what had been the family business for generations, the manufacture and exportation of woolen cloths, in which he amassed a large fortune. From her father Josephine inherited remarkable skill in the management of affairs, firmness in whatever involved principle, and unswerving fidelity to duty; from her mother, a gentle and amiable disposition which endeared her to all. She was edu-

cated by the Sisters of Notre-Dame, at their mother-house at Namur, Belgium, and by private tutors at home. Her desire to enter the novitiate being thwarted for some years, she busied herself in works of piety and charity, until in 1837 she was permitted to return to Namur. Clothed in the religious habit, 15 Oct., 1837, under the name of Sister Louise, her fervour was such that her time of probation was shortened, and she pronounced her vows on 7 May, 1839.

That same year Bishop, later Archbishop, J. B. Purcell, of Cincinnati, visiting Namur, asked for sisters for his diocese; and Sister Louise was one of eight volunteers chosen for the distant mission. The sisters landed in New York, 19 Oct., 1840, and proceeded at once to Cincinnati, where, after some delay, they settled in the house on East Sixth Street, which still forms the nucleus of the large convent and schools. Sister Louise's knowledge of the English language, her great mind, but still more her edifying life, caused her, although the youngest of the community, to be named in 1845 superior of the convent at Cincinnati, and in 1848 superior of all houses which might branch out from that, a responsibility she bore until her death. During these forty years the institute spread rapidly, owing to her zeal and prudence. She founded houses at Cincinnati (Court Street), Toledo, Chillicothe, Columbus, Hamilton, Reading, and Dayton (Ohio); Philadelphia (Pennsylvania); Washington (D. C.); Boston (4), Lowell, Lawrence, Salem (2), Cambridge, Somerville, Chelsea, Lynn, Springfield, Worcester, Chicopee, Milford, Holyoke, and Woburn (Massachusetts). In many of these cities the sisters, residing in one convent, teach in the schools of several parishes; so that in 1886 the number of pupils all told was 23,000, while the pupils in Sunday schools and the members of sodalities for women counted as many more. The institute itself increased in the meantime from eight members to nearly twelve hundred. From the outset the rule was kept in its integrity. Strict union has always been maintained with the mother-house at Namur; but it was early recognized that if the supply of teachers was to keep up with the demand, a novitiate must be established in America. This was accordingly done, and the first to be clothed by Sister Louise in the New World (March, 1846) was Sister Julia, destined to be her successor in the office of provincial, after she had been her trusted counsellor for years. In 1877 a second novitiate was opened at Roxbury, in the suburbs of Boston, Massachusetts, which was later transferred to Waltham. Up to that time, colonies of sisters had occasionally been sent from Namur, and the ranks had been increased by some of the sisters exiled from Guatemala in 1859. On the other hand, Sister Louise was able to send some help to the province of California, established in 1851.

The mere recital of these facts as the outline of one woman's life-work implies her possession of uncommon talents and of administrative power of a high order. Sister Louise was a perfect religious; yet her sanctity was so free from any singularity of manners or conduct, so true to the rules and spirit of her institute, that what was said of St. Teresa by her sisters might also be said of her, "Thank God, we have seen a saint just like ourselves". From her zeal for God's glory and the salvation of souls sprang love of prayer, open-handed generosity in adorning the house of God, reverence for priests and religious. From her spirit of faith sprang trust in God, humility, charity to the poor and the suffering, and the thoughtful motherly tenderness for all her sisters with which her great heart overflowed. She sedulously prepared her teachers to impart an education, simple, solid, practical, progressive, full of the spirit of faith, capable of turning out good Catholic young women for the upbuilding of the home and the nation. She had no patience with the superficial, the showy, in the training of girls. She visited every year the convents east and west, saw all the sisters privately, inspected the schools, and consulted with the reverend pastors. It was therefore with full knowledge of her wide field of labour that she uttered as her last advice to her community, and unconsciously therein her own best eulogy: "Thank God, there are no abuses to be corrected. Individual faults there are, for that is human nature, but none of community. Keep out the world and its spirit, and God will bless you."

SISTER OF NOTRE DAME, *Life of Sister Superior Louise;* MANNIX, *Memoirs of Sister Louise; Annals of the House of Cincinnati; Conferences of Sister Louise to her Community;* see also JULIE BILLIART, BLESSED, and NOTRE DAME DE NAMUR, SISTERS OF.

SISTER OF NOTRE DAME.

Louisiana.—I. COLONIAL—The history of Louisiana forms an important part of the history of the United States, and is romantic and interesting. It is closely connected with the history of France and of Spain, somewhat with that of England, and for this reason is more picturesque than the history of any other state of the American Union. Alvarez de Pineda is said to have discovered the Mississippi River in 1519, but his Rio del Espiritu Santo was probably the Mobile River, and we may leave to Hernando de Soto the honour of having been in 1541 the discoverer of the mighty stream into which his body was projected by his companions after the failure of his expedition, undertaken for the conquest of Florida. Some time before the discovery by De Soto, Pamphilo de Narvaez had perished in endeavouring to conquer Florida, but five of his followers had succeeded in reaching Mexico. One of them, Alvar Nuñez Cabeza de Vaca, described their wanderings, in which they must have crossed the Mississippi. Many years after de Soto the great Mississippi was rediscovered in 1673 by the Canadian trader Louis Joliet, and by the saintly missionary, Father Jacques Marquette, forerunners of Robert Cavelier de La Salle, the celebrated Norman explorer. The latter floated down the Illinois River in 1682, and, entering the Mississippi, followed the course of the river to its mouth, and on 9 April took possession, in the name of Louis XIV, of the country watered by the Mississippi and its tributaries. To that vast region he gave the name of "Louisiane" in honour of the King of France, who carried royal power to the highest point, and who was always firm, energetic, and courageous. Among La Salle's companions were the chivalric Henry de Tonty and Fathers Zénobe Membré and Anastase Douay. The name Louisiane is found for the first time in a grant of an island to François Daupin, signed by La Salle, 10 June, 1679.

Louis XIV wished to colonize Louisiana and to unite it to his possessions in Canada by a chain of posts in the Mississippi valley. England would thus be hemmed in between the Atlantic Ocean and the Appalachian range of mountains. La Salle endeavoured to carry out this scheme in 1684, but his colony, Fort Louis, established by mistake on the coast of what is now Texas, perished when its founder was murdered on the Trinity River by some of his own men on 19 March, 1687. In 1688 James II was expelled from England, and the war which ensued between Louis XIV and William III lasted until 1697. When there was peace, the King of France thought once more of settling the land discovered by La Salle, and his minister Maurepas chose Pierre Le Moyne d'Iberville as the man best fitted to accomplish that task. Iberville was the third son of Charles Le Moyne, a Norman established in Canada. He was a native of Villemarie (Montreal), was "as military as his sword", and was a brave and able marine officer. He left Brest on 24 Oct., 1698, and that date is of great importance in the history of the United States, for on board the small frigates, the Badine and the Marin,

were the seeds from which was to grow Louisiana, the province which was to give to the American Union thirteen states and one territory and to exert a great influence on the civilization of the United States. In February, 1699, Iberville and his young brother Bienville saw the beautiful coast of the Gulf of Mexico, where are now Biloxi and Ocean Springs, and after having found the mouth of the Mississippi on 2 March, 1699, and explored the "hidden" river, they built Fort Maurepas and laid the foundation of the French colony on the Gulf Coast, on the Ocean Springs side of the Bay of Biloxi. Iberville ordered a fort to be built fifty-four miles from the mouth of the Mississippi. This was the first settlement in the present State of Louisiana, and was abandoned in 1705. On 4 May, 1699, Iberville sailed for France on board the Badine, with the Count de Surgères who commanded the Marin. Sauvole, a young French officer, had been given command of the fort at Biloxi, and Bienville had been appointed lieutenant (second in command). Sauvole, who may be considered the first Governor of Louisiana, died on 22 Aug., 1701, and Jean-Baptiste Le Moyne de Bienville succeeded him in the command of the colony. Iberville ordered Bienville to remove the seat of the colony from Biloxi and form an establishment on Mobile River. This was done in January, 1702, when Fort Louis de la Mobile was constructed at a point eighteen leagues from the sea. In 1711 the settlement was moved to the site which is now occupied by the city of Mobile. In 1704 the devoted friend of La Salle, Henry de Tonty, died at Mobile, and on 9 July, 1706, Iberville, the founder of Louisiana, died at Havana of yellow fever.

The founders of Louisiana had made the mistake of neglecting the banks of the Mississippi, when the fort on the river was abandoned in 1705, and, although there were Old Biloxi and Mobile, the settlement could not prosper as long as it was limited in its site to the land on the gulf. The colony might not have been permanent, had not Bienville in February, 1718, twelve years after the death of Iberville, founded New Orleans, so admirably situated between the deep and broad Mississippi and beautiful Lake Pontchartrain. In 1722 the seat of the colony was transferred from New Biloxi, which had been founded in 1719, to New Orleans, and the future of Louisiana was assured. It was then directed by the Western Company, had received for a time the aid of the bank of John Law, and from 1712 to 1717 had been conceded to another banker, Crozat, who had agreed to develop the resources of the colony but had failed in his enterprise. On 10 January, 1722, Father Charlevoix, in a letter dated from New Orleans, says: "This wild and desert place, which the weeds and trees still cover almost entirely, will be one day, and perhaps that day is not distant, an opulent city and the metropolis of a rich and great colony." The distinguished historian based this hope "on the situation of this town thirty-three leagues from the sea, and on the bank of a navigable river, which one can ascend to this place in twenty-four hours; on the fertility of its soil, on the mildness and goodness of its climate, at a latitude of thirty degrees north; on the industry of its inhabitants; on the proximity of Mexico, where one can go in two weeks by sea; on that of Havana, which is still closer, of the most beautiful islands of America and of the English colonies."

It was no easy matter to establish a successful colony in the New World, and the French under Iberville and Bienville, and the descendants of these men, were just as energetic as the Englishmen who settled Virginia and Massachusetts. There were on the banks of the Mississippi primeval forests to be cut down, in order to cultivate profitably the fertile land deposited by the great river in its rapid course towards the gulf. The turbulent waters of the river were to be held in their bed by strong embankments, and the Indians had to be subdued. It was only then that the work of civilization could be begun, and the admirable culture of the French extended to the Mississippi Valley. The elegance and refinement of manners of Paris in the eighteenth century were found in New Orleans from the very foundation of the city, and the women of Louisiana are mentioned by the early chroniclers with great praise for their beauty and charm. They owed, to a great extent, their mental and moral training to the instruction and education which they received at the convent of the Ursuline nuns. The sons of wealthy colonists were sent to France to be educated or were taught at private schools at home, such as the one kept in 1727 by Father Cécile, a Capuchin monk. As girls could not be sent to Europe to obtain an education, a school for them was absolutely necessary in New Orleans, and Bienville, at the suggestion of the Jesuit Father de Beaubois, asked that six Ursuline nuns be sent from France to attend to the hospital and to open a school for girls. The nuns arrived in July, 1727, and were received with great kindness by Governor Périer, his wife, and the people of the town. In her letters to her father Sister Madeleine Hachard gives an interesting account of New Orleans in 1727, speaks of the magnificent dresses of the ladies, and says that a song was publicly sung in which it was said that the city had as much "appearance" as Paris, and she adds quaintly: "Indeed it is very beautiful, but besides that I have not enough eloquence to be able to persuade you of the beauty which the song mentions, I find a difference between this city and that of Paris. It might persuade people who had never seen the capital of France, but I have seen it, and the song will not persuade me of the contrary of what I believe. It is true that it is increasing every day, and later may become as beautiful and as large as the principal towns of France, if there still come workmen, and it become peopled according to its size." Sister Madeleine was prophetic, as Father Charlevoix had been in his letter quoted above (in 1722). In 1734 the Ursulines occupied the convent, built for them by the Government, which is still standing on Chartres street. They remained there until 1824, when they moved to another building down the river. Their services as educators of the girls of Louisiana in colonial times were invaluable.

The Province of Louisiana had been divided on 16 May, 1722, into three spiritual jurisdictions. The first, comprising all the country from the mouth of the Mississippi to the Wabash, and west of the Mississippi, was allotted to the Capuchins, whose superior was to be vicar-general of the Bishop of Quebec and was to reside in New Orleans. The second extended north from the Wabash and belonged to the Jesuits, whose superior, residing in the Illinois country, was also to be vicar-general of the Bishop of Quebec in that department. The third comprised all the country east of the Mississippi from the sea to the Wabash, and was given to the Carmelites, whose superior was also vicar-general and resided usually at Mobile. The Capuchins took possession of their district in 1722. The Jesuits had already been in theirs a long time. The jurisdiction of the Carmelites was added to that of the Capuchins on 19 December, 1722, and the former returned to France. In December, 1723, the jurisdiction of the Capuchins was restricted to the country on both sides of the river from Natchez south to the sea, as the Capuchins were not very numerous. It was, however, decided in 1725 that no monks or priests could attend to churches or missions within the jurisdiction of the Capuchins without the consent of the latter. A little later the spiritual care of all the savages in the province was given to the Jesuits, and their superior was allowed to reside in New Orleans, provided he performed no ecclesiastical functions without the consent of the Capuchins. Several Jesuits

arrived in New Orleans with the Ursuline nuns, and Father de Beaubois soon became their superior. It was the Jesuits who in 1751 introduced the sugar cane into Louisiana from Hispaniola. They cultivated on their plantation the sugar-cane, indigo, and the myrtle-wax shrub.

The tribes with which the early colonists had principally to deal were the Natchez, the Chickasaws, and the Choctaws. The last named were very numerous but not warlike, and were generally friendly to the French, while the Natchez and the Chickasaws were often at war with the colonists, and the former had to be nearly destroyed to ensure the safety of the colony. The village of the Natchez was the finest in Louisiana, and their country was delightful. The men and women of their tribe were well-shaped and very cleanly. Their chief was called the Great Sun, and inheritance of that title was in the female line. They had a temple in which a fire was kept burning continually to represent the sun which they adored. Whenever a Great Sun died, or a female Sun, or any of the inferior Suns, the wife or the husband was strangled together with the nearest relatives of the deceased. Sometimes little children were sacrificed by their parents. The Natchez were defeated by Périer and by St. Denis, and what remained of the tribe were adopted by the Chickasaws. The name of the Natchez as a nation was lost, but it will live for ever in literature on account of the charming pages devoted to them by Chateaubriand. Bienville wished to compel the Chickasaws to surrender the Natchez who had taken refuge among them, and his ill-success in two campaigns against that powerful tribe was the cause of his asking in 1740 to be allowed to go to France to recuperate his exhausted health. He left Louisiana in May, 1743, and never returned to the colony which he and Iberville had founded. He had endeavoured to establish in New Orleans a school for boys, but had not been successful. La Salle, Iberville, and Bienville are the greatest names in the history of French Louisiana.

Pierre Rigaud, Marquis de Vaudreuil, arrived in Louisiana on 10 May, 1743. He was known as the "Grand Marquis", and his administration was very popular. In 1752 he became Governor of Canada, where he was not as successful as he had been in Louisiana. The time had come to settle forever the question of supremacy on the American continent between France and England, and the brave Montcalm and his able lieutenant Lévis could not prevent the British from capturing Quebec and Montreal. On the Plains of Abraham in 1759, where both Wolfe and Montcalm fell, the fate of Canada was decided, and the approaching independence of the English colonies might have been foreseen. By the Treaty of Paris in February, 1763, Canada was ceded by France to England, as well as the city of Mobile, and the part of Louisiana on the left bank of the Mississippi River, with the exception of New Orleans and the Island of Orleans. Spain, in her turn, ceded to Great Britain the Province of Florida, and all the country to the east and south-east of the Mississippi. Already, by the secret Treaty of Fontainebleau (3 Nov., 1762), the wretched Louis XV had made to Charles III of Spain a gift of "the country known by the name of Louisiana, as well as New Orleans and the island in which that city is situated." This was the province which was retroceded to France in 1800, and ceded by France to the United States in 1803. Although the King of Spain had accepted on 13 Nov., 1762, the gift of his gracious cousin, the Treaty of Fontainebleau was announced to the Louisianians only in 1764 by a letter from the King of France to Director-General d'Abbadie, dated at Versailles, 21 April. The selfish monarch, who cared nothing for his subjects in Europe, in India, or in America, ended his letter with these hypocritical words: "Hoping, moreover, that His Catholic Majesty will be pleased to give to his subjects of Louisiana the marks of protection and good-will which they have received under my domination, and which only the misfortunes of war have prevented from being more effectual." The Louisianians were remote from France and were attached to their sovereign, whose defects they really did not know. They wished, therefore, to remain Frenchmen, and sent Jean Milhet as their delegate to beg Louis XV not to give away his subjects to another monarch. It was in vain that Bienville went to see Minister Choiseul with Milhet. They were kindly received, but were told that the Treaty of Fontainebleau could not be annulled. In the meantime Don Antonio de Ulloa had arrived in New Orleans on 5 March, 1766, as governor, and the Spanish domination had begun.

The rule of the Spaniards was more apparent than real, for Ulloa came with only two companies of infantry, and did not take possession officially of the colony in the name of the King of Spain. Indeed the Spanish banner was not raised in the *Place d'Armes* in New Orleans, the capital of Louisiana, and the orders of Ulloa were issued through Aubry, the French commandant or governor. The colonists should have been treated with gentleness at the very beginning of a change of regime, but Ulloa, who was a distinguished scientist, lacked tact in his dealings with the Louisianians, and issued unwise commercial regulations. Jean Milhet returned from France at the end of 1767, and the colonists were greatly excited by the narrative of the failure of his mission. The inhabitants of Louisiana resolved to expel the foreign governor, and held a meeting in New Orleans, where it was decided to present a petition to the Superior Council on 28 Oct., 1768. The colonists said that they would "offer their property and blood to preserve for ever the sweet and inviolable title of French citizen." Nicolas Chauvin de Lafrénière, the attorney-general, who had been the principal speaker at the great meeting in New Orleans, addressed the council in favour of the petition and delivered a bold and eloquent discourse. On 29 Oct., 1768, the council rendered a decree in compliance with the demands of the inhabitants and the conclusions of Lafrénière. Aubry protested against the decree, but the council ordered its enforcement, and on 31 October Ulloa embarked on board a French ship which he had chartered. The next day the cables of the vessel were cut by a Louisianian named Petit, and the foreigner was expelled. It was a real revolution. The colonists were actuated by the highest and most patriotic motives, resistance against oppression and love of country. They endeavoured by all means in their power to induce the King of France to keep them as his subjects, and, not succeeding in their efforts, they thought of proclaiming a republic on the banks of the Mississippi in New Orleans. This contribution of a spirit of heroism and independence to the civilization of the future United States is of the greatest importance, and deserves to be carefully noted.

The Louisianians were not successful in the Revolution of 1768, for the Spanish Government sent powerful troops to subdue the insurgents. General Alexander O'Reilly arrived in New Orleans with 3000 soldiers on 17 Aug., 1769, and raised the Spanish flag in the *Place d'Armes*. At first he treated the chiefs of the insurgents with great politeness, and led them to believe that he would take no harsh measures in regard to the event of October, 1768. He acted, however, with great duplicity, and caused the principal insurgents against Ulloa to be arrested while they were attending a reception at the governor's house. Villeré, who was a planter on the German coast and one of the leaders of the revolution, was killed while resisting arrest, and Lafrénière, Marquis, Noyan, Carresse, and Joseph Milhet were condemned to be hanged. No one was found in the colony to act as executioner, and

the five heroic men were shot by Spanish soldiers on 25 Oct., 1769. Six others of the insurgents were condemned to imprisonment in Morro Castle at Havana. Among them was Jean Milhet, the patriotic merchant. O'Reilly acted with unpardonable severity, and his victims are known as "the Martyrs of Louisiana". Although the Spanish domination began with cruelty, it was afterwards mild and paternal, and at one time glorious. Most of the officials married creole wives, women of French origin, and the influence of charming and gentle ladies was most beneficial. Unzaga, who succeeded O'Reilly in the government of Louisiana, acted with great tact in dealing with the Louisianians, and Bernardo de Galvez gave them prosperity and glory and reconciled them to the rule of Spain. In 1779 the war between the United States and Great Britain was at its height. France had recognized the independence of the new republic, and Lafayette had offered his sword to aid Washington in his great work. Spain came also to the help of the Americans, and declared war against England on 8 May, 1779. On 8 July Charles III authorized his subjects in America to take part in the war, and Galvez, who had thus far acted as provisional governor, received his commission as governor and intendant. He resolved immediately to attack the British possessions in West Florida, and refused to accept the advice of a council of war, that he should not begin his operations before he had received reinforcements from Havana. He had already aided the cause of the Americans by furnishing ammunition and money to their agent in New Orleans.

He called a meeting of the principal inhabitants in the city and told them that he could not take the oath of office as governor, unless the people of Louisiana promised to help him in waging war against the British. This was assented to with enthusiasm by all the men who were at the meeting, and Galvez made preparations to attack Baton Rouge, which the British had named New Richmond, and which for a time had been called Dironville by the French from Diron d'Artaguette, an early official in the colony. On 27 Aug., 1779, Galvez marched with an army of 670 men against Baton Rouge, and sent his artillery by boats on the river. On 7 September he took by storm Fort Bute at Manchac, and on 21 September, captured Baton Rouge. It was agreed that Fort Panmure at Natchez should capitulate also. The campaign of Galvez was glorious, and the greater part of his army was composed of Louisianian creoles of French origin, and of Acadians who wished to take vengeance upon the British for their cruelties against them, when they were so ruthlessly torn from their homes in 1755. The heroism of Galvez and his army in 1779 inspired Julien Poydras to write a short epic poem, "La Prise du Morne du Baton Rouge par Monseigneur de Galvez", a work which was published in New Orleans in 1779, and was the first effort of French literature in Louisiana. In 1780 Galvez attacked Fort Charlotte at Mobile and captured it, and in 1781 he resolved to make the conquest of Pensacola and to expel the British entirely from the country adjoining New Orleans. He went to Havana and obtained men and a fleet for his expedition. Among the ships was a man-of-war, the "San Ramon", commanded by Commodore Calbo de Irazabal. When an attempt was made to cross the bar and enter the harbour of Pensacola the "San Ramon" ran aground. Irazabal, thereupon, refused to allow the frigates of his fleet to cross the bar. Galvez, who understood how important it was that the fleet should enter the port, in order that the army should not be left without means of subsistence on the island of St. Rosa, resolved to be the first to force entrance into the port. He embarked on board the brig "Galveztown", commanded by Rousseau, a Louisianian, and which was directly under his orders, and, followed by a schooner and two gunboats, he boldly entered the port. He had caused his pennant to be raised on the "Galveztown", that his presence on board might be known, and acted with such valour that the Spanish squadron followed the next day and crossed the bar. After a siege of several months Fort George and Fort Red Cliff in the Barrancas were captured, and Pensacola surrendered on 9 May, 1781. For his exploits against the British the King of Spain made Galvez a lieutenant-general and captain-general of Louisiana and West Florida, and allowed him to place as a crest on his coat of arms the brig "Galveztown" with the motto, "Yo Solo" (I alone). The campaigns of Galvez gave the Louisianians the right to claim the honour of having taken part in the war for American independence, and the help given the Americans by the Spaniards was acknowledged by Washington in letters to Galvez. The heroic Governor of Louisiana became Viceroy of Mexico in 1785 and died in 1786, aged thirty-eight.

During the Spanish domination, besides the exploits of Galvez, we may mention as being of importance in the history of the United States the attempts made by Governor Miró of Louisiana in 1788, and Governor Carondelet in 1797, to separate the western country from the United States and join it to the Spanish possessions in the south. The Mississippi River was absolutely necessary to the people in the West for their exports, and the right of deposit of their products at New Orleans was guaranteed to them by a treaty between Spain and the United States in 1795. In 1800, however, Louisiana became French again by treaty, and the Americans seemed destined to have much more powerful neighbours than the Spaniards had ever been. France was at the time under the rule of Napoleon Bonaparte. He wished to revive the colonial empire of France, lost during the wretched reign of Louis XV. He easily obtained that province from Charles IV. By the secret Treaty of St. Ildefonso, 1 Oct., 1800, confirmed by that of Madrid, 21 March, 1801, Louisiana was retroceded to France, and Bonaparte made great plans for the administration and development of the province. He wished it to be a kind of storehouse for Santo Domingo, which he intended to reconquer from the blacks, and he appointed as captain-general of Louisiana one of his most distinguished officers, Victor, who later became Duke of Bellune and Marshal of France.

The plans of Bonaparte in regard to Louisiana were frustrated by the subsequent outbreak of hostilities between France and England. Victor never reached the province he was given to govern, and when Pierre-Clément de Laussat, the colonial prefect, arrived in New Orleans in March, 1803, Louisiana was on the point of becoming American. The right of deposit in New Orleans had been twice withdrawn by the Spanish intendant, and the people of the West feared they would lose the natural outlet for their products. There was great agitation on the subject in Congress, and President Jefferson sent James Monroe to France in March, 1803, to co-operate with Robert R. Livingston in the negotiations concerning the cession to the United States of New Orleans and of the Island of Orleans. Bonaparte, meanwhile, made up his mind to offer the whole province to the American negotiators, and on 30 April, 1803, Monroe, Livingston, and Barbé-Marbois signed the Treaty of Paris, by which Louisiana was ceded to the United States for about $15,000,000. Bonaparte himself prepared the third article of the treaty, which reads as follows: "The inhabitants of the ceded territory shall be incorporated in the Union of the United States and admitted as soon as possible, according to the principles of the Federal Constitution, to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States, and in the mean time they shall be maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty, prosperity, and the religion which they

profess." In the old Cabildo building in New Orleans the province was transferred on 30 Nov., 1803, by the Spanish commissioners Casa Calvo and Salcedo to Laussat, the representative of France; and the latter, at the same place, transferred the sovereignty of Louisiana on 20 Dec., 1803, to the American Commissioners, Wilkinson and Claiborne. There was no longer a colonial Louisiana. In 1804 the territory of Orleans was organized, which became on 30 April, 1812, the State of Louisiana.

French and Spanish manuscripts in archives of Louisiana Historical Society, New Orleans: transcripts from French and Spanish archives, among which are PIERRE MARGRY'S *Documents sur la Louisiane; Manuscript Memoir* of FRANCISCO BOULIGNY, Military Governor of Louisiana in 1799 (1776); official royal orders, regulations, and edicts, in archives of Louisiana Historical Society; *Le Moniteur de la Louisiane* (1794 to 1803). Consult MARGRY, *Origines françaises des Pays d'Outre-Mer* (6 vols., Paris, 1881); BÉNARD DE LA HARPE, *Journal Historique de l'établissement des Français à la Louisiane* (New Orleans, 1831); LE PAGE DU PRATZ, *Histoire de la Louisiane* (3 vols., Paris, 1758); DUMONT, *Mémoires Historiques sur la Louisiane* (Paris, 1753); CHARLEVOIX, *Journal d'un Voyage dans l'Amérique Septentrionale*, VI (Paris, 1744); GRAVIER, *Relation du Voyage des Ursulines* (Paris, 1872); LAUSSAT, *Mémoires* (Pau, 1831); MARTIN, *History of Louisiana* (2 vols., New Orleans, 1827); MONETTE, *History of the Valley of the Mississippi* (2 vols., New York, 1846); GAYARRÉ, *Histoire de la Louisiane* (2 vols., New Orleans, 1846–7); IDEM, *History of Louisiana* (4 vols., New Orleans, 1854–6); KING, *Sieur de Bienville* (New York, 1893); HAMILTON, *Colonial Mobile* (Boston, 1898); FORTIER, *Louisiana Studies* (New Orleans, 1894); IDEM, *History of Louisiana* (4 vols., New York, 1904).

ALCÉE FORTIER.

II. THE STATE OF LOUISIANA, lying at the mouth of the Mississippi River, was so named in honour of Louis XIV in 1682. Louisiana of the seventeenth century extended from the Mississippi River to the Rocky Mountains, and from the Rio Grande and Gulf of Mexico to British America. The present State of Louisiana is bounded on the south by the Gulf of Mexico; on the east by the State of Mississippi; on the west by the State of Texas, and on the north by the State of Arkansas. The thirty-third parallel of latitude forms the boundary between Louisiana and Arkansas.

SEAL OF LOUISIANA

Physical Characteristics.—The area of the state is 45,420 square miles, of which 2328 are water surface. There is no very high land in the state. The Red River enters the state from Texas a few miles south of the northern boundary, and traverses the whole state in a south-easterly direction, emptying itself into the Mississippi River at the thirty-first parallel of latitude. The northern portion of Louisiana is mainly forest area with numerous small farms, but in the eastern portion, north of Red River and for some distance south of its mouth, there are large cotton plantations on alluvial soil, while below the mouth of Red River stretches the sugar country, all the south-eastern portion of Louisiana with small exceptions being devoted to sugar cultivation. In the south-western portion are the great salt and sulphur mines, oil-wells, and rice fields. With means of communication from one part of the state to another, Louisiana is probably better provided than any other state in the Union. Within the borders of the state are 3771 miles of navigable water, and 6162 miles of railroad (including 2000 miles of side-tracks). The alluvial lands along the rivers and larger streams are protected by 1430 miles of embankments, locally called *levees* and maintained by the state.

Industries.—Agriculture is the chief resource of Louisiana, although of late salt, oil, and sulphur are beginning to produce large returns. The report of the Louisiana State Board of Agriculture for 1908, gives the agricultural output as follows:

Total area under cultivation		4,730,148 acres
Cotton	517,796 bales	1,845,330 "
Corn	20,308,717 bushels	1,537,135 "
Sugar	444,241,800 pounds	401,461 "
Molasses	21,549,050 gallons	
Cleaned Rice	170,096,700 pounds	373,866 "
Sweet Potatoes	3,010,615 bushels	54,221 "
Irish "	729,345 "	27,333 "
Oranges	106,440 boxes	2,200 "

The mineral products are chiefly sulphur, salt, and petroleum. The largest sulphur deposit in the world is at Sulphur City, whence 1000 tons daily are shipped. It is estimated that there are forty million tons of sulphur in this deposit. At Avery's Island is found a deposit of pure salt, 500 tons daily being mined. In this section the auger went down 1800 feet through salt. Large quantities of petroleum are piped out of wells in the south-western and north-western parts of the state.

History.—The history of Louisiana as a colony has already been traced from the first settlements, and the growth of the population up to its admission to the Union. The cession of Louisiana by France to the United States took place on 20 December, 1803, and in 1804 Congress organized the Territory of Orleans, which comprised a portion of the great district of Louisiana. In 1806 there were but 350 English speaking white men in New Orleans. Between 1806 and 1809, 3100 Americans arrived. In 1809–10 came the immigration from the West Indies, due to the Santo Domingo and Haitian negro uprisings. In 1810 the Irish began to come, and they kept coming steadily for over forty years. The Civil War (1861–5) stopped all immigration until about 1900, since which time Italians are arriving in great numbers. The first steamboat, the "Orleans", from Pittsburg, Pennsylvania, arrived in New Orleans, 10 January, 1812.

In 1811 Congress authorized the inhabitants of the territory to draw up a constitution, with a view to establish a state government. This constitution was adopted in 1812, and immediately thereafter, on 30 April, 1812, Congress admitted Louisiana into the Union. Almost simultaneously with her admission, the war with England broke out, and on 8 January, 1815, the famous battle of New Orleans, between 12,000 English soldiers under Pakenham and 5000 American recruits under General Andrew Jackson, was fought within a few miles of the city of New Orleans, resulting in the overwhelming defeat of the British. The commercial position of New Orleans being very advantageous, her growth was phenomenal. In 1840 she was the third city in population in the United States, the Mississippi and its tributaries pouring great commercial wealth into Louisiana. However, as the railroads began to be built, much of this river commerce was carried by them to northern and eastern marts. On 26 January, 1861, an ordinance of secession was passed, withdrawing Louisiana from the Union, and on 21 March, 1861, the Convention of Louisiana ratified the Confederate Constitution and joined the Confederacy. The Civil War laid waste Louisiana in common with her sister states of the south. In April, 1862, the city of New Orleans was captured by the Union forces. In 1864, under the auspices of the Federal troops, a convention was held to draw up a new constitution for the state, preparatory to its re-admission to the Union Under Federal auspices it was ratified by a vote of the people in September, 1864. This constitution, although adopted under the auspices of the United States Government, was not satisfactory to that government, and in December, 1867, another convention was called and prepared a constitution that was adopted on 6 March, 1868, whereby Louisiana was again admitted to the

Union upon condition of her ratifying the Fourteenth Amendment to the Federal Constitution. This was done on 9 July, 1868, and on 13 July the state was transferred from the military to the civil powers.

Then began the period of reconstruction, which was practically a seven years' orgy. Adventurers from the north, camp-followers left behind by the Union armies, and renegade southerners, under the protection of Federal bayonets, welded the recently emancipated negro slaves into a political party, and the disgraceful scenes, which form that blot upon American history known as the "Reconstruction Era", cost Louisiana millions of treasure and hundreds of lives. In September, 1874, a revolt occurred which overthrew the state government and placed the intelligent people of the state in office. Three days afterwards the United States troops expelled the popular government, and replaced the negroes and adventurers in office. In the election of 1876, the Democratic party carried the state both for state offices and for presidential electors. Then began the national dispute in Congress which resulted in a compromise being made, whereby the vote of Louisiana for President and Vice-President of the United States was counted for the Republican party, and the vote for state offices and legislature was counted for the Democratic party. The carrying out of this compromise by the seating of President Hayes in the White House, and the forming of a Democratic or white man's government in Louisiana, marked the end of the long period of misrule. The great moral movement against the Louisiana State Lottery, ending in its abolition in 1892, is probably the most creditable event in the history of the state.

Principal Religious Denominations. — The latest available statistics of religious denominations are given in the U. S. Census Bulletin for 1906, from which we take the following table, except that the number of Jews is taken from the "Jewish Year Book" for 1907: Catholics, 477,774; Baptists, 185,554; Methodists, 79,464; Jews, 12,000; Protestant Episcopalians, 9070; Presbyterians, 8350; Lutherans, 5793; German Evangelicals, 4353; Disciples, 2458; Congregationalists, 1773; all other denominations, 4222. It must be borne in mind that these figures do not give us a proper comparative view, because the bases of various denominations are different. For example, most Protestant bodies count as members only those persons officially enrolled as members. And, in counting Catholics, the Census Bureau counts only those over nine years of age; whereas, in the figures given elsewhere in this article we count all those who have been baptized.

Catholicism.—Because of her Latin origin, Catholics and Catholic influences have always been predominant in Louisiana. Her first governor, Clairborne, was a Protestant from Virginia, but nearly all his descendants were Catholics. With few exceptions the governors of the state were Catholics. Amongst noted Louisianians of the Catholic Faith we may include F. X. Martin, presiding justice of the Supreme Court for forty years, Bermudez, one of his successors, Breaux, the present (1909) incumbent, Thomas J. Semmes, the eminent jurist and Confederate senator, Alexander Dimitry, who in 1847 organized the public school system of the state, Adrien Rouquette, the poet-priest and Indian missionary, Charles Gayarre, the historian, Justice E. D. White, now on the United States supreme bench, Paul Morphy, the famous chess-player, Father Etienne Vial, the first native-born Catholic priest (b. 1736).

The state comprises the Archdiocese of New Orleans (the southern half), and the Diocese of Natchitoches (the northern half). The "Catholic Directory" for 1909 gives the following figures: 1 archbishop; 1 bishop; 1 abbot; 181 secular and 132 regular priests; 152 churches with resident priests; 212 missions, stations and chapels; 1 preparatory seminary with 30 students; 11 colleges and academies for boys with 2253 students; 29 academies for young ladies with 3519 students; 111 parishes have parochial schools. The Catholic population is 556,431, but no statistics are available to show its racial classification; the baptisms of 1908 were 15,853. Of the 3935 marriages only 472 were mixed.

Laws affecting Religion and Religious Work.—There is, of course, absolute freedom of worship recognized by law and practically carried out throughout the state. There is a Sunday Law prohibiting the opening of any place of business, except of certain classes, such as drug-stores, barber-shops, etc. All liquor saloons are kept closed. Theatres, however, are permitted to open on Sunday. In all the courts the oath is administered on the Bible to all witnesses. Blasphemy and profanity are prohibited by law. The Legislature opens each session in each house with prayer, clergymen of different denominations officiating. Among the legal holidays prescribed by law, on which all public offices are closed, etc., we find New Year's Day, Shrove Tuesday, Good Friday, All Saints' Day, Christmas, and of course every Sunday. The Catholic churches of the state are not all incorporated. For instance, in the northern diocese called the Diocese of Natchitoches, all parochial property vests in the bishop; whereas, in the southern portion of the state, in the Archdiocese of New Orleans, every church is incorporated. There is a separate corporation for each church, the directors being the archbishop, the vicar-general, the parish priest, and two laymen from the congregation, and this corporation holds title to all parish property. Church property used for the purpose of public worship, the actual residence of the pastor, the parochial school buildings and grounds, and, of course, all asylums, hospitals and charitable institutions are exempt from all taxation. Cemeteries and places of public burial are exempt from all taxes and from seizure for debt.

All clergymen are exempt from jury and military service, and in fact from every forced public duty. The supreme court has held that, while public funds cannot be given to religious institutions, yet the government may contract with religious institutions for the care of the sick or the poor, and for such pay them compensation. In all prisons and reformatories clergymen of all denominations are welcomed and given access to the inmates, and in most of the large institutions, where there are many Catholic inmates, Mass is celebrated every Sunday. Bequests made to priests for Masses have been held as valid, and, although there is an inheritance tax levied on inheritances in Louisiana, yet legacies, made *eo nomine* to churches and charitable institutions, are exempt from this tax, although a legacy left to a priest in his own name would be subject to the inheritance tax. Under the first Constitution of Louisiana (1812) no clergyman could hold a public office. The second Constitution (1845) excluded them only from the legislature. The third Constitution (1852) abolished the restriction, which has not been re-enacted in the subsequent Constitutions of 1868, 1879, and 1898.

Marriage and Divorce.—The marriage and divorce laws of Louisiana are not so loose as those of some other states. Marriage between whites and blacks is prohibited by law. Any clergyman has the power to perform a marriage ceremony, but, before doing so, he must be handed a license issued by the local secular authorities authorizing the marriage, and must have the marriage registered within ten days after its solemnization. Absolute divorce is permissible for the following causes: (1) adultery; (2) condemnation to an infamous punishment; (3) habitual intemperance or cruelty of such a nature as to render living together insupportable; (4) public defamation of the other by husband of wife; (5) desertion; (6) attempt of one

spouse to kill the other; (7) when husband or wife is a fugitive from justice, charged with an infamous offence, but proof of guilt must be made. For the first and second mentioned causes immediate divorce is granted. For the other causes only a separation, which ripens into a divorce at the expiration of one year on the application of the plaintiff, provided no reconciliation has taken place, or also at the expiration of two years on the application of the defendant.

Population.—The growth of population, as shown by the United States Census, is as follows:—

1810.....	76,556	1870.....	726,915
1820.....	153,407	1880.....	940,236
1830.....	215,739	1890.....	1,118,587
1840.....	352,411	1900.....	1,381,625
1850.....	517,762	1906 (U. S.	
1860.....	708,202	Census Est.)	1,539,449

Education.—The educational system of Louisiana is under the control of the State Board of Education, and subordinate boards in the various parishes (such being the Louisiana name for counties):

Educable youth: white 275,087; coloured 221,714; total 496,801.

Enrolment in schools: white 163,603; coloured 80,128; total 243,731.

Teachers employed in public schools: white 4812; coloured 1168; total 5980.

Teachers employed in private schools 1125.

Pupils in private schools: white 36354; coloured 8646; total 45,000.

Number of public schools: white 2316; coloured 1167; total 3483.

Number of private schools: white 274; coloured 154; total 428.

Receipts from Public School Funds in 1907 (including $563,153.24 on hand, 1 January, 1907), $3,856,871.09; disbursements, $3,481,275.59.

At the head of the system is the Louisiana State University in Baton Rouge, the state capital, with 57 instructors and 657 students. Tulane University, in New Orleans, is a semi-official institution, with an endowment of $5,454,423.83, 225 instructors, and 1600 students. The public school system, besides primary, grammar and high schools, includes the following institutions:—State Normal School, with 32 instructors and 700 students; Audubon Sugar School for instruction in sugar making; three experimental stations for agricultural instruction; Ruston Industrial Institute, with 31 instructors and 500 students; Lafayette Industrial Institute, with 18 instructors and 250 students; State Institute for Deaf and Dumb; State Institute for the Blind; Gulf Biologic Station, located on Gulf Coast; Southern University for coloured youth, with 397 students.

FORTIER, *History of Louisiana* (Paris, 1904); *Report of Louisiana State Superintendent of Education* (1907); *Report of Louisiana Commissioner of Agriculture* (1908); *Bulletin No. 103 U. S. Census Bureau* (1909); *Jewish Year Book* (1907); *Catholic Directory* (1909); GAYARRÉ, *History of Louisiana* (New Orleans, 1903).

JAMES J. MCLOUGHLIN.

Louis-Marie Grignion de Montfort, BLESSED, missionary in Brittany and Vendée; b. at Montfort, 31 January, 1673; d. at Saint-Laurent-sur-Sèvre, 28 April, 1716. From his childhood, he was indefatigably devoted to prayer before the Blessed Sacrament, and, when from his twelfth year he was sent as a day pupil to the Jesuit college at Rennes, he never failed to visit the church before and after class. He joined a society of young men who during holidays ministered to the poor and to the incurables in the hospitals, and read for them edifying books during their meals. At the age of nineteen, he went on foot to Paris to follow the course in theology, gave away on the journey all his money to the poor, exchanged clothing with them, and made a vow to subsist thenceforth only on alms. He was ordained priest at the age of twenty-seven, and for some time fulfilled the duties of chaplain in a hospital. In 1705, when he was thirty-two, he found his true vocation, and thereafter devoted himself to preaching to the people. During seventeen years he preached the Gospel in countless towns and villages. As an orator he was highly gifted, his language being simple but replete with fire and divine love. His whole life was conspicuous for virtues difficult for modern degeneracy to comprehend: constant prayer, love of the poor, poverty carried to an unheard-of degree, joy in humiliations and persecutions. The following two instances will illustrate his success. He once gave a mission for the soldiers of the garrison at La Rochelle, and, moved by his words, the men wept, and cried aloud for the forgiveness of their sins. In the procession which terminated this mission, an officer walked at the head, barefooted and carrying a banner, and the soldiers, also barefooted, followed, carrying in one hand a crucifix, in the other a rosary, and singing hymns. Grignion's extraordinary influence was especially apparent in the matter of the calvary at Pontchâteau. When he announced his determination of building a monumental calvary on a neighbouring hill, the idea was enthusiastically received by the inhabitants. For fifteen months between two and four hundred peasants worked daily without recompense, and the task had just been completed, when the king commanded that the whole should be demolished, and the land restored to its former condition. The Jansenists had convinced the Governor of Brittany that a fortress capable of affording aid to persons in revolt was being erected, and for several months five hundred peasants, watched by a company of soldiers, were compelled to carry out the work of destruction. Father de Montfort was not disturbed on receiving this humiliating news, exclaiming only: "Blessed be God!"

This was by no means the only trial to which Grignion was subjected. It often happened that the Jansenists, irritated by his success, secured by their intrigues his banishment from the district, in which he was giving a mission. At La Rochelle some wretches put poison into his cup of broth, and, despite the antidote which he swallowed, his health was always impaired. On another occasion, some malefactors hid in a narrow street with the intention of assassinating him, but he had a presentiment of danger and escaped by going by another street. A year before his death, Father de Montfort founded two congregations—the Sisters of Wisdom, who were to devote themselves to hospital work and the instruction of poor girls, and the Company of Mary, composed of missionaries. He had long cherished these projects but circumstances had hindered their execution, and, humanly speaking, the work appeared to have failed at his death, since these congregations numbered respectively only four sisters and two priests with a few brothers. But the blessed founder, who had on several occasions shown himself possessed of the gift of prophecy, knew that the tree would grow. At the beginning of the twentieth century the Sisters of Wisdom numbered five thousand, and were spread throughout every country; they possessed forty-four houses, and gave instruction to 60,000 children. After the death of its founder, the Company of Mary was governed for 39 years by Father Mulot. He had at first refused to join de Montfort in his missionary labours. "I cannot become a missionary", said he, "for I have been paralysed on one side for years; I have an affection of the lungs which scarcely allows me to breathe, and am indeed so ill that I have no rest day or night." But the holy man, impelled by a sudden inspiration, replied, "As soon as you begin to preach you will be completely cured." And the event justified the prediction. Grignion de Montfort was beatified by Leo XIII in 1888.

CRUIKSHANK, *Blessed Grignion*, etc. (London, 1892); JAC, *Vie*, etc. (Paris, 1903); LAVEILLE, *Vie*, etc. (Paris, 1907).

AUSTIN POULAIN.

Louis of Casoria, VENERABLE, Friar Minor and founder of the Frati Bigi; b. at Casoria, near Naples, 11 March, 1814; d. at Pausilippo, 30 March, 1885. His name in the world was Archangelo Palmentiere. On 1 July, 1832, he entered the Order of Friars Minor, and shortly after the completion of the year's noviciate was appointed to teach philosophy and mathematics in the Franciscan convent of San Pietro in Naples. Following the advice of his superiors, he instituted a branch of the Third Order at San Pietro from the members of which he formed later a religious institute, commonly known as the Frati Bigi on account of the grayish or ashen colour of their habits. Louis instituted likewise a congregation of religious women, known as the Suore Bigie, whom he placed under the protection of St. Elizabeth of Hungary. About the year 1852 he opened a school for the education of African boys and girls redeemed from slavery. Ten years before his death he was attacked with a serious and painful illness, from which he never completely recovered. The numerous works of charity in Naples, Rome, Assisi, and Florence which owe their origin to Louis of Casoria, as well as the fame for sanctity which he enjoyed even during his lifetime, account for the veneration in which he was held by all classes, high and low alike. The cause of his beatification was introduced in Rome in 1907.

Acta Ordinis Minorum (May, 1907), 156–158; *The Catholic World* (November, 1895), 155–166; *Voce di Sant' Antonio* (July, 1907), 23–26.

STEPHEN M. DONOVAN.

Louis of Granada, theologian, writer, and preacher; b. of very humble parentage at Granada, Spain, 1505; d. at Lisbon, 31 December, 1588. At the age of nineteen he was received into the Dominican Order in the convent of Santa Cruz, Granada. With a mentality of the highest quality and the gift of unremitting application he united a profoundly spiritual character which promised a brilliant and fruitful career in the service of the Church. His philosophical studies finished, he was chosen by his superiors to represent his convent at the College of St. Gregory at Valladolid, an institution of the Dominican Order reserved for students possessed of more than ordinary ability. Here he acquitted himself with rare distinction, not only in the regular ecclesiastical courses, but in the humanities, to which he gave special attention at the request of his superiors. His studies completed, he at once entered upon the career of a preacher, in which he continued with extraordinary success during forty years. The fame of his preaching spread beyond the boundaries of his native land, and at the request of the Cardinal Infante, Dom Henrique of Portugal, son of King Manuel, he was transferred to the latter country, where he became provincial of the Portuguese Dominicans in 1557. His extraordinary sanctity, learning, and wisdom soon attracted the attention of the queen regent, who appointed him her confessor and counsellor. The Bishopric of Viseu and the Archbishopric of Braga were successively offered to him only to be courteously, but firmly, refused. The honours of the cardinalate, offered to him by Pope Sixtus V, were also declined.

Among the hundreds of eminent ascetical writers of Spain, Louis of Granada remains unsurpassed in the beauty and purity of his style, the solidity of his doctrine, and the popularity and influence of his writings. Besides ascetical theology, his published works treat of Scripture, dogma, ethics, biography, and history. He is best known, however, for his ascetical writings. The appreciation of their worth extended throughout Europe, and later to America, and their popularity still remains but little impaired after the passage of four hundred years. Nearly all of these works were translated into the various European languages and several into Turkish and Japanese. The best known of his ascetical writings, and the one that achieved the greatest measure of success, is "The Sinner's Guide" (La Guia de Pecadores). This work was published at Badajoz in 1555. It is marked by a smooth, harmonious style of purest Spanish idiom which has merited for it the reputation of a classic, and by an unctuous eloquence that has made it a perennial source of religious inspiration. It has been most favourably compared with A Kempis's "Imitation of Christ". Within a comparatively short time after its first appearance it was translated into Italian, Latin, French, German, Polish, and Greek. A new and revised English translation was published at New York in 1889. His "Memorial of the Christian Life" (Memorial de la vida christiana) is almost equally well known. In 1576 he published at Lisbon a Latin work on the principles of pulpit oratory (Rhetoricæ Ecclesiasticæ, sive de ratione concionandi). It enjoyed an extensive vogue, not only in Spain, but in most of the countries of Europe; new editions appeared successively at Venice (1578), Cologne (1578, 1582, 1611), Milan (1585), and Paris (1635). A Spanish translation was published at Madrid in 1585. To illustrate the principles embodied in this work, a volume of the author's sermons, marked by great purity of style and deep religious feeling, was published seven years after his death. In all, some twenty-seven works are attributed to his pen. A Latin edition of all his writings was published by Andrew Schott and Michael of Isselt at Cologne in 1628–29. A complete edition of his ascetical works was brought out at Madrid, in 1679, by Dionysius Sánchez Moreno, O.P., and a complete edition of his sermons, in French, at Paris, in 1868.

TICKNOR, *History of Spanish Literature*, III (London, 1871); QUÉTIF AND ECHARD, *Script. Ord. Præd.*; TOURON, *Histoire des hommes illustres de l'Ordre de Saint Dominique*, IV (Paris, 1743–49), 558–592; HURTER, *Nomenclator literarius*, I. The first part of *The Sinner's Guide* entitled *Counsels on Holiness of Life*, ed. SHIPLEY in *The Ascetic Library*, VIII (London, 1869), contains a brief sketch of the author's life.

J. B. O'CONNOR.

Louis of Toulouse, SAINT, Bishop of Toulouse, generally represented vested in pontifical garments and holding a book and a crosier, b. at Brignoles, Provence, Feb., 1274; d. there, 19 Aug., 1297. He was the second son of Charles II of Anjou, called the Lame, King of Naples (1288–1309), and nephew of St. Louis IX of France; and of Mary of Hungary, whose great-aunt was St. Elizabeth of Hungary. If in some and even early sources (Analecta Franciscana, IV, 310) he is called *primogenitus*, it is only because he succeeded to the rights of his eldest brother, Charles Martel (d. 1295). In 1288 Louis was sent with two of his brothers to the Kingdom of Aragon as hostage for his father, who had been defeated and captured in a naval battle off Naples by the Sicilians and Aragonians (1284). During the seven years of their captivity (1288–95) in the castle of Sciurana, Diocese of Tarragona, and partly in Barcelona, the education of the three princes was entrusted to some Franciscan friars, among whom were Ponzius Carbonelli (Analecta Franciscana, IV, 310), Peter of Falgar, and Richard of Middleton (Analecta Bollandiana, IX, 295). Peter John Olivi, the great Franciscan Spiritual, was also one of their friends, who on 18 May, 1295, wrote them a long letter, published by Ehrle in "Archiv f. Litt. u. Kirchengesch.", III, 534–40 (see ibid., 439–41). Louis outstripped his brothers both in holiness and learning, and, during a severe illness, made the vow to become a Friar Minor.

He was still in captivity when Celestine V entrusted to him the administration of the Archbishopric of Lyons, on 7 Oct., 1294 (Bullar. Franc., IV, 332), having previously granted Francis of Apt, O.F.M., the saint's confessor, the faculty of giving him the clerical

tonsure and minor orders (cf. Bullar. Franc., IV, 332). Neither Bull seems to have been carried out. From John of Orta (Anal. Boll., IX, 292) it appears that he was tonsured only on 1 Nov., 1295, after his release. Louis then returned to Naples. After renouncing all the rights of succession in favour of his brother Robert, he was ordained subdeacon in Rome by Boniface VIII, and in 1296 deacon and priest at Naples (Anal. Boll., IX, 314). Boniface VIII appointed the saintly young priest Bishop of Toulouse, but Louis, wishing first to become a Friar Minor, received the Franciscan habit in Rome from the minister general, John Minio of Murro, on 24 Dec., 1296, and immediately made solemn profession. He was consecrated Bishop of Toulouse by Boniface VIII on 29 (30?) Dec., 1296 ("Bullar. Franc.", IV, 422; cf. "Anal. Boll.", IX, 297). After the Feast of St. Agatha (5 Feb.), 1297, on which day he appeared for the first time publicly in the Franciscan habit, he betook himself to Toulouse, where his mild figure and his virtues were admired by everybody. He was the father of the poor and a model of administration. But his episcopate was very brief, for on his return journey from a visit to his sister, the Queen of Aragon, he was seized by fever and died at Brignoles.

We have scarcely any record of literary work of St. Louis. Recently, however, Amelli, O.S.B., published in the "Archivium Franciscanum Historicum", II (Quaracchi, 1909), 378–83, a small treatise on music written by the saint, and from this it appears that he is also the author of a "Liber de Musicæ Commendatione". Sbaralea ("Suppl. ad Script.", Rome, 1806, p. 498) ascribes to him also some sermons. His canonization, promoted by Clement V in 1307 (Bullar. Franc., V, 39), was solemnized by John XXII on 7 April, 1317 (loc. cit., 111). His relics reposed in the Franciscan church at Marseilles till 1423, when they were taken by Alfonso V of Aragon to the cathedral church of Valencia, of which town Louis became patron saint. His feast, celebrated in the Franciscan Order on 19 Aug., was decreed by the general chapter held at Marseilles in 1319 (Anal. Franc., III, 473), and the rhythmical office, beginning *Tecum*, composed by the saint's brother, King Robert of Naples, was inserted in the Franciscan Breviary by the General Chapter of Marseilles in 1343 (loc. cit., 539), but seems to have been abolished by the Tridentine reform of the Breviary under Pius IV, 1568 (cf. Acta SS., Aug., III, 805)

The best contemporary life is by the saint's chaplain, JOHN DE ORTA in *Anal. Boll.*, IX (Paris and Brussels, 1890), 278–340; *ibid.*, 341–51 (miracles); and in *Anal. Ord. Min. Cap.*, XIII (Rome, 1897), 338–51, 360–72; XIV (1898), 16–27, 83–92; some appendixes, *ibid.*, 92–4, 120–6, 156–8, 181–3. A second old life is by PETER CALO, of which extracts are given in *Acta SS.*, Aug., III, 781–97, passim; a compendium edited by PRESUTI in *Archiv. Franc. Hist.*, I (Quaracchi, 1908), 278–80; cf. *ibid.*, 569–76 (miracles). BARTHOLOMEW OF PISA in *Anal. Franc.*, IV (Quaracchi, 1906), 309–17; *Chronicle of the XXIV Generals* in *Anal. Franc.*, III (Quaracchi, 1897), 447–52; BLUME AND DREVES, *Anal. Hymnica Medii Ævii*, XXVI (Leipzig, 1897), 265–74, give three rhythmical offices formerly used in Franciscan Breviaries. For some samples of notable hymns see EUSÈBE CLOP, *Cantus varii in usu apud nostrates* (Tournai, 1902), 177–88. LEON, *Lives of the Saints and Blessed of the Three Orders of St. Francis* (Taunton, 1886), 26–49, tr. from the *Auréole Séraphique*, III. The best modern life is: VERLAQUE, *Saint Louis, prince royal, évêque de Toulouse* (Paris, 1885); DA PALMA, *Vita di S. Lodovico d'Angiò* (Naples, 1855). On the iconography, see SALTER, *Franciscan Legends in Italian Art* (London, 1905), 180–182; BERTAUX, *Les saints Louis dans l'art italien* in *Revue des Deux Mondes*, CLVIII (Paris, 1900), 616–44; KLEINSCHMIDT, *St. Ludwig von Toulouse in der Kunst* in *Archivum Franc. Hist.*, II (Quaracchi, 1909) 197–215. Concerning the sixth centenary see the richly illustrated work, *S. Lodovico d'Angio . . . e Sua Santità Leone XIII, Ricordo del VI Centenario della morte del Santo 1297–1897 e del LX Anniversario del Giubileo Sacerdotale di Sua Santità 1838–1898* (Rome, 1898).

LIVARIUS OLIGER.

Louisville, DIOCESE OF, comprises that part of Kentucky west of the Kentucky River and western borders of Carroll, Owen, Franklin, Woodford, Jessamine, Garrard, Rockcastle, Laurel, and Whitley Counties, embracing an area of 22,714 square miles. Prior to the erection of the Covington Diocese (29 July, 1853), it embraced all the State of Kentucky with an area of 47,000 square miles. Originally it was called Diocese of Bardstown, and its bishop administered spiritually a territory now divided into over twenty-eight dioceses (five of which are archdioceses). The first Catholics who are known to have settled in Kentucky were William Coomes and family (Mrs. Coomes was not only the first white female settler, she was also the first school-mistress) and Dr. Hart the first resident physician. They were among the first white settlers at Harrod's fort (Spring, 1775). Catholic settlers soon followed from Maryland, and in a short time their numbers were greatly increased by an influx of Irish-born immigrants. The latter were probably more numerous at Hardin Creek station than at any other, with the sole exception of the wholly Irish settlement at Lower Cox's Creek (seven miles north of Bardstown), where the Irish language was almost exclusively spoken (see KENTUCKY). Dr. Carroll was unable to send a priest before the year 1787, and religion suffered greatly thereby. The first missionary sent (1787) was Father Whelan, an Irish Franciscan, succeeded by Fathers Badin, de Rohan, and Barrières, Fournier and Salmon. The first American-born priest assigned to Kentucky was Father Thayer, a converted Congregational minister. He remained four years, only two of which were spent in missionary duties. Father Nerinckx arrived at St. Stephen's on 18 July, 1805, and remained there with Father Badin till 1811. He was a tireless and energetic worker, and erected ten churches. He founded the Sisterhood of Loretto (see LORETTO, SISTERS OF). A colony of Trappists, under Fr. Urban Guillet, came to Kentucky in 1805, and settled on Pottinger's Creek, about one mile from Holy Cross church, and established a school for boys. Fr. Guillet, however, withdrew his monks from Kentucky in the spring of 1809. The Dominicans under Father Fenwick came to Kentucky in 1806, and settled on a farm (now St. Rose's Convent near Springfield). A brick church was immediately begun but not finished until 1808. This was the cradle of the Dominican Order in the United States. Upon the resignation of Father Fenwick, Father Wilson was appointed provincial and under him the foundation became prosperous and permanent. A novitiate opened in 1808 was soon filled with candidates from the school.

ERECTION OF THE DIOCESE OF BARDSTOWN.—Pius VII ("Ex debito", 8 April, 1808) erected Bardstown into an episcopal seat and appointed Rev. Benedict Joseph Flaget, a Sulpician, as its first bishop. The new diocese embraced the States of Kentucky and Tennessee, and its bishop was given spiritual jurisdiction, not only over his own diocese proper, but also, until other dioceses might prudently be formed, over the whole north-western territory (states and territories) of the United States lying between 35° N. latitude and the Great Northern Lakes, and between the states bordering on the Atlantic Ocean and the Rocky Mountains, thus including the present States of Michigan, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, Kentucky, Tennessee, about half of Arkansas, Wisconsin, and Iowa. From this mother-see of the West were formed ten dioceses (including that of Little Rock) in the life of its first sainted bishop. Though the Bulls for Flaget's consecration reached him in September, 1808, the consecration did not for several reasons take place until 4 November, 1810, when Bishop Carroll, assisted by Bishop Cheverus (Boston) and Bishop Egan (Philadelphia) consecrated him at St. Patrick's church, Fell's Point.

Bishops.—(1) Bishop Flaget, accompanied by Fathers David and Savine, and three seminarians (one of whom, Guy I. Chabrat, was afterwards the second coadjutor to Flaget) reached Louisville from Pittsburg on 4 May, and arrived on 9 May, 1811, at Bards-

LOUISVILLE

1. CHURCH OF THE ASSUMPTION
2. ST. BONIFACE'S CHURCH
3. HOSPITAL OF STS. MARY AND ELIZABETH
4. ST. JOSEPH'S INFIRMARY
5. ST. LOUIS BERTRAND'S CHURCH

town. Until a residence and church could be built, Bishop Flaget resided at St. Stephen's. The bishop found twenty-four stations and ten churches all built of logs, except the Danville church which was built of brick upon ground donated by an Irishman, named Daniel McElroy, and with monies mainly given by the Irish in the vicinity, attended by six priests. The Catholics of Kentucky then numbered about 6000 souls. Outside of Kentucky he had one priest at Detroit, Michigan, one at Kaskaskia. The congregation at Vincennes, Indiana, had no priests, and was indifferent. Cahokia had no pastor, but was anxious for one. The bishop sent Fr. Savine. There was no priest in Ohio. He had ten priests for a territory over which before his death ten bishops wielded the crosier. Father David removed on 11 November, 1811, to the Howard house and farm and began to erect a log seminary and brick church. On Christmas Day, 1811, Bishop Flaget ordained in St. Rose's church Guy Ignatius Chabrat, first priest of the seminary and first priest ordained west of the Alleghanies. With the help of the seminarians who cut wood, burned the brick, and mixed and carried the mortar, a small brick church was built in 1816. Then (1817) followed the erection of a brick seminary. The first diocesan synod in the west was held on 20 February, 1812. According to the bishop's report to Pius VII (11 April, 1815) the Catholics had increased to 10,000 souls, ministered to by 10 priests, there were 6 subdeacons (5 of them Dominicans), 6 in minor orders, and 6 tonsured clerics, 5 brick and 14 log churches; Tennessee had about 25 Catholics; Ohio 50 families without a priest; Indiana 130 families attended occasionally from Kentucky; Illinois about 120 families; and Michigan 2000 souls. The seminary from its beginning until 1819 had given eleven diocesan priests to the missions. Vocations were numerous, but on account of the poverty of parents and bishop, almost as many were turned away as were received. Burdened with episcopal labours too heavy for one, Bishop Flaget applied for a coadjutor with right of succession, and Rev. Father David, president of the theological seminary, was appointed in the autumn of 1817, but the consecration was put off until 15 August, 1819, one week after the completion and consecration of the cathedral at Bardstown, which had been begun on 16 July, 1816.

Bishop Flaget was relieved of Ohio and North-Western Territory by the erection of Cincinnati (19 June, 1821) and the consecration of Father Fenwick as its first bishop (13 January, 1822). A community of religious women under guidance of Dominican Fathers was started (1822) near St. Rose's church. The bishop initiated (1823) a religious society called the Brotherhood of the Christian Doctrine, but it survived only three years. The year 1826 is notable for a wonderful renewal of faith as the fruit of a series of missions all through the diocese. The missions were successful. Six thousand received the Sacraments of Penance and the Eucharist, 1216 were confirmed, and many converts were baptized. In 1828 Bishop Flaget consecrated Most Rev. James Whitfield, fourth Archbishop of Baltimore. In September, 1828, he attended the First Council of Baltimore. Soon after his return to Kentucky he consecrated Dr. Kenrick (6 June, 1830). A new church, a replica of Bardstown cathedral, was built on Fifth street by the Rev. Robert A. Abell, and consecrated in 1830. The Sisters of Charity started a school for girls near the St. Louis's church. The Jesuits, invited in 1828, arrived in 1832, and were presented with St. Mary's College by its founder and owner, Rev. Wm. Byrne. Whilst at St. Louis, Bishop Flaget received news from Rome that his resignation of the Bishopric of Bardstown had been accepted, and that his coadjutor, Father David, would be his successor.

(2) Rt. Rev. John Baptist Mary David, b. in 1761, near Nantes, France, educated and ordained there on 24 September, 1785. Having joined the Sulpicians, he taught philosophy and theology in France, and, in 1792, came to the United States. He laboured on the Maryland missions for twelve years with indefatigable zeal; and after teaching some years at Georgetown College and St-Mary's, Baltimore, in 1810 he went west with Bishop Flaget, and established the theological seminary of St. Thomas at Bardstown. He was a strict disciplinarian and an able and lucid professor. He founded the religious institute of Sisters of Charity of Nazareth (November, 1812), and was their ecclesiastical superior almost to the end of his life. Appointed coadjutor to Bishop Flaget in autumn, 1817, his consecration was delayed for almost two years by reason of his reluctance to accept the dignity. After his consecration, he continued at the head of the seminary, discharging at the same time the duties of professor and pastor of the cathedral parish. The priests trained under him numbered forty-seven, of whom twenty-three were either natives of the diocese, or had been raised in it from childhood. Four of them became bishops: Chabrat (coadjutor to Bishop Flaget), Reynolds (Charleston), McGill (Richmond, Va.), Martin John Spalding (Louisville, and later Archbishop of Baltimore). Upon succeeding to the bishopric early in December, 1832, his first act was to appoint the former bishop, the Rt. Rev. B. J. Flaget, vicar-general with as ample faculties as he could, and then forward his resignation to Rome. Rome accepted the resignation (May, 1833), and reappointed Bishop Flaget to the See of Bardstown. Declining health compelled Bishop David, towards the end of 1841, to retire to Nazareth, where he died 12 July, 1841, aged 80, in the fifty-sixth year of his priesthood, and twenty-second of his episcopate.

(3) Bishop Flaget, reappointed to Bardstown, thus became its third bishop. Dr. Chabrat was named his coadjutor (29 June, 1834). After consecrating him (20 July, 1834), Flaget left to him the details of the administration. In September, of the same year, a small church and orphan asylum were erected in Covington, thus laying the foundation of the Covington Diocese. Indiana, and the eastern portion of Illinois, were removed from Bishop Flaget's jurisdiction by the erection of the Diocese of Vincennes, 6 May, 1834. Bishop Flaget, in 1835, visited France, and made his episcopal visit to Rome. The first weekly Catholic paper, "The Catholic Advocate", was published in Bardstown in 1836, succeeding a monthly magazine, the "Minerva", founded and edited by the faculty of St. Joseph's College, in October, 1834. During the years 1836–7 several churches were erected and dedicated, among them one at Lexington, Fancy Farm, Lebanon, and Louisville (St. Boniface was the first erected for German Catholics). In April, 1837, Dr. Chabrat attended the Third Provincial Council of Baltimore, and made known Bishop Flaget's desire to have Tennessee formed into a new diocese. Gregory XVI established the Diocese of Nashville on 25 July, 1837. Father Napoleon Joseph Perché (afterwards Archbishop of New Orleans) organized a new city parish, Our Lady's of the Port. The diocese numbered at this time forty churches, seventy stations, fifty-one priests, two ecclesiastical seminaries, and nine academies for young ladies. Bishop Flaget returned to Bardstown in September, 1839, and new churches were erected at Taylorsville and Portland. Louisville had in 1841 a population of 21,210. Owing to its increasing population, and the development of its Catholic institutions, the episcopal seat was transferred to it from Bardstown in that year, and Flaget became Bishop of Louisville and Bardstown.

Diocese of Louisville.—La Salle, a Catholic explorer, was the first white man who visited the Falls of Ohio and the site upon which the city of Louisville is built. Thomas Bullitt and party arrived at the Falls on 8 July, 1773, and marked off the site of the

city in August of the same year. Louisville was established by Act of the Legislature of Virginia on 1 May, 1780, on 1000 acres belonging to one John Connolly. Three French priests, Revs. Flaget, Levadoux, and Richard, met in Louisville and probably said Mass there for the first time in 1792. It is not certain that any professing Catholic was resident before 1791. Several Catholic families of Irish and American birth settled there between 1805 and 1825. In 1806 a large colony of Frenchmen, with their families, settled about one or two miles south of the city limits, and upon the southern bank of the Ohio, and though but very few of them were practical Catholics they aided Father Badin liberally. A church was erected on the corner of Tenth and Main streets, and opened on Christmas Day, 1811, but not finished until 1817. Father Philip Hosten attended it occasionally from Fairfield until 17 August, 1822, when he was appointed pastor of Louisville. Typhoid fever was carrying off hundreds of the population when he arrived, and he ministered night and day to the sick and dying. He fell a victim to the fever and died, 30 October. He was succeeded in 1823 by Father Robert A. Abell, who attended the Catholics in the town proper, and the villages of Shippingport and Portland, St. John's, Bullitt county, on the southern, and those of New Albany and Jeffersonville on the northern bank of the Ohio. Father Abell was succeeded by Rev. J. I. Reynolds, who had for assistants Fathers George Hayden, McGill, and Clark. Father Stahlsmidt replaced Father Clark, and gathered together the Catholic Germans in the basement chapel, and thus laid the foundation of the first German congregation in the city.

Bishops.—(1) Rt. Rev. Benedict Joseph Flaget, on the removal of the see from Bardstown to Louisville, appointed Father Reynolds vicar-general, and Rev. Dr. Martin J. Spalding, pastor of the old cathedral at Bardstown. A colony of five sisters of the Good Shepherd, from Angers, France, arrived in Louisville in 1842, and were installed in a home on Eighth street near Walnut purchased for them by Bishop Flaget. This was the cradle of this religious community in the United States. The confraternity of the Immaculate Heart of Mary for the Conversion of Sinners was established on 21 March, 1843, by Bishop Flaget. The coadjutor bishop, Dr. Chabrat, being threatened with the loss of sight, tendered his resignation, which was at length (1847) accepted, and Dr. Martin J. Spalding appointed in his place. Two Franciscan Brothers from Ireland opened the first free school in Louisville in 1847. The year previous the Jesuit Fathers, in charge of St. Mary's College for fourteen years, left the diocese. About May, 1848, negotiations between the bishop and the Jesuits of St. Louis were completed, by which the fathers took charge of St. Joseph's College, at Bardstown, and the Catholic free school founded by the Irish Franciscan Brothers. Soon after the Jesuits arrived in Louisville, they erected a spacious edifice as a college adjoining the free school. The college attendance was from 100 to 200, and that of the free school about 200 boys. Late in December, 1848, a colony of Trappists from Melleray, France, arrived at and settled on a farm of about 1600 acres formerly belonging to the Loretto Sisters, and named Gethsemani. Bishop Flaget d. on 11 February, 1850 (see FLAGET, BENEDICT JOSEPH).

Coadjutor Bishop Guy Ignatius Chabrat, b. at Chambre, France, on 28 December, 1787; d. at Mauriac, France, on 21 November, 1868. He came to Kentucky in 1809 and was ordained on 25 December, 1811. He did missionary duty at St. Michael's, Fairfield, St. Clare's, and Louisville. He had charge for a short time (1823) of St. Pius's, Scott County. Upon the death of Father Nerinckz, Father Chabrat succeeded him as superior of the Loretto sisterhood till 1846. He was consecrated (20 July, 1834) Bishop of Bolina and coadjutor of Bardstown. When Bishop Chabrat was forced to resign by reason of his approaching blindness he retired (1847) on a comfortable pension to his old home in France. He died in the thirty-fourth year of his episcopate.

(2) Rt. Rev. Martin John Spalding, b. 23 May, 1810, was one of the first pupils of Father Byrne's College, afterwards of the diocesan seminary of St. Thomas, thence he passed to Rome and was ordained on 13 August, 1834; became vicar-general of the diocese in 1844, coadjutor bishop on 10 September, 1848, and bishop on the death of Dr. Flaget, 11 February, 1850. Upon the death of Dr. Kendrick, Bishop Spalding was elevated, 11 June, 1864, to the Archdiocese of Baltimore. He appointed his brother, Rev. Dr. Benedict Joseph Spalding, administrator of the diocese. In 1848 Bishop Spalding found 30,000 souls in the whole state, cared for by 40 priests, and at his departure there were 70,000 souls with 51 diocesan and 24 religious priests in the Diocese of Louisville. There were but 43 Catholic churches in the state in 1848; in 1864 there were 80 in the Diocese of Louisville. During the administration of Dr. B. J. Spalding the Jesuit Fathers of St. Joseph's College left the diocese (see SPALDING, MARTIN JOHN).

(3) Rt. Rev. Peter Joseph Lavialle, b. in 1820 at Lavialle near Mauriac, in Auvergne, France, made his preparatory studies in France, and came to Kentucky with his relative, Bishop Chabrat, in 1841; he was ordained priest in 1844, and assigned to work at the cathedral. In the year 1849 he was appointed professor of St. Thomas's Seminary where he remained until Bishop Spalding, in 1856, made him president of St. Mary's College, which office he held until he was consecrated Bishop of Louisville on 24 September, 1865. He invited the Dominican Fathers to locate in the episcopal city in December, 1865. The following year St. Joseph's and St. Michael's churches, Louisville, were dedicated, and a temporary frame church (St. Louis Bertrand's) built and the convent of the Dominican Fathers commenced. Though exhausted from continued labours and mortifications, he attended the Second Council of Baltimore in October, 1866, and on his return resumed the diocesan visitation, but had to retire to St. Joseph's Infirmary, and thence to Nazareth Academy where he died on 11 May, 1867. He was buried in the crypt of Louisville cathedral. Very Rev. B. J. Spalding was again appointed administrator of the diocese, but he soon died (4 August, 1868). Archbishop Purcell then appointed Very Rev. Hugh I. Brady administrator *sede vacante*.

(4) Rt. Rev. William George McCloskey; b. on 10 November, 1823, in Brooklyn, N. Y. He studied law in New York City, but abandoning his worldly career he was ordained priest by Archbishop Hughes on 4 October, 1852. After acting as assistant for one year to his brother, Rev. John McCloskey, pastor of the Nativity church, New York, he was appointed professor of Latin and afterwards of holy Scripture and moral theology at St. Mary's College, Maryland, and in 1857 was chosen as director of Mount St. Mary's Seminary, which office he held until he was appointed (8 December, 1859) by Pius IX first rector of the recently established American College at Rome. Upon the death of Bishop Lavialle the Pope named Dr. McCloskey to the vacant see, and he was consecrated bishop by Cardinal Reisach in the American College on 24 May, 1868. Bishop McCloskey ruled the diocese for forty-one years and died at Preston Park Seminary on 17 September, 1909. Very Rev. James P. Cronin, former vicar-general, was appointed administrator of the diocese by Archbishop Moeller of Cincinnati. The Right Rev. Denis O'Donaghue, Titular Bishop of Pomario (25 April, 1900) and Bishop Auxiliary of Indianapolis, was chosen as the new Bishop of Louisville and took possession of his see on 29 March, 1910.

STATISTICS.—Priests 204 (142 diocesan, 62 regular); churches 163; seminary 1; colleges 3, pupils 718; academies 16, pupils 1621; parochial schools 70, pupils 11,225; kindergartens 3, pupils 145; industrial and reform schools 4, inmates 225; orphan asylums 3, orphans 272; hospitals 4; homes for aged poor 4; inmates 301; Catholic population 135,421. The coloured Catholics number 4251, and have 4 churches and 7 schools with 365 pupils.

Religious Communities.—(Men): Benedictines 2; Dominicans 17 (14 priests); Franciscan Friars Minor, professed 24, clergy 18; Minor Conventual, professed 6 priests; Passionists in community 24; Fathers of the Resurrection, professed 5, total 12; Reformed Cistercian, professed 32, total 87; Brothers of Mary 7; Xaverian Brothers 20 professed.

(Women); Sisters of Charity: mother-house at Nazareth, Ky., 22 houses in the diocese and establishments in States of Ohio, Tennessee, Arkansas, Mississippi, Maryland, Virginia and Massachusetts; total religious, 800. Sisters of Loretto at the Foot of the Cross: mother-house at Nerinckx, Nelson Co., Ky., 700 members, conducting 23 academies and 42 parochial schools in the Dioceses of Louisville, Covington, Cleveland, Columbus, Mobile, Belleville, St. Louis, Kansas City, Lincoln, Denver, Dallas, Tucson, and Santa Fé. Sisters of Third Order of St. Dominic: mother-house, St. Catherine near Springfield, Ky., professed sisters, 64, total number, 79. Good Shepherd Sisters: 2 convents, professed choir sisters 24, 18 lay, 9 out-door sisters having in charge 55 professed magdalenes, 39 penitents, 170 in reformatory class, and 170 children from 5 to 12 years of age in St. Philomena's Industrial School. Ursuline nuns: mother-house in Louisville, local houses, 7, academies, 3, 20 parochial schools, and 1 orphan asylum, and establishments in Maryland and Indiana, total subject to mother-house, 247. Sisters of Mercy: mother-house at Louisville, academy house and parochial school, professed 60. Franciscan Sisters: St. Anthony's hospital, 23 sisters. Little Sisters of the Poor: home for the aged, 18 sisters in charge of 225 aged poor.

NOTRE-DAME DE LOURDES

M. J. SPALDING, *Life, Times and Character of Benedict Joseph Flaget* (Louisville, 1852); IDEM, *Sketches of the Early Catholic Missions in Kentucky, 1787–1827* (Louisville, 1846); SHEA, *History of Catholic Church in the United States* (New York, 1886–93); J. L. SPALDING, *Life of Archbishop Spalding* (New York, 1873); WEBB, *Centenary of Catholicity in Kentucky* (Louisville, 1884); DEPPEN, *Louisville Guide* (Louisville, 1887); *Catholic Orphan's Souvenir* (Louisville, 1901); files of *Catholic Advocate, Catholic Guardian* and *Catholic Record.*

P. M. J. ROCK.

Lourdes, BROTHERS OF OUR LADY OF (abbreviation C.N.D.L.—Congrégation de Notre-Dame de Lourdes), a community devoted to the education of youth and the care of the sick and infirm. It was founded at Renaix, Flanders, in 1830, by Etienne Modeste Glorieux, a Belgian priest, and approved in 1892 by Leo XIII. The congregation, numbering 518 members, has its mother-house at Oostacker, Belgium, and 30 filial houses, one in the United States and the others in Belgium and Holland. The American house is at South Park, in the Diocese of Seattle, Washington, where there are 13 Brothers in charge of a house of studies and day- and boarding-school for boys.

HEIMBUCHER, *Die Orden und Kongregationen*, III (Paderborn, 1908), 360; *Catholic Directory* (Milwaukee, 1910).

LEO A. KELLY.

Lourdes, NOTRE-DAME DE, in the Department of Hautes Pyrenées, France, is far-famed for the pilgrimage of which it is a centre and for the extraordinary events that have occurred and still occur there.

History—The pilgrimage of Lourdes is founded on the apparitions of the Blessed Virgin to a poor, fourteen-year-old girl, Bernadette Soubiroux. The first apparition occurred 11 February, 1858. There were eighteen in all; the last took place 16 July, of the same year. Bernadette often fell into an ecstasy. The mysterious vision she saw in the hollow of the rock Massabielle was that of a young and beautiful lady. "Lovelier than I have ever seen" said the child. But the girl was the only one who saw the vision, although sometimes many stood there with her. Now and then the apparition spoke to the seer who also was the only one who heard the voice. Thus, she one day told her to drink of a mysterious fountain, in the grotto itself, the existence of which was unknown, and of which there was no sign, but which immediately gushed forth. On another occasion the apparition bade Bernadette go and tell the priests she wished a chapel to be built on the spot and processions to be made to this grotto. At first the clergy were incredulous. It was only four years later, in 1862, that the bishop of the diocese declared the faithful "justified in believing the reality of the apparition". A basilica was built upon the rock of Massabielle by M. Peyramale, the parish priest. In 1873 the great "national" French pilgrimages were inaugurated. Three years later the basilica was consecrated and the statue solemnly crowned. In 1883 the foundation stone of another church was laid, as the first was no longer large enough. It was built at the foot of the basilica and was consecrated in 1901 and called the Church of the Rosary. Pope Leo XIII authorized a special office and a Mass, in commemoration of the apparition, and in 1907 Pius X extended the observance of this feast to the entire Church; it is now observed on 11 February.

Never has a sanctuary attracted such throngs. At the end of the year 1908, when the fiftieth anniversary of the apparition was celebrated, although the record really only began from 1867, 5297 pilgrimages had been registered and these had brought 4,919,000 pilgrims. Individual pilgrims are more numerous by far than those who come in groups. To their number must be added the visitors who do not come as pilgrims, but who are attracted by a religious feeling or sometimes merely by the desire to see this far-famed spot. The Company of the Chemins de Fer du Midi estimates that the Lourdes station receives over one million travellers per annum. Every nation in the world furnishes its contingent. Out of the total of pilgrimages given above, four hundred and sixty-four came from countries other than France. They are sent by the United States, Germany, Bel-

gium, Austria, Hungary, Spain, Portugal, Italy, England, Ireland, Canada, Brazil, Bolivia, etc. The bishops lead the way. At the end of the year of the fiftieth anniversary, 2013 prelates, including 546 archbishops, 10 primates, 19 patriarchs, 69 cardinals, had made the pilgrimage to Lourdes. But more remarkable still than the crowd of pilgrims is the series of wonderful occurrences which take place under the protection of the celebrated sanctuary. Passing over spiritual cures, which more often than not escape human observance, we shall confine ourselves to bodily diseases. The writer of this article has recorded every recovery, whether partial or complete, and in the first half-century of the shrine's existence he has counted 3962. Notwithstanding very careful statistics which give the names and surnames of the patients who have recovered, the date of the cure, the name of the disease, and generally that of the physician who had charge of the case, there are inevitably doubtful or mistaken cases, attributable, as a rule, to the excited fancy of the afflicted one and which time soon dispels. But it is only right to note: first, that these unavoidable errors regard only secondary cases which have not like the others been the object of special study; it must also be noted that the number of such cases is equalled and exceeded by actual cures which are not put on record. The afflicted who have recovered are not obliged to present themselves, and half of them do not present themselves, at the Bureau des Constatations Médicales at Lourdes, and it is from this bureau's official reports that the list of cures is drawn up.

LOURDES, FRANCE

The estimate that about 4000 cures have been obtained at Lourdes within the first fifty years of the pilgrimage is undoubtedly considerably less than the actual number. The Bureau des Constatations stands near the shrine, and there are recorded and checked the certificates of maladies, and also the certificates of cure; it is free to all physicians, whatever their nationality or religious belief. Consequently, on an average, from two to three hundred physicians annually visit this marvellous clinic. As to the nature of the diseases which are cured, nervous disorders so frequently mentioned, do not furnish even the fourteenth part of the whole; 278 have been counted, out of a total of 3962. The present writer has published the number of cases of each disease or infirmity, among them tuberculosis, tumours, sores, cancers, deafness, blindness, etc. The "Annales des Sciences Physiques", a sceptical review whose chief editor is Doctor Ch. Richet, Professor at the Medical Faculty of Paris, said in the course of a long article, apropos of this faithful study: "On reading it, unprejudiced minds cannot but be convinced that the facts stated are authentic."

BERNADETTE SOUBIROUX, WHO SAW THE VISION OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN AT LOURDES

Their Cause.—There exists no natural cause capable of producing the cures witnessed at Lourdes which dispense an unbiassed mind from tracing them back to the particular agency of God. Those who refused to believe in a miraculous intervention sought at first the scientific interpretation of the occurrences in the chemical composition of the water of the Grotto. But it was then declared by an eminent chemist officially appointed to make the analysis, and his statement has since been corroborated, that the water contains no curative properties of a natural character. Then the incredulous said, perhaps it operates through its temperature, or the results obtained at Lourdes may be accounted for by the bathing in cold water. However, every one knows that hydrotherapy is practised elsewhere than at Lourdes, and that it does not work the miracle of curing every kind of disease, from cancers to troubles which bring on blindness. Besides, many ailing ones are cured without ever bathing in the basins of the Grotto; this decides the question. Therefore, those who deny supernatural intervention attribute the wonderful results seen at Lourdes to two other causes. The first is suggestion. To this we answer unhesitatingly that suggestion is radically powerless to furnish the hoped-for explanation. Omitting nervous or functional diseases, since they are in the minority among those registered as cured at the Medical Office of the Grotto, and the fact we are now establishing does not require them to be taken into account, we may confine our attention to organic diseases. Can suggestion be used efficaciously in diseases of this nature? The most learned and daring of the suggestionists of the present day, Bernheim, a Jew, head of the famous school of Nancy, the more advanced rival of the Ecole de la Salpétrière, answers in the negative in twenty passages of the book in which he has recorded the result of his observations: "Hypnotisme, Suggestion, Psychotherapie" (Paris, 1903, 2nd edition). Studying this work, we find also that in the very cases where suggestion has a chance of success, as in certain functional diseases, it requires the co-operation of time, it cures slowly and progressively, while the complete cures of Lourdes are instantaneous. Therefore curative suggestion is no explanation. It is not suggestion that operates at Lourdes; the cause which cures acts differently and is infinitely more powerful.

There remains the last resource of having recourse to some unknown law and of saying, for instance, "How

do we know that some natural force of which we are still ignorant does not operate the marvellous cures which are attributed directly to God?" How do we know? In the first place, if a law of this nature did exist, the pilgrims of Lourdes would not be cognizant of it any more than the rest of mankind; neither would they know any better than others how to set it in motion. Why should this law operate for them and not for others? Is it because they deny its existence and the others believe in it? Moreover, not only there does not exist, but there cannot exist, and consequently will never exist, a natural law producing instantaneously the regeneration of tissues affected with lesion, that is to say, the cure of an organic disease. Why so? Because any growth and consequently any

THE VIRGIN OF THE SANCTUARY, LOURDES

restoration of the tissues of the organism is accomplished—and this is a scientific fact—by the increase and growth of the protoplasms and cells which compose every living body. Every existing protoplasm comes from some former protoplasm, and that from a previous one and so on, back to the very beginning; these generations (the fact is self-evident) are necessarily successive, that is, they require the co-operation of time. Therefore, in order that a natural force should be able to operate a sudden cure in an organic disease, the essential basis of life as it is in the present creation would have to be overthrown; nature as we know it would have to be destroyed and another created on a different plan. Therefore, the hypothesis of unknown forces of nature cannot be brought forward to explain the instantaneous cures of Lourdes. It is logically untenable. As a matter of fact, no natural cause, known or unknown, is sufficient to account for the marvellous cures witnessed at the foot of the celebrated rock where the Virgin Immaculate deigned to appear. They can only be from the intervention of God.

LASSERRE, *Notre-Dame de Lourdes;* BOISSARIE, *L'œuvre de Lourdes;* BERTRIN, *Histoire critique des événements de Lourdes, apparitions et guérisons* (Paris, 1909), tr. GIBBS; IDEM, *Un miracle d'aujourd'hui avec une radiographie* (Paris, 1909).

GEORGES BERTRIN.

Louth. See CLOGHER, DIOCESE OF.

Louvain, UNIVERSITY OF.—In order to restore the splendour of Louvain, capital of his Duchy of Brabant, John IV of the House of Burgundy petitioned the papal authority for the establishment of an educational institution called at the time *studium generale.* The Bull of Martin V, dated 9 December, 1425, was the result. This Bull, in founding the university, prescribed also that the prince should give it advantages and privileges. In its early days, however, the university was incomplete. It was only in 1431 that Eugene IV created the faculty of theology. Louvain had the character of a *studium generale,* i. e., it had the right to receive students from all parts of the world, and the degree of doctor which it conferred gave the right to teach anywhere. Popes and princes vied with one another in granting the university important privileges and establishing endowments to provide for its needs and development. The organization of the university and its history have been recorded by many annalists. The MSS. preserved in the archives amply complete the literary sources, although the entire history of the university has not yet been written. From any point of view that may be taken, the history and description of the university admit of an important division, the regime from 1425 to 1797 being quite different from that adopted at the time of the restoration in 1834.

First Period (1425–1797).—The ancient university constituted a juridical body enjoying a large measure of autonomy. The arrangement of the programme of studies and the conferring of degrees were among its prerogatives; it had jurisdiction and disciplinary powers over its members. Its constitution was elective; the authority of the rector was conferred for three months, then for six, by delegates of the faculties, each one holding in turn the rectoral office. The faculties organized after the foundation of the theological faculty comprised those of law (civil and canon), medicine, and arts. The scope of the latter was very broad, including the physical and mathematical sciences, philosophy, literature, and history. It covered everything contained in the trivium and quadrivium of the Middle Ages; it was an encyclopedic faculty. The university profited by the increasing power of the sovereigns of Brabant, dukes of Burgundy, afterwards princes of Habsburg, Austria, and Spain. The imperial splendour of Charles V contributed greatly to its prosperity, owing to the important position of the Netherlands among the nations of Europe. Doubtless, too, it felt the effects of the civil and foreign wars, which devastated these provinces; its material and scientific interests suffered considerably, but for all that, during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, it was one of the strongest intellectual centres of the West. The princes had contributed to the influence exerted by Louvain by giving it a university monopoly; for, fearing the influence of the doctrines taught in other countries, the Farnese Government forbade young Belgians to study in foreign universities, as many of them had been doing until that time. It is true that this rule permitted exceptions for worthy motives. On the other hand, to provide for the southern provinces, Philip II had brought about the establishment of an affiliated university at Douai, which was soon to rival the parent institution and share its privileges. The faculties of Louvain did not confine themselves to oral teaching in optional courses. Various institutions sprang up about the university. More than forty colleges received students of various groups provided with special means. Special chairs were created, for instance, in the sixteenth century, the celebrated "College of the Three Languages" founded by Busleiden. In these colleges (Lys, Porc, Château, Faucon) courses were given and a very keen competition for academic honours sprang up among them. The students were also grouped according to

nationalities, e. g., the German nation, the Brabantine nation, etc.

In the ancient university the faculty of law occupied a dominant position. Its course of studies, however, offers no features characteristic of that period. Founded at the time when Roman law was beginning to assert its supremacy in Europe, the faculty of Louvain remained a stanch exponent of its principles. Here as in France, it is possible to distinguish various periods, but the reaction brought about in that country by the school of Cujas was not equally strong in Belgium with Mudée and his disciples in the sixteenth century. Roman law reigned almost supreme in the lecture-halls; even during the formation of national law, while the up-building of this law was everywhere



The University of Louvain

in process, it found no place in the teaching of the university. It was only in exceptional cases that certain subjects succeeded in obtaining recognition. The jurists of Louvain, however, exercised a tremendous influence. Indeed they soon filled the tribunals and the councils. Administration and judiciary drew their jurisprudence from the sources in the university; magistrates and officials studied under the teachers at Louvain, and sometimes the teachers themselves were called to these high positions. And thus the law developed under their inspiration. When the period of compilations (such as those of customary and princely laws) began in the seventeenth century, the jurists of Louvain lavished on the work the result of their learning and experience. The perpetual edict on the reform of justice issued in 1611, marks a memorable epoch in this respect. The situation became still more tense when in 1617 a rule was adopted requiring for eligibility to membership in the councils of justice, and even for admission to the bar, the completion of a course of studies in a university of the Netherlands. In this scheme, the teaching of Roman law had a large place; it was regarded as the scientific element, but it served in practice to mould and co-ordinate, not to destroy the living law of national custom. While one preserved the theoretical primacy, the other was in actual control, and it is from their union realized in studies and edicts that the written national law came forth. Influential in all that pertained to law as such, the jurists of Louvain had also a strong political influence. Under the old regime justice and administration were not divided. Then, the highest governmental offices were almost always entrusted to experienced jurists who held diplomas from Louvain.

The jurists of Louvain, brought up in the spirit of Byzantine law, were somewhat imbued with royalist theories; however, although serving the prince, they showed a decided preference for the limited monarchy. They certainly consolidated and enlarged the princely power, but they did not favour an absolute monarchy. The national opposition to the royal power, which had become too foreign in character, undoubtedly met among the legists adversaries so far as these helped powerfully to create the mechanism of the princely state; but if a number were hostile to the old privileges of the provinces, the theory of absolute royalty found no representative among them even in the seventeenth century. It is only in the eighteenth century that royalist conceptions took on greater importance at Louvain, without, however, becoming predominant. The history of these conceptions has been sketched in a volume of the faculty of law indicated below. If the faculty of law exercised a far-reaching influence in the inner life of the university, the faculty of arts shed a more brilliant light. There we find the illustrious group of Humanists who for a century and a half give Louvain an international fame; it becomes one of the scientific centres of the literary Renaissance which so largely developed the knowledge of letters and history and gave a new impetus to many branches of learning, but which was also marked by the ferment of many dangerous germs and hazardous ideas. Louvain is in the very heart of this literary movement, and, apart from the subtle trifling with ideas which endangered orthodoxy, reference must be made, and often with well-deserved praise, to the brilliant phalanx of linguists, philologists, and historians gathered at the university. There we find a succession of names which adorn the literary annals of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and the history of which has been written in part by Félix Nève ("La Renaissance des lettres en Belgique", Louvain, 1890), a work which is being gradually brought to completion, especially by the writings of Professor Roersen, of Ghent. The ancient languages ruled over this domain, the Oriental and Græco-Latin studies occupying a prominent place. It is particularly through this faculty that Louvain shed its lustre beyond the Netherlands. If its jurists were well known, its philologists were even more famous. Besides, literary Humanism formed a vast international association for fine cultural study, and intercourse between teachers was supplemented by the journeys of their disciples. Louvain had a distinguished reputation in this world of letters; it was the Athens of Belgium. The English Catholic Humanists, such as Thomas More, found there a happy refuge during the persecution. At the end of the sixteenth century, the name of Justus Lipsius, poor as a philosopher and statesman, but great as a philologist, sums up this prestige of classical lore, of which he stands out as the culminating point, forming with Casaubon and Scaliger the "triumvirate" of European Humanism. Distinguished names abound, but that of Clénard, the Arabist, is entitled to special mention. Thomissen and Roersch have written the life of this indomitable scholar. Moreover, the study of letters permeated the other sciences and the professors of law were Humanists as well.

But, as we know, the faculty of arts does not consist wholly of linguistic and philological studies; it includes the natural and mathematical sciences in close connexion with philosophy. Without attempting to treat its history and controversies, it may suffice to

note that in the sixteenth century, geometry, astronomy, and geography found at Louvain celebrated professors who paved the way for the practical achievements of Antwerpian cartography. Adrian Romanus and Gemma Frisius are its accredited representatives. The Cartesian disputes of the seventeenth century gave rise to heated controversies, the stirring history of which has been related by Georges Minchamp (Le Cartésianisme en Belgique, 1886). The same is true of the system of Copernicus and the trials of Galileo (Monchamp, "Galilée et la Belgique", Brussels, 1892). The eighteenth century brings the name of Minckelers, who invented illuminating gas. Within the last few years several monuments have been erected to him at Maastricht and at Louvain, and Professor Dewalque, of Louvain, has written his biography. The history of each science will not be related here, as it should properly be left to specialists. This in particular is true as regards the faculty of medicine. It may be stated, however, that although few in number this faculty grouped in its midst and about it powerful elements of progress. Vesalius and Van Helmont worked at Louvain; Réga was an authority in surgery in the eighteenth century, and there are many illustrious names close to these shining lights, a list of which has recently been made by Dr. Masoin, of Louvain.

Belonging to a very different order in virtue of its high mission stands the faculty of theology. The task of treating its doctrines lies beyond the scope of this article. As a whole its history is one of fruitful activity to which its numerous productions bear witness. It was disturbed by the currents of thought which agitated religious doctrine throughout the world, but it vigorously resisted Protestantism. The errors which sprang from its bosom through the teachings of Baïus and Jansenius caused serious anxiety during the entire seventeenth century. In the eighteenth century the influence of Febronianism and Josephinism was strongly felt, without, however, ever becoming predominant in the faculty. The theological teaching, from the end of the seventeenth century onwards, was based upon that of the scholastics, the writings of St. Thomas Aquinas having replaced those of Peter Lombard. Special scholastic chairs were added through the initiative of the princes. Among its illustrious teachers we shall name but one: Adrian Floris, tutor of Charles V, later Cardinal of Utrecht, and finally pope under the name of Adrian VI (1522). To him is due the foundation of a university college which still bears his name.

The statutes of the university had been modified several times, but the *laura doctoralis* was throughout the crowning feature of the studies. The doctorate ceremonies were not alike in all the faculties nor were they the only ones observed in the university; but the conferring of degrees was always a considerable event accompanied with festivities academical, gastronomical, and public. Not only did solemn processions pass through the town, but these were repeated in each community according to a traditional ritual both complicated and onerous. These functions were commemorated in verse, tableaux, stories and are perpetuated in the nation's memory. Except for well-justified retrenchments, the custom has been maintained in certain doctorates, the conferring of which still preserves the festive form and the public procession. Certain competitions in the faculty of arts roused great interest. At the conclusion of each competition the candidates were graded; the "Primus" in the first "line" became from that fact an important personage, an honour to his family and city.

It goes without saying that the student body of Louvain was not given exclusively to study. The police of the university and the rectoral tribunal who had jurisdiction over the entire academic body occasionally had very difficult cases to handle. During the civil wars the habits of the young men had not become any more peaceful. If it happened that in the sixteenth century they rendered Louvain the great service of saving it from being taken and pillaged by armed bands, on the other hand their rapiers often endangered public peace. Unfortunately we have but few facts concerning the student life of the period, although one of our historians, Poullet, has written an interesting sketch (see "Revue catholique", Louvain, 1867). Certain articles of the statutes constituted the disciplinary code relating to the violation of university regulations, and during the stormy times of civil struggles and general warfare, the academic tribunal had all it could do to keep the restless student throng in order. Studies at the university went through various phases. For a long time they were under the exclusive jurisdiction of the university body itself. But in the midst of civil disturbances, certain weaknesses and defects of organization became apparent, and these the authorities endeavoured to remedy. At the beginning of the seventeenth century an important fact is to be noted: the

Vestibule of the University of Louvain

investigation and reform of 1617. In union with Paul V, and after a careful examination the sovereign archdukes published new university statutes. Thenceforth the programme of studies and the conferring of degrees were minutely provided for. Moreover, the diploma of studies and examinations was generally required for the professions of law and of medicine. There was still free scientific activity, but the professional regulating tendencies were much in evidence in the faculties of law and of medicine. The new regulation contributed to the uplifting of the standard of instruction. There were still defects and omissions, however, and the wars during the reign of Louis XIV were not conducive to academic work. But there was considerable activity in the way of publication, notwithstanding the complaints of the Government on the score of discipline.

The seventeenth century cannot be looked upon as a period of decay for the university, as there are noted names and numerous scholarly productions. True, ancient literature no longer had the brilliancy given it by Justus Lipsius up to 1606, but there were very distinguished jurists, noted Humanists (like Putianus). The attraction exerted by Louvain was still very great. In fact it was only towards the middle of the seventeenth century that the *natio germanica*, which comprised a succession of distinguished names from various parts of the empire, was officially established. Louvain was celebrated and many studied there in preference to the Protestant universities of Germany and Holland (Wils, "L'illustre nation germanique", Louvain, 1909). Publications, Belgian bibliographies of various kinds flourished; the "Bibliotheca Bel-

gica" in important and numerous volumes did honour to the publishing houses, especially to the celebrated printing house of Plantin and Moretus at Antwerp. Through its teachers and its influence, Louvain had a very large sphere in their activity. Even more than the seventeenth century the eighteenth, hitherto scarcely known, has been represented as one of decadence for the university. One may be surprised at this, since from 1756 at least, owing to the reconciliation of the Habsburgs and the Bourbons, the country enjoyed perfect peace under the apparently easy-going administration of Prince Charles of Louvain. But in reality, if there were some shortcomings, the imputation of decay got its principal emphasis from the Austrian Government itself. The princely authorities followed a policy which met with strong opposition, especially in ecclesiastical matters. The ministers from Vienna expected to find political tools in the university faculties and did not succeed. On the other hand, there was reason to regard the programme of studies as out of date in some respects. There was a certain amount of routine. The faculty of law especially confined itself to the teaching of Roman law, and this was clearly no longer sufficient for the training of young jurists. And such was the case in other branches. It is certainly a matter of regret that the two questions, the academic and the political, were linked together.



Collège du Roi and Collège des Prémontrés, Louvain

In seeking to impregnate the university with centralizing and royalist ideas the Austrian ministers and particularly the Marquis of Nony, the commissioner attached to the university, practically defeated the attempt to reform the programme of studies. It was rightly considered that war was declared against the university privileges, the national traditions, and the religious rights of the Church. It was on this account and also because of the opinions of the professors appointed that the creation of a course in public law, so useful in itself, twice failed. Verhaegen, in his "Histoire des cinquante dernières années de l'ancienne université" (1884) has shown how, even in the eighteenth century, the university had still a creditable scientific existence, and, on the other hand, how bravely it resisted the encroachments made upon it by the Government. The conflict between the Government and the university reached an acute crisis under the reign of Emperor Joseph II, who wished to force the professors to adopt his royalist theories. Some of them yielded, but many resisted, particularly when the emperor, on his own authority and in disregard of the right of the Church, attempted to impose a general seminary on the university. This struggle resulted in the suspension and exile of a number of professors, whilst those who supported the Government began teaching in Brussels, as they could not remain at Louvain. The crisis was consequently a violent one and entirely to the credit of the university. It ceased only with the end of the Josephinist regime. The National Conservative Government reopened the university in 1790 and recalled the exiles. Unfortunately this tempest was but the forerunner of another which was to last longer. In 1792 the Netherlands were occupied by the French Republican troops and officially annexed by the Convention in 1795. The existence of the university, its privileges and its teachings were incompatible with the regime of the new teachers. In 1797 the university was suppressed; its scientific property fell into the hands of the spoilers; the whole institution was ruined for a long time by this fury of destruction.

Second Period — 1834–1909. — After an interval marked by the establishment of a state university under the Dutch Government of 1815, the episcopate of Belgium decided to create a free Catholic institution for higher education. The Constitution of independent Belgium had proclaimed freedom of education, and advantage was taken of this with daring initiative. Gregory XVI sanctioned the project. First opened at Mechlin, the university, at the request of the city of Louvain, was transferred the following year to the buildings of the old *Alma Mater* and thus took up again the historical succession. The pope of 1834 revived the work of his predecessor of 1425. The restored university is a free university. Its administration, its teaching, and its budget are independent of the state. The episcopate controls the institution and appoints its head, the *Rector Magnificus*. The latter governs with the assistance of a rectoral council composed of deans of the five faculties (theology, law, medicine, philosophy, letters) and of a few other members. The professors are appointed by the bishops on presentation of the rector; grouped into faculties they elect their dean for one year or for two. The vice-rector, whose special charge is to watch over the students, also assists the rector and takes his place when necessary; within recent years the latter has also been given an assistant. In principle the university organizes its teaching and regulates its scientific degrees as it sees fit. Practical necessities have set limits not to its rights, but to the use of those rights. While respecting the freedom of teaching, the State has prescribed examination requirements for the practice of certain professions; the programme of these examinations is fixed by law. The state universities must necessarily conform to it; the free universities comply with it in order to secure the legal professional advantages for their diplomas. The Government, moreover, faithful in its interpretation of liberty, deals with the free universities just as it deals with its own. The diplomas awarded have the same value on the same conditions; viz., efficiency in the prescribed minimum of academic work, this efficiency being guaranteed through the supervision of a commission specially appointed for the purpose. In no case does this supervision operate as a control or restriction on the methods or tendencies of the teaching itself, for that would suppress liberty. Under these minimum requirements the universities themselves confer the legal degrees. Until 1876 it was the work of a jury, either central or mixed. Since then the freedom of teaching has been made complete and has been extended to the conferring of degrees. The university, therefore, has free action guaranteed by the Constitution and its exercise is sanctioned by the laws.

Besides the official programme of legal studies, the university develops as it best pleases the various branches of special teaching. This development has been considerable. The University of Louvain has had a large share in the scientific movement of the country. "Le Mouvement scientifique en Belgique", a recent and important publication from the department of sciences and arts, enables one to judge of the prominent place it occupies in all the branches. The University of Louvain is the only one in Belgium that has a theological faculty, and this faculty is Catholic in virtue of the fundamental principle of the institution itself. The doctorate, which requires six years of extra study after the completion of the seminary course, is an academic event. It is not conferred every year, but the series of dissertations is already important. The American College, treated in another article of this "Encyclopedia", is connected with this faculty. The non-ecclesiastic faculties have also grown considerably and numerous foundations of institutes and special chairs have been added. As a necessary result of contemporary discoveries, the technical sciences have taken on a large expansion, and the ancient faculties of law and philosophy have shared in the development.

Séminaire Léon XIII, Louvain

Before giving an outline of the work of the university it is well to say a word regarding its character. For a long time, as was everywhere else the case, the auditive, receptive method prevailed. This is no longer so. The constant effort is to stimulate love of work and personal initiative, especially among the students who show ability. These earnest workers are increasing in number, for they find within their reach both instruments and methods. The preference for research has thus become quite marked, particularly during the past twenty-five years. University work is not at all, then, a mere preparation for a profession. On the part of the professors it is serious scientific investigation; and so it is with the students who are being carefully directed along the same lines. As a consequence, the courses of study, the institutes, the special courses, the seminaries (in the German sense of the word, practical courses), the publications, competitions, collections are steadily increasing. The list of university institutes and the bibliography are very important. On various occasions, and especially in 1900 and 1908, there has been published a very complete and instructive account which makes up a large volume. Activity on the part of the professors and personal collaboration of student and teachers are therefore characteristic features of the present condition of university life.

As we have already pointed out, one must distinguish two groups of studies and diplomas. Some are primarily professional; they pave the way to a lucrative career. They have a scientific basis and the work is serious; but among the auditors there are quite a number who wish to do the least amount of work possible. Then there are the special scientific courses, among which may be ranked certain professional courses, for instance those preparatory to teaching. The professional diplomas regulated by state laws are chiefly those of doctor in medicine, surgery, and obstetrics, pharmacy, doctor in law, notary, the doctor in philosophy and letters (especially with a view to teaching languages and history), in natural sciences, mathematics, mining and civil engineering. It is not possible to analyse here the courses leading to these diplomas, as this would involve the entire history of higher professional teaching. Side by side with these programmes is a series of specialties, the importance of which is indicated by the titles: doctorate in social and political, or political and diplomatic sciences; commercial or colonial sciences; higher philosophy; moral and historical sciences; archæology; Oriental literature and languages (Semitic or Indo-European). The historical and linguistic doctorates are, as aforementioned, professional also. Further, there is a doctorate in natural sciences, mathematics, and their special branches. Then there are a few free professional diplomas, not regulated by law: agriculture, engineering, architecture, arts and manufactures, electricity, etc.

As will be readily understood, this development of the work has brought about a corresponding increase in the teaching staff and a parcelling out of specialties into a large number of institutes. Doubtless, too, the unification of all branches of study is advantageous in the way of contact and co-operation; and while each of the various branches preserves its autonomy, the work of the university as a whole is also very fruitful. These institutes are quite numerous; it will be sufficient to name a few. The higher philosophical institute (Institut supérieur de philosophie), due to the initiative of Pope Leo XIII, is based on the teachings of St. Thomas of Aquin. It was organized by Professor Mercier, head of the school of neo-scholastic philosophy, and now Cardinal Archbishop of Mechlin. His works are known the world over, among them "La Revue Néo-Scolastique", of which he is the founder. The school of political and social sciences (L'Ecole des sciences politiques et sociales) annexed to the faculty of law and due to the initiative of the minister of State, Professor van den Heuvel, has produced an important series of publications, and has added to its courses conferences of a practical character. The in-

stitute of agriculture (L'Institut supérieur d'agronomie), as well as the commercial, consular, and colonial school (L'Ecole commerciale, consulaire et coloniale), prepares students for careers in these several lines. The historical and linguistic lectures have grown steadily in importance, thanks to professors such as Jungmann, Moeller, Collard, and Cauchie. The latter is publishing, with the present rector, P. Ladeuze, the

American Seminary, Louvain

well-known "Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique". Particular mention must be made of a branch of teaching which is not organized in a distinct school, but which has here an important development; it is that of the Oriental languages (Hebrew, Syriac, Arabic, Coptic), distributed in various faculties, and for which there is a special diploma.

The various schools and institutes, provided with libraries, apparatus, etc., familiarize the student with methods of study under the immediate supervision of masters. They are also centres of scientific production; we have already mentioned the importance of the bibliography of the university (Bibliographie des travaux universitaires), the catalogue of which has been published. These publications include a series of periodicals which carry abroad the work of Louvain and bring back in exchange the productions of the outside world. There are about thirty of these periodicals published by the professors of Louvain, and more than one thousand are received in exchange from other sources. Among these reviews may be mentioned: "La Revue Néo-Scolastique" and "La Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique", which have already been noticed; "La Revue Sociale Catholique" and "La Revue Catholique de Droit" (all four from the philosophical institute); "La Revue Médicale" (double); "La Cellule" (review of biology, founded by Carnoy); "La Névrose" (review of neurology, founded by Van Gehuchten); the "Bulletins" of the schools of engineering, commerce, agriculture, and electricity; "Le Musée Belge" (pedagogy); "La Muséon" (philology and Oriental sciences); "Revue des Sociétés Commerciales", etc. To the above might be added collections that do not appear regularly, but which form important series, such as the historical and philological conferences; and the publications of the school of political sciences; the collection of the ancient philosophers of Belgium (M. de Wulf), and that of the old English dramas (Bang). Frequently, too, the professors bring out their students' work in foreign magazines not under their direction, and in the bulletins of various academies. The list of these is to be found in the university bibliography. An idea may thus be formed of the activity of men like Louis Henry (chemistry) and J. Denys (bacteriology), who prefer this mode of publication.

Besides these lines of work, there are others in which professors and students do not work absolutely side by side; others in which the teacher's rôle ceases to be that of immediate instruction, and becomes one of assistance and supervision. The conferences on history and social economy are really courses of teaching, where the students work under the constant supervision of the professor with an increasing amount of individuality. The "circle" in apologetics created by the present rector comprises expositions by professors, at times by students—along with questions and solutions of the difficulties presented by the study of religious subjects. Elsewhere the student does his work independently, and submits his results for discussion by his comrades. The rôle of the presiding professor becomes a very uneven one and is, at times, purely external. It then becomes rather a matter of exercises between students, very useful and very commendable, but of quite another kind. There are quite a number of clubs in the various faculties, where the professor plays a very active part as inspirer, guide, adviser. Among the other ones which have rendered great services are: "Le cercle industriel", "L'émulation", "Le cercle d'études sociales", the Flemish society "Tyd en Vlyt", and, more recently, "La société philosophique", "Le cercle agronomique", and various literary and social clubs.

Since Belgium gained its independence, Louvain has almost always been represented in Parliament and very often in the Cabinet Councils. Professor Delcour and Professor Thonissen were ministers of the Interior on which depended the department of Education; and to-day Professor Baron Descamps is minister of science; several had other portfolios; notably Nyssens, who in 1897 established the department of labour. But Louvain does not seek merely to turn out professional men and scientists; it aims at making men and Christians of its students; that is one of its fundamental characteristics. The influence over the spirit and mode of living of its young men is far-reaching. It is exerted through the teaching itself, without departing from scientific accuracy, but on the contrary proving by it the harmony between science and faith. It is extended by the action of different groups and by personal initiative. Furthermore, there are many societies of a distinctly moral and religious nature appealing to the life and character of youth: religious reunions, organizations for instruction, apostleship, pious and charitable enterprises, such as the Eucharistic adoration, Catholic missions, the Christian Press, Society of St. Vincent de Paul, school for adult workingmen. Nor is physical development overlooked, and there are fine equipments for the various sports.



Hotel de Ville, Louvain

The university has a strong bond of unity; its moral force is incontestably the most powerful element of its vitality. The relations between professors and students still continue when the university days are over, and the majority retain their attachment to the *Alma Mater*. The *Alumni* associations are one of the outward signs; the permanence of personal relations is even more telling.

To complete this sketch of Louvain something must be said about the student life. Owing to the limited territory of the country, to the many easy and inex-

pensive means of communication, many students are enabled to return home every day. They are called *navettes* in the college slang. The others live at Louvain, some (about 200) in the university colleges (*convictus*), supervised by one of the professors as president, where for a moderate sum (about 700 francs) they are given full board. Others live with citizens of the town, usually occupying two rooms. A very large number go away and spend Sunday with their families, and this is encouraged. The academic year allows for quite a number of vacations. It begins about the third week in October with the Mass of the Holy Ghost. There is a fortnight's vacation at Christmas, three weeks at Easter; the lectures cease on 25 June. The month of July and the first part of October are devoted to examinations. During their sojourn at Louvain the students lead a life which though serious may be varied and agreeable. There are the numerous clubs previously mentioned; also, friendly societies grouped by cities and provinces, and it is easy for the students to have daily reunions. Notwithstanding all the sources of distraction it seems that the work of the average student is improving. It is quite evident also that the better class of students is becoming more and more select, while social gradations are more clearly and more securely defined.

This sketch of the university life of Louvain would be incomplete if we did not add a few statistical elements. "L'Annuaire", a valuable volume published regularly by the university authorities, records the events and achievements of each year and is indispensable as a means of studying the activity and growth of Louvain. Number of students in 1834, 86; 1854, 600; 1874, 1160; 1894, 1636; 1904, 2148. Distribution in 1908: theology, 125; law, 491; medicine, 475; philosophy, 313; sciences, 286; special schools, 570: total, 2260. In this total were 252 foreigners: 29 from the United States, 5 from Canada, 13 from South America, 7 from England, 6 from Ireland. The corps of instructors numbered 120 in active service holding various positions: full professors, associates, lecturers, substitutes. Among the eminent professors of the university since the restoration in 1834 we select for mention the following deceased: In theology: Beelen (Oriental languages, Scripture), Jungmann (ecclesiastical history), Malou (Bishop of Bruges), Lamy (Oriental languages, Syriac, etc., Scripture), Reussens (archæology, history). In law: de Coux and Périn (political economy), Thonissen (criminal law), Nyssens (commercial law). In philosophy and letters: Arendt, David, Moeller, Poullet (history), Nève, de Harlez (Oriental literature), Willems (philology and history). In physical sciences and mathematics: Gilbert (mathematics), de la Vallée Poussin (geology), Van Beneden (zoology), Carnoy (biology). In medicine: Schwann, Cranincx, Michaux, van Kempen, Hubert, Lefèbvre. Charles Cartuyvels, vice-rector for over twenty-five years, was far-famed for his pulpit eloquence. The rectors during the modern period were seven in number: P. J. de Ram, a very prolific historian; N. J. Laforet; A. J. Namèche, Belgium's historian; C. Pieraerts; J. B. Abbeloos, orientalist; Ad. Hebbelynk, another orientalist who has recently been succeeded in the rectorate by a colleague of the same department, P. Ladeuze, appointed in July, 1909.

The bibliography of the university is very extensive and it is impossible to quote it in full. There are both ancient sources and recent writings with regard to the old university, among the former being the works of MOLANUS; VALERIUS-ANDREAS; VERNULÆUS; VAN LANGENDONCK; VAN DE VELDE, and numerous MSS. documents, notably a portion of the "Acta" of the faculties. These sources are indicated in the modern works mentioned below although unfortunately a general history of the university has not yet been written. The chief source of the history of the restored university is its own *Annuaire;* since 1900 there has also been published regularly the *Bibliographie de l'Université*, in which there is a section indicating the contributions to the history of the institution. *Université Catholique de Louvain, Annuaire* (73 vols., Louvain, 1837–1909); *Université Catholique de Louvain, Bibliographie de l'Université* (Louvain, 1900–8), *L'Université de Louvain, Coup d'œil sur son histoire et ses institutions* (Brussels, 1900); VERHAEGEN, *Les cinquante dernières années de l'ancienne université de Louvain* (Ghent, 1884); BRANTS, *La faculté de droit à Louvain à travers cinq siècles* (Louvain, 1906); NÈVE, REUSSENS, and DE RAM numerous works mentioned in the *Bibliography* of the university under their names; *Liber memorialis*, or report of the jubilee celebrations of the restoration of the university in 1884 and 1909 (Louvain, 1884, 1909).

V. BRANTS.

Love, THEOLOGICAL VIRTUE OF, the third and greatest of the Divine virtues enumerated by St. Paul (I Cor., xiii, 13), usually called *charity*, and defined: a Divinely infused habit, inclining the human will to cherish God for His own sake above all things, and man for the sake of God. This definition sets off the main characteristics of charity:—(1) Its *origin*, by Divine infusion. "The charity of God is poured forth in our hearts, by the Holy Ghost" (Rom., v, 5). It is, therefore, distinct from, and superior to, the inborn inclination or the acquired habit of loving God in the natural order. Theologians agree in saying that it is infused together with sanctifying grace, to which it is closely related either by way of real identity, as some few hold, or, according to the more common view, by way of connatural emanation. (2) Its *seat*, in the human will. Although charity is at times intensely emotional, and frequently reacts on our sensory faculties, still it properly resides in the rational will, a fact not to be forgotten by those who would make it an impossible virtue. (3) Its *specific act*, i. e., the love of benevolence and friendship. To love God is to wish Him all honour and glory and every good, and to endeavour, as far as we can, to obtain it for Him. St. John (xiv, 23; xv, 14) emphasizes the feature of reciprocity which makes charity a veritable friendship of man with God. (4) Its *motive*, i. e., the Divine goodness or amiability taken absolutely and as made known to us by faith. It matters not whether that goodness be viewed in one, or several, or all of the Divine attributes, but, in all cases, it must be adhered to, not as a source of help, or reward, or happiness for ourselves, but as a good in itself infinitely worthy of our love; in this sense alone is God loved for His own sake. However, the distinction of the two loves: concupiscence, which prompts hope; and benevolence, which animates charity, should not be forced into a sort of mutual exclusion, as the Church has repeatedly condemned any attempts at discrediting the workings of Christian hope (q. v.). (5) Its *range*, i. e., both God and man. While God alone is all lovable, yet, inasmuch as all men, by grace and glory, either actually share or at least are capable of sharing in the Divine goodness, it follows that supernatural love rather includes than excludes them, according to Matt., xxii, 39, and Luke, x, 27. Hence one and the same virtue of charity terminates in both God and man, God primarily and man secondarily.

I. LOVE OF GOD.—Man's paramount duty of loving God is tersely expressed in Deut., vi, 5; Matt., xxii, 37; and Luke, x, 27. Quite obvious is the imperative character of the words "thou shalt". Innocent XI (Denziger, nos. 1155–57) declares that the precept is not fulfilled by an act of charity performed once in a lifetime, or every five years, or on the rather indefinite occasions when justification cannot be otherwise procured. Moralists urge the obligation (1) at the beginning of the moral life when reason has attained its full development; (2) at the point of death; and (3) from time to time during life, an exact count being neither possible nor necessary since the Christian habit of daily prayer surely covers the obligation. The violation of the precept is generally negative, i. e., by omission, or indirect, i. e., implied in every grievous fault; there are, however, sins directly opposed to the love of God: spiritual sloth, at least when it entails a voluntary loathing of spiritual goods, and the hatred of God, whether it be an abomination of God's restrictive and punitive laws or an aversion for His Sacred Person (see SLOTH; HATRED).

The qualifications, "with thy whole heart, and with thy whole soul, and with thy whole mind, and with thy whole strength", do not mean a maximum of intensity, for intensity of action never falls under a command; still less do they imply the necessity of feeling more sensible love for God than for creatures, for visible creatures, howsoever imperfect, appeal to our sensibility much more than the invisible God. Their true significance is that, both in our mental appreciation and in our voluntary resolve, God should stand above all the rest, not excepting father or mother, son or daughter (Matt., x, 37). St. Thomas (II-II, Q. xliv, a. 5) would assign a special meaning to each of the four Biblical phrases; others, with more reason, take the whole sentence in its cumulative sense, and see in it the purpose, not only of raising charity above the low Materialism of the Sadducees or the formal Ritualism of the Pharisees, but also of declaring that "to love God above all things is to insure the sanctity of our whole life" (Le Camus, "Vie de Notre-Seigneur Jésus-Christ", III, 81).

The love of God is even more than a precept binding the human conscience; it is also, as Le Camus observes, "the principle and goal of moral perfection".

As the *principle of moral perfection* in the supernatural order, with faith as foundation and hope as incentive, the love of God ranks first among the means of salvation styled by theologians necessary, "necessitate medii". By stating that "charity never falleth away" (I Cor., xiii, 8), St. Paul clearly intimates that there is no difference of kind, but only of degree, between charity here below and glory above; as a consequence Divine love becomes the necessary inception of that God-like life which reaches its fullness in heaven only. The necessity of habitual charity is inferred from its close communion with sanctifying grace. The necessity of actual charity is no less evident. Apart from the cases of the actual reception of baptism, penance, or extreme unction, wherein the love of charity, by a special dispensation of God, admits of attrition as a substitute, all adults stand in need of it, according to I John, iii, 14: "He that loveth not, abideth in death".

As the *goal of moral perfection*, always in the supernatural order, the love of God is called "the greatest and the first commandment" (Matt., xxii, 38), "the end of the commandment" (I Tim., i, 5), "the bond of perfection" (Col., iii, 14). It stands as an all-important factor in the two main phases of our spiritual life, justification and the acquisition of merits. The justifying power of charity, so well expressed in Luke, vii, 47, and I Pet., iv, 8, has in no way been abolished or reduced by the institution of the Sacraments of Baptism and Penance as necessary means of moral rehabilitation; it has only been made to include a willingness to receive these sacraments where and when possible. Its meritorious power, emphasized by St. Paul (Rom., viii, 28), covers both the acts elicited or commanded by charity. St. Augustine (De laudibus caritatis) calls charity the "life of virtues" (*vita virtutum*); and St. Thomas (II-II, Q. xxiii, a. 8), the "form of virtues" (*forma virtutum*). The meaning is that the other virtues, while possessing a real value of their own, derive a fresh and greater excellence from their union with charity, which, reaching out directly to God, ordains all our virtuous actions to Him. As to the manner and degree of influence which charity should exercise over our virtuous actions in order to render them meritorious of heaven, theologians are far from being agreed, some requiring only the state of grace, or habitual charity, others insisting upon the more or less frequent renewal of distinct acts of divine love. Of course, the meritorious power of charity is, like the virtue itself, susceptible of indefinite growth. St. Thomas (II-II, Q. xxiv, 24 a. 4 and 8) mentions three principal stages: (1) freedom from mortal sin by strenuous resistance to temptation; (2) avoidance of deliberate venial sins by the assiduous practice of virtue; (3) union with God through the frequent recurrence of acts of love. To these, ascetic writers like Alvarez de Paz, St. Teresa, St. Francis of Sales, add many more degrees, thus anticipating even in this world the "many mansions in the Father's house". The prerogatives of charity should not, however, be construed so as to include inamissibility. The saying of St. John (I Ep., iii, 6), "Whosoever abideth in him [God], sinneth not", means indeed the special permanence of charity chiefly in its higher degrees, but it is no absolute guarantee against the possible loss of it; while the infused habit is never diminished by venial sins, a single grievous fault is enough to destroy it and so end man's union and friendship with God.

II. Love of Man.—While charity embraces all the children of God in heaven, on earth, and in purgatory (see Communion of Saints), it is taken here as meaning man's supernatural love for man, and that in this world; as such, it includes both love of self and love of neighbour.

(1) *Love of Self.*—St. Gregory the Great (Hom. XIII in Evang.) objects to the expression "charity towards self", on the plea that charity requires two terms; and St. Augustine (De bono viduitatis, xxi) remarks that no command was needed to make man love himself. Obviously, St. Gregory's objection is purely grammatical; St. Augustine's remark applies to natural self-love. As a matter of fact, the precept of supernatural love of self is not only possible or needed, but also clearly implied in Christ's command to love our neighbour as ourselves. Its obligation, however, bears in a vague manner on the salvation of our soul (Matt., xvi, 26), the acquisition of merits (Matt., vi, 19 sqq.), the Christian use of our body (Rom., vi, 13; I Cor., vi, 19; Col., iii, 5), and can hardly be brought down to practical points not already covered by more specific precepts.

(2) *Love of Neighbour.*—The Christian idea of brotherly love as compared with the pagan or Jewish concept has been touched upon elsewhere (see Charity and Charities). Briefly, its distinctive feature, and superiority as well, is to be found less in its commands, or prohibitions, or even results, than in the motive which prompts its laws and prepares its achievements. The faithful carrying out of the "new commandment" is called the criterion of true Christian discipleship (John, xiii, 34 sq.), the standard by which we shall be judged (Matt., xxv, 34 sqq.), the best proof that we love God Himself (I John, iii, 10), and the fulfilment of the whole law (Gal., v, 14), because, viewing the neighbour in God and through God, it has the same value as the love of God. The expression "to love the neighbour for the sake of God" means that we rise above the consideration of mere natural solidarity and fellow-feeling to the higher view of our common Divine adoption and heavenly heritage; in that sense only could our brotherly love be brought near to the love which Christ had for us (John, xiii, 35), and a kind of moral identity between Christ and the neighbour (Matt., xxv, 40), become intelligible. From this high motive the universality of fraternal charity follows as a necessary consequence. Whosoever sees in his fellow-men, not the human peculiarities, but the God-given and God-like privileges, can no longer restrict his love to members of the family, or co-religionists, or fellow-citizens, or strangers within the borders (Lev., xix, 34), but must needs extend it, without distinction of Jew or Gentile (Rom., x, 12), to all the units of the human kind, to social outcasts (Luke, x, 33 sqq.), and even to enemies (Matt., v, 23 sq.). Very forcible is the lesson wherein Christ compels His hearers to recognize, in the much despised Samaritan, the true type of the neighbour, and truly new is the commandment whereby He urges us to forgive our enemies, to be reconciled with them, to assist and love them.

The exercise of charity would soon become injudicious and inoperative unless there be in this, as in all

the moral virtues, a well-defined order. The *ordo caritatis*, as theologians term it, possibly from a wrong rendering into Latin of Cant., ii, 4 (*ordinavit in me charitatem*), takes into account these different factors: (1) the persons who claim our love, (2) the advantages which we desire to procure for them, and (3) the necessity in which they are placed. The precedence is plain enough when these factors are viewed separately. Regarding the persons alone, the order is somewhat as follows: self, wife, children, parents, brothers and sisters, friends, domestics, neighbours, fellow-countrymen, and all others. Considering the goods by themselves, there is a triple order: the most important spiritual goods appertaining to the salvation of the soul should first appeal to our solicitude; then the intrinsic and natural goods of the soul and body, like life, health, knowledge, liberty, etc.; finally, the extrinsic goods of reputation, wealth, etc. Viewing apart the various kinds of necessity, the following order would obtain: first, extreme necessity, wherein a man is in danger of damnation, or of death, or of the loss of other goods of nearly equal importance and can do nothing to help himself; second, grave necessity, when one placed in similar danger can extricate himself only by heroic efforts; third, common necessity, such as affects ordinary sinners or beggars who can help themselves without great difficulty.

When the three factors are combined, they give rise to complicated rules, the principal of which are these: (1) The love of complacency and the love of benefaction do not follow the same standard, the former being guided by the worthiness, the latter by the nearness and need, of the neighbour. (2) Our personal salvation is to be preferred to all else. We are never justified in committing the slightest sin for the love of any one or anything whatsoever, nor should we expose ourselves to spiritual danger except in such cases and with such precautions as would give us a moral right to, and guarantee of, God's protection. (3) We are bound to succour our neighbour in extreme spiritual necessity even at the cost of our own life, an obligation which, however, supposes the certainty of the neighbour's need and of the effectiveness of our service to him. (4) Except in the very rare cases described above, we are not bound to risk life or limb for our neighbour, but only to undergo that amount of inconvenience which is justified by the neighbour's need and nearness. Casuists are not agreed as to the right to give one's life for another's life of equal importance.

TANQUEREY, *De virtute caritatis* in *Synopsis Theologiæ Moralis*, II (New York, 1906), 426; SLATER, *A Manual of Moral Theology*, I (New York, 1909), 179 sqq.; BATIFFOL, *L'Enseignement de Jésus* (Paris, 1905); NORTHCOTE, *The Bond of Perfection* (London, 1907); GAFFRE, *La Loi d'Amour* (Paris, 1908); DE SALES, *Traité de l'amour de Dieu;* PESCH, *Prælectiones Dogmaticæ*, VIII (Freiburg im Br., 1898), 226 sqq.; DUBLANCHY, in *Dict. de Théol. Cath.*, s. v. *Charité*, with an exhaustive bibliography of the theologians and mystics who have dealt with this matter.

J. F. SOLLIER.

Low Church, the name given to one of the three parties or doctrinal tendencies that prevail in the Established Church of England and its daughter Churches, the correlatives being High Church and Broad Church. The last of these names is not a century old, but the other two came into use simultaneously at the beginning of the eighteenth century. Their invention was due to the controversies stirred up by William III's endeavour to undo the Act of Uniformity of 1662 and concede to the Dissenters all that they had demanded in the Savoy Conference. Quite a war of pamphlets was carried on at the time in which the terms High Church and Low Church were bandied to and fro. To cite one witness out of many, Bishop Burnet, in his "History of his own Time" (VII. 347), writes: "From these disputes in Convocation divisions ran through the whole body of the clergy, and to fix them new names were found out. They were distinguished by the names of High and Low Church. All that treated the Dissenters with temper and moderation, and were for residing constantly at their cures . . . were represented as secret favourers of presbytery, and as disaffected to the Church, and were called Low Churchmen. It was said that they were in the Church only while the law and preferments were on its side, but that they were ready to give it up as soon as they saw a proper time for declaring themselves."

Naturally the Low Churchmen resented an appellation with which this suggestion of unworthy motives was associated. Still the term has passed into general usage, nor, if we forget, as the world has forgotten, an implication which is by no means essential to it, can it be denied that it and its correlative indicate fairly well a root-difference which throughout their various stages has characterized the two parties. What is the nature of the visible Church? Is it a society whose organization with its threefold ministry has been preordained by Jesus Christ, and is therefore essential, or is it one in which this organization, though of Apostolic precedent, can be departed from without forfeiture of church status? The High Churchmen have always stood for the former of these alternatives, the Low Churchmen for the latter. Moreover, round these central positions more or less consequential convictions have gathered. The High Churchmen, in theory at least, emphasize the principle of church authority as the final court of doctrinal appeal; whilst the Low Churchmen appeal rather to the Bible, privately interpreted, as the decisive judge. The High Churchmen exalt ecclesiastical tradition as the voice of church authority, regard the Holy Eucharist as in some sense a sacrifice and the sacraments as efficacious channels of grace, and they insist on rites and ceremonies as the appropriate expression of external worship; whilst the Low Churchmen are distrustful of what they call human traditions, regard the Holy Eucharist as a symbolic meal only, hold firmly that the grace of justification and sanctification is imparted to the soul independently of visible channels, and dislike all rites and ceremonies, save those of the simplest kind, as tending to substitute an external formalism for true inward devotion. In short, the one party attaches a higher, the other a lower degree of importance to the visible Church and its ordinances; and this may suffice to justify the retention of the names—though it must always be borne in mind that they state extremes between which many intermediate grades of thought and feeling have always subsisted in the Anglican Church.

Of the pre-Revolution period, although the two names were not as yet coined, it may be said that Low Church ideas were in the ascendant all through the reign of Elizabeth, but that under James I religious opinion began to grow high, until, mainly through the action of Archbishop Laud, it obtained a firm footing in the national Church; and, the lapse of the Rebellion notwithstanding, retained it throughout the Caroline period, and even through the reigns of William and Anne —although William filled the episcopal sees with Low Church prelates. With the advent of the Hanoverian dynasty a deep spiritual lethargy settled down on the country. The bishoprics were now openly given as rewards for political service, the lesser benefices were mostly filled by pluralists of good family. The chief solicitude of the clergy was to lead comfortable lives, their highest spiritual effort, if such it could be called, taking the form of sermons on the reasonableness of Christianity directed against the Deists, or vapid laudations of moral virtue. Then, in the forties of the eighteenth century, there broke on this season of torpor an intense revival of religious fervour which stirred the country to its foundations, and gave a new and much improved complexion to the belief and spirit of the Low Church party. Now as before the appella-

tion was resented, the adherents of the transformed party claiming to be called, as their descendants do still, Evangelicals. The name, however, has attached to them, and is applicable in so far as they share the doctrine about the Church which has been described.

The Evangelicals of the eighteenth century insisted that they were not introducing any new doctrines into their Church but only calling on people to take its doctrines to heart and apply them seriously to their lives. Still there were points of doctrine to which they gave a construction of their own, and on which they laid special stress. It is by these that their party is characterized. They insisted on the total depravity of human nature in God's eyes as the consequence of the Fall; on the vicarious sacrifice of Christ as the substitute for fallen man; on the imputed righteousness of Christ as the sole formal cause of justification; on the necessity of a conscious conversion to God which must be preceded by conviction of sin (not of sins only), and which involves a species of faith whereby the hand is, as it were, stretched out with firm assurance to appropriate the justification offered, the witness of the Spirit whereby the soul is interiorly certified that it is in a state of salvation, and the commencement of a process of interior sanctification wrought in the heart by the Holy Spirit. This doctrine, which in its earliest form is traceable to Luther, is in reality due to a false analysis of some fundamental Catholic truths, and it is this intermixture of truth with error which renders intelligible the rich harvest of edifying conversions and holy lives, chequered, however, by not infrequent instances of regrettable extravagances, which marked the beginnings of the new spiritual movement. The foremost name among its leaders was that of John Wesley, who, it must be remembered, if somewhat restive to its discipline, never himself forsook the Anglican communion, though the main body of his followers did shortly after his death.

But side by side with the Wesleys and Whitefield, the Anglican Church of that time had other leaders in whom the same species of spiritual impulse was active, but in whom it was kept freer from emotional excesses and manifested no tendency to stray off into separatism. It is these who must be recognized as the true Fathers of the modern Low Church or Evangelical party. William Romaine may be regarded as their forerunner, but he was soon followed by Henry Venn of Huddersfield, John Newton of Olney, William Cowper, the poet, with their younger colleagues, Thomas Scott, the commentator, Joseph Milner, their historian, and Isaac Milner his brother, also Richard Cecil, their intellectual chief. These were the leaders in the second half of the eighteenth century. In the nineteenth century Bishop Handley Moule, their most distinguished representative at the present day, assigns three periods of Evangelical history. Of these the first lasted till about the middle of the century. He names it the period of Simeon and Wilberforce, after the cleric and the layman whose influence contributed the most of all to its progress and development. At the commencement of this period one remarkable feature was the gathering round Lord Teignmouth, Henry Thornton, and John Venn of the so-called "Clapham Sect". To this little group belonged also Zachary Macaulay, Josiah Pratt, James Stephen, and Sir Fowell Buxton. Though thus few in number, the effect of their intimate association with one another was seen in the important works to which their zeal gave birth. They founded the "Christian Observer" (for three-quarters of a century, the organ of their party), of which Josiah Pratt and Zachary Macaulay were the first editors. They were mainly instrumental in founding the Church Missionary Society in 1799, had much to do with the founding of the Bible Society in 1804, and collaborated actively, to their eternal credit, with Wilberforce and Henry Thornton in their successful crusade against the slave trade.

His second period Bishop Moule names the Shaftesbury period, after the truly venerable nobleman who devoted his life to the protection and elevation of the poorer classes. He was a fervent Evangelical, and as a great layman bore to the party something of the relation which William Wilberforce had borne to it in the earlier part of the century, its members in their turn co-operating with him energetically in his many charitable undertakings. Through his influence with Lord Palmerston he obtained the promotion of several conspicuous Evangelicals to posts of responsibility. Thus Villiers, Baring, Waldegrave, Wigram, and Pelham were promoted to bishoprics, and Close to the deanery of Carlisle. Other names of note during this period were John Bird Sumner, Archbishop of Canterbury, Edward Bickersteth, John Charles Ryle, Hugh McNeile, Hugh Stowell. This too was the flourishing period of the May meetings held annually at Exeter Hall, and it was in 1876 that the Keswick conventions, which have since become annual events, were first commenced. His third period, to which he assigns the last two decades of the nineteenth century, Bishop Moule calls the Church Missionary Society period, in view of the immense advance which that pet child of the party has made during recent years. As did Evangelicalism to the old Low Church ideas, so has Tractarianism, which rose up in the middle of the nineteenth century, given a new interpretation to the old High Church views, which since then have been carried in the direction of Catholic doctrine far beyond what the old Caroline divines ever dreamt of. This movement has also struck root in the country, and has so extended itself that of late years people have begun to ask if the Evangelical party is not dying out. There are, indeed, appearances which may seem to point that way, but as an evidence to the contrary the Evangelicals may reasonably point to their Church Missionary Society, which is supported entirely by their contributions. Its annual income of late has fallen little short of £400,000, which is more than double that of the society that comes next to it. Surely it is a fair inference from this impressive fact that Evangelicalism is still a living force of great power; and it must be added that, though this is not by any means its exclusive privilege, it can still as of old point to numberless bright examples of holy living among those who take its teaching to heart.

HISTORICAL.—*The principles of Low-Church-Men fairly represented and defended. By a layman constantly conforming to the Church of England as by law established* (London, 1714); PRODY, *Annals of the Low Church Party down to the death of Archbishop Tait* (London, 1883); OVERTON, *The Evangelical Revival in the eighteenth century* (1886) in CREIGHTON, *Epochs of English Church History*; HUNT, *Religious Thought in England to the end of the last (18th) century* (London, 1881); TULLOCH, *Movements of Religious Thought in England during the Nineteenth Century* (Edinburgh, 1885); HANDLEY MOULE, *The Evangelical School in the Church of England. Its men and work in the Nineteenth Century* (London, 1901); STEPHEN, *Essays in Ecclesiastical Biography* (London, 1849); STOCK, *History of the Church Missionary Society* (London, 1899); HEATH, *The Waning of Evangelicalism* in *Contemporary Review*, LXXIII (1898); GUINNESS ROGERS, *Is Evangelicalism declining?*, *ibid.*

DOCTRINAL AND DEVOTIONAL.—VENN, *The Complete Duty of Man* (1763, and many subsequent editions); WILBERFORCE, *A Practical View of the prevailing religious system of professed Christians, in the higher and middle classes in this country, contrasted with real Christianity* (1797, and many subsequent editions); GOODE, *Divine Rule of Faith and Practice* (London, 1842); LITTON, *Introduction to Dogmatic Theology, on the basis of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England* (London, 1882, 1892); MOULE, *Faith, its Nature and Work* (London, New York, 1909).

SYDNEY F. SMITH.

Low Sunday, the first Sunday after Easter. The origin of the name is uncertain, but it is apparently intended to indicate the contrast between it and the great Easter festival immediately preceding, and also, perhaps, to signify that, being the Octave Day of Easter, it was considered part of that feast, though in a lower degree. Its liturgical name is *Dominica in albis depositis*, derived from the fact that on it the

neophytes, who had been baptized on Easter Eve, then for the first time laid aside their white baptismal robes. St. Augustine mentions this custom in a sermon for the day, and it is also alluded to in the Eastertide Vesper hymn, "Ad regias Agni dapes" (or, in its older form, "Ad cœnam Agni providi"), written by an ancient imitator of St. Ambrose. Low Sunday is also called by some liturgical writers *Pascha clausum*, signifying the close of the Easter Octave, and "Quasimodo Sunday", from the Introit at Mass—"Quasi modo geniti infantes, rationabile, sine dolo lac concupiscite", —which words are used by the Church with special reference to the newly baptized neophytes, as well as in general allusion to man's renovation through the Resurrection. The latter name is still common in parts of France and Germany.

DURAND, *Rationale Divini Officii* (Venice, 1568); MARTÈNE, *De Antiquis Monachorum Ritibus* (Lyons, 1790); GUÉRANGER, *L'Année liturgique*, tr. SHEPHERD, *The Liturgical Year* (Dublin, 1867); LEROSEY, *Histoire et symbolisme de la Liturgie* (Paris, 1889); BATIFFOL, *Histoire du Bréviaire Romaine* (Paris, 1893).

G. CYPRIAN ALSTON.

Lübeck, a free imperial state and one of the Hanse towns, is in area the second smallest and in population the twentieth state in the German Empire. The state, which includes the city of Lübeck and its neighbourhood, has an area of about 115 sq. m. and a population (1905) of 105,857 inhabitants, of whom 101,724 were Lutherans, 2457 Catholics, and 638 Jews. Of the three Hanse towns which still remain—Hamburg, Bremen, and Lübeck—Lübeck was the last founded. It was first established in the eleventh century, below the site of the present town, and in the midst of the Slavic tribes dwelling on the coast of the Baltic, and a church was erected there under the protection of Henry the Proud. This settlement, however, proved too weak to withstand the attack of the pagan Slavs, and was destroyed early in the twelfth century. In 1143 Count Adolf II of Holstein founded a new colony above the site of the former, at the junction of the Trave and the Wakenitz, and introduced settlers from Flanders, Holland, Westphalia, and Friesland. The rapid development of the town awakened at first the envy of Duke Henry the Lion, and he only began to favour it after its submission to him in 1157. He gave the town a municipal constitution, established a mint there, and made Bishop Gerold transfer to Lübeck the seat of the Bishopric of Oldenburg, founded by Otto I for Wagria. In 1173 Henry himself laid the foundation-stone of the Romanesque cathedral, which was completed in 1210. To the east of the town the Johanneskloster was founded in 1177, and occupied by Benedictines from Brunswick.

On the downfall of Henry, the bishopric became immediately subject to the Holy See, while the town itself voluntarily submitted to Frederick Barbarossa, who, in 1188, confirmed its liberties and its territorial boundaries. The commerce of the town developed rapidly, and its ships traversed the whole Baltic Sea. This prosperity by no means diminished with the advent of the Danes, who, under Cnut VI, brought Holstein and Lübeck into subjection in 1201. The victory of the Holsteiners over the Danes at Yornhöod, in 1227, restored to Lübeck its complete independence. In 1226 it had been already raised by Frederick II to the rank of a free city of the empire, although the emperor had not availed himself of his authority to appoint a protector for its territories. Even the bishop, who resided at first in the *area capituli* (the *Thum* or Domhof)—but after the middle of the thirteenth century in Eutin, while his chapter remained in the cathedral area—had no secular jurisdiction over the town, whose privileges were ratified by Popes Innocent IV and Alexander IV. What great prestige Lübeck acquired throughout Northern Germany by its vigorous preservation of its independence, may be inferred from the fact that numerous North German towns adopted the municipal law of Lübeck as the model for their own. The prominent position which Lübeck held in Baltic commerce from the thirteenth century resulted naturally in her taking the leading part in the Hansa, or great confederacy of Low German cities, formed in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. As head of the Hansa, the importance of Lübeck increased enormously in Northern Europe, until finally it stood at the head of over 100 towns and cities which had adopted its statutes. At times, however, it had to bear the burden of defending the Hansa unassisted, especially against its hereditary foe, Denmark.

In the war of 1362–70, Lübeck captured Copenhagen (1368), and, by the Peace of Stralsund, was appointed arbitrator of the dispute concerning the Danish Crown. The following decades constitute the era of Lübeck's greatest prosperity. In 1372 its burgomaster was appointed by the emperor. Domestic strife between the patricians and the guilds broke out in Lübeck as elsewhere, but resulted in its case in the maintenance of the rule of the merchant patricians, from whose families were chosen throughout the Middle Ages the four burgomasters and the twenty councillors. The power of Lübeck in the fifteenth century is shown by the emperor's request, in 1464, that it should arrange peace between the Teutonic Order and the Poles, although the mission of the burgomaster, Castorp, was none too successful. He met with greater success in preventing his city from being drawn into the disputes of the neighbouring Scandinavian lands. In the war between Christian I of Denmark and Sweden (1499—), however, Lübeck could not remain neutral; it afforded protection and shelter to the exiled Gustavus Vasa, formed the confederacy of the Wendish towns and Danzig against Christian, in 1521, asserted once more the might of the Hansa in the Baltic, and dispatched with Gustavus Vasa a fleet to blockade Stockholm in 1522. In 1523 Stockholm had to surrender to the Lübeck admirals, and from their hands the newly elected King Vasa of Sweden received the keys of his capital.

The Reformation found a later entrance into Lübeck than into other North-German towns. The initiative in introducing the new doctrine was taken by the middle classes, while the municipal authorities, on account of their friendship for the emperor and the bishop, strongly opposed the innovation. After 1529, however, in consequence of the pecuniary demands of the council, a citizens' committee of forty-eight members was formed to enquire into the finances of the town. This committee procured a petition of the citizens for the introduction of Lutheran preachers. On 5 June, 1530, pursuant to a decree of the citizens which the council could not oppose, Lutheran services were introduced into all the churches of Lübeck except the cathedral, which was under the territorial jurisdiction of the chapter, and all clergymen were forbidden to celebrate Mass until further notice. In consequence of the supineness of the chapter, Lutheran services were held even in the cathedral in July, and it was only in the choir, and at certain hours that Catholic worship was tolerated. The reigning bishop, Heinrich III Bockholt (1523–35), could offer no effective resistance to the Reformation in the town, but he exerted himself to the utmost. After his death, the cathedral chapter, desiring the friendship of the neighbouring Protestant princes lest their property should be confiscated, elected bishops of Lutheran views—Detlef von Reventlow (1535) and Balthasar von Rantzow (1536–47). These were succeeded by four Catholic bishops: Jodokus Hodfilter (1547–53), who, however, lived away from his diocese; Theodorich von Reden, who resigned in 1555; Andreas von Barby (1557–79), who did not obtain papal confirmation; and the determined Catholic, Johann

Tiedemann (d. 1561). Eberhard von Holle (1564–86) openly espoused Protestantism in 1565, introduced the Reformation almost completely into the cathedral chapter, and, in 1571, surrendered even the choir of the cathedral to the preachers.

With the eleven-year-old Johann Adolf, who was the first bishop to marry (1596), began the succession of bishops from the House of Holstein-Gottorp, in whose possession this bishopric—the only Lutheran bishopric of Germany—remained, even after the Peace of Westphalia, until the secularization of 1803. Most of the canonries also fell into the hands of the Protestants: on 1 Jan., 1624, the Catholics still occupied 6 canonries, 13 vicarships, and 4 prebends in the cathedral; at the end of the seventeenth century they held only four canonries. It was owing to the continued existence of a remnant of Catholic property within the city that Catholicism did not utterly perish in Lübeck. The care of the few Catholics there (in 1709, fourteen families with sixty members within the city and about forty outside) was entrusted to a missionary paid by the canons. This missionary was, as a rule, one of the Jesuits who, from 1651, were permanently established within the cathedral domain, or area. The Catholics of Lübeck repeatedly received imperial letters of protection in favour of the free practice of their religion. In 1683 the Catholic clergy were granted the right of holding service within the cathedral *area* and administering the sacraments, and the right of the Catholics of the city to attend these services and receive the sacraments was never afterwards disputed. Concerning the right to administer the sacraments of Baptism and Matrimony, disputes afterwards arose, and, for the periods 1705–14 and 1775–1805, the Catholic priests did not dare to baptize or marry in public. The Jesuits resided with the canons until 1702, when they founded a separate establishment in which they held Catholic worship until 1773. On the suppression of their order, the fathers at first continued their pastoral duties as secular priests, but other secular priests succeeded them in course of time. It was the French domination, in 1811, which first brought an extension of religious freedom for Catholics.

In the sixteenth century the political importance of Lübeck declined. The rash efforts of Burgomaster Jürgen Wullenweber (1533–35) to oust Dutch trade from the Baltic, to revive Lübeck's hegemony there, and, in union with Count Christopher of Oldenburg, to restore the exiled Christian II of Denmark to his throne, ended, after some initial successes, unfortunately, and led to the decay of Lübeck. Once more did it appear as an important political factor, when war broke out between Denmark and Sweden in 1563, and Lübeck sustained, in union with the former, a vigorous and successful naval conflict against Sweden. The Peace of Stettin, in 1570, guaranteed the town many of its claims, but the heavy cost of the war had imposed such a burden on it that it was henceforth without the resources for carrying on war. With the diminution, through various causes, of the power and influence of the whole Hansa, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, that of Lübeck also declined, especially as Hamburg and Bremen were now gradually outstripping it in commerce. The town finally sank into the position of a port of call between the transatlantic and northern commerce. The Thirty Years' War imposed grievous burdens on the defenceless citizens in consequence of the repeated quartering of soldiers in the town. When, after its last diets in 1630 and 1669, the Hansa was finally dissolved and there was formed a defensive alliance—Lübeck, Hamburg, and Bremen, the Council of Lübeck still retained the directorship as the sole remnant of its former position of eminence.

During the long period of peace, following the confusion of the Northern War which crippled Baltic trade for the first two decades of the eighteenth century, the prosperity of Lübeck gradually increased, although the town was far removed from the great trade-routes of the world. The Imperial Delegates' Enactment of 1803 (see GERMANY) brought it a small increase of territory by assigning to it the portion of that diocese (the *area capituli*) which lay within its boundaries; the remainder fell to the Duchy of Oldenburg, to which the episcopal line of the House of Gottorp had succeeded in 1773, and forms to-day the Oldenburg principality of Lübeck. As the imperial delegates had also guaranteed Lübeck perpetual neutrality, and the citizens had begun to level the fortifications, they were unable to offer any resistance to the French, who, after the Battle of Jena, in 1806, pursued Blücher northwards. Occupied by the French on 5 November, the town was pillaged for three days, and remained in their possession until 1813. For the Catholics, who then numbered between 500 and 600, the foreign occupation brought, in some measure, an equality of rights with the Protestants, and the liberty —never since contested—of baptizing and marrying their co-religionists according to Catholic rites, without outside interference. The Congress of Vienna recognized Lübeck as a free member of the German League. Subsequently the town devoted itself with great energy to removing all the obstacles impeding the development of its commerce and navigation. These were due principally to the opposition of Denmark, which still occupied Holstein.

The Liberal Constitution of 1848, which guaranteed to the middle classes a great measure of influence in the government of the city side by side with the Senate, contributed very greatly to foster the public spirit of the citizens and initiated a new period of prosperity for the old Hanse town. Its inclusion in the German Customs Union (*Zollverein*) opened to Lübeck, in 1868, a great field of commercial activity. In 1866 Lübeck had unhesitatingly taken the side of Prussia. In the new German Empire its position as a free city is unimpaired: under the protection of the Empire, and during the long epoch of peace since 1871, it has developed, not precipitately, but steadily and surely, and its population has more than doubled (1871: in the city, 39,743, and within the state boundaries, 52,158; 1905: in the city, 91,541, and in the state, 105,857).

The Catholics of Lübeck, whom immigration has increased almost threefold since 1871, are subject to the Vicar Apostolic of the Northern Missions. The priests of the parish of Lübeck (1 pastor and 3 assistants) minister to all the Catholics of the free state, the Catholics of the Principality of Lübeck, who live nearer to Lübeck than to Eutin, and a portion of the Catholics of Ratzeburg, Lauenberg, Holstein, and Mecklenburg-Schwerin. The Catholic soldiers are spiritually subject to the army provost at Berlin, who entrusts them to the care of the pastor at Lübeck.

By the Regulation of 18 March, 1904, which determines its relations towards the Catholic Church, the state has reserved to itself the *jus circa sacra.* The names of the clergy appointed by the Bishop of Osnabrück must be submitted to the Senate with copies of all their certificates of studies. Religious orders and congregations may at any time be excluded by the Senate. Catholic citizens, who are taxed on an income of more than 1000 marks, must pay a church tax; otherwise, the ecclesiastical revenue is derived from the general church and school funds, and—since this is insufficient to meet the expenditure—from the voluntary contributions of the Catholics, who are mostly poor, and from the Bonifatiusverein. To the assistance of this association is also due the erection of the parish church of the Sacred Heart in the town (1888–91) and of the chapel-of-ease in the industrial district of Kücknitz (1909–10). Since 1850 there has been a Catholic school, which is conducted by a

religious director, and has received since 1905 a grant from the state. In 1874 an establishment of the Sisters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, from the mother-house at Breslau, was founded to teach and to care for the sick. The Catholic associations of Lübeck include those of the Christian Family, the Holy Childhood, Guardian Angels, St. Elizabeth, St. Charles Borromeo, and one for the adornment of poor churches, an association for Catholic business men and officials, a men's association; an association for journeymen, one for youths, and a Sodality of Mary for unmarried women. The Catholic press is represented by the "Nordische Volkszeitung".

BECKER, *Umständliche Geschichte der kaiserlichen und des Heiligen Römischen Reiches freyen Stadt Lübeck* (3 vols., Lübeck, 1782–1805); PETERSEN, *Ausführliche Geschichte der Lübeckischen Kirchenreformation 1529–1531* (Lübeck, 1830); DIECKE, *Die Freie und Hansestadt Lübeck* (4th ed., Lübeck, 1881); *Urkundenbuch der Stadt Lübeck* (11 vols., Lübeck, 1843–1904); *Urkundenbuch des Bistums Lübeck* (Oldenburg, 1856); *Die Freie und Hansestadt Lübeck* (Lübeck, 1890); HOFFMAN, *Geschichte der Freien und Hansestadt Lübeck* (Lübeck, 1889–92); ILLIGENS, *Der Glaube der Väter dargestellt in den kirchlichen Altertümern Lübecks* (Paderborn, 1895); IDEM, *Geschichte der Lübeckischen Kirche von 1530–1896, Geschichte des ehemaligen katholischen Bistums, der nunmehrigen katholischen Gemeinde* (Paderborn, 1896); *Lübeck, seine Bauten und Kunstwerke* (Lübeck, 1897); HOLM, *Lübeck, die Freie und Hansestadt* (Bielefeld, 1900); *Die Bau- und Kunstdenkmäler der Freien und Hansestadt Lübeck* (2 vols., Lübeck, 1906); KOSTER, *Nachrichten über die römische-katholische Pfarrgemeinde Lübeck* (Lübeck, 1908); *Zeitschrift des Vereins für lübeckische Geschichte und Altertumskunde* (11 vols., Lübeck, 1860–1910); *Hansische Geschichts-blätter* (1871—); *Hansische Geschichtsquellen* (1875—), *Hanserecesse* (1876—), *Hansisches Urkundenbuch* (1876—), *Hansische Inventare* (1876).

JOSEPH LINS.

Lublin, DIOCESE OF (LUBLINENSIS).—The city of Lublin is in Russian Poland, capital of the Government of Lublin, lies on the Bistrzyca, a tributary of the Vistula, and in 1897 had a population of 50,152, of whom 30,914 were Catholics. It is the seat of a Catholic bishop, a governor, and an army corps. Conspicuous among the eleven Catholic churches of the town are the cathedral, dedicated to St. John the Baptist and St. John the Evangelist, which was built by Bernhard Maciejowski (afterwards cardinal) between 1582 and 1600, remained till 1772 in the possession of the Jesuits, and since 1832 has been the cathedral; also the church of St. Stanislaus, erected in 1342 by King Casimir for the Dominicans; the church of the Assumption of Mary "de triumphis", built during 1412 and 1426 by King Wladislaw Jagello, in memory of the victory gained over the Teutonic Order; the parish church of the Conversion of St. Paul, erected in 1461, and till 1864 the church of the Franciscans, etc.

Lublin was founded in the eleventh century, and soon began to flourish. In the events arising out of the relations between Poles and Lithuanians, the town on various occasions played an important rôle. From the diets which assembled there, the so-called union of diets of 1569 came to be of decisive importance to the fortunes of both kingdoms. The alliance between Lithuanians and Poles was always more or less loose (see LITHUANIA); only the hostility, common to both of them against the Teutonic Order, obviated a separation more than once. Following the downfall of the order, a much more dangerous enemy arose in the East in the upward-struggling empire of the Muscovites under Ivan III. When he had got rid of the Tatars he set about building up a centralized state. And as he had designs on Polish territory, he sought to rouse up enemies against the Poles. His successor followed a like policy. It became obvious that there would have to be a fight with Russia over the supremacy in the East. That could only be done with any success if, in place of the looser alliance, a uniform incorporation of the states took place. King Sigismund (1548–1572) showed himself strenuously in favour of a closer union. Nevertheless when the united diets finally met at Lublin in 1569, the Lithuanians, although their Greek Orthodox nobles had in 1563 by royal decree become possessed of the same rights as the Catholic nobility of Poland, stoutly opposed a closer union between Lithuania and Poland. Their representatives demanded absolute independence in all home questions, and the maintenance of their own constitution and administration. Only in the case of war were Lithuanians and Poles to meet in diet, while the monarch was not to be common to both, but to be separated from both countries, and to be freely elected. A passionate conflict ensued with the Polish nobility. These latter were so much the stronger that they had the king on their side, and could also reckon on the lower Lithuanian nobles, who were much oppressed by princes and senators, and were not possessed of the same independence as the higher nobility. The king cleared away the last legal obstacle by renouncing his hereditary rights as Grand Duke of Lithuania, and thus placed both divisions in the same relation to his person. When, then, Sigismund Augustus by virtue of his royal authority commanded the Lithuanians to consent to the union, they left the diet, in order to prevent the union, and made every preparation to defend their independence by the sword. The Poles, however, broke the opposition by inducing the king to unite one by one to the Polish crown the Lithuanian territories, such as Podlachia, Volhynia and others, in which his authority remained unshaken. Only the use of the Russian language in the courts was guaranteed to them. The few who refused to submit to this arrangement were declared to have forfeited their lands and dignities, and thus Lithuania was robbed of its richest province. The Lithuanian magnates, who had also the smaller nobility opposed to them, had nothing to do but submit. They joined the diet at Lublin again, and on 27 June, 1569, announced their willingness to acknowledge the union. On 1 July the union was solemnly proclaimed. Lithuania thus ceased to be a self-dependent state. It retained however at least some marks of independence: Lithuanian offices, its own seal, and the title of grand duchy.

Under King Stephen Báthori (1576–86) Lublin became the seat of five of the highest law courts, which the king, under the renunciation of his old right, established to pronounce judgment as courts of appeal for the several combined territories. King John Sobieski, the conqueror of the Turks at Vienna (1680), summoned a synod at Lublin, to put an end to the controversies among Roman Catholics and those of other confessions and to win over the small number of schismatics, who after the Union of Brest remained in Lithuania; but the synod had no success. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries Lublin still remained one of the most important towns in Poland. At the Partition of Poland the town went first to Austria; in 1809, after the victory of Napoleon, to the Grand Duchy of Warsaw, on the disruption of which by the Congress of Vienna Russia obtained it. During the period of Austrian rule Pius VII, on the petition of Emperor Francis II, established at Lublin a separate bishopric. Adalbert Skarszewski was appointed first bishop in 1807. When, during the reorganization of the Catholic Church in Russia, Pius VII, by the Bull "Militantis Ecclesiæ", of 12 March, 1817, elevated the Bishopric of Warsaw into an archbishopric, Lublin with other dioceses was placed under it as suffragan and at the same time a bishopric was instituted for Podlachia, with the seat in Janow. In 1868 both dioceses were in a way united, the Bishop of Lublin being likewise permanent Vicar Apostolic of Podlachia. Josephus Marcellinus Dziecielski (1828–39) succeeded the first bishop, who was elevated in 1825 to the Archbishopric of Warsaw, then, after a long vacancy, Vincentius a Paulo Pienkowski (1853–63), Valentinus Barenowski (1871–79), Casimirus Josephus Joannes Wnorowski (1883–85), and the present bishop, Fran-

ciscus Jaczewski (since 1889). The brief history of the bishopric exhibits many vicissitudes, particularly since Tsar Nicholas I took up the plans of Catharine II, to bring over to the Orthodox Church those who were in communion with Rome, and carried them through by the most violent methods. Thousands of Catholics in communion with the Church in the Diocese of Lublin were "converted" by force to Orthodoxy, and a great number of religious buildings were taken from them. The appointment of an auxiliary bishop for this large diocese has for a long time been consistently frustrated by the Russian Government, and the long-continued oppression in many parishes hinders the care of souls and does great injury to the Church. Since the issue of the edict allowing religious toleration, in 1905, the conditions have somewhat improved, though the officials put all the obstacles they can in the way of a return to Catholicism by those who were formerly compelled to join the Orthodox Church. In spite of everything, many thousands have returned to the Catholic Church since 1906.

The diocese includes the greater part of the Governments of Lublin and Siedlec, and numbers 19 deaneries, 427 parishes, 403 secular priests (205 administrators, 28 curates, 145 vicars, and 25 other priests), and 1,532,300 Catholics. The cathedral chapter has 4 prelacies and 8 canonries; there is also a collegiate chapter with 3 prelacies and 4 canonries at Zamosć. The diocesan seminary for priests at Lublin has 1 regent, 1 viceregent, 6 professors, and 108 students. The Sisters of Charity have 6 establishments with 29 sisters.

Tagebuch des Unionsreichstags zu Lublin (St. Petersburg, 1869); *Catalogus Ecclesiarum et utriusque Cleri tam sæcularis quam regularis Diœceseos Lublinensis pro anno Domini 1909* (Lublin, 1909). JOSEPH LINS.

Luca, GIOVANNI BATTISTA DE, Cardinal and Italian canonist of the seventeenth century, b. at Venusia, Southern Italy, in 1614; d. at Rome, on 5 February, 1683. Born of humble parentage, he studied at Naples, but owing to ill-health he had to return to his native place. In 1645 he went to Rome, where he soon won a high reputation for his legal ability, thereby stirring up much enmity and jealousy. At an advanced age he became a priest and enjoyed the patronage of Innocent XI, who made him successively referendary *Utriusque Signaturæ*, auditor of the Sacred Palace and finally in 1681 raised him to the cardinalate. His writings, which are eminently practical in character, are most important for a proper understanding of the jurisprudence of the Roman Court and especially of the Rota in his time. We may mention his "Relatio Curiæ Romanæ" (Cologne, 1683), "Sacræ Rotæ decisiones" (Lyons, 1700) "Annotationes praticæ ad S. Conciluim Tridentinum" (Cologne, 1684). His complete works were published under the title "Theatrum veritatis et justitiæ (19 vols., Rome, 1669–77; 12 vols., Cologne, 1689–99).

SHERER in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.; SCHULTE, *Die Geschichte der Quellen und Literatur des canonischen Rechts*, III (Stuttgart, 1875–80), 487; WERNZ, *Jus Decretalium*, I (Rome, 1898), 415; HURTER, *Nomenclator litterarius*, II, 364.

A. VAN HOVE.

Lucas, FREDERICK, Member of Parliament and journalist, b. in Westminster, 30 March, 1812; d. at Staines, Middlesex, 22 Oct., 1855. He was the second son of Samuel Hayhurst Lucas, a London corn-merchant who was a member of the Society of Friends. Educated first at a Quaker school in Darlington, then at University College, London, he gave early proof of his abilities, particularly in essay-writing and as a speaker in the college debating society. Even at this time he was an ardent supporter of Catholic Emancipation, which was then being much discussed. On leaving college he began to study for the law at the Middle Temple, and was called to the bar in 1835. Two lectures on education which he delivered at Staines in 1838 showed that he felt that attraction to the Christianity of the Middle Ages which was then influencing so many minds. Yet ruled by the prejudices of his early education it was to the Oxford School rather than to the Catholic Church that he was first led. But early in 1839 an end was put to his doubts and difficulties: his intimate friend Thomas Chisholm Anstey (q. v.), himself a recent convert, persuaded him to examine the Catholic claims, and the perusal of Milner's "End of Controversy" convinced him of their truth. He was received into the Church by Father Lythgoe, S.J. In a letter to the Kingston monthly meeting of Friends he resigned his membership of the Society and announced his conversion (18 Feb., 1839). In 1840 he married Miss Elizabeth Ashby of Staines, who, like two of his brothers, followed him into the Catholic Church.

In the same year he determined to start a weekly Catholic paper, "The Tablet", the first number of which appeared on 16 May, 1840. After two years his original supporters, Messrs. Keasley, failed in business, and he was left without the resources necessary for continuing the paper. But he had many Catholic friends who put great confidence in his courage, ability, and broad scholarship, and they came to his assistance. A claim on the part of the printers, which he regarded as unjust, led to a struggle between him and them for the possession of the premises, and during the year 1842 rival publications were issued—the "Tablet" by the printers, and the "True Tablet" by Lucas. By the end of the year he was victorious, and in January, 1843, he was able to begin the fourth volume of the "Tablet" without a rival. He conducted the paper on such fearless lines that he alarmed some of the old English Catholics, who had been trained in a school of the utmost prudence and circumspection, and who looked askance at the uncompromising boldness with which he asserted Catholic rights and defended the Catholic position. He received, however, the hearty support of many Irish priests with whose political aspirations he was thoroughly in sympathy. This led him in 1849 to transfer the publishing offices of the "Tablet" from London to Dublin, and from this time forward he took a keen interest in Irish politics.

Returned to Parliament in 1852 as one of the members for Meath, he quickly won for himself a position in the House of Commons, and was recognized as one of the leading Catholic politicians. Questioning the sincerity of some of the Irish Nationalist members, he did not shrink from denouncing them, and before long he became involved in a conflict with the Archbishop of Dublin, Dr. Cullen, who prohibited his priests from interference in politics. Lucas attacked this action of the archbishop in the "Tablet", and in 1854 he went to Rome to lay his case before the pope. Pius IX received him kindly, and requested him to draw up a memorial on Irish affairs and the differences between himself and the archbishop. Though in failing health he set about this task, which occupied him through the winter. In May, 1855, he returned to England hoping after a few weeks to go back to Rome, but his health grew worse and he died on 22 October in the house of his brother-in-law at Staines. His death was regarded as a public loss by Catholics both in England and Ireland, who realized that he had breathed a new spirit of independence into Catholic journalism and set an example of high principle in political life. "As a father, a husband, a journalist and member of Parliament he had a high ideal of duty —an ideal such as rarely, if ever enters into the minds of ordinary men" (Life, II, 468).

LUCAS, *The Life of Frederick Lucas, M. P.* (London, 1886); ANON., *A Memoir of Frederick Lucas* (Derby, 1857); RIETHMÜLLER, *Frederick Lucas: A Biography* (London, 1862); *Tablet*, 27 Oct., 3 Nov., 10 Nov., 1855; GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.*, s. v.; COOPER in *Dict. Nat. Biob.*, s. v.

EDWIN BURTON.

Lucca, Archdiocese of (Lucensis).—Lucca, the capital of the like named province in Tuscany, Central Italy, is situated on the River Serchio in a fertile cultivated plain. Its chief industries are the quarrying and dressing of marble, and the production of silk, wool, flax, and hemp. Its olive oil enjoys a world-wide fame. Noteworthy among the church buildings is the cathedral, which dates back to the sixth century; it was rebuilt in the Roman style in the eleventh century, consecrated by Alexander II (1070), and again restored in the quattrocento, when the beautiful columns of the upper arches were added. In the apse are three large windows painted by Ugolino da Pisa. Of the sculptural adornments we may mention Civitali's equestrian statue of St. Martin dividing his cloak with the beggar, the Deposition by Nicolò Pisano, and the Adoration of the Magi by Giovanni da Pisa—all three on the façade. Within are pictures by Tintoretto and Parmigianino, and a Madonna by Frà Bartolommeo. But the most celebrated work is the *Volto Santo*, an ancient crucifix carved in wood, with Christ clothed in the "colobium", a long sleeveless garment. Throughout the Middle Ages this image was regarded as a palladium by the Lucchesi, who, on their journeys to every country, distributed facsimiles, thus giving rise to the legends of St. Liberata and St. Wilgefortis, of the "heilige Kummernis" of the Germans and the "Ontkommer" of the Dutch; Professor Schnürer of the University of Fribourg (Switzerland), has in preparation a study on this subject. San Frediano is the only example of Lombard architecture preserved without notable alteration, excepting the façade, which is of the year 1200. S. Maria foris Portam, S. Michele, S. Romano, and the other churches (fully eighty in number), all possess valuable works of art. In the church of S. Francesco (quattrocento) is the tomb of the Lucchese poet, Guidiccioni. Among the profane edifices is the Palazzo Pubblico, formerly the ducal palace, begun by Ammarati in 1578, continued by Pini in 1729, and further enlarged by Prince Bacciochi in the nineteenth century; adjoining are the library, with many valuable manuscripts, and a picture gallery. The Manzi palace also contains a collection of paintings. There is a magnificent aqueduct of 459 arches, constructed by Nattolini (1823–32). The archives of the capitol and the archiepiscopal palace are important for their many private documents of the early Middle Ages. Ruins of a Roman amphitheatre of imperial times still exist. The territory of Lucca is rich in mineral and thermal springs. The celebrated baths of Lucca are about fifteen miles from the city.

The Cathedral, Lucca

Lucca was a city of the Ligurians, and is first mentioned in 218 B.C., when the Roman general Sempronius retired thither after an unsuccessful battle with Hannibal. In 177 B.C. a Roman colony was established there. In 56 B. C. Cæsar, Pompey, and Crassus renewed the triumvirate at Lucca. During the Gothic wars the city was besieged and taken by Totila (550). Hoping for assistance from the Franks, the Lucchesi obstinately resisted the attack of Narses, surrendering only after a siege of seven months (553). It later fell into the hands of the Lombards, was thenceforward a place of great importance, and became the favourite seat of the Marquesses of Tuscany. In 981 Otto bestowed on its bishop civil jurisidiction over the entire diocesan territory; but in 1081 Henry IV made it a free city and conferred other favours upon it, especially in the way of trade. This was the origin of the Republic of Lucca, which lasted until 1799. From 1088 to 1144 Lucca was continually at war with her rival Pisa, and either by conquest or purchase increased her possessions. In 1160 the Guelph marquess finally surrendered all right of jurisdiction. Lucca was generally on the side of the pope against the emperor, and hence joined the League of S. Ginesio (1197). In the thirteenth century, despite her wars with Pisa, Florence, and the imperial cities, Lucca increased her power and commerce. But in 1313 the city was taken by Uguccione della Faggiuola, Lord of Pisa. The Lucchesi, however, under the most dramatic circumstances, freed themselves and chose for captain their fellow-citizen, Castruccio degli Antelminelli, known as Castracane (1316), the restorer of the military art, who had been imprisoned by Uguccione. Castruccio drove out the Pisans, obtained for life the title of Defender of the People, and received from Louis the Bavarian the hereditary title of Duke of Lucca. His descendants, however, were deprived of the title by the same prince (1328–9). Castruccio adorned and fortified the city whose territory now extended from the Magra to Pistoia and Volterra.

On the death of Castruccio, Louis conferred Lucca on Francesco, a relative and enemy of Castruccio. The Lucchesi, however, placed themselves under John of Bohemia; the latter, in 1333, pawned the city to the Rossi of Parma, who ceded it to Mastino della Scala (1335), by whom it was sold to the Florentines for 100,000 florins (1341). This displeased the Pisans, who occupied the city (1342). It was liberated by Charles IV (1360), who gave it an imperial vicar. From 1370 it was free. In 1400 Paolo Guinigi obtained the chief power, which he exercised with moderation and justice. At the instigation of the Florentines, who sought possession of the city, Guinigi was betrayed into the hands of Filippo Maria Visconti (1430), who caused him to be murdered at Pavia. With the aid of Piccinino, Lucca maintained her freedom against the Florentines. After that the security of this little state, governed by the people, was undisturbed except by the revolt of the *straccioni* (the lowest class) in 1521, and the conspiracy of Pietro Fatinelli (1542), who aspired to power. But in 1556 the Martinian law (Martino Bernardini) restricted participation in the government to the sons of citizens, and in 1628 this limitation was further accentuated, until in 1787 only eighty families enjoyed the right to public office. Among the institutions of this republic the *discolato* deserves mention. It was similar to the ostracism of the Athenians. If a citizen, either through wealth or merit, obtained excessive favour among the people, twenty-five signatures were sufficient to ban-

ish him. In 1799 Lucca was joined to the Cisalpine Republic. In 1805 Napoleon made it a dukedom for his cousin Felice Bacciochi. In 1814 it was occupied by the Neapolitans, and later by the Austrians. In 1817 it was given to Maria Luisa, widow of the King of Etruria, whose son Carlo Ludovico ceded it to Tuscany in 1847. Illustrious citizens of Lucca were Pope Lucius III (Allucingoli); the jurist, Bonagiunta Urbiciani (thirteenth century); the physician, Teodoro Borgognoni; the historian, Tolomeo de' Fiadoni; the women poets, Laura Guidiccioni and Chiara Matraini; the philologist, L. Fornaciari (nineteenth century); the painters, Berlinghieri and Orlandi (thirteenth century); the sculptor, Matteo Civitali (first half of the fifteenth century).

There is a legend that the Gospel was preached at Lucca by St. Paulinus, a disciple of St. Peter, and the discovery in 1197 of a stone, recording the deposition of the relics of Paulinus a holy martyr, apparently confirmed this pious belief. On the stone, however, St. Paulinus is not called Bishop of Lucca, nor is there any allusion to his having lived in Apostolic times ("Analecta Bollandiana", 1904, p. 491; 1905, p. 502). The first bishop of certain date is Maximus, present at the Council of Sardica (343). At the Council of Rimini (359), Paulinus, Bishop of Lucca, was present. Perhaps the above-mentioned legend arose through a repetition of this Paulinus. Remarkable for sanctity and miracles was St. Fridianus (560–88), son of Ultonius, King of Ireland, or perhaps of a king of Ulster (*Ultonia*), of whom in his "Dialogues" (III, 10) St. Gregory the Great relates a miracle. On St. Fridianus see Colgan, "Acta Sanct. Scot.", I (1645), 633–51; "Dict. Christ. Biog.", s. v.; Fanucchi, "Vita di San Frediano" (Lucca, 1870); O'Hanlon, "Lives of Irish Saints", under 18 Nov.; "Analecta Bolland.", XI (1892), 262–3, and "Bolland. Bibl. hagiogr. lat." (1899), 476. In 739, during the episcopate of Walprandus, Richard, King of the Angles and father of Saints Willibald, Wunibald, and Walburga, died at Lucca and was buried in the church of S. Frediano. Under Blessed Giovanni (787) it is said the Volto Santo was brought to Lucca. Other bishops were Anselmo Badagio (1073), later Pope Alexander II, who was succeeded as bishop by his nephew Anselm of Lucca, a noted writer; Apizio (1227), under whom Lucca was deprived of its episcopal see for six years by Gregory IX; the Franciscan Giovanni Salvuzzi (1383), who built the episcopal palace; Nicolò Guinigi (1394), exiled by his relative Paolo Guinigi, Lord of Lucca. In 1408 Gregory XII went to Lucca to come to a personal agreement with the anti-pope, Benedict XIII, and was there abandoned by his cardinals. Worthy of mention also are the writer, Felino Maria Sandeo (1499), nephew of Ariosto; Cardinals Sisto della Rovere (1508), Francesco Sforza Riario (1517), and Bartolommeo Guidiccioni (1605), under the last-named of whom the Diocese of San Miniato was formed and separated from Lucca; Cardinal Girolamo Bonvisi (1657); Bernardino Guinigi (1723), the first archbishop (1726); the learned Gian Domenico Mansi (1764–9); and finally the present cardinal archbishop, Benedetto Lorenzelli (1904), last nuncio to Paris before the separation. The Archdiocese of Lucca has no suffragans; it has 246 parishes with 230,000 souls.

Mansi, *Diario sacro della Chiesa di Lucca* (Venice, 1753); Tommasi, *Sommario della storia di Lucca* (1847); Cappelletti, *Le Chiese d'Italia*, XV (Venice, 1857). See, for further bibliography, Chevalier, *Topo-bibl.*, s. v. *Lucques*.

U. Benigni.

Lucera, Diocese of (Lucerinensis).—Lucera is a very ancient city in the province of Foggia in Apulia, Southern Italy. It originally belonged to Daunia. In 320 B. C. it was taken by the Romans, a Roman colony being established there in 314. The Samnites defeated the Romans near Lucera in 294. During the war between Cæsar and Pompey it was an important point of defence for the latter. In A. D. 663 it was captured from the Lombards and destroyed by Constantius II. Lucera attained great importance when Frederick II transferred thither the Saracens of Sicily whom he had shortly before subjugated, and who from enemies became his most faithful and trusted supporters in his wars against the popes and the great barons of the Kingdom of Naples. The royal treasury was also located at Lucera. During the invasion of Charles of Anjou Lucera made the longest resistance. The remaining Saracens were converted *en masse* in 1300; their mosque was destroyed by Charles II, and upon its ruins arose the present cathedral, S. Maria della Vittoria. Local tradition traces the origin of the episcopal see to the third century (St. Bassus). The first historically certain bishop is Marcus (c. 743). Among other noteworthy bishops were Nicolò, papal legate at Constantinople in 1261; the Dominican Agostino Gasotti (1318), formerly Archbishop of Zagabria; Tommaso de Acerno (1378), author of "De creatione Urbani VI opusculum"; Scipione Bozzuti (1582), killed in a sack of the city by some exiles in 1591. In 1391 the Diocese of Lucera was increased by the addition of that of Farentino, or Castelfiorentino, a city founded in 1015 by the Byzantine catapan, Basileios. It was the place of Frederick II's death. After 1409 the See of Tortiboli (Tortibulum) created before 1236, was united to Lucera. Finally in 1818, the united Diocese of Montecorvino and Vulturaria were added to Lucera. Montecorvino became an episcopal see in the tenth century, and among its bishops was St. Albert (d. 5 April, 1037). Its union with Vulturaria, a town now almost deserted, took place in 1433. Noteworthy among the later bishops was Alessandro Gerardini d'Amelia (1496), a Latin poet, author of many historical, educational, and moral works, and one of the chief supporters of the expedition of Columbus; in 1515 he was transferred to San Domingo in America, where he died in 1521. The Diocese of Lucera has 17 parishes with 75,000 souls; 4 religious houses of men and 6 of women; 1 school for boys and 3 for girls. In March, 1908, the Diocese of Troia was united with Lucera. It was established in the eleventh century, and has 9 parishes with 26,200 souls, one Franciscan convent, and three houses of monks.

Cappelletti, *Le Chiese d'Italia*, XIX (Venice, 1857); d'Ameli, *Storia della città di Lucera* (1861).

U. Benigni.

Lucerne, chief town of the Canton of Lucerne in Switzerland. The beginnings of the town, as well as the derivation of its name, are obscure; the supposition of Ægidius Tschudi, that Lucerne was once the chief town of the Burgundian kings in Aargau, is legendary. It is safer to assert that, in the eighth century, there stood at the place where the Reuss flows out of the Lake of the Four Cantons a small Benedictine monastery dedicated to St. Leodegar, which, as early as the reign of King Pepin, belonged to the Abbey of Murbach in Alsace. It is doubtful whether there was a previous settlement here, or whether the place was only an accretion of the monastery. The earliest mention of Lucerne is in a charter of Emperor Lothair I, 25 July, 840. With the flourishing church community a civil community also developed, and the buildings of the two gradually combined to make a small town, which appears in German documents of the thirteenth century as *Lucerren*, or *Luzzernon*. The Abbot of Murbach exercised feudal fiscal rights through a steward or bailiff; twice a year the abbot himself administered justice from the steps in front of the Hofkirche, with twelve free men beside him as aldermen. Each newly elected Abbot of Murbach had to promise fidelity to the law in Lucerne. The paramount jurisdiction over the settlement belonged to the Landgrave of the Aargau (after 1239,

the Count of Habsburg), who exercised it through *juniores*, or bailiffs. The rapid rise of the town in the thirteenth century was chiefly due to the opening of the road over the St. Gothard, and the consequent increase of traffic between Italy and Western Germany. Lucerne thus became an important mart, and the citizens aspired to make themselves entirely independent of any overlord. To this end they exploited the financial embarrassments of the abbots to purchase one privilege after another. In the so-called *Geschworenen Brief* of 1252, the council and the citizens of the town already appear as quite independent of the abbot, who was theoretically their feudal lord, and as a community possessing a seal and its own tribunals

As the abbots of Murbach were often at odds with the Counts of Habsburg, who were also Landgraves in Alsace, in regard to their estates in Upper Alsace, Rudolf of Habsburg, after his election as emperor, confirmed all the privileges of the town, and declared that the citizens of Lucerne were received as a fief of the Empire. In order to conciliate the town, he bought, in 1291, from the Abbot of Murbach the estates of the abbey in Lucerne and in the Forest Cantons (Schwyz, Uri, and Unterwalden) for 2000 silver marks and five villages in Alsace. Although the town looked very unfavourably on this change of ownership, it was nevertheless obliged to swear allegiance to Rudolf's son Albrecht for the confirmation of its liberties. But the Habsburg supremacy did not last long. By the renewal of the league of the above three Forest Cantons, which had revolted from Austria, the foundation of a Swiss nationality was laid. In the wars which now broke out, Lucerne had to fight against its own countrymen; still it was faithful to its Austrian suzerain until after the Battle of Morgarten (1315). The victory gained there by the Swiss encouraged the friends of liberty, and two parties were formed in Lucerne, an Austrian and a Swiss. When the town was transferred, in 1228, from the jurisdiction of Rothenburg to that of Baden, twenty-six citizens formed an association for five years to maintain the city's privileges; in 1330 this association was joined by the burgomaster and the council, and on 7 November, 1332, Lucerne entered into a perpetual league with the three Forest Cantons. Although this alliance did not contemplate complete independence, still the struggle with the House of Habsburg could not be long delayed.

After 1336 several campaigns were carried on, and the city's liberties were sometimes increased, sometimes curtailed; but Lucerne was still Austrian. In 1361 it obtained exemption from the St. Gothard toll; in 1379 Wenceslaus granted it the judicial jurisdiction of first instance over property, and in 1381 penal jurisdiction also was granted. While the Austrian supremacy was thus dwindling, the city's territory was augmented by the accession of Krienz, Horw, and other neighbouring towns. In consequence of a dispute about tolls, the Lucerners stormed Rothenburg, on 23 Dec., 1385, destroyed the castle, took Entlebuch, and assisted in the destruction of the castle of Wolhusen. The war with Austria ended with the Battle of Sempach (9 July, 1386), in which the Burgomaster of Lucerne, Peter von Gunoldigen, met a hero's death, and the city was rid of the Austrian yoke. Lucerne henceforward had free scope for development. In 1394 it acquired the lordships of Wolhusen, Rothenburg, and Sempach; in 1406 of Habsburg, in 1407 the countship of Willisau. The village of Merenschwand voluntarily placed itself under the protection of Lucerne in 1397. About this time the city was encircled with strong fortifications, of which the "Musegg", to the north, with its nine towers, still exists.

When the Austrian Frederick "Empty-purse" was put under the ban of the Empire at the Council of Constance (1415), by Emperor Sigismund, on account of his relations with Pope John XXIII, and the Swiss, allied with the emperor, prepared to conquer the Aargau, Lucerne conquered Sursee and occupied the Cistercian monastery of St. Urban at Bonnwalde, the monastery at Beromünster, and other places. The whole territory was now divided into thirteen bailiwicks. Lucerne took a considerable part in the numerous Italian campaigns of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, especially in the victorious campaigns of the Swiss against Charles the Bold of Burgundy, which brought rich spoils to the city. By the war of the Swiss against Maximilian in 1499, known as the Swabian War, the bond between Lucerne and the German Empire was entirely severed in fact, though this fact was finally recognized only in 1648, by the Peace of Westphalia.

The fifteenth century brought important internal changes: the Council, which had governed somewhat arbitrarily, was forced to stipulate that, without the consent of the entire community, it would begin no war, enter into no alliance, purchase no lordships, and impose no new taxes. As in politics, so also in learning, Lucerne took a leading part in Switzerland; in the Hofschule, dating from 1290, it possessed the oldest teaching institution of Switzerland; in addition, there was a school at the Minorite convent. The latter was famous for the production of religious dramas, which reached their zenith in the second half of the fifteenth century and attracted audiences numbering as many as 30,000. The Benedictine foundation, which had fallen into decay, was in 1456 changed into a foundation of canons, which exists to this day. In the course of the sixteenth century an aristocratic constitution was formed, which survived every political storm and lasted till the dissolution of the canton.

The Reformation divided Switzerland into two camps. Besides the four Forest Cantons (Schwyz, Uri, Unterwalden, and Lucerne), Fribourg and Soleure formed the Catholic part. The new teaching found no great following in the city, although a few scholars like Myconius and Textorius, tried at first to obtain admission. A zealous defender of the Faith arose in the Franciscan Thomas Murner, who came to Lucerne in 1524. The authorities also actively interposed against the followers of the new teaching. As the most important of the Catholic cities, Lucerne took the leading part in the conflict, notably at the Battle of Kappel, which strengthened the position of the Catholic Church in Switzerland, under her burgomasters, Hug and Golder. Also it was at the head of all the alliances which the Catholic cantons made with France or with the pope. St. Charles Borromeo, who visited Lucerne in 1570, rendered great services to the Catholic Church in Switzerland (see CHARLES BORROMEO, SAINT). At his suggestion, on 7 Aug., 1574, the first Jesuits entered Lucerne, two fathers and a lay brother; in 1577 they received the Rittersche palace for a college. Their special protector was the burgomaster, the famous Swiss soldier, Ludwig Pfyffer, who had fought at Jarnac and Montcontour against the Huguenots, and who, from 1571 to his death in 1594, as "King of the Swiss", was the principal leader of Catholic opinion in Switzerland. His assistant for many years was the learned town clerk Renward Cysat, who collected valuable materials for the history of his native city.

In 1583 the Capuchins obtained an establishment in the city, and a permanent papal nunciature was erected there, Giovanni Francesco Bonhomini, Archbishop of Vercelli, being the first nuncio. The alliances of the Swiss with warlike popes of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries had resulted in active intercourse with Rome. At the instance, and in the presence, of the third nuncio, Battista Santorio, there was concluded (15 Oct., 1586), in the Hofkirche of Lucerne, the so-called Borromean, or Golden, Alliance, in which the four Forest Cantons, together with Zug, Fribourg, and Soleure, swore to be faithful to the

Catholic Church, to strive for the conversion of any of their number who might fall away, and to protect the Faith to the best of their ability. As the capital of Catholic Switzerland, Lucerne made many sacrifices, and rendered great services, at the beginning of the seventeenth century to maintain the Faith in the Canton of Valais. At the same time the Council strongly insisted upon its ancient spiritual rights, in opposition to the nuncio, and this led to the sharp disputes which eventually, in 1725, caused the nuncio, Passionei, to abandon Lucerne for many years. In domestic affairs the ascendency of the patricians increased; eligibility to office was limited to a few families, and the hereditary principle even invaded the Council. Trials for witchcraft cast a deep shadow on this period, and corruption was rife among public officials and members of the Government.

The eighteenth century wore on in a generally peaceful course, after its stormy beginning in the unfortunate participation (1712) of Lucerne in the quarrel of the Abbot of St. Gall with the rebellious Toggenburg. Signs of decay showed themselves little by little in the body politic. The embezzlement of state funds and the wrangles of certain families, who dragged the State into their private feuds, added to the unpopularity of the twenty-nine "ruling families". The ideas of "enlightenment", emanating from France in the eighteenth century, found in Lucerne zealous literary champions in Councillor Felix Balthassar, whose work "De Helvetiorum juribus circa sacra", appeared in 1768, and in Councillor Valentin Meyer. Thus the Revolution found a well-prepared soil at Lucerne. After the entry of the French into the Waadtland (Vaud), and the Revolution at Basle in 1798, Lucerne could no longer remain unaffected: without any popular upheaval, the high Council, quite unexpectedly, on 31 Jan., 1798, promulgated the abolition of aristocratic government, and ordered the convocation of delegates from the country, to consider a new constitution founded upon the principle of legal equality. Before this project could be realized, the entry of the French into Bern, in March, 1798, ended the old confederation. Under orders from France the "Helvetian Republic" was formed, and the territory of the confederation was divided into uniformly administered subordinate provinces. The Act of Mediation of Napoleon (19 Feb., 1803), which restored the old federal constitution of the republic, also brought to the people of Lucerne a larger share of self-government. With the fall of Napoleon and the entry of the allies into Lucerne, the old constitution was re-established there (Feb., 1814), with the patrician regime. At the same time Lucerne became, alternately with Berne and Zurich, the seat of the National Diet.

In the following twenty years much feeling was aroused by the question arising out of the secularization of the Bishopric of Constance. A vicar-generalship, under the Provost Göldlin von Beromünster, was created for the part of Switzerland that had belonged to Constance. In 1821 the Bishopric of Constance was entirely abolished, and it being left to Lucerne to decide what should take its place, the city wished to be itself the new see. After years of negotiation, however, the Diocese of Basle was erected (1828), with the see at Soleure. The Liberal Democratic movement, which began in that year, destroyed the Conservative Government. The Revolution of July in France helped on the Radical victory, and at the end of March, 1831, a Liberal Government came into power, whose leaders were the Burgomaster Amrhyn and the brothers Pfyffer. Josephinism thereupon became dominant in the relations of Church and State. On the advice of the burgomaster, Edward Pfyffer, the Government called a conference, on 20 Jan., 1834, at Baden, which agreed upon a number of articles defining the State's rights over the Church, and to inaugurate certain ecclesiastical reforms. After the High Council had adopted these Baden articles (which the pope condemned by the Bull of 18 May, 1835) the Government began to carry them out; the schools were laicized; the Franciscan monastery at Lucerne and others were abolished; property of foundations considered superfluous was inventoried; obnoxious clergy were called to account. The Government even considered the idea of expelling the nuncio, but he forestalled them, and transferred his residence to Schwyz. Those of the people who remained faithful to the Church organized themselves under the leadership of the worthy peasant Joseph Leu of Ebersoll. Their first steps, such as the proposal to recall the Jesuits, were indeed without result. But when the High Council of the Canton of Aargau, on 20 Jan., 1841, on the proposal of Augustin Keller, director of seminaries, had suppressed all the monasteries of the canton, and the Liberal party at Lucerne had openly expressed their sympathy with these hostile measures, the Liberal regime was overturned by the Conservatives in the election of 1 May, 1841, and a new constitution was formed, which safeguarded the Church's rights. Under Joseph Leu, Siegwart Müller, and Bernhard Meyer, Lucerne was again at the head of the Catholic cantons, the Baden Articles were declared null and void, and the nuncio reinstated at Lucerne.

In 1844 the recall of the Jesuits was decided upon by 70 votes to 24, an act which caused much bitterness of feeling and loud protests among the Liberals. The more thoughtless of them even had some idea of obtaining their ends by force; guerilla warfare was organized in the Cantons of Basle, Soleure, and Aargau, which in 1844 and 1845, united with their Lucerne sympathizers, to the number of 3600, and marched against the city of Lucerne, but were easily vanquished by the city's forces. The victories of the Radicals in several cantons and the murder of Leu (20 July, 1845) caused Lucerne to conclude a separate alliance (*Sonderbund*, 11 Dec., 1845) with Uri, Schwyz, Unterwalden, Fribourg, Zug, and Valais, in opposition to the alliance of the Liberal cantons of 1832. Civil war was now almost inevitable. On 20 July the Swiss Diet decided on the dissolution of the *Sonderbund*, and on 16 Aug. accepted a revision of the alliance; on 2 Sept. the expulsion of the Jesuits was decided on. When, on 29 Sept., a proposal of the seven cantons for an arrangement was refused by the Liberal majority, who wished to ensure an extension of the federal power and a curtailment of the sovereignty of the individual cantons, the delegates of the *Sonderbund* left the Diet, and the war desired by the Liberal majority broke out. With the superiority of the alliance, the result could scarcely be in doubt. On 13 Nov., Fribourg was conquered; on 23 Nov., the *Sonderbund* troops were beaten in the Battle of Gislikon; on 24 Nov., Lucerne was forced to surrender, whereupon the other *Sonderbund* cantons also surrendered one by one. The campaign was decided in twenty days. Under the protection of the troops of the Confederation, a Liberal Government was elected at Lucerne, the Jesuits expelled, a few monasteries suppressed, notably the rich foundation of St. Urban, and the remaining ones burdened with levies. The new constitution (1848) of the Confederation substantially curtailed the rights of the cantons, as also did the Revision of 1874.

After several decades of religious peace, the Old-Catholic movement brought fresh discord into the canton. The reckless proceedings of the Confederation in favour of the Old Catholics, the deposition of Bishop Lachat of Basle by the diocesan conference of 29 Jan., 1873, the bigoted suppression of the nunciature by the national Government, which had the approval of the Lucerne Liberals, goaded the Catholics. Their victory at the election of 1871 led to the establishment of the Conservative Government (then headed by Philipp A. von Segesser) which since then has held its own at

every election. Under it Lucerne afforded a refuge to the exiled bishop, Lachat, until the dispute was settled after protracted negotiations in which Lucerne took a considerable part. Since the opening of the St. Gothard railway, the town, owing to its noble situation on the lake, and as the gateway opening into the heart of Switzerland, has rapidly developed and has become one of the centres of Swiss travel.

The canton of Lucerne, at the census of 1900, numbered 146,519 inhabitants, 134,020 of whom were Catholics, 12,085 Protestants, and 414 of other denominations; the city, 29,255 inhabitants (23,955 Catholics, 4933 Protestants, 299 Jews). Of the eight Catholic churches and seven chapels, the most important is the collegiate church called the Hofkirche, which was rebuilt after the fire of 1633; the two towers of the old Gothic building still remain. The former church of the Jesuits was built in 1667–73. The earlier Franciscan church has one of the oldest architectural monuments of the city in its thirteenth-century Gothic choir. Lucerne is the seat of the seminary for the Diocese of Basle, with six professors. Besides the collegiate foundation in the city of Lucerne, with eleven canons and four chaplains, there has existed since the end of the tenth century the foundation of Beromünster, with a provost, eighteen canons, and ten chaplains. Of religious establishments there are at present three Capuchin houses (Lucerne, Sursee, and Schüpfheim), a house of Capuchinesses at Gerlisheim, one of Cistercianesses at Eschenbach, whose abbess has the right of bearing the crosier; the Sisterhood of St. Martha in the hospital at Lucerne and the society of the Baldegger Sisters, with a branch house and a seminary for governesses. The "Vaterland", the most important Catholic newspaper in Switzerland, appears at Lucerne, also the excellent "Schweizerische Katholische Kirchenzeitung".

PFYFFER, *Geschichte der Stadt und des Kantons Luzern* (2 vols., Zurich, 1850–52); IDEM, *Historisch-geographisch-statistisches Gemälde des Kantons Luzern* (2 vols., Lucerne, 1851–58); VON SEGESSER, *Rechtsgeschichte der Stadt und Republik Luzern* (4 vols., Lucerne, 1851–58); IDEM, *45 Jahre in luzernischen Staatsdienst* (Bern, 1887); MEYER, *Erlebnisse* (Vienna, 1875); VON LIEBENAU, *Das alte Luzern* (Lucerne, 1881); FLEISCHLIN, *Die Stifts- und Pfarrkirche zu Sankt Leodegarius und Mauritius in Hof zu Luzern* (Lucerne, 1908); KESSER, *Luzern und der Vierwaldstättersee* (Leipzig, 1908); *Nuntiaturberichte aus der Schweiz seit dem Konzil von Trient*, I (Solothurn, 1906); HENGGELER, *Aus Recht und Geschichte der kath. Kirche in der Innerschweiz*, I (Lucerne, 1909); *Der Geschichtsfreund. Mitteilungen des historischen Vereins der 5 Orte Luzern, Uri, Schwyz, Unterwalden und Zug* (Einsiedeln and Stans, 1843——).

JOSEPH LINS.

Lucianists. See MARCION AND MARCIONITES.

Lucian of Antioch, a priest of the Church of Antioch who suffered martyrdom (7 January, 312) during the reign of Maximinus Daza. According to a tradition preserved by Suidas (s. v.), Lucian was born at Samosata, of pious parents, and was educated in the neighbouring city of Edessa at the school of a certain Macarius. Not much faith can be attached to these statements, which are not corroborated by any other author; Suidas very probably confounded the history of Lucian with that of his famous namesake, the pagan satirist of a century earlier. The confusion is easily pardoned, however, as both exhibited the same intellectual traits and the same love for cold literalism.

Early in life Lucian took up his residence at Antioch, where he was ordained presbyter, and where he soon attained a commanding position as head of the theological school in that city. Though he cannot be accused of having shared the theological views of Paul of Samosata, he fell under suspicion at the time of Paul's condemnation, and was compelled to sever his communion with the Church. This breach with the orthodox party lasted during the episcopates of three bishops, Domnus, Timæus, and Cyril, whose administration extended from 268 to 303. It seems more likely that Lucian was reconciled with the Church early in the episcopate of Cyril (perhaps about 285) than in that of his successor; otherwise it is hard to understand how bishops in the Orient could have received his pupils. Very little is known about the life of Lucian, though few men have left such a deep imprint on the history of Christianity. The opposition to the allegorizing tendencies of the Alexandrines centred in him. He rejected this system entirely and propounded a system of literal interpretation which dominated the Eastern Church for a long period. In the field of theology, in the minds of practically all writers (the most notable modern exception being Gwatkin, in his "Studies of Arianism", London, 1900), he has the unenviable reputation of being the real author of the opinions which afterwards found expression in the heresy of Arius. In his Christological system—a compromise between Modalism and Subordinationism — the Word, though Himself the Creator of all subsequent beings, was a creature, though superior to all other created things by the wide gulf between Creator and creature. The great leaders in the Arian movement (Arius himself, Eusebius, the court Bishop of Nicomedia, Maris, and Theognis) received their training under him and always venerated him as their master and the founder of their system.

Despite his heterodoxy, Lucian was a man of the most unexceptionable virtue (Eusebius, H. E., VIII, xiii, 2); at the height of the Arian controversy his fame for sanctity was not less than his reputation as a scholar. During the persecution of Maximinus Daza he was arrested at Antioch and sent to Nicomedia, where he endured many tortures and, after delivering a long oration in defence of his faith, was finally put to death. The most enduring memorial of the life of Lucian, next to the Christological controversy which his teachings aroused, was his influence on Biblical study. Receiving the literal sense alone, he laid stress on the need of textual accuracy and himself undertook to revise the Septuagint on the original Hebrew. His edition was widely used in the fourth century (Jerome, De Vir. Ill., lxxvii; Præf. ad Paralip.; Adv. Rufinum xxvi; Epis., 106). He also published a recension of the New Testament. St. Jerome (De Vir. Ill., 77), in addition to the recension of the Bible, speaks of "Libelli de Fide", none of which are extant. He is also credited with the composition of a Creed, presented to the Council of Antioch in 341 (Athan., "Ep. de Synod. Arim. et Seleuc.", xxiii), but his authorship is doubtful; in fact it is certain he did not compose it in its present form. Rufinus (H. E., IX, vi) has preserved a translation of his apologetic oration. There are epistles mentioned by Suidas; a fragment of one announces the death of Anthimus, a bishop ("Chronicon Paschale", in P. G., XCII, 689).

ROUTH, *Reliquiæ Sacræ*, IV, 1, 17; *Acta* SS. Jan. I, 357, 365; BARDENHEWER, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur*, II, 235, 241; HARNACK, *Die Chronologie der altchristlichen Litteratur*, II, 138–146; BATIFFOL, *Etude d'hagiographie arienne: La Passion de Saint Lucien d'Antioche, compte-rendu au congrès scientifique international des Catholiques* (Paris, 1891), sect. 11, 181, 196; WESTCOTT, *History of the New Testament Canon*, 392 sq.; NEWMAN, *Arians of the Fourth Century;* BARDENHEWER, *Patrology*, tr. SHAHAN (St. Louis, 1908).

PATRICK J. HEALY.

Lucić (or LUCIUS), JOHN, Croatian historian, b. early in the seventeenth century, at Trojir, or Tragurion, in Dalmatia; d. at Rome, 11 January, 1679. He was descended from an ancient and noble Croatian family. After making his college course at his birthplace, he took up the study of law, first at Padua (1620) and later at Rome, where he received the degree of *Doctor Utriusque Juris*. Returning to Trojir in 1633, he resided there until 1654, and there discovered the manuscript of the "Cœna Trimalchionis", known as the "Traguriensis", which was afterwards published by Statilić at Padua, 1664. At Trojir he began his re-

searches into the history of his native country, to which he chiefly devoted the rest of his life, and which gained for him the title of "Father of Croatian History". When, in 1654, he returned to Rome to continue his historical studies, he gained the friendship and protection of many men of eminence, among them several cardinals. To Ughelli, the author of "Italia Sacra", he furnished much of the material relating to Croatian history. In April, 1663, he was named president of the "Congregatio S. Hieronymi nationis Illyricorum de Urbe", by Cardinal Julius Sacchetti. Lucić also wrote various works on ecclesiastical history, most of which are lost. A few of them are still preserved in the Vatican Library.

Lucić was never married. He resided at Rome until his death, and was buried there, in the church of St. Jerome, where a monument was erected to his memory in 1740. The following are his principal published works: "De Regno Dalmatiæ et Croatiæ libri sex" (6 vols., Amsterdam, 1666 and 1668; Frankfort, 1667); "Memorie storiche di Tragurio ora detto Traù" (6 vols., Venice, 1673); "Inscriptiones Dalmaticæ, notæ ad memoriale Pauli de Paulo, notæ ad Palladium Fuscum, addenda vel corrigenda in opere de regno Dalmatiæ et Croatiæ, variæ lectiones Chronici Ungarici manuscripti cum editis" (Venice, 1673).

KLAIĆ, *Povjest Hrvata*, I (Zagreb, 1899), 3–6; RACKI, *Povjestnik Ivan Lučić-U Radu Jugoslavenske Akademije* (Zagreb, 1879); LJUBIĆ, *Dizionario biografico degli uomini illustri della Dalmazia* (Vienna, 1856).

ANTHONY-LAWRENCE GANCEVIĆ.

Lucifer (Hebr. *hēlēl;* Septuagint *ἑωσφόρος*, Vulgate *lucifer*) originally denotes the planet Venus, emphasizing its brilliancy. The Vulgate employs the word also for "the light of the morning" (Job, xi,17), "the signs of the zodiac" (Job, xxxviii, 32), and "the aurora" (Ps., cix, 3). Metaphorically, the word is applied to the King of Babylon (Is., xiv, 12) as pre-eminent among the princes of his time; to the high priest Simon son of Onias (Ecclus., l, 6), for his surpassing virtue; to the glory of heaven (Apoc., ii, 28), by reason of its excellency; finally, to Jesus Christ himself (II Petr., i, 19; Apoc., xxii, 16; the "Exultet" of Holy Saturday), the true light of our spiritual life. The Syriac version and the version of Aquila derive the Hebrew noun *hēlēl* from the verb *yālāl*, "to lament"; St. Jerome agrees with them (In Is., i, 14; P. L., XXIV, 161), and makes Lucifer the name of the principal fallen angel, who must lament the loss of his original glory bright as the morning star. In Christian tradition this meaning of Lucifer has prevailed; the Fathers maintain that Lucifer is not the proper name of the devil, but denotes only the state from which he has fallen (Petavius, "De Angelis", III, iii, 4).

The principal commentaries on the foregoing texts of Sacred Scripture and LESÈTRE in *Dict. de la Bible*, IV, 407 sqq.

A. J. MAAS.

Lucifer of Cagliari (LUCIFER CALARITANUS), bishop, must have been born in the early years of the fourth century; d. in 371. His birthplace and the circumstances of his youth are unknown. He first appears in ecclesiastical history, in full maturity of strength and abilities, in 354 when he was deputed by Pope Liberius, with the priest Pancratius and the deacon Hilary, to request the Emperor Constantius to convene a council, to deal with the accusations directed against St. Athanasius and his previous condemnation. This council was convened at Milan. Lucifer there defended the Bishop of Alexandria with much passion and in very violent language, thus furnishing the adversaries of the great Alexandrian with a pretext for resentment and further violence, and causing a new condemnation of Athanasius. Constantius, unaccustomed to independence on the part of the bishops, grievously maltreated Lucifer and his colleague, Eusebius of Vercelli. Both were exiled, Lucifer being sent to Germanica, in Syria, and thence to Eleutheropolis in Palestine; he was finally relegated to the Thebaid.

In the course of this exile Lucifer wrote an extremely virulent pamphlet entitled "Ad Constantium Augustum pro sancto Athanasio libri II", an eloquent defence of Catholic orthodoxy, but in such exaggerated language that it overshot the mark and injured the cause it was meant to serve. Lucifer boasted of his work, and Constantius, tyrant that he was, refrained from further revenge. After the death of Constantius, Julian allowed all the exiles to return to their cities. Lucifer went to Antioch, and at once meddled in the dissensions which divided the Catholic party. He prolonged and embittered them by consecrating a bishop who appeared to him capable of continuing the opposition to the bishop and party which he judged the weaker under the circumstances. Incapable of tact, he aggravated the dissenters, instead of dealing cautiously with them in order to win them, and displayed special severity towards those Catholics who had wavered in their adherence to the Nicene Creed. About this time a Council of Alexandria presided over by St. Athanasius decreed that Arians renouncing their heresy should be pardoned and that bishops who, by compulsion, had temporized with heretics should not be disturbed. Against this indulgence Lucifer protested, and went so far as to anathematize his former friend, Eusebius of Vercelli, who carried out the decrees of the Council of Alexandria. Seeing that his extreme opinions won partisans neither West nor East, he withdrew to Sardinia, resumed his see, and formed a small sect called the Luciferians. These sectaries pretended that all priests who had participated in Arianism should be deprived of their dignity, and that bishops who recognized the rights of even repentant heretics should be excommunicated. The Luciferians, being earnestly opposed, commissioned two priests, Marcellinus and Faustinus, to present a petition, the well-known "Libellus precum", to the Emperor Theodosius, explaining their grievances and claiming protection. The emperor forbade further pursuit of them, and their schism seems not to have lasted beyond this first generation.

HARTEL in *Corp. script. eccles. lat.*, XIV (1886); USENER, *Lucifer von Cagliari und sein Latein* in *Archiv für latein. Lexikogr. und Gramm.*, III (1886), 1–58; KRÜGER, *Lucifer Bischof von Calaris und das Schisma der Luciferianer* (Leipzig, 1886); TILLEMONT, *Mém. hist. ecclés.*, VII (1700), 514–24, 763–66; DAVIES in *Dict. Christ. Biog.*, s. v.

H. LECLERCQ.

Lucina, CRYPT OF, the traditional title of the most ancient section of the catacomb of St. Callistus. According to the theory of De Rossi, St. Lucina (honoured at Rome on 30 June), after whom this portion of the cemetery is called, was the original donor of the area, and at the same time identical with the noble Roman matron, Pomponia Græcina, wife of the conqueror of Britain, Aulus Plautius. Lucina is believed to have been the baptismal name of Pomponia Græcina. De Rossi's hypothesis, which is generally accepted, rests on a passage of the "Annals" of Tacitus (XIII, xxxii), and on certain inscriptions discovered in the Crypt of Lucina. According to Tacitus, "Pomponia Græcina, a distinguished lady, wife of the Plautius who on his return from Britain received an ovation, was accused of some foreign superstition, and handed over to her husband's judicial decision. Following ancient precedent, he heard his wife's cause in the presence of kinsfolk, involving, as it did, her legal status and character, and he reported that she was innocent. This Pomponia lived a long life of unbroken melancholy. After the murder of Julia, Drusus's daughter, by Messalina's treachery, for forty years she wore only the attire of a mourner with her heart ever sorrowful. For this, during the reign of Claudius,

she escaped unpunished, and it was afterwards counted a glory to her." The "foreign superstition" of the Roman historian is now generally regarded as probably identical with the Christian religion. When de Rossi first conjectured that this might be the case, he announced his view merely as a more or less remote probability, but subsequent discoveries in the cemetery of St. Callistus confirmed his supposition in the happiest manner. The first of these discoveries



SECTION OF THE CRYPT OF LUCINA

was the tomb of a *Pomponius Grekeinos*, evidently a member of the family of Pomponia, and possibly her descendant; the inscription dates from about the beginning of the third century. A short distance from this, the tomb of a Pomponius Bassus was also found —another member of the family to which belonged the mysterious lady of the reign of Claudius. Thus the conversion to Christianity of this noble lady is established with a degree of probability that approaches certainty.

NORTHCOTE AND BROWNLOW, *Roma Sotterranea*, I (2nd ed., London, 1879), 82–3, 279–81; STOKES in SMITH AND WACE, *Dict. Christ. Biog.*, IV (London, 1887), s. v. *Pomponia Græcina*.

MAURICE M. HASSETT.

Lucius I, SAINT, POPE (253–254); d. at Rome, 5 March, 254. After the death of St. Cornelius, who died in exile in the summer of 253, Lucius was chosen to fill his place, and consecrated Bishop of Rome. Nothing is known of the early life of this pope before his elevation. According to the "Liber Pontificalis", he was Roman born, and his father's name was Porphyrius. Where the author obtained this information is not known. The persecution of the Church under the Emperor Gallus, during which Cornelius had been banished, still went on. Lucius also was sent into exile soon after his consecration, but in a short time, presumably when Valerian was made emperor, he was allowed to return to his flock. The Felician Catalogue, whose information is found in the "Liber Pontificalis", informs us of the banishment and the miraculous return of Lucius: "Hic exul fuit et postea nutu Dei incolumis ad ecclesiam reversus est." St. Cyprian, who wrote a (lost) letter of congratulation to Lucius on his elevation to the Roman See and on his banishment, sent a second letter of congratulation to him and his companions in exile, as well as to the whole Roman Church (ep. lxi, ed. Hartel, II, 695 sqq.).

The letter begins: "Beloved Brother, only a short time ago we offered you our congratulations, when in exalting you to govern His Church God graciously bestowed upon you the twofold glory of confessor and bishop. Again we congratulate you, your companions, and the whole congregation, in that, owing to the kind and mighty protection of our Lord, He has led you back with praise and glory to His own, so that the flock can again receive its shepherd, the ship her pilot, and the people a director to govern them and to show openly that it was God's disposition that He permitted your banishment, not that the bishop who had been expelled should be deprived of his Church, but rather that he might return to his Church with greater authority." Cyprian continues, alluding to the three Hebrew children in the fiery furnace, that the return from exile did not lessen the glory of the confession, and that the persecution, which was directed only against the confessors of the true Church, proved which was the Church of Christ. In conclusion he describes the joy of Christian Rome on the return of its shepherd. When Cyprian asserts that the Lord by means of persecution sought "to bring the heretics to shame and to silence them," and thus to prove where the Church was, who was her one bishop chosen by God's dispensation, who were her presbyters bound up with the bishop in the glory of the priesthood, who were the real people of Christ, united to His flock by a peculiar love, who were those who were oppressed by their enemies, and at the same time who those were whom the Devil protects as his own, he obviously means the Novatians. The schism of Novatian, through which he was brought forward as antipope, in opposition to Cornelius, still continued in Rome under Lucius.

In the matter of confession and the restoration of the "Lapsi" (fallen) Lucius adhered to the principles of Cornelius and Cyprian. According to the testimony of the latter, contained in a letter to Pope Stephen (ep. lxviii, 5, ed. Hartel, II, 748), Lucius, like Cornelius, had expressed his opinions in writing: "Illi enim pleni spiritu Domini et in glorioso martyrio constituti dandam esse lapsis pacem censuerunt et pœnitentia acta fructum communicationis et pacis negandum non esse litteris suis signaverunt." (For they, filled with the spirit of the Lord and confirmed in glorious martyrdom, judged that pardon ought to be given to the Lapsi, and signified in their letters that, when these had done penance, they were not to be denied the enjoyment of communion and reconciliation.) Lucius died in the beginning of March, 254. In the "Depositio episcoporum" the "Chronograph of 354" gives the date of his death as 5 March, the "Martyrologium Hieronymianum" as 4 March. The first date is probably right. Perhaps Lucius died on 4 March and was buried 5 March. According to the "Liber Pontificalis" this pope was beheaded in the time of Valerian, but this testimony cannot be admitted. It is true that Cyprian in the letter to Stephen above mentioned (ep. lxviii, 5) gives him, as well as Cornelius, the honorary title of martyr: "servandus est enim antecessorum nostrorum beatorum martyrum Cornelii et Lucii honor gloriosus" (for the glorious memory of our predecessors the blessed martyrs Cornelius and Lucius is to be preserved); but probably this was on account of Lucius's short banishment. Cornelius, who died in exile, was honoured as a martyr by the Romans after his death; but not Lucius. In the Roman calendar of feasts of the "Chronograph of 354" he is mentioned in the "Depositio episcoporum", and not under the head of "Depositio martyrum". His memory was, nevertheless particularly honoured, as is clear from the appearance of his name in the "Martyrologium Hieronymianum". Eusebius, it is true, maintains (Hist. Eccl., VII, 10) that Valerian was favourable to the Christians in the early part of his reign. The emperor's first persecution edict appeared only in 257.

Lucius was buried in a compartment of the papal vault in the catacombs of St. Callistus. On the excavation of the vault, de Rossi found a large fragment of the original epitaph, which only gives the pope's name in Greek: ΛΟΥΚΙϹ. The slab is broken off just behind the word, so that in all probability there was nothing else on it except the title ΕΠΙϹΚΟΠΟϹ (bishop). The relics of the saint were transferred by Pope Paul I (757–767) to the church of San Silvestro in Capite, or by Pope Paschal I (817–824) to the Basilica of St. Praxedes [Marucchi, "Basiliques et églises de Rome", Rome, 1902, 399 (inscription in San Silvestro), 325 (inscription in S. Praxedes)]. The author of the "Liber Pontificalis" has unauthorizedly ascribed to St. Lucius a decretal, according to which two priests and three deacons must always accompany the bishop to bear witness to his virtuous life: "Hic præcepit, ut duo presbyteri et tres diaconi in omni loco episcopum non desererent propter testimonium ecclesiasticum." Such a measure might have been necessary under certain conditions at a later period; but in Lucius's time it was incredible. This alleged decree induced a later forger to invent another apocryphal decretal, and attribute it to Lucius. The story in the "Liber Pontificalis" that Lucius, as he was being led to death, gave the archdeacon Stephen power over the Church, is also a fabrication. The feast of St. Lucius is held on 4 March.

Liber Pontificalis, ed. Duchesne, I, XCVII, 153; Allard, *Histoire des persécutions*, III (Paris, 1887), 27 sq.; de Rossi, *Roma sotterranea*, II (Rome, 1867), 62–70; Jaffé, *Regesta Rom. Pont.*, 2nd ed., I, 19–20; Wilpert, *Die Papstgräber und die Cäciliengruft* (Freiburg im Br., 1909), 19.

J. P. Kirsch.

Lucius II, Pope (Gherardo Caccianemici dal Orso), b. at Bologna, unknown date, d. at Rome, 15 February, 1145. Before entering the Roman Curia he was a canon regular in Bologna. In 1124 Honorius II created him Cardinal-Priest of Santa Croce in Gerusalemme. From 1125–1126 he was papal legate in Germany where he took part in the election of King Lothair III in 1125, was instrumental in the appointment of St. Norbert as Bishop of Magdeburg in July, 1126, and helped settle the quarrel concerning the filling of the See of Würzburg, after Bishop Gebhard had been deposed by papal authority in 1126. During the pontificate of Innocent II (1130–43) we find him three times as legate in Germany, viz., in the years 1130–1, 1133–4, and 1136. In all these legations he loyally supported the interests of Innocent II, and it must be ascribed chiefly to his exertions that Lothair III made two expeditions to Italy for the purpose of protecting Innocent II against the antipope, Anacletus II. Towards the end of the pontificate of Innocent II he was appointed papal chancellor and librarian. He was elected and consecrated pope at Rome on 12 March, 1144, to succeed Celestine II who had reigned only five months and twelve days.

The new pope took the name of Lucius II; shortly after his accession he had a conference with King Roger of Sicily at Ceperano early in June, 1144, for the purpose of reaching an understanding with the king regarding his duties as a vassal of the Apostolic See. Roger's demands, however, were so extravagant that Lucius on the advice of his cardinals rejected them. The king now had recourse to arms and Lucius was forced to conclude a truce on terms that were dictated by Roger. In Rome affairs were even less promising. Lucius, indeed, had succeeded in dissolving the senate which had been reluctantly established by Innocent II and which had practically wrested the temporal power from the pope, but encouraged by the success of King Roger of Sicily, the republican faction now elected Pierleoni, a brother of the antipope Anacletus, as senator and demanded that the pope should relinquish all temporal matters into his hands. After vainly calling upon Emperor Conrad for protection, Lucius II marched upon the Capitol at the head of a small army but suffered defeat. If we may believe the statement of Godfrey of Viterbo in his "Pantheon" (Muratori, "Script rer. Ital.", VII, 461; and P. L., CXCVIII, 988) Lucius II was severely injured by stones that were thrown upon him on this occasion and died a few days later. At a synod held in Rome during May, 1144, he settled the prolonged dispute between the Metropolitan of Tours and the Bishop of Dol by making the latter suffragan of the former. He requested Abbot Peter of Cluny to send thirteen of his monks to Rome and upon their arrival gave them the monastery of St. Sabas on the Aventine on 19 January, 1145. He founded a few other monasteries in Italy and Germany and was especially well disposed towards the recently instituted Order of the Premonstratensians. His epistles and privileges are printed in P. L., CLXXIX, 823–936.

Jaffé, *Regesta pontificum Romanorum* (Leipzig, 1885–8); Watterich, *Pontificum Romanorum v'æ* (Leipzig, 1862), 278–281; Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, V (Freiburg, 1886), 492 sq.; Grisar in *Kirchenlex.*, also the histories of the city of Rome by Gregorovius and von Reumont.

Michael Ott.

Lucius III, Pope, (Ubaldo Allucingoli), b. at Lucca, unknown date; d. at Verona, 25 November, 1185. Innocent II created him Cardinal-Priest of Santa Prassede on 23 February, 1141, and afterwards sent him as legate to France. Under Eugene III he was sent as legate to Sicily and on 1 January, 1159, he became Bishop of Ostia and Velletri. In 1177 he was commissioned by Alexander III to take part in the famous peace congress of Venice, where an amicable settlement was reached between Alexander III and Emperor Frederick I. Hereupon he was appointed a member of the court of arbitration which was instituted to investigate the validity of the donation of Countess Matilda, but which arrived at no definite conclusion. On 1 September, 1181, a day after the death of Alexander III, he was elected pope at Velletri where he was also crowned on the following Sunday, 6 September. In the beginning of November he came to Rome, but there the revolutionary party soon became so incensed against him because he refused to grant them certain privileges which his predecessors had granted, that he was compelled to leave Rome in the middle of March, 1182. He went to Velletri where he received the ambassadors whom King William of Scotland had sent to obtain absolution from the ban which he had incurred under Alexander III. He freed the king from all ecclesiastical censures and as a sign of good will sent him the Golden Rose on 17 March, 1183. From Velletri the pope proceeded to Segni where on 5 September, 1183, he canonized Saint Bruno, who had been bishop of that place. He again returned to Rome endeavouring to put an end to the continual intestine dissensions of the Romans, but they made life so unbearable to him that he left the city a second time.

After spending a short time in Southern Italy Lucius III went to Bologna where he consecrated the cathedral on 8 July, 1184. The remainder of his pontificate he spent at Verona, where, with the co-operation of Emperor Frederick I, he convened a synod from October to November, 1184, at which severe measures were taken against the prevalent heresies of those days, especially against the Cathari, the Waldenses, and the Arnoldists. At this synod the emperor promised to make preparations for a crusade to the Holy Land. Though the relations between Lucius III and Emperor Frederick I were not openly hostile, still they were always strained. When after the death of Bishop Arnold of Trier a double election ensued, the pope firmly refused to give his approbation to Volkmar, the candidate of the minority, although the Emperor had already invested him at Constance. Neither did Lucius III yield to the emperor who de-

manded that the German bishops, unlawfully appointed by the antipopes during the pontificate of Alexander III, should be reconsecrated and retain their sees. He also refused to grant Frederick's request to crown his son Henry IV emperor. On the other hand, Frederick would not acknowledge the validity of the Matildan donations to the Holy See, and did not assist Lucius against the Roman barons. The letters and decrees of Lucius III are printed in P. L., CCI, 1071–1376.

JAFFÉ, *Regesta pontificum Romanorum* (Leipzig, 1885–8); *Liber Pontificalis*, ed. DUSCHESNE, II (Paris, 1886–92), 450; WATTERICH, *Pontificum Romanorum vitæ*, II (Leipzig, 1862), 650–62; PIGHI, *Centenario di Lucio III e Urbano III in Verona* (Verona, 1886); GRISAR in *Kirchenlex;* SCHEFFER-BOICHORST, *Kaiser Friedrichs letzer Streit mit der Kurie* (1866); GREGOROVIUS, *Gesch. der Stadt Rom im Mittelalter* (Stuttgart, 1859–72); VON REUMONT, *Gesch. der Stadt Rom* (Berlin, 1867–70).

MICHAEL OTT.

Lucius, KING OF BRITAIN. See ELEUTHERIUS, POPE; WELSH CHURCH.

Luck. See LUTZK, DIOCESE OF.

Luçon, DIOCESE OF (LUCIONENSIS), embraces the Department of La Vendée. It was suppressed by the Concordat of 1801 and annexed to the Diocese of La Rochelle; however, its re-establishment was agreed upon in the Concordat of 1817 and came into effect in 1821. The new Diocese of Luçon comprised the territory of the ancient diocese (minus a few parishes incorporated in the Diocese of Nantes) and almost all the former Diocese of Maillezais.

DIOCESE OF LUÇON.—The monastery of Luçon was founded in 682 by Ansoald, Bishop of Poitiers, who placed it under the government of St. Philbert (616–684). The latter, being expelled from Jumièges, established the monastery of the Black Benedictines on the Isle of Her (Noirmoutiers), of which Luçon was at first a dependency, probably as a priory. The list of the abbots of Luçon begins about the middle of the eleventh century. In 1317 John XXII erected the Bishopric of Luçon and among the occupants of the see were Nicolas Cœur (1441–51), brother of the celebrated financier Jacques Cœur; Cardinal Jean de Lorraine (1523–4); Cardinal Louis de Bourbon (1524–7); Jacques Duplessis-Richelieu (1584–92); and Armand Duplessis-Richelieu, the famous cardinal (1606–23); Nicolas Colbert, brother of the great minister (1661–71); De Mercy (1775–90), who emigrated during the Revolution and became illustrious through the excellent instructions sent to his priests; and René-François Soyer (1821–45), famed for the activity with which, even as a young priest, he had assumed various disguises and, during the most perilous hours of the Revolution exercised his ecclesiastical functions in the suburbs of Poitiers. Bishop Soyer had for a very short time as his vicar-general the Abbé Affre, who subsequently, as Archbishop of Paris, fell in 1848 on the barricades in an effort to make peace.

DIOCESE OF MAILLEZAIS.—The Benedictine monastery of Maillezais was founded about 989 by Gauzbert, Abbot of St-Julien de Tours, urged thereto by William IV, Duke of Aquitaine, and his wife Emma. Abbot Pierre (about 1100), who followed Richard Cœur de Lion to the crusade, composed two books on the construction and transfer of the Abbey of Maillezais. In 1317 John XXII erected the Bishopric of Maillezais and among its bishops were Guillaume de Lucé (1421–38) and Thibaud de Lucé (1438–55), political counsellors of Charles VII, King of France. In 1631 Urban VIII, with a view to a more active struggle against Protestantism, transferred the residence of the Bishop of Maillezais to Fontenay-le-Comte; in 1648 the see itself was suppressed by Innocent X and its territory annexed to the Aunis district and the Isle of Ré, both of which had been detached from the Diocese of Saintes in order to form that of La Rochelle: this condition lasted until 1821. Besides St. Philbert the principal saints honoured in the Diocese of Luçon are: St. Benedict of Aizenay, a contemporary of St. Hilary, the apostle of Bas Poitou (fourth century); St. Macarius, disciple of St. Martin, apostle of the land of the Mauges (fourth century); St. Viventianus (d. 413); and St. Martin of Vertou (d. 601), apostle of the country of the Herbauges; St. Florent, of the Isle of Yeu, disciple of St. Martin and founder of the monastery of St. Hilaire on the Isle of Yeu (fourth century); St. Lienne, disciple of St. Hilary, Abbot of St. Hilaire le Grand of Poitiers, in whose honour a monastery was erected at La-Roche-sur-Yon (fourth century); St. Senoch of Tiffauges, hermit and miracle-worker (sixth century); St. Amandus, of the Isle of Yeu (d. 675), monk at St. Hilaire on the Isle of Yeu and later Bishop of Maastricht; St. Vitalis or Viaud, hermit (seventh or eighth century); St. Adalard (see ADALARD) who died at Noirmoutiers and, because of his virtue, was called by his contemporaries "Antoine des Gaules"; and Blessed Louis-Marie-Grignion de Montfort (1673–1716).

Rabelais was a Franciscan at Fontenay-le-Comte and a monk in the monastery of Maillezais and was honoured with the friendship of Geoffroy d'Estissac (1518–43), Bishop of Maillezais. The Diocese of Luçon was violently disturbed at the time of the Reformation. In 1568 a canon who fortified himself in the cathedral and sustained a long siege against the Protestants, was captured and hanged, and the Catholics who had shut themselves up in the church with him were massacred. During the Revolution this diocese was the centre of the War of La Vendée. The chief places of pilgrimage are: Notre-Dame de Garreau in the Hermier chapel, visited probably by Louis XIII at the time of his wars against the Huguenots; La Sainte Famille du Chêne at La Rabatelière (since 1874); since the beatification of Grignion de Montfort (22 January, 1888) his tomb and the calvary that he established at Saint-Laurent sur Sèvre, attract over 20,000 pilgrims yearly.

The Diocese of Luçon was the nursery of very important congregations; among the congregations of men dispersed by the Association law of 1901, the following merit mention: the Missionary Priests of the Society of Mary (Compagnie de Marie); and the Christian Brothers of St. Gabriel (Frères de l'instruction chrétienne de Saint Gabriel) founded in 1705 at Saint-Laurent-sur-Sèvre by Blessed Louis-Marie-Grignion de Montfort and whose numbers increased greatly since 1820 under the direction of Père Gabriel Deshayes. In 1901 the Missionary Priests had establishments in ten French dioceses, also in England, Canada, Holland, and Haiti, while the brothers, devoted to teaching, had a membership of 1420 and 165 establishments, some of them in Canada, England, Belgium, and the French Congo. There were also the Sons of Mary Immaculate (Enfants de Marie Immaculée), missionaries and teachers, founded early in the nineteenth century at Chavagnes en Paillers by Venerable Louis-Marie Baudouin, with missionary houses in the English Antilles. Among the congregations of women we must mention: Sisters of Christian Union (Sœurs de l'Union chrétienne), a teaching order founded in 1630 by Marie Lumague with a mother-house at Fontenay-le-Comte; Daughters of Wisdom (Filles de la Sagesse), devoted to nursing and teaching, founded in 1703 by Blessed Grignion de Montfort and having in 1901 a membership of 4800, with 360 establishments in France and 43 in Haiti; Ursulines of Jesus (Ursulines de Jésus), a teaching order founded in 1802 at Chavagnes en Paillers by Venerable Louis-Marie Baudouin with houses in England; Sisters of the Sacred Heart of Jesus and of Mary (Sœurs du Sacré Cœur de Jésus et de Marie), teachers, founded by the Abbé Moreau in 1818, with mother-house at Mormaison to which in 1900 were subject over 1033 members in 154 institutions.

At the end of 1907 there remained in the diocese

eleven religious communities of women. At the close of the nineteenth century the diocese could boast of the following establishments conducted by religious: 42 infant schools, 1 boys' orphanage, 5 girls' orphanages, 1 alms-house, 15 hospitals or hospices, and 13 communities for the care of the sick in their homes. At the end of 1907 the Diocese of Luçon had a population of 441,311, 36 canonical parishes, 262 "succursales" parishes, 154 curacies, 12 chapels-of-ease, and 633 priests.

Gallia christiana, nova, II (1720), 1404–19, and *instrumenta*, 389–428; *nova*, II (1720), 1362–79, and *instrumenta*, 379–90; La Fontenelle de Vaudoré, *Histoire du Monastère et des Evêques de Luçon* (Fontenay-le-Comte, 1847); du Tressay, *Histoire des Moines et des Evêques de Luçon*, I (Paris, 1868); Barbier de Montault, *L'Office de la Conception à Luçon au XV^e siècle* (Vannes, 1888); Boutin, *Légendes des saints du propre de l'église de Luçon* (Fontenay-le-Comte, 1892); Labaulère, *Recherches historiques sur Luçon* (Luçon, 1907); Lacroix, *Richelieu à Luçon* (Paris, 1890); Lacurie, *Histoire de l'abbaye de Maillezais* (Fontenay-le-Comte, 1852); Chevalier, *Topobibl.*, s. v.).

Georges Goyau.

Lucy, Saint, a virgin and martyr of Syracuse in Sicily, whose feast is celebrated by Latins and Greeks alike on 13 Dec. According to the traditional story, she was born of rich and noble parents about the year 283. Her father was of Roman origin, but his early death left her dependent upon her mother, whose name, Eutychia, seems to indicate that she came of a Greek stock. Like so many of the early martyrs, Lucy had consecrated her virginity to God, and she hoped to devote all her worldly goods to the service of the poor. Her mother was not so single-minded, but an occasion offered itself when Lucy could carry out her generous resolutions. The fame of the virgin-martyr Agatha, who had been executed fifty-two years before, in the Decian persecution, was attracting numerous visitors to her relics at Catania, not fifty miles from Syracuse, and many miracles had been wrought through her intercession. Eutychia was therefore persuaded to make a pilgrimage to Catania, in the hope of being cured of a hæmorrhage, from which she had been suffering for several years. There she was in fact cured, and Lucy, availing herself of the opportunity, persuaded her mother to allow her to distribute a great part of their riches among the poor. The largess stirred the greed of the unworthy youth to whom Lucy had been unwillingly betrothed, and he denounced her to Paschasius, the Governor of Sicily. It was in the year 303, during the fierce persecution of Diocletian. She was first of all condemned to suffer the shame of prostitution; but in the strength of God she stood immovable, so that they could not drag her away to the place of shame. Faggots were then heaped about her and set on fire, and again God saved her. Finally, she met her death by the sword. But before she died she foretold the punishment of Paschasius and the speedy termination of the persecution, adding that Diocletian would reign no more, and Maximian would meet his end. So, strengthened with the Bread of Life, she won her crown of virginity and martyrdom.

Saint Lucy
Tiepolo, Church of the Holy Apostles, Venice

This beautiful story cannot unfortunately be accepted without criticism. The details may be only a repetition of similar accounts of a virgin martyr's life and death. Moreover, the prophecy was not realized, if it required that Maximian should die immediately after the termination of his reign. Paschasius, also, is a strange name for a pagan to bear (see Schill in Kraus, "Real-Encyc.", s. v. "Namen"). However, since there is no other evidence by which the story may be tested, it can only be suggested that the facts peculiar to the saint's story deserve special notice. Among these, the place and time of her death can hardly be questioned; for the rest, the most notable are her connexion with St. Agatha and the miraculous cure of Eutychia, and it is to be hoped that these have not been introduced by the pious compiler of the saint's story or a popular instinct to link together two national saints. The story, such as we have given it, is to be traced back to the Acta, and these probably belong to the fifth century. Though they cannot be regarded as accurate, there can be no doubt of the great veneration that was shown to St. Lucy by the early Church. She is one of those few female saints whose names occur in the Canon of St. Gregory, and there are special prayers and antiphons for her in his "Sacramentary" and "Antiphonary". She is also commemorated in the ancient Roman Martyrology. St. Aldhelm (d. 709) is the first writer who utilizes her Acts to give a full account of her life and death. This he does in prose in the "Tractatus de Laudibus Virginitatis" (Tract. xlii, P. L., LXXXIX, 142) and again, in verse, in the poem "De Laudibus Virginum" (P. L., LXXXIX, 266). Following him, the Venerable Bede inserts the story in his Martyrology.

With regard to her relics, Sigebert (1030–1112), a monk of Gembloux, in his "sermo de Sancta Lucia", says that her body lay undisturbed in Sicily for 400 years, until Faroald, Duke of Spoleto, captured the island and transferred the saint's body to Corfinium in Italy. Thence it was removed by the Emperor Otho I, 972, to Metz and deposited in the church of St. Vincent. And it was from this shrine that an arm of the saint was taken to the monastery of Luitburg in the Diocese of Spires—an incident celebrated by Sigebert himself in verse. The subsequent history of the relics is not clear. On their capture of Constanti-

nople in 1204, the French found some of the relics in that city, and the Doge of Venice secured them for the monastery of St. George at Venice. In the year 1513 the Venetians presented to Louis XII of France the head of the saint, which he deposited in the cathedral church of Bourges. Another account, however, states that the head was brought to Bourges from Rome whither it had been transferred during the time when the relics rested in Corfinium.

The lives, by BEAUGRAND (Paris, 1882, It. tr., Mantua, 1896); by CHIERICONI (Cortona, 1888); by SIMONELLI (Caserta, 1893); BIGELMAIR in BUCHBERGER, *Kirchliches Handlex.*, s. v. *Lucia*(1).

JAMES BRIDGE.

Ludden, PATRICK A. See SYRACUSE, DIOCESE OF.

Ludger (LÜDIGER or LIUDGER), SAINT, missionary among the Frisians and Saxons, first Bishop of Münster in Westphalia, b. at Zuilen near Utrecht about 744; d. 26 March, 809. Feast, 26 March. Represented as a bishop reciting his Breviary, or with a swan at either side. His parents, Thiadgrim and Liafburg, were wealthy Frisians of noble lineage. In 753 Ludger saw the great apostle of Germany, St. Boniface, and this sight and the subsequent martyrdom of the saint made deep impressions on his youthful mind. At his urgent request he was sent to the school which St. Gregory had founded at Utrecht, and made good progress. In 767 Gregory, who did not wish to receive episcopal consecration himself, sent Alubert, who had come from England to assist him in his missionary work, to York to be consecrated bishop. Ludger accompanied him to receive deaconship and to study under Alcuin, but after a year returned to Utrecht. Some time later he was granted an opportunity to continue his studies in the same school, and here contracted a friendship with Alcuin which lasted throughout life. In 773 a friction arose between the Anglo-Saxons and the Frisians, and Ludger, to provide for his personal safety, left for home, taking with him a number of valuable books. In 775 he was sent to Deventer to restore the chapel destroyed by the heathen Saxons and to find the relics of St. Lebwin (Liafwin), who had laboured there as missionary, had built the chapel, and had died there. Ludger was successful in his undertaking, and then taught in the school of Utrecht. He and some others were next sent north to destroy the heathen places of worship west of the Lauwers Zee.

After Ludger had been ordained at Cologne in 777 the missions of Ostergau (Ostracha, i. e., Eastern Friesland) were committed to his charge, and Dokkum, the place of the martyrdom of St. Boniface, was made the centre. During each autumn he came to Utrecht to teach at the cathedral school. In this manner he toiled for about seven years, until Widukind, the indomitable leader of the Saxons, induced the Frisians to drive out the missionaries, burn the churches, and return to the heathen gods. Ludger escaped with his disciples. In 785 he visited Rome, was well received by Pope Adrian, and obtained from him good counsel and special faculties. From Rome he went to Monte Cassino, where he lived according to the rule of St. Benedict, but did not bind himself by vows. The news of Widukind's submission, and the arrival of Charlemagne at Monte Cassino in 787, put an end to Ludger's peaceful retirement. He was appointed missionary to the five districts at the mouth of the Ems, which was still occupied almost entirely by heathens. With his usual energy and unbounded confidence in God he began his work; and, knowing the language and habits of the people, he was able to turn to advantage many national traits in effecting their conversion. His zeal knew no bounds; the island of Bant, long since swallowed by the sea, is mentioned as the scene of his apostolic work. He visited Heligoland (Fossitesland), where St. Willibrord had preached; he destroyed the remaining vestiges of heathenism, and built a Christian temple. The well once sacred to the heathen gods became his baptismal font. On his return he met the blind bard Berulef, cured his blindness, and made him a devout Christian.

In 793 (Hist. Jahrb., I, 282) Charlemagne wished to make Ludger Bishop of Trier, but he declined the honour, while declaring himself willing to undertake the evangelizing of the Saxons. Charlemagne gladly accepted the offer, and North-western Saxony was thus added to Ludger's missionary field. To defray necessary expenses the income of the Abbey of Leuze, in the present Belgian Province of Hainaut, was given him, and he was told to pick his fellow-labourers from the members of that abbey. As Mimigernaford (Mimigardeford, Miningardvard) had been designated the centre of the new district, Ludger built a monastery (*monasterium*) there, from which the place took its name Münster. Here he lived with his monks according to the rule of St. Chrodegang of Metz, which in 789 had been made obligatory in the Frankish territories (Schmitz Kallenberg, "Monasticon Westphaliæ", Münster, 1909, p. 62, places the date of foundation between 805 and 809). He also built a chapel on the left of the Aa in honour of the Blessed Virgin, besides the churches of Billerbeck, Coesfeld, Herzfeld, Nottuln, and others. Near the church of Nottuln he built a home for his sister, St. Gerburgis, who had consecrated herself to God. Many pious virgins soon gathered about her, and so arose the first convent in Westphalia (c. 803). At the request of Charlemagne, Ludger received episcopal consecration some time between 13 Jan., 802, and 23 April, 805, for on the first date he is still styled abbot, while on the latter he is called bishop (Hist. Jahrb., I, 283). His principal care was to have a good and efficient clergy. He, to a great extent, educated his students personally, and generally took some of them on his missionary tours. Since his sojourn at Monte Cassino Ludger had entertained the idea of founding a Benedictine monastery. During the past years he had been acquiring property and looking for a suitable location. At length he decided upon Werden; but it was only in 799 that building began in earnest, and in 804 that he consecrated the church.

On Passion Sunday, 809, Ludger heard Mass at Coesfeld early in the morning and preached, then went to Billerbeck, where at nine o'clock he again preached, and said his last Mass. That evening he expired peacefully amidst his faithful followers. A dispute arose between Münster and Werden for the possession of his body. His brother Hildegrim being appealed to, after consultation with the emperor, decided in favour of Werden, and here the relics have rested for eleven centuries. Portions have been brought to Münster and Billerbeck. From 22 June to 4 July, 1909, the Diocese of Münster celebrated the eleventh centenary. "Bishop Hermann Dingelstad, the present successor of the apostle, celebrated the Jubilee, uniting it with the golden jubilee of his own priesthood. A most touching scene was witnessed when thousands of men, who had come from far and near, after a stirring sermon of the orator-bishop of Treves, Mgr Felix Korum, renewed their baptismal vows at the same well from which St. Ludgerus had baptized their forefathers. A Benedictine abbot and eleven bishops, among them the archbishop of the saint's Frisian home, Utrecht, and Cardinal Fischer of Cologne, took part in the sacred celebrations" ("America", I, 381).

BUTLER, *Lives of the Saints; Revue Benedictine*, III, 107; VII, 412; STADLER, *Heiligenlex.*; SCHWANE in *Kirchenlex.*; *Geschichtsquellen der Diözese Münster*, IV; PINGSMANN, *Der hl. Ludgerus* (Freiburg, 1879); BÖSER, *Am Grabe des hl. Ludger* (Münster, 1908).

FRANCIS MERSHMAN.

Ludlam, ROBERT, VENERABLE. See GARLICK, NICHOLAS, VENERABLE.

Ludmilla (Lidmilla), Saint, wife of Boriwoi, the first Christian Duke of Bohemia, b. at Mielnik, c. 860; d. at Tetin, near Beraun, 15 September, 921. She and her husband were baptized, probably by St. Methodius, in 871. Pagan fanatics drove them from their country, but they were soon recalled, and after reigning seven more years they resigned the throne in favour of their son Spitignev and retired to Tetin. Spitignev died two years later and was succeeded by Wratislaw, another son of Boriwoi and Ludmilla. Wratislaw was married to Drahomira, a pretended Christian, but a secret favourer of paganism. They had twin sons, St. Wenceslaus and Boleslaus the Cruel, the former of whom lived with Ludmilla at Tetin. Wratislaw died in 916, leaving the eight-year-old Wenceslaus as his successor. Jealous of the great influence which Ludmilla wielded over Wenceslaus, Drahomira instigated two noblemen to murder her. She is said to have been strangled by them with her veil. She was at first buried in the church of St. Michael at Tetin, but her remains were removed to the church of St. George at Prague before the year 1100, probably by St. Wenceslaus, her grandson. She is venerated as one of the patrons of Bohemia, and her feast is celebrated on 16 September.

The chief source is *Vita et passio s. Wenceslai et s. Ludmilæ aviæ ejus*, written probably towards the end of the tenth century by the Benedictine monk Christian, a son of Boleslaw I. Until recently this work was considered a forgery of the 12–14 century. But Pekar, *Die Wenzels- und Ludmilla-Legenden und die Echtheit Christians* (Prague, 1905), and Voigt, *Die von dem Premysliden Christian verfasste und Adalbert von Prag gewidmete Biographie des heil. Wenzel und ihre Geschichtsdarstellung* (Prague, 1907), have adduced grave reasons for its genuineness, *Acta SS.*, IV, 16 Sept.; Dunbar, *Dictionary of Saintly Women*, I (London, 1904), 475–7.

Michael Ott.

Ludolph of Saxony (Ludolph the Carthusian), an ecclesiastical writer of the fourteenth century, date of birth unknown; d. 13 April, 1378. His life is as little known as his works are celebrated. We have no certain knowledge of his native country; for in spite of his surname, "of Saxony", he may well, as Echard remarks, have been born either in the Diocese of Cologne or in that of Mainz, which then belonged to the Province of Saxony. He first joined the Dominicans, passed through an excellent course of literary and theological studies, and may have learnt the science of the spiritual life at the school of the celebrated doctors Tauler and Suso, his contemporaries and companions in religion. After about thirty years spent in the active life, he entered the Charterhouse of Strasburg towards the year 1340. Three years later he was called upon to govern the newly founded (1331) Charterhouse of Coblentz; but scruples of conscience led him to resign his office of prior in 1348; and, having again become a simple monk, first at Mainz and afterwards at Strasburg, he spent the last thirty years of his life in retreat and prayer, and died almost an octogenarian, universally esteemed for his sanctity, although he never seems to have been honoured with any public cult.

Ludolph is one of the many writers to whom the authorship of "The Imitation of Jesus Christ" has been assigned; and if history protests against this, it must nevertheless acknowledge that the true author of that book has manifestly borrowed from the Carthusian. Other treatises and sermons now either lost or very doubtful have also been attributed to him. Two books, however, commend him to posterity: (1) A "Commentary upon the Psalms", concise but excellent for its method, clearness, and solidity. He especially developed the spiritual sense, according to the interpretations of St. Jerome, St. Augustine, Cassiodorus, and Peter Lombard. This commentary, which was very popular in Germany in the Middle Ages, has passed through numerous editions, of which the first dates from 1491, and the last (Montreuil-sur-Mer) from 1891. (2) The "Vita Christi", his principal work. This is not a simple biography as we understand such to-day, but at once a history, a commentary borrowed from the Fathers, a series of dogmatic and moral dissertations, of spiritual instructions, meditations, and prayers, in relation to the life of Christ, from the eternal birth in the bosom of the Father to His Ascension. It has been called a *summa evangelica*, so popular at that time, in which the author has condensed and resumed all that over sixty writers had said before him upon spiritual matters. Nothing shows better the great popularity of the "Vita Christi" than the numerous manuscript copies preserved in libraries and the manifold editions of it which have been published, from the first two editions of Strasburg and Cologne, in 1474, to the last editions of Paris (folio, 1865, and 8vo, 1878). It has besides been translated into Catalonian (Valencia, 1495, folio, Gothic), Castilian (Alcalá, folio, Gothic), Portuguese (1495, 4 vols., folio), Italian (1570), French, "by Guillaume Lernenand, of the Order of Monseigneur St. François", under the title of the "Great Life of Christ" (Lyons, 1487, folio, many times reprinted), and more recently by D. Marie-Prosper Augustine (Paris, 1864) and by D. Florent Broquin, Carthusian (Paris, 1883). St. Teresa and St. Francis de Sales frequently quote from it, and it has not ceased to afford delight to pious souls, who find in it instruction and edification, food for both mind and heart.

Quétif and Echard, *Scriptores Ordinis Prædicatorum*, I, 568; Broquin, *Introductory Notice* to his tr. of the *Vita Christi*, I (Paris, 1883), i-xxvii; Dorean, *Ephemerides of the Carthusian Order*, IV (Montreuil-Sur-Mer, 1900), 384–93.

Ambrose Mougel.

Ludovicus a S. Carolo (Ludovicus Jacob), Carmelite writer, b. at Châlons-sur-Marne (according to some at Chalon-sur-Saône), 20 Aug., 1608; d. at Paris 10 March, 1670. The son of Jean Jacob (whence he is also commonly known as Ludovicus Jacob) and Claudine Mareschal, he entered the Order of Carmelites of the Old Observance in his native town, and made his profession 11 June, 1626. While in Italy (1639) he took great interest in epigraphy, regretting the wholesale destruction of inscriptions in the catacombs. A lasting fruit of his sojourn in Rome was the completion and publication of the "Bibliotheca Pontificia", begun by Gabriel Naudé (1600–53, librarian to Cardinal Mazarin). Though not free from errors and mistakes, the work met with fully deserved success. On his return to France he obtained the post of librarian to Cardinal de Retz, and later on the dignity of royal councillor and almoner. At a later period he became librarian to Achille de Harlay, first president of the parliament, in whose house he lived and finally died.

Besides the work already mentioned, and some twelve books which he edited for their respective authors, he left, according to the "Bibliotheca Carmelitana" (II, 272), twenty-seven printed works and sixty manuscripts, of which the following deserve notice: A relation of the procession held 17 July, 1639, at the church of Sts. Sylvester and Martin at Rome in honour of Our Lady of Mount Carmel (Paris, 1639). Catalogue of authors proving René Gros de Saint-Joyre, the poet, to have been related to Pope Clement IV (Lyons, 1642). The panegyric of Ven. Jeanne de Cambry, of Tournay, Augustinian nun (Paris, 1644). He it was who published the first yearly lists of printed books, an undertaking which speedily found favour with the world of letters as well as with the book trade, and in which he has found numerous imitators down to the present time. We have from his pen the lists of Paris publications for 1643-44 and 1645, and the list of French publications for 1643–45. Among his manuscript notes were collections of bibliographical notices concerning his order, which were utilized by Martialis a S. Johanne Bap-

tista (Bordeaux, 1730), and Villiers de S. Etienne (Orléans, 1752).

Bibl. Carmelit., II, 272-599.

BENEDICT ZIMMERMAN.

Lueger, KARL, burgomaster of Vienna, Austrian political leader and municipal reformer, b. at Vienna, 24 October, 1844; d. there, 10 March, 1910. His father, a custodian in the Institute of Technology in Vienna, was of a peasant family of Neustadtl in Lower Austria, his mother, the daughter of a Viennese cabinet maker. After completing the elementary schools, in 1854 he entered the Theresianum, Vienna, from which he passed in 1862 to the University of Vienna, enrolling in the faculty of law, taking his degree four years later. After serving his legal apprenticeship from 1866 to 1874, he opened an office of his own and soon attained high rank in his profession by his sure and quick judgment, his exceptionally thorough legal knowledge, and his cleverness and eloquence in handling cases before the court. His generosity in giving his services gratuitously to poor clients, who flocked to him in great numbers, was remarkable, and may account largely for the fact that, although he practised law until 1896, he never became a wealthy man.

In 1872, having decided upon a political career, he joined an independent Liberal political organization, the Citizens' Club of the Landstrasse, one of the districts, or wards, of Vienna. Liberalism, which had guided Austria from aristocracy to democracy in government, was at this period the one political creed the profession of which offered any prospect of success in practical politics. But Liberalism had come to mean economic advancement for the capitalist at the cost of the small tradesman, the capitalist being usually a Jew. The result was an appalling material moral degradation and a regime of political corruption focussed at Vienna, which city in the seventies of the last century was the most backward capital in Europe, enormously overtaxed, and with a population sunk in a lazy indifference, political, economic, and religious. The Jewish Liberalism ruled supreme in city and country; public opinion was moulded by a press almost entirely Jewish and anti-clerical; Catholic dogmas and practices were ridiculed; priests and religious insulted in the streets. In 1875 Lueger was elected to the Vienna city council for one year. Re-elected in 1876 for a full term of three years, he resigned his seat in consequence of the exposure of corruption in the city administration. Having now become the leader of the anti-corruptionist movement, he was again elected councillor in 1878 as an independent candidate, and threw himself heart and soul into the battle for purity in the municipal government.

In 1882 Lueger's party, called the Democratic was joined by the Reform and by the German National organizations, the three uniting under the name Anti-Semitic party. In 1885 Lueger associated himself with Baron Vogelsang, the eminent social-political worker, whose influence and principles had great weight in the formation of the future Christian Socialists. The year 1885 witnessed, too, Lueger's election to the Reichsrat, where, although the only member of his party in the house, he quickly assumed a leading position. He made a memorable attack on the dual settlement between Austria and Hungary, and against what he bitterly called "Judeo-Magyarism" on the occasion of the *Ausgleich* between Austria and Hungary in 1886. A renewal of this attack in 1891 almost caused him to be hounded from the house. At his death there were few members of the Austrian Reichsrat who did not share his views. In 1890 Lueger had been elected to the Lower Austrian Landtag; here again he became the guiding spirit in the struggle against Liberalism and corruption. In municipal, state, and national politics he was now the leader of the Anti-Semitic and Anti-Liberal party, the back-bone of which was the union of Christians called variously the Christian Socialist Union and, in Vienna especially, the United Christians. This union developed later into the present (1910) dominant party in Austria, the Christian Socialists. In 1895 the United Christians were strong enough to elect Lueger burgomaster of Vienna, but his majority in the council was too small to be effective and he would not accept. His party returning after the September elections with an increased majority, Lueger was once more elected burgomaster, but Liberal influence prevented his confirmation by the emperor. The council stubbornly re-elected him and was dissolved. In 1896 he was again chosen. Not, however, until the brilliant victory of his party, now definitely called the Christian Socialist party, in the Reichsrat elections in 1897, when he was for the fifth time chosen burgomaster, did the emperor confirm the choice.

Lueger's subsequent activity was devoted to moulding and guiding the policy of the Christian Socialist party and to the re-creation of Vienna, of which he remained burgomaster until his death, his re-election occurring in 1903 and 1909. The political ideal of the Christian Socialists is a German-Slav-Magyar state under the Habsburg dynasty, federal in plan, Catholic in religion but justly tolerant of other beliefs, with the industrial and economic advancement of all the people as an enduring political basis. The triumph of the party has conditioned an ever-increasing revival of Catholic religious life and organization of every kind. Under Lueger's administration Vienna was transformed. Nearly trebled in size, it became, in perfection of municipal organization and in success of municipal ownership, a model to the world. In beauty it is now unsurpassed by any European capital. A born leader of the people, Lueger joined to a captivating exterior a fiery eloquence tempered by a real Viennese wit, great organizing power, unsullied loyalty to the Habsburg dynasty, and unimpeachable integrity. Among all classes his influence and popularity were unbounded. A beautiful characteristic was his tender love of his mother; he was himself in turn idolized by children. He was anti-Semitic only because Semitism in Austria was politically synonymous with political corruption and oppressive capitalism. Lueger never married. A fearless outspoken Catholic, the defence of Catholic rights was ever in the forefront of his programme. His cheerfulness, resignation, and piety throughout his last illness edified the nation. His funeral was the most imposing ever accorded in Vienna to anyone not a royal personage.

STAURACZ, *Dr. Karl Lueger, Zehn Jahre Bürgermeister* (Vienna, 1907); IDEM, *Dr. Lueger's Leben und Wirken* (Klagenfurt); *Dublin Review*, CXLII, 321; DRUM in the *Messenger*, 1908; AHERN in *America*, III, 5, 33.

M. J. AHERN.

Lugano. See BASLE-LUGANO, DIOCESE OF.

Lugo, DIOCESE OF (LUCENSIS), in Galicia, Spain, a suffragan of Santiago, said to have been founded (by Agapitus) in Apostolic times. The see certainly existed in the fifth century, as the authentic catalogue of its bishops begins with Agrescius (A. D. 433), who is ranked as a metropolitan; Lugo, however, became a suffragan of Braga somewhat later. In 561 it was restored to its ancient dignity, Orense, Iria, Astorga, and Britonia being its dependent sees. Councils were held at Lugo in 569, 572, and perhaps 610 (see Baronius, 1597; Hardouin, Conc., II, 373). In 666 it again lost its metropolitan rank. The see is now occupied by Mgr Emmanuel Basulto y Gimenez, elected 4 September, 1909, in succession to Mgr Murua y López; the diocese embraces all the province of Lugo and part of Pontevedra and Coruña. It contains 1102 parishes, (Perujo says 647, *infra*), 1108 priests, 649 chapels, and 21 oratories. There are 5 religious houses for men, and

8 convents of women. The population is about 366,000, practically all Catholics. The diocese takes its name from the capital of the province (19,000 inhabitants) which is situated on the Rio Miño. The city is surrounded by an immense Roman wall, 36 feet high and 19 feet broad. It possesses a fine cathedral dedicated to St. Froilano, built about 1129, though the actual main façade and towers date only from 1769. Its elegant stalls were carved by Francisco Mouro (1624). This cathedral enjoys the extraordinary privilege of having the Blessed Sacrament perpetually exposed, a privilege which is commemorated in the armorial bearings of the town. The seminary of San Lorenzo, Lugo, with 400 students, was founded in 1591; it is incorporated with the University of Salamanca.

Perujo and Angulo, *Dicc. de Ciencias Eclesiást.*, s. v.; Flórez, *España sagrada*, XL (1796), XLI, (1798).

A. A. MacErlean.

Lugo, Francisco de, Jesuit theologian, b. at Madrid, 1580; d. at Valladolid, 17 December, 1652. He was the elder brother of Cardinal de Lugo, and, like him, a distinguished member of the Society of Jesus, which he entered at the novitiate of Salamanca in 1600. In answer to his request for the foreign missions, he was sent to Mexico, where, quite apart from any desire of his own, he was appointed to teach theology, a task which his rare talent enabled him to perform with much success. Being recalled to Spain, he sailed in company with others under the protection of the Spanish fleet; but unfortunately during the voyage the Spanish fleet encountered the Dutch, and in the ensuing struggle Francisco de Lugo, although he succeeded in saving his life, could not save the greater part of his commentary on the entire Summa of St. Thomas. He subsequently taught both philosophy and theology in Spain, was censor of books, and theologian to the General of the Society of Jesus at Rome. Having been twice rector of the College of Valladolid, he died with the reputation of being a brilliant theologian and a very holy man, being especially remarkable for humility. His published works are: "Theologia scholastica"; "Decursus prævius ad theologiam moralem"; "De septem Ecclesiæ sacramentis, praxim potius quam speculationem attendens et intendens"; "De sacramentis in genere".

Hurter, *Nomenclator literarius*, I, 373; Sommervogel, *Bibl. de la C. de J.*, V, 75.

J. H. Fisher.

Lugo, John de, Spanish Jesuit and Cardinal, one of the most eminent theologians of modern times, b. at Madrid in November, 1583, though he used to call himself "Hispalensis", because his family seat was at Seville; d. at Rome, 29 August, 1660. Both his father, John de Lugo, and his mother, Teresa de Quiroga, whose family name he bore for a time, as was the custom for the second son, were of noble birth. Such was de Lugo's intellectual precocity that at the age of three years he could read printed or written books; at ten, he received the tonsure; at fourteen, he defended a public thesis in logic, and about the same time was appointed by Philip II to an ecclesiastical benefice which he retained till his solemn profession in 1618. Like his elder brother Francis, he was sent by his father to the University of Salamanca to study law; but Francis having entered the Society of Jesus where he became a distinguished theologian, John soon desired to imitate him and, having vainly asked his father's permission, in two letters, he entered without it in 1603. After completing his studies, he was appointed professor of philosophy at Medina del Campo, in 1611, and later of theology at Valladolid, where he taught for five years. His fame as a professor of theology attracted the attention of the General of the Jesuits, Mutius Vitelleschi, and de Lugo was summoned to Rome, where he arrived early in June, 1621.

The teaching of de Lugo at Rome was brilliant; his lectures even before being printed were spread by copyists in other countries. When the General of the Society ordered him to print his works, he obeyed and without help had the material for the first three volumes prepared within five years (1633, 1636, 1638). When the fourth volume, "De justitia et jure", was about to be published, his superiors thought it proper that he should dedicate it to Urban VIII; de Lugo had to present it himself to the pope, who was so much surprised and delighted by the theologian's learning and judgment that he frequently consulted him, and in 1643, created him a cardinal. This put an end to de Lugo's teaching; but several of his works were published after 1643. As cardinal he took part in the Congregations of the Holy Office, of the Council, etc. and often had occasion to place his learning at the service of the Church. He died aged seventy-seven, being assisted by Cardinal Sforza Pallavicini, one of his most devoted disciples, also a Jesuit. According to his wish, he was buried near the tomb of St. Ignatius that "his heart might rest where his treasure was", as is said in his epitaph. De Lugo was a man not only of great learning, but also of great virtue; obedience alone induced him to publish his works and he always retained the simplicity and humility which had led him to refuse, but for the pope's order, the cardinalitial dignity; the fine carriage sent by Cardinal Barberini to bring him as a cardinal to the pope's palace, he called his hearse. His generosity to the poor was very great, and although his income was small, he daily distributed among them bread, money, and even remedies, such as quinquina, then newly discovered, which the people at Rome used for a time to call Lugo's powder.

The works of John de Lugo, some of which have never been printed, cover nearly the whole field of moral and dogmatic theology. The first volume "De Incarnatione Domini" (Lyons, 1633), of which the short preface is well worth reading to get an idea of de Lugo's method, came out in 1633. It was followed by: "De sacramentis in genere;" "De Venerabili Eucharistiæ Sacramento et de sacrosancto Missæ Sacrificio" (Lyons, 1636); "De Virtute et Sacramento pœnitentiæ, de Suffragiis et Indulgentiis" (Lyons, 1638); and "De justitia et jure" (Lyons, 1642), the work on which de Lugo's fame especially rests. In the composition of this important treatise, he was greatly aided by his knowledge of law acquired in his younger days at Salamanca, and it was this work which he dedicated and presented to the pope in person and which may be said to have gained for him a cardinal's hat. De Lugo wrote two other works: "De virtute fidei divinæ" (Lyons, 1646), and "Responsorum moralium libri sex" (Lyons, 1651), published by his former pupil and friend, Cardinal Sforza Pallavicini. In these six books de Lugo gives, after thorough discussion, the solution of many difficult cases in moral theology; this work has a very high value both from a theoretical and a practical standpoint, as in the main it consists of questions proposed to him for solution during long years. The seventh volume, "De Deo, de Angelis, de Actibus humanis et de Gratia" (Cologne, 1716), was published over fifty years after the author's death; the idea, as we find it expressed on the title page, was to complete his printed course of lectures. Other works on theology and especially on philosophy: "De Anima", "Philosophia", "Logica", "De Trinitate", "De Visione Dei", etc. are still preserved in manuscripts in the libraries of Madrid, Salamanca, Karlsruhe, Mechlin, etc.

Among the unprinted works, the analysis of Arnauld's book "De frequenti Communione" and the "Memorie del conclave d'Innocenzo X: Riposta al discorso . . . che le corone hanno jus d'eschiudere li cardinali del Pontificato" may be of special interest; they are the only controversial works of de Lugo.

THE DORMITION OF THE VIRGIN

BERNARDINO LUINI, THE PRADO, MADRID

What he intended in his writings was not to give a long treatise, exhaustive from every point of view; he wished only "to open up a small river, to the ocean", without repeating what others had said before him and without giving a series of opinions of previous writers or furnishing authors and quotations in number; he aimed at adding what he had found from his own reflexion and deep meditation on each subject. Other important features of his theological conceptions are the union he always maintains between moral and dogmatic theology, the latter being the support of the former, and the same treatment being applied to both, discussing thoroughly the principle on which the main points of the doctrine rest. From this point of view the last lines of his preface "De justitia et jure", are instructive.

All his writings, whether on dogmatic or moral theology, exhibit two main qualities: a penetrating critical mind, sometimes indulging a little too much in subtilities, and a sound judgment. He may be ranked among the best representatives of the theological revival of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The small river he wished to open up, is indeed one of the most important which empties its waters into the ocean of theology, so that in many dogmatic or moral questions, the opinion of de Lugo is of preponderating value. In several problems he formed a system of his own, as for instance about faith, the Eucharist, the hypostatic union, etc., and owing to the thorough discussion of the question at issue, his opinion is always to be taken into account. In moral theology he put an end, as Ballerini remarks, to several disputed points. St. Alphonsus de Liguori does not hesitate to rank him immediately after St. Thomas Aquinas, "post S. Thomam facile princeps", and Benedict XIV calls him "a light of the Church". Two complete editions of Lugo's works were published at Venice in 1718 and 1751, each edition containing seven volumes. Another edition (Paris, 1768) was never completed. The last edition is that of Fournials (Paris, 1868-69), in seven volumes, to which an eighth volume with the "Responsa moralia" and the "Indices" was added in 1891.

HURTER, *Nomencla'or*, III (Innsbruck, 1907), 911; SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibliothèque de la Campagnie de Jésus*, V (Brussels, 1896), 175: IX, 619; ANDRADE, *Varones ilu tres*, V, 221–244.

J. DE GHELLINCK.

Lugos, DIOCESE OF, in Hungary, suffragan of Fogaras and Alba Julia of the Uniat-Rumanian Rite, was erected in November, 1853, with that of Armenopolis, or Szamos-Ujvár, out of parishes taken away from Fogaras and Grosswardein (Nagy-Várad); it had then 90 parishes and about 47,000 faithful. Its first bishop, Mgr Dobra, 1854–70, was also the first of all the Austro-Hungarian clergy of the Byzantine Rite to obtain the title of Doctor; in spite of countless difficulties, he contributed by his learning and holy life to bring several thousand Orthodox back to Catholicism. As his diocese had no foundation, Mgr Dobra established the Rudolph foundation for poor students and another for aged priests or widowers. After him the diocese was administered by Mgr John Olteanu, transferred to Grosswardein in 1873; Mgr Victor Mihályi de Apsia, 1874–96, subsequently transferred to the archiepiscopal See of Fogaras, and during whose episcopacy a diocesan synod was held in November, 1882; Mgr Demetrias Radu, 1896–1903, to-day occupying the See of Grosswardein; finally, Mgr Basil Hosszu the present bishop. This very extensive diocese comprises the Counties of Krassó-Szörény, Torontal, Temes, Hunyad, and a part of Arad; it contains about 98,000 Uniat-Rumanians, 552,000 Catholics of the Latin Rite, 1,002,000 Orthodox Rumanians, several thousand Protestants and Jews. There are 15 unmarried priests, 139 married, and 29 widowers; 163 parishes, 149 churches with resident priest, 14 without priest, 85 primary schools with an attendance of 6730. The diocese has no seminary, but twenty-two ecclesiastical students are being trained elsewhere. The city of Lugos itself has 16,000 inhabitants, 1030 Uniat-Rumanians, 7440 Latins, 4760 Orthodox Rumanians; the remainder Protestants or Jews. Situated on the right bank of the Temes, a tributary of the Danube, in Krassó-Szörény county, it has a church built by Etienne Bathory, a Franciscan monastery, and several other objects of interest. It was the last place of resort of the Hungarian Government of 1849. Its trade is fairly important; in the suburbs are fine vineyards.

NEHER in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v. *Fogaras; Missiones catholicæ* (Rome, 1907), 787–8; *Diecesa Lugoshului Shematism istoric* (Lugos, 1903), contains all the official documents concerning the creation of the Diocese of Lugos and detailed statistics.

S. VAILHÉ.

Luini, BERNARDINO, Milanese painter, b. between 1470 and 1480; d. after 1530. The actual facts known respecting the life history of this delightful painter are very few. We are not even certain that his name was Luini, as he himself uses the Latin form Lovinus, and Vasari calls him in one place, del Lupino, and in another di Lupino. As Luini he has, however, been generally known, and his birth is stated to have taken place at Luino, where there still remain certain frescoes of simple work, said to have been amongst his earliest productions. All we do know about him is that in 1507 he was a master with many commissions, that in 1512 he was working at Chiaravalle and Milan, that he is referred to in the archives of Legnano in 1516, that he was at work in the Great Monastery at Milan for Count Bentivoglio between 1522 and 1524, that he was at Saronno in 1525, that in 1529 and 1530 he was at work at Lugano and in the side chapel of the Great Monastery at Milan, and that he is said to have died, according to one authority in 1532, and according to another in 1533, whilst a manuscript preserved at Saronno seems to imply, although it does not actually state it as a fact, that Luini was alive and residing at that place in 1547. Beyond these facts everything is conjecture. The inhabitants of Luino point to an old house in an open space at the top of a steep road as his birthplace. They have called two of the streets of the town after his name, and there are three tradesmen in the place bearing the same name, and claiming direct descent from the painter.

The frescoes in Luino are characteristic of the painter's work in many respects, exemplifying his strange faults of composition, but possessing a general sense of immaturity, and there seems considerable probability that the Luino traditions respecting them and the birth of the painter, are accurate. We have no evidence that he was a pupil of Leonardo. Influenced, of course, he was by the great painter, and in certain respects—more particularly in his "Christ crowned with Thorns" at Milan, and in certain pictures of the Virgin and Child, notably those at Saronno —he comes exceedingly close in style to Leonardo, while in colouring, design, effect of relief, and depth of feeling, he approaches more nearly to that master than any other artist of the period. His works, however, show a sweetness and an intense fervour of devotion marking them out from those of Leonardo. There is no sign of the mysterious Leonardo smile, nor of the semi-pagan quality which at times is so marked in Leonardo's female figures. Luini was evidently not a philosopher nor a man of deep intellectual discernment, but one of sweet disposition, simple mind, and lofty religious belief. He lacked, no doubt, coherence and skill in composition where many figures are required, but he possessed to a supreme degree the power to create emotion, and to produce upon those who looked at his pictures the still, quiet, religious quality at which he aimed. His earliest fresco work was probably that done for the Casa Pelucca near

Monza, now to be seen either in the Brera, the Louvre, or in one or two private collections, one fragment only remaining at the villa itself. Some of his most beautiful frescoes were included in this scheme of decoration. Probably after this work came the various frescoes done for churches and monasteries at Milan, now to be seen in the Brera, because the religious houses in question have either been closed or destroyed. One of the most important is the Madonna with St. Anthony and St. Barbara, signed with the Latin signature and dated 1521.

Another scheme of decoration he carried out was that for the Casa Litta, the frescoes from which are now to be seen in the Louvre. They include the life-size, half-length Christ, one of Luini's most important works. Less known than these works, however, are those which Luini did at Chiaravalle near Rogoredo, executed in 1512 and 1515, concerning which one or two documents have been recently discovered, giving us the stipend paid to the artist for the work. The largest fresco, however, of this period is the magnificent "Coronation of Our Lord", painted for the Confraternity of the Holy Crown, and now to be seen in the Ambrosian Library. The document concerning it tells us distinctly that the work was commenced on 12 October, 1521, and finished on 22 March, 1522—a veritable *tour de force*, as the fresco is of huge size, crowded with figures, evidently most of them portraits, and contains in the figure of the Redeemer one of the greatest works Luini ever produced. Unfortunately, the dignity of the central figure is rather diminished by the statuesque grandeur of the six kneeling figures representing the members of the confraternity who commissioned the work.

THE DAUGHTER OF HERODIAS RECEIVING THE HEAD OF ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST
Bernardino Luini, Uffizi Gallery, Florence

By far the most notable work, however, which Luini ever executed was the decoration in the church of St. Maurice, known as the Old Monastery, commenced for Giovanni Bentivoglio and his wife, and commemorative of the fact that their daughter took the veil in this church, and entered the monastery with which it was connected. The whole of the east end of the church, including the high altar, was decorated by Luini, and the effect is superb. He returned to the same church in 1528 to decorate the chapel of St. Maurice for Francesco Besozzi, and the whole of the interior of this chapel is covered with his exquisite work, the Flagellation scene and the two frescoes of St. Catherine being of remarkable beauty, and the entire chapel a shrine to the great painter. It is impossible to recount here all Luini's important works, but his frescoes in the sanctuary at Saronno are in their way almost as great as the decoration at the Great Monastery, and perhaps the polytych at Legnano is even more important than either of them, so sumptuous is it in its colouring and so exquisite in its religious feeling.

Of his other work in oil, perhaps the chief and finest cabinet picture is the "Madonna of the Rose Hedge", but it is by fresco work that the artist will always be known, for, exquisite though many of his oil panels may be, yet, by reason of their fine detailed work, minute execution, and high surface, with a very smooth quality, they lack the charm of beauty which belongs to the fresco with its greater breadth and strength and its lower scheme of colouring. Nothing in the fresco work can be finer than the 1530 lunette at Legnano, showing the Madonna, the Divine Child, and St. John the Baptist. Fortunately, the entry in the books of the convent concerning the payment for this fresco can still be seen; it was spread over a long time, and was trifling at the best. In that payment we have our last authoritative statement concerning the painter. True, Salvatori, a Capuchin monk, said that in a convent near Milan there was a picture dated 1547, which Luini commenced, and his son Aurelio finished, while Orlandi, in the Abecedario, definitely states that the painter was alive in 1540—to the Saronno document we have already referred—but from 1533 Luini vanishes into silence, and we can only conjecture concerning any later years. He was the supreme master of fresco work, and had an exquisite feeling for loveliness of form, with a deep sense of the pathos, sorrow, and suffering of life. He was not subtle or profound, his works were not archaic, as were those of Foppa and Borgognone, nor architectural, as those of Bramantino, although from all three men he doubtless derived impressions. His composition is not always well-balanced and is never as rich as that of Sodoma. His colouring is neither luscious nor voluptuous, and especially in his frescoes, quiet, simple, and at times pale and cold, but his pictures invariably, like a note of music, draw a corresponding chord from the heart—a chord which is, at the will of the painter, bright with joy or tremulous with sorrow and grief. He appeals notably to those who pray, and to those who weep, and reveals by his work that he was a man of intense personal feeling, and had an intimate knowledge of the mysteries alike of great joy and bitter sorrow.

WILLIAMSON, *Luini* (London, 1900); GAUTHIEZ, *Luini* (Paris, 1906); LUCA, *Sacred Lombard Art* (Milan, 1897); ORLANDI, *Abecedario* (Venice, 1753); LOMAZZO, *Trattato dell' Arte della Pittura* (Milan, 1584); RIO, *De l'Art Chrétien* (Paris, 1874); ROSINI, *Storia della Pittura Italiana* (Pisa, 1847); documents inspected by the writer at Legnano, Lugano, Luino, Milan and other places.

GEORGE CHARLES WILLIAMSON.

Luke, GOSPEL OF SAINT.—The subject will be treated under the following heads: I. Biography of Saint Luke; II. Authenticity of the Gospel; III. Integrity of the Gospel; IV. Purpose and Contents; V. Sources of the Gospel; Synoptic Problem; VI. Saint Luke's Accuracy; VII. Lysanias, Tetrarch of Abilene; VIII. Who Spoke the Magnificat? IX. The Census of Quirinius; X. Saint Luke and Josephus.

I. BIOGRAPHY OF SAINT LUKE.—The name *Lucas* (Luke) is probably an abbreviation from Lucanus, like

Annas from Ananus, Apollos from Apollonius, Artemas from Artemidorus, Demas from Demetrius, etc. (Schanz, "Evang. des heiligen Lucas", 1, 2; Lightfoot on "Col.", iv, 14; Plummer, "St. Luke", introd.) The word *Lucas* seems to have been unknown before the Christian Era; but Lucanus is common in inscriptions, and is found at the beginning and end of the Gospel in some Old Latin MSS. (ibid.). It is generally held that St. Luke was a native of Antioch. Eusebius (Hist. Eccl., III, iv, 6) has: *Λουκᾶς δὲ τὸ μὲν γένος ὢν τῶν ἀπ' Ἀντιοχείας, τὴν ἐπιστήμην ἰατρὸς, τὰ πλεῖστα συγγεγονὼς τῷ Παύλῳ, καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς δὲ οὐ παρέργως τῶν ἀποστόλων ὡμιλνκώς*—"Lucas vero domo Antiochenus, arte medicus, qui et cum Paulo diu conjunctissime vixit, et cum reliquis Apostolis studiose versatus est." Eusebius has a clearer statement in his "Quæstiones Evangelicæ", IV, i, 270: *ὁ δὲ Λουκᾶς τὸ μὲν γένος ἀπὸ τῆς βοωμένης Ἀντιοχείας ἦν*—"Luke was by birth a native of the renowned Antioch" (Schmiedel, "Encyc. Bib."). Spitta, Schmiedel, and Harnack think this is a quotation from Julius Africanus (first half of the third century). In Codex Bezæ (D) Luke is introduced by a "we" as early as Acts, xi, 28; and, though this is not a correct reading, it represents a very ancient tradition. The writer of Acts took a special interest in Antioch and was well acquainted with it (Acts, xi, 19–27; xiii, 1; xiv, 18–21, 25; xv, 22, 23, 30, 35; xviii, 22). We are told the locality of only one deacon, "Nicolas, a proselyte of Antioch", vi, 5; and it has been pointed out by Plummer that, out of eight writers who describe the Russian campaign of 1812, only two, who were Scotchmen, mention that the Russian general, Barclay de Tolly, was of Scotch extraction. These considerations seem to exclude the conjecture of Renan and Ramsay that St. Luke was a native of Philippi.

St. Luke was not a Jew. He is separated by St. Paul from those of the circumcision (Col., iv, 14), and his style proves that he was a Greek. Hence he cannot be identified with Lucius the prophet of Acts, xiii, 1, nor with Lucius of Rom., xvi, 21, who was *cognatus* of St. Paul. From this and the prologue of the Gospel it follows that Epiphanius errs when he calls him one of the Seventy Disciples; nor was he the companion of Cleophas in the journey to Emmaus after the Resurrection (as stated by Theophylact and the Greek Menol.). St. Luke had a great knowledge of the Septuagint and of things Jewish, which he acquired either as a Jewish proselyte (St. Jerome) or after he became a Christian, through his close intercourse with the Apostles and disciples. Besides Greek, he had many opportunities of acquiring Aramaic in his native Antioch, the capital of Syria. He was a physician by profession, and St. Paul calls him "the most dear physician" (Col., iv, 14). This avocation implied a liberal education, and his medical training is evidenced by his choice of medical language. Plummer suggests that he may have studied medicine at the famous school of Tarsus, the rival of Alexandria and Athens, and possibly met St. Paul there. From his intimate knowledge of the eastern Mediterranean, it has been conjectured that he had lengthened experience as a doctor on board ship. He travelled a good deal, and sends greetings to the Colossians, which seems to indicate that he had visited them.

St. Luke first appears in the Acts at Troas (xvi, 8 sqq.), where he meets St. Paul, and, after the vision, crossed over with him to Europe as an Evangelist, landing at Neapolis and going on to Philippi, "being assured that God had called us to preach the Gospel to them" (note especially the transition into first person plural at verse 10). He was, therefore, already an Evangelist. He was present at the conversion of Lydia and her companions, and lodged in her house. He, together with St. Paul and his companions, was recognized by the pythonical spirit: "This same following Paul and us, cried out, saying: These men are the servants of the most high God, who preach unto you the way of salvation" (verse 17). He beheld Paul and Silas arrested, dragged before the Roman magistrates, charged with disturbing the city, "being Jews", beaten with rods, and thrown into prison. Luke and Timothy escaped, probably because they did not look like Jews (Timothy's father was a gentile). When Paul departed from Philippi, Luke was left behind, in all probability to carry on the work of Evangelist. At Thessalonica the Apostle received highly appreciated pecuniary aid from Philippi (Phil., iv, 15, 16), doubtless through the good offices of St. Luke. It is not unlikely that the latter remained at Philippi all the time that St. Paul was preaching at Athens and Corinth, and while he was travelling to Jerusalem and back to Ephesus, and during the three years that the Apostle was engaged at Ephesus. When St. Paul revisited Macedonia, he again met St. Luke at Philippi, and there wrote his Second Epistle to the Corinthians.

St. Jerome thinks it is most likely that St. Luke is "the brother, whose praise is in the gospel through all the churches" (II Cor., viii, 18), and that he was one of the bearers of the letter to Corinth. Shortly afterwards, when St. Paul returned from Greece, St. Luke accompanied him from Philippi to Troas, and with him made the long coasting voyage described in Acts, xx. He went up to Jerusalem, was present at the uproar, saw the attack on the Apostle, and heard him speaking "in the Hebrew tongue" from the steps outside the fortress Antonia to the silenced crowd. Then he witnessed the infuriated Jews, in their impotent rage, rending their garments, yelling, and flinging dust into the air. We may be sure that he was a constant visitor to St. Paul during the two years of the latter's imprisonment at Cæsarea. In that period he might well become acquainted with the circumstances of the death of Herod Agrippa I, who had died there "eaten up by worms" (*σκωληκόβρωτος*), and he was likely to be better informed on the subject than Josephus. Ample opportunities were given him, "having diligently attained to all things from the beginning", concerning the Gospel and early Acts, to write in order what had been delivered by those "who from the beginning were eyewitnesses and ministers of the word" (Luke, i, 2, 3). It is held by many writers that the Gospel was written during this time; Ramsay is of opinion that the Epistle to the Hebrews was then composed, and that St. Luke had a considerable share in it. When Paul appealed to Cæsar, Luke and Aristarchus accompanied him from Cæsarea, and were with him during the stormy voyage from Crete to Malta. Thence they went on to Rome, where, during the two years that St. Paul was kept in prison, St. Luke was frequently at his side, though not continuously, as he is not mentioned in the greetings of the Epistle to the Philippians (Lightfoot, "Phil.", 35). He was present when the Epistles to the Colossians, Ephesians, and Philemon were written, and is mentioned in the salutations given in two of them: "Luke, the most dear physician, saluteth you" (Col., iv, 14); "There salute thee . . . Mark, Aristarchus, Demas, and Luke my fellow labourers" (Philem., 24). St. Jerome holds that it was during these two years Acts was written.

We have no information about St. Luke during the interval between St. Paul's two Roman imprisonments, but he must have met several of the Apostles and disciples during his various journeys. He stood beside St. Paul in his last imprisonment; for the Apostle, writing for the last time to Timothy, says: "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course. . . . Make haste to come to me quickly. For Demas hath left me, loving this world. . . . Only Luke is with me" (II Tim., iv, 7–11). It is worthy of note that, in the three places where he is mentioned in the Epistles (Col., iv, 14; Philem., 24; II Tim., iv, 11) he is named with St. Mark (cf. Col., iv, 10), the other

Evangelist who was not an Apostle (Plummer); and it is clear from his Gospel that he was well acquainted with the Gospel according to St. Mark; and in the Acts he knows all the details of St. Peter's delivery—what happened at the house of St. Mark's mother, and the name of the girl who ran to the outer door when St. Peter knocked. He must have frequently met St. Peter, and may have assisted him to draw up his First Epistle in Greek, which affords many reminiscences of Luke's style. After St. Paul's martyrdom practically all that is known about him is contained in the ancient "Prefatio vel Argumentum Lucæ", dating back to Julius Africanus, who was born about A. D. 165. This states that he was unmarried, that he wrote the Gospel, in Achaia, and that he died at the age of seventy-four in Bithynia (probably a copyist's error for Bœotia), filled with the Holy Ghost. Epiphanius has it that he preached in Dalmatia (where there is a tradition to that effect), Gallia (Galatia?), Italy, and Macedonia. As an Evangelist, he must have suffered much for the Faith; but it is controverted whether he actually died a martyr's death. St. Jerome writes of him (De Vir. Ill., vii): "Sepultus est Constantinopoli, ad quam urbem vigesimo Constantii anno, ossa ejus cum reliquiis Andreæ Apostoli translata sunt [de Achaia?]." St. Luke is always represented by the calf or ox, the sacrificial animal, because his Gospel begins with the account of Zachary, the priest, the father of John the Baptist. He is called a painter by Nicephorus Callistus (fourteenth century), and by the Menology of Basil II, A. D. 980. A picture of the Virgin in S. Maria Maggiore, Rome, is ascribed to him, and can be traced to A. D. 847 It is probably a copy of that mentioned by Theodore Lector, in the sixth century. This writer states that the Empress Eudoxia found a picture of the Mother of God, at Jerusalem, which she sent to Constantinople (see "Acta SS.", 18 Oct.). As Plummer observes, it is certain that St. Luke was an artist, at least to the extent that his graphic descriptions of the Annunciation, Visitation, Nativity, Shepherds, Presentation, the Shepherd and lost sheep, etc., have become the inspiring and favourite themes of Christian painters.

St. Luke is one of the most extensive writers of the New Testament. His Gospel is considerably longer than St. Matthew's; his two books are about as long as St. Paul's fourteen Epistles; and Acts exceeds in length the Seven Catholic Epistles and the Apocalypse. The style of the Gospel is superior to any N. T. writing except Hebrews. Renan says (Les Evangiles, xiii) that it is the most literary of the Gospels. St. Luke is a painter in words. "The author of the Third Gospel and of the Acts is the most versatile of all New Testament writers. He can be as Hebraistic as the Septuagint, and as free from Hebraisms as Plutarch. . . He is Hebraistic in describing Hebrew society and Greek when describing Greek society" (Plummer, introd.). His great command of Greek is shown by the richness of his vocabulary and the freedom of his constructions.

II. Authenticity of the Gospel.—A. *Internal Evidence.*—The internal evidence may be briefly summarized as follows: The author of Acts was a companion of Saint Paul, namely, Saint Luke; and the author of Acts was the author of the Gospel. The arguments are given at length by Plummer, "St. Luke" in "Int. Crit. Com." (4th ed., Edinburgh, 1901); Harnack, "Luke the Physician" (London, 1907); "The Acts of the Apostles" (London, 1909); etc.

(1) The Author of Acts was a companion of Saint Paul, namely, Saint Luke.—There is nothing more certain in Biblical criticism than this proposition. The writer of the "we" sections claims to be a companion of St. Paul. The "we" begins at Acts, xvi, 10, and continues to xvi, 17 (the action is at Philippi). It reappears at xx, 5 (Philippi), and continues to xxi, 18 (Jerusalem). It reappears again at the departure for Rome, xxvii, 1 (Gr. text), and continues to the end of the book.

Plummer argues that these sections are by the same author as the rest of the Acts: (a) from the natural way in which they fit in; (b) from references to them in other parts; and (c) from the identity of style. The change of person seems natural and true to the narrative, but there is no change of language. The characteristic expressions of the writer run through the whole book, and are as frequent in the "we" as in the other sections. There is no change of style perceptible. Harnack (Luke the Physician, 40) makes an exhaustive examination of every word and phrase in the first of the "we" sections (xvi, 10–17), and shows how frequent they are in the rest of the Acts and the Gospel, when compared with the other Gospels. His manner of dealing with the first word (ὡς) will indicate his method: "This temporal ὡς is never found in St. Matthew and St. Mark, but it occurs forty-eight times in St. Luke (Gospel and Acts), and that in all parts of the work." When he comes to the end of his study of this section, he is able to write: "After this demonstration those who declare that this passage was derived from a source, and so was not composed by the author of the whole work, take up a most difficult position. What may we suppose the author to have left unaltered in the source? Only the 'we'. For, in fact, nothing else remains. In regard to vocabulary, syntax, and style, he must have transformed everything else into his own language. As such a procedure is absolutely unimaginable, we are simply left to infer that the author is here himself speaking." He even thinks it improbable, on account of the uniformity of style, that the author was copying from a diary of his own, made at an earlier period. After this, Harnack proceeds to deal with the remaining "we" sections, with like results. But it is not alone in vocabulary, syntax, and style, that this uniformity is manifest. In "The Acts of the Apostles", Harnack devotes many pages to a detailed consideration of the manner in which chronological data, and terms dealing with lands, nations, cities, and houses, are employed throughout the Acts, as well as the mode of dealing with persons and miracles; and he everywhere shows that the unity of authorship cannot be denied except by those who ignore the facts. This same conclusion is corroborated by the recurrence of medical language in all parts of the Acts and the Gospel.

That the companion of St. Paul who wrote the Acts was St. Luke is the unanimous voice of antiquity. His choice of medical language proves that the author was a physician. Westein, in his preface to the Gospel ("Novum Test. Græcum", Amsterdam, 1741, 643), states that there are clear indications of his medical profession throughout St. Luke's writings; and in the course of his commentary he points out several technical expressions common to the Evangelist and the medical writings of Galen. These were brought together by the Bollandists ("Acta SS.", 18 Oct.). In the "Gentleman's Magazine" for June, 1841, a paper appeared on the medical language of St. Luke. To the instances given in that article, Plummer and Harnack add several others; but the great book on the subject is Hobart, "The Medical Language of St. Luke" (Dublin, 1882). Hobart works right through the Gospel and Acts, and points out numerous words and phrases identical with those employed by such medical writers as Hippocrates, Arctæus, Galen, and Dioscorides. A few are found in Aristotle, but he was a doctor's son. The words and phrases cited are either peculiar to the Third Gospel and Acts, or are more frequent than in other New Testament writings. The argument is cumulative, and does not give way with its weakest strands. When doubtful cases and expressions common to the Septuagint, are set aside, a

large number remain that seem quite unassailable. Harnack (Luke the Physician, 13) says: "It is as good as certain from the subject-matter, and more especially from the style, of this great work that the author was a physician by profession. Of course, in making such a statement one still exposes oneself to the scorn of the critics, and yet the arguments which are alleged in its support are simply convincing. . . . Those, however, who have studied it [Hobart's book] carefully, will, I think, find it impossible to escape the conclusion that the question here is not one of merely accidental linguistic colouring, but that this great historical work was composed by a writer who was either a physician or was quite intimately acquainted with medical language and science. And, indeed, this conclusion holds good not only for the 'we' sections, but for the whole book." Harnack gives the subject special treatment in an appendix of twenty-two pages. Hawkins and Zahn come to the same conclusion. The latter observes (Einl., II, 427): "Hobart has proved for everyone who can appreciate proof that the author of the Lucan work was a man practised in the scientific language of Greek medicine—in short, a Greek physician" (quoted by Harnack, op. cit.).

In this connexion, Plummer, though he speaks more cautiously of Hobart's argument, is practically in agreement with these writers. He says that when Hobart's list has been well sifted a considerable number of words remains. "The argument", he goes on to say, "is cumulative. Any two or three instances of coincidence with medical writers may be explained as mere coincidences; but the large number of coincidences renders their explanation unsatisfactory for all of them, especially where the word is either rare in the LXX, or not found there at all" (64). In "The Expositor" (Nov, 1909, 385 sqq.), Mayor says of Harnack's two above-cited works: "He has, in opposition to the Tübingen school of critics, successfully vindicated for St. Luke the authorship of the two canonical books ascribed to him, and has further proved that, with some few omissions, they may be accepted as trustworthy documents. . . . I am glad to see that the English translator . . . has now been converted by Harnack's argument, founded in part, as he himself confesses, on the researches of English scholars, especially Dr. Hobart, Sir W. M. Ramsay, and Sir John Hawkins." There is a striking resemblance between the prologue of the Gospel and a preface written by Dioscorides, a medical writer who studied at Tarsus in the first century (see Blass, "Philology of the Gospels"). The words with which Hippocrates begins his treatise "On Ancient Medicine" should be noted in this connexion: Ὀκόσοι ἐπεχείρησαν περὶ ἰητρικῆς λέγειν ἢ γράφειν, κ. τ. λ. (Plummer, 4). When all these considerations are fully taken into account, they prove that the companion of St. Paul who wrote the Acts (and the Gospel) was a physician. Now, we learn from St. Paul that he had such a companion. Writing to the Colossians (iv, 11), he says: "Luke, the most dear physician, saluteth you." He was, therefore, with St. Paul when he wrote to the Colossians, Philemon, and Ephesians; and also when he wrote the Second Epistle to Timothy. From the manner in which he is spoken of, a long period of intercourse is implied.

(2) The Author of Acts was the Author of the Gospel.—"This position", says Plummer, "is so generally admitted by critics of all schools that not much time need be spent in discussing it." Harnack may be said to be the latest prominent convert to this view, to which he gives elaborate support in the two books above mentioned. He claims to have shown that the earlier critics went hopelessly astray, and that the traditional view is the right one. This opinion is fast gaining ground even amongst ultra critics, and Harnack declares that the others hold out because there exists a disposition amongst them to ignore the facts that tell against them, and he speaks of "the truly pitiful history of the criticism of the Acts". Only the briefest summary of the arguments can be given here. The Gospel and Acts are both dedicated to Theophilus, and the author of the latter work claims to be the author of the former (Acts, i, 1). The style and arrangement of both are so much alike that the supposition that one was written by a forger in imitation of the other is absolutely excluded. The required power of literary analysis was then unknown; and, if it were possible, we know of no writer of that age who had the wonderful skill necessary to produce such an imitation. It is to postulate a literary miracle, says Plummer, to suppose that one of the books was a forgery written in imitation of the other. Such an idea would not have occurred to anyone; and, if it had, he could not have carried it out with such marvellous success. If we take a few chapters of the Gospel and note down the special, peculiar, and characteristic words, phrases and constructions, and then open the Acts at random, we shall find the same literary peculiarities constantly recurring. Or, if we begin with the Acts, and proceed conversely, the same results will follow. In addition to similarity, there are parallels of description, arrangement, and points of view; and the recurrence of medical language, in both books, has been mentioned under the previous heading.

We should naturally expect that the long intercourse between St. Paul and St. Luke would mutually influence their vocabulary, and their writings show that this was really the case. Hawkins (Horæ Synopticæ) and Bebb (Hast., "Dict. of the Bible", s. v. "Luke, Gospel of") state that there are 32 words found only in St. Matt. and St. Paul; 22 in St. Mark and St. Paul; 21 in St. John and St. Paul; while there are 101 found only in St. Luke and St. Paul. Of the characteristic words and phrases which mark the three Synoptic Gospels a little more than half are common to St. Matt. and St. Paul, less than half to St. Mark and St. Paul, and two-thirds to St. Luke and St. Paul. Several writers have given examples of parallelism between the Gospel and the Pauline Epistles. Among the most striking are those given by Plummer (44). The same author gives long lists of words and expressions found in the Gospel and Acts and in St. Paul, and nowhere else in the New Testament. But more than this, Eager in "The Expositor" (July and August, 1894), in his attempt to prove that St. Luke was the author of Hebrews, has drawn attention to the remarkable fact that the Lucan influence on the language of St. Paul is much more marked in those Epistles where we know that St. Luke was his constant companion. Summing up, he observes: "There is in fact sufficient ground for believing that these books, Colossians, II Corinthians, the Pastoral Epistles, First (and to a lesser extent Second) Peter, possess a Lucan character." When all these points are taken into consideration, they afford convincing proof that the author of the Gospel and Acts was St. Luke, the beloved physician, the companion of St. Paul, and this is fully borne out by the external evidence.

B. *External Evidence.*—The proof in favour of the unity of authorship, derived from the internal character of the two books, is strengthened when taken in connexion with the external evidence. Every ancient testimony for the authenticity of Acts tells equally in favour of the Gospel; and every passage for the Lucan authorship of the Gospel gives a like support to the authenticity of Acts. Besides, in many places of the early Fathers both books are ascribed to St. Luke. The external evidence can be touched upon here only in the briefest manner. For external evidence in favour of Acts, see ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

The many passages in St. Jerome, Eusebius, and

Origen, ascribing the books to St. Luke, are important not only as testifying to the belief of their own, but also of earlier times. St. Jerome and Origen were great travellers, and all three were omniverous readers. They had access to practically the whole Christian literature of preceding centuries; but they nowhere hint that the authorship of the Gospel (and Acts) was ever called in question. This, taken by itself, would be a stronger argument than can be adduced for the majority of classical works. But we have much earlier testimony. Clement of Alexandria was probably born at Athens about A. D. 150. He travelled much, and had for instructors in the Faith an Ionian, an Italian, a Syrian, an Egyptian, an Assyrian, and a Hebrew in Palestine. "And these men, preserving the true tradition of the blessed teaching directly from Peter and James, John and Paul, the holy Apostles, son receiving it from father, came by God's providence even unto us, to deposit among us those seeds [of truth] which were derived from their ancestors and the Apostles". (Strom., I, i, 11; cf. Euseb., "Hist. Eccl.", V, xi). He holds that St. Luke's Gospel was written before that of St. Mark, and he uses the four Gospels just as any modern Catholic writer. Tertullian was born at Carthage, lived some time in Rome, and then returned to Carthage. His quotations from the Gospels, when brought together by Rönsch, cover two hundred pages. He attacks Marcion for mutilating St. Luke's Gospel, and writes: "I say then that among them, and not only among the Apostolic Churches, but among all the Churches which are united with them in Christian fellowship, the Gospel of Luke, which we earnestly defend, has been maintained from its first publication" (Adv. Marc., IV, v).

The testimony of St. Irenæus is of special importance. He was born in Asia Minor, where he heard St. Polycarp give his reminiscences of St. John the Apostle, and in his numerous writings he frequently mentions other disciples of the Apostles. He was priest in Lyons during the persecution in 177, and was the bearer of the letter of the confessors to Rome. His bishop, Pothinus, whom he succeeded, was ninety years of age when he gained the crown of martyrdom in 177, and must have been born while some of the Apostles and very many of their hearers were still living. St. Irenæus, who was born about A. D. 130 (some say much earlier), is, therefore, a witness for the early tradition of Asia Minor, Rome, and Gaul. He quotes the Gospels just as any modern bishop would do; he calls them Scripture; believes even in their verbal inspiration; shows how congruous it is that there are four and only four Gospels; and says that Luke, who begins with the priesthood and sacrifice of Zachary, is the calf. When we compare his quotations with those of Clement of Alexandria, variant readings of text present themselves. There was already established an Alexandrian type of text different from that used in the West. The Gospels had been copied and recopied so often, that, through errors of copying, etc., distinct families of text had time to establish themselves. The Gospels were so widespread that they became known to pagans. Celsus in his attack on the Christian religion was acquainted with the genealogy in St. Luke's Gospel, and his quotations show the same phenomena of variant readings.

The next witness, St. Justin Martyr, shows the position of honour the Gospels held in the Church, in the early portion of the century. Justin was born in Palestine about A. D. 105, and converted in 132–135. In his "Apology" he speaks of the memoirs of the Lord which are called Gospels, and which were written by Apostles (Matthew, John) and disciples of the Apostles (Mark, Luke). In connexion with the disciples of the Apostles he cites the verses of St. Luke on the Sweat of Blood, and he has numerous quotations from all four. Westcott shows that there is no trace in Justin of the use of any written document on the life of Christ except our Gospels. "He [Justin] tells us that Christ was descended from Abraham through Jacob, Judah, Phares, Jesse, David—that the Angel Gabriel was sent to announce His birth to the Virgin Mary—that it was in fulfilment of the prophecy of Isaiah . . . that His parents went thither [to Bethlehem] in consequence of an enrolment under Cyrinius—that as they could not find a lodging in the village they lodged in a cave close by it, where Christ was born, and laid by Mary in a manger", etc. (Westcott, "Canon", 104). There is a constant intermixture in Justin's quotations of the narratives of St. Matthew and St. Luke. As usual in apologetical works, such as the apologies of Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Cyprian, and Eusebius, he does not name his sources because he was addressing outsiders. He states, however, that the memoirs which were called Gospels were read in the churches on Sunday along with the writings of the Prophets; in other words, they were placed on an equal rank with the Old Testament. In the "Dialogue", cv, we have a passage peculiar to St. Luke. "Jesus as He gave up His Spirit upon the Cross said, 'Father, into thy hands I commend my Spirit' [Luke, xxiii, 46], even as I learned from the Memoirs of this fact also." These Gospels which were read every Sunday must be the same as our four, which soon after, in the time of Irenæus, were in such long established honour, and regarded by him as inspired by the Holy Ghost. We never hear, says Salmon, of any revolution dethroning one set of Gospels and replacing them by another; so we may be sure that the Gospels honoured by the Church in Justin's day were the same as those to which the same respect was paid in the days of Irenæus, not many years after. This conclusion is strengthened not only by the nature of Justin's quotations, but by the evidence afforded by his pupil Tatian, the Assyrian, who lived a long time with him in Rome, and afterwards compiled his harmony of the Gospels, his famous "Diatessaron", in Syriac, from our four Gospels. He had travelled a great deal, and the fact that he uses only those shows that they alone were recognized by St. Justin and the Catholic Church between 130–150. This takes us back to the time when many of the hearers of the Apostles and Evangelists were still alive; for it is held by many scholars that St. Luke lived till towards the end of the first century.

Irenæus, Clement, Tatian, Justin, etc., were in as good a position for forming a judgment on the authenticity of the Gospels as we are of knowing who were the authors of Scott's novels, Macaulay's essays, Dickens's early novels, Longfellow's poems, no. xc of "Tracts for the Times" etc. But the argument does not end here. Many of the heretics who flourished from the beginning of the second century till A. D. 150 admitted St. Luke's Gospel as authoritative. This proves that it had acquired an unassailable position long before these heretics broke away from the Church. The Apocryphal Gospel of Peter, about A. D. 150, makes use of our Gospels. About the same time the Gospels, together with their titles, were translated into Latin; and here, again, we meet the phenomena of variant readings, to be found in Clement, Irenæus, Old Syriac, Justin, and Celsus, pointing to a long period of previous copying. Finally, we may ask, if the author of the two books were not St. Luke, who was he?

Harnack (Luke the Physician, 2) holds that as the Gospel begins with a prologue addressed to an individual (Theophilus) it must, of necessity, have contained in its title the name of its author. How can we explain, if St. Luke were not the author, that the name of the real, and truly great, writer came to be completely buried in oblivion, to make room for the name of such a comparatively obscure disciple as St. Luke? Apart from his connexion, as supposed author, with

the Third Gospel and Acts, he was no more prominent than Aristarchus and Epaphras; and he is mentioned only in three places in the whole of the New Testament. If a false name were substituted for the true author, some more prominent individual would have been selected.

III. Integrity of the Gospel.—Marcion rejected the first two chapters and some shorter passages of the Gospel; and it was at one time maintained by rationalistic writers that his was the original Gospel of which ours is a later expansion. This is now universally rejected by scholars. St. Irenæus, Tertullian, and Epiphanius charged him with mutilating the Gospel; and it is known that the reasons for his rejection of those portions were doctrinal. He cut out the account of the infancy and the genealogy, because he denied the human birth of Christ. As he rejected the Old Testament all reference to it had to be excluded. That the parts rejected by Marcion belong to the Gospel is clear from their unity of style with the remainder of the book. The characteristics of St. Luke's style run through the whole work, but are more frequent in the first two chapters than anywhere else; and they are present in the other portions omitted by Marcion. No writer in those days was capable of successfully forging such additions. The first two chapters, etc., are contained in all the MSS. and versions, and were known to Justin Martyr and other competent witnesses. On the authenticity of the verses on the Bloody Sweat, see Agony of Christ.

IV. Purpose and Contents.—The Gospel was written, as is gathered from the prologue (i, 1–4), for the purpose of giving Theophilus (and others like him) increased confidence in the unshakable firmness of the Christian truths in which he had been instructed, or "catechized"—the latter word being used, according to Harnack, in its technical sense. The Gospel naturally falls into four divisions; (1) Gospel of the infancy, roughly covered by the Joyful Mysteries of the Rosary (ch. i, ii); (2) ministry in Galilee, from the preaching of John the Baptist (iii, 1, to ix, 50); (3) journeyings towards Jerusalem (ix, 51–xix, 27); (4) Holy Week: preaching in and near Jerusalem, Passion, and Resurrection (xix, 28, to end of xxiv). We owe a great deal to the industry of St. Luke. Out of twenty miracles which he records six are not found in the other Gospels: draught of fishes, widow of Naim's son, man with dropsy, ten lepers, Malchus's ear, spirit of infirmity. He alone has the following eighteen parables: good samaritan, friend at midnight, rich fool, servants watching, two debtors, barren fig-tree, chief seats, great supper, rash builder, rash king, lost groat, prodigal son, unjust steward, rich man and Lazarus, unprofitable servants, unjust judge, Pharisee and publican, pounds. The account of the journeys towards Jerusalem (ix, 51–xix, 27) is found only in St. Luke; and he gives special prominence to the duty of prayer.

V. Sources of the Gospel; Synoptic Problem.—The best information as to his sources is given by St. Luke, in the beginning of his Gospel. As many had written accounts as they heard them from "eyewitnesses and ministers of the word", it seemed good to him also, having diligently attained to all things from the beginning, to write an ordered narrative. He had two sources of information, then, eyewitnesses (including Apostles) and written documents taken down from the words of eyewitnesses. The accuracy of these documents he was in a position to test by his knowledge of the character of the writers, and by comparing them with the actual words of the Apostles and other eyewitnesses.

That he used written documents seems evident on comparing his Gospel with the other two Synoptic Gospels, Matthew and Mark. All three frequently agree even in minute details; but in other respects there is often a remarkable divergence, and to explain these phenomena is the Synoptic Problem. St. Matthew and St. Luke alone give an account of the infancy of Christ; both accounts are independent. But when they begin the public preaching they describe it in the same way, here agreeing with St. Mark. When St. Mark ends, the two others again diverge. They agree in the main both in matter and arrangement within the limits covered by St. Mark, whose order they generally follow. Frequently all agree in the order of the narrative, but, where two agree, Mark and Luke agree against the order of Matthew, or Mark and Matthew agree against the order of Luke; Mark is always in the majority, and it is not proved that the other two ever agree against the order followed by him. Within the limits of the ground covered by St. Mark, the two other Gospels have several sections in common not found in St. Mark, consisting for the most part of discourses, and there is a closer resemblance between them than between any two Gospels where the three go over the same ground. The whole of St. Mark is practically contained in the other two. St. Matthew and St. Luke have large sections peculiar to themselves, such as the different accounts of the infancy, and the journeys towards Jerusalem in St. Luke. The parallel records have remarkable verbal coincidences. Sometimes the Greek phrases are identical, sometimes but slightly different, and again more divergent. There are various theories to explain the fact of the matter and language common to the Evangelists. Some hold that it is due to the oral teaching of the Apostles, which soon became stereotyped from constant repetition. Others hold that it is due to written sources, taken down from such teaching. Others, again, strongly maintain that Matthew and Luke used Mark or a written source extremely like it. In that case, we have evidence how very closely they kept to the original. The agreement between the discourses given by St. Luke and St. Matthew is accounted for, by some authors, by saying that both embodied the discourses of Christ that had been collected and originally written in Aramaic by St. Matthew. The long narratives of St. Luke not found in these two documents are, it is said, accounted for by his employment of what he knew to be other reliable sources, either oral or written. (The question is concisely but clearly stated by Peake "A Critical Introduction to the New Testament", London, 1909, 101. Several other works on the subject are given in the literature at the end of this article.)

VI. Saint Luke's Accuracy.—Very few writers have ever had their accuracy put to such a severe test as St. Luke, on account of the wide field covered by his writings, and the consequent liability (humanly speaking) of making mistakes; and on account of the fierce attacks to which he has been subjected.

It was the fashion, during the nineteenth century, with German rationalists and their imitators, to ridicule the "blunders" of Luke; but that is all being rapidly changed by the recent progress of archæological research. Harnack does not hesitate to say that these attacks were shameful, and calculated to bring discredit, not on the Evangelist, but upon his critics; and Ramsay is but voicing the opinion of the best modern scholars when he calls St. Luke a great and accurate historian. Very few have done so much as this latter writer, in his numerous works and in his articles in "The Expositor", to vindicate the extreme accuracy of St. Luke. Wherever archæology has afforded the means of testing St. Luke's statements, they have been found to be correct; and this gives confidence that he is equally reliable where no such corroboration is as yet available. For some of the details see Acts of the Apostles, where a very full bibliography is given.

For the sake of illustration, one or two examples may here be given:—(1) Sergius Paulus, Proconsul

in Cyprus.—St. Luke says, Acts, xiii, 7, that when St. Paul visited Cyprus (in the reign of Claudius) Sergius Paulus was proconsul (*ἀνθύπατος*) there. Grotius asserted that this was an abuse of language, on the part of the natives, who wished to flatter the governor by calling him proconsul, instead of proprætor (*ἀντιστράτηγος*), which he really was; and that St. Luke used the popular appellation. Even Baronius (Annales, ad Ann. 46) supposed that, though Cyprus was only a prætorian province, it was honoured by being ruled by the proconsul of Cilicia, who must have been Sergius Paulus. But this is all a mistake. Cato captured Cyprus; Cicero was proconsul of Cilicia and Cyprus in 52 B. C.; Mark Antony gave the island to Cleopatra; Augustus made it a prætorian province in 27 B. C., but in 22 B. C. he transferred it to the senate, and it became again a proconsular province. This latter fact is not stated by Strabo, but it is mentioned by Dion Cassius (LIII). In Hadrian's time it was once more under a proprætor, while under Severus it was again administered by a proconsul. There can be no doubt that in the reign of Claudius, when St. Paul visited it, Cyprus was under a proconsul (*ἀνθύπατος*), as stated by St. Luke. Numerous coins have been discovered in Cyprus, bearing the head and name of Claudius on one side, and the names of the proconsuls of Cyprus on the other. A woodcut engraving of one is given in Conybeare and Howson's "St. Paul", at the end of chapter v. On the reverse it has: ΕΠΙ ΚΟΜΙΝΟΥ ΠΡΟΚΛΟΥ ΑΝΘΥΠΑΤΟΥ: ΚΥΠΡΙΩΝ—"Money of the Cyprians under Cominius Proclus, Proconsul." The head of Claudius (with his name) is figured on the other side. General Cesnola discovered a long inscription on a pedestal of white marble, at Solvi, in the north of the island, having the words: ΕΠΙ ΠΑΥΛΟΥ ΑΝΘΥΠΑΤΟΥ—"Under Paulus Proconsul." Lightfoot, Zochler, Ramsay, Knabenbauer, Zahn, and Vigouroux hold that this was the actual (Sergius) Paulus of Acts, xiii, 7.

(2) The Politarchs in Thessalonica.—An excellent example of St. Luke's accuracy is afforded by his statement that rulers of Thessalonica were called "politarchs" (*πολιτάρχαι*—Acts, xvii, 6, 8). The word is not found in the Greek classics; but there is a large stone in the British Museum, which was found in an arch in Thessalonica, containing an inscription which is supposed to date from the time of Vespasian. Here we find the word used by St. Luke together with the names of several such politarchs, among them being names identical with some of St. Paul's converts: Sopater, Gaius, Secundus. Burton in "American Journal of Theology" (July, 1898) has drawn attention to seventeen inscriptions proving the existence of politarchs in ancient times. Thirteen were found in Macedonia, and five were discovered in Thessalonica, dating from the middle of the first to the end of the second century.

(3) The geographical, municipal, and political knowledge of St. Luke, when speaking of Pisidian Antioch, Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe, is fully borne out by recent research (see Ramsay, "St. Paul the Traveller", and other references given in GALATIANS, EPISTLE TO THE).

(4) He is equally sure when speaking of Philippi, a Roman colony, where the duumviri were called "prætors" (*στρατηγοί*—Acts, xvi, 20, 35), a lofty title which duumviri assumed in Capua and elsewhere, as we learn from Cicero and Horace (Sat., I, v, 34). They also had lictors (*ῥαβδοῦχοι*), after the manner of real prætors.

(5) His references to Ephesus, Athens, Corinth, are altogether in keeping with everything that is now known of these cities. Take a single instance: "In Ephesus St. Paul taught in the school of Tyrannus, in the city of Socrates he discussed moral questions in the market-place. How incongruous it would seem if the methods were transposed! But the narrative never makes a false step amid all the many details as the scene changes from city to city; and that is the conclusive proof that it is a picture of real life" (Ramsay, op. cit., 238). St. Luke mentions (Acts, xviii, 2) that when St. Paul was at Corinth the Jews had been recently expelled from Rome by Claudius, and this is confirmed by a chance statement of Suetonius. He tells us (ibid., 12) that Gallio was then proconsul in Corinth (the capital of the Roman province of Achaia). There is no direct evidence that he was proconsul in Achaia, but his brother Seneca writes that Gallio caught a fever there, and went on a voyage for his health. The description of the riot at Ephesus (Acts, xix) brings together, in the space of eighteen verses, an extraordinary amount of knowledge of the city, that is fully corroborated by numerous inscriptions, and representations on coins, medals, etc., recently discovered. There are allusions to the temple of Diana (one of the seven wonders of the world), to the fact that Ephesus gloried in being her temple-sweeper, her caretaker (*νεωκόρος*), to the theatre as the place of assembly for the people, to the town clerk (*γραμματεύς*), to the Asiarchs, to sacrilegious (*ἱεροσύλοι*), to proconsular sessions, artificers, etc. The *ecclesia* (the usual word in Ephesus for the assembly of the people) and the *grammateus* or town-clerk (the title of a high official frequent on Ephesian coins) completely puzzled Cornelius à Lapide, Baronius, and other commentators, who imagined the *ecclesia* meant a synagogue, etc. (see Vigouroux, "Le Nouveau Testament et les Découvertes Archéologiques", Paris, 1890).

(6) The Shipwreck.—The account of the voyage and shipwreck described in Acts (xxvii, xxvii) is regarded by competent authorities on nautical matters as a marvellous instance of accurate description (see Smith's classical work on the subject, "Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul" (4th ed., London, 1880). Blass (Acta Apostolorum, 186) says: "Extrema duo capita habent descriptionem clarissimam itineris maritimi quod Paulus in Italiam fecit: quæ descriptio ab homine harum rerum perito judicata est monumentum omnium pretiosissimum, quæ rei navalis ex tota antiquitate nobis relicta est. V. Breusing, 'Die Nautik der Alten' (Bremen, 1886)." See also Knowling, "The Acts of the Apostles" in "Exp. Gr. Test." (London, 1900).

VII. LYSANIAS, TETRARCH OF ABILENE.—Gfrorrer, B. Bauer, Hilgenfeld, Keim, and Holtzmann assert that St. Luke perpetrated a gross chronological blunder of sixty years by making Lysanias, the son of Ptolemy, who lived 36 B. C., and was put to death by Mark Antony, tetrarch of Abilene when John the Baptist began to preach (iii, 1). Strauss says: "He [Luke] makes rule, 30 years after the birth of Christ, a certain Lysanias, who had certainly been slain 30 years previous to that birth—a slight error of 60 years." On the face of it, it is highly improbable that such a careful writer as St. Luke would have gone out of his way to run the risk of making such a blunder, for the mere purpose of helping to fix the date of the public ministry. Fortunately, we have a complete refutation supplied by Schürer, a writer by no means over friendly to St. Luke, as we shall see when treating of the Census of Quirinius. Ptolemy Mennæus was King of the Itureans (whose kingdom embraced the Lebanon and plain of Massyas with the capital Chalcis, between the Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon) from 85–40 B. C. His territories extended on the east towards Damascus, and on the south embraced Panias, and part, at least, of Galilee. Lysanias the older succeeded his father Ptolemy about 40 B. C. (Josephus, "Ant.", XIV, xii, 3; "Bel. Jud.", I, xiii, 1), and is styled by Dion Cassius "King of the Itureans" (XLIX, 32). After reigning about four or five years he was put to death by Mark Antony, at the instigation of Cleopatra, who received a large portion of his territory (Josephus, "Ant.", XV, iv, 1; "Bel. Jud.", I, xxii, 3; Dion Cassius, op. cit.).

Typogravure Goupil of Paris (France). *F. Hanfstaengl, photo*

ST. LUKE PAINTING THE VIRGIN AND CHILD

ROGER VAN DER WEYDEN

As the latter and Porphyry call him "king", it is doubtful whether the coins bearing the superscription, "Lysanias tetrarch and high priest" belong to him, for there were one or more later princes called Lysanias. After his death his kingdom was gradually divided up into at least four districts, and the three principal ones were certainly not called after him. A certain Zenodorus took on lease the possessions of Lysanias, 23 B. C., but Trachonitis was soon taken from him and given to Herod. On the death of Zenodorus in 20 B. C., Ulatha and Panias, the territories over which he ruled, were given by Augustus to Herod. This is called the tetrarchy of Zenodorus by Dion Cassius. "It seems therefore that Zenodorus, after the death of Lysanias, had received on rent a portion of his territory from Cleopatra, and that after Cleopatra's death this 'rented' domain, subject to tribute, was continued to him with the title of tetrarch" (Schürer, I, II, app., 333, i). Mention is made on a monument, at Heliopolis, of "Zenodorus, son of the tetrarch Lysanias". It has been generally supposed that this is the Zenodorus just mentioned, but it is uncertain whether the first Lysanias was ever called tetrarch. It is proved from the inscriptions that there was a genealogical connexion between the families of Lysanias and Zenodorus, and the same name may have been often repeated in the family. Coins for 32, 30, and 25 B. C., belonging to our Zenodorus, have the superscription, "Zenodorus tetrarch and high priest." After the death of Herod the Great a portion of the tetrarchy of Zenodorus went to Herod's son, Philip (Jos., "Ant.", XVII, xi, 4), referred to by St. Luke, "Philip being tetrarch of Iturea" (Luke, iii, 1).

Another tetrarchy sliced off from the dominions of Zenodorus lay to the east between Chalcis and Damascus, and went by the name of Abila or Abilene. Abila is frequently spoken of by Josephus as a tetrarchy, and in "Ant.", XVIII, vi, 10, he calls it the "tetrarchy of Lysanias". Claudius, in A. D. 41, conferred "Abila of Lysanias" on Agrippa I (Ant., XIX, v, 1). In A. D. 53, Agrippa II obtained Abila, "which last had been the tetrarchy of Lysanias" (Ant., XX., vii, 1). "From these passages we see that the tetrarchy of Abila had belonged previously to A. D. 37 to a certain Lysanias, and seeing that Josephus nowhere previously makes any mention of another Lysanias, except the contemporary of Anthony and Cleopatra, 40–36 B. C. . . . criticism has endeavoured in various ways to show that there had not afterwards been any other, and that the tetrarchy of Abilene had its name from the older Lysanias. But this is impossible" (Schürer, 337). Lysanias I inherited the Iturean empire of his father Ptolemy, of which Abila was but a small and very obscure portion. Calchis in Cœle-Syria was the capital of his kingdom, not Abila in Abilene. He reigned only about four years and was a comparatively obscure individual when compared with his father Ptolemy, or his successor Zenodorus, both of whom reigned many years. There is no reason why any portion of his kingdom should have been called after his name rather than theirs; and it is highly improbable that Josephus speaks of Abilene as called after him seventy years after his death. As Lysanias I was king over the whole region, one small portion of it could not be called *his* tetrarchy or kingdom, as is done by Josephus (Bel. Jud., II, xii, 8). "It must therefore be assumed as certain that at a later date the district of Abilene had been severed from the kingdom of Calchis, and had been governed by a younger Lysanias as tetrarch" (Schürer, 337). The existence of such a late Lysanias is shown by an inscription found at Abila, containing the statement that a certain Nymphaios, the freedman of Lysanias, built a street and erected a temple in the time of the "August Emperors". *Augusti* (Σεβαστοί) in the plural was never used before the death of Augustus, A. D. 14. The first contemporary Σεβαστοί were Tiberius and his mother Livia, i. e. at a time fifty years after the first Lysanias. An inscription at Heliopolis, in the same region, makes it probable that there were several princes of this name. "The Evangelist Luke is thoroughly correct when he assumes (iii, 1) that in the fifteenth year of Tiberius there was a Lysanias tetrarch of Abilene" (Schürer, op. cit., where full literature is given; Vigouroux, op. cit).

VIII. Who Spoke the Magnificat?—Lately an attempt has been made to ascribe the Magnificat to Elizabeth instead of to the Blessed Virgin. All the early Fathers, all the Greek MSS., all the versions, all the Latin MSS. (except three) have the reading in Luke, i, 46: Καὶ εἶπεν Μαριάμ—*Et ait Maria* [And Mary said]: *Magnificat anima mea Dominum*, etc. Three Old Latin MSS. (the earliest dating from the end of the fourth cent.), a, b, l (called *rhe* by Westcott and Hort), have *Et ait Elisabeth*. These tend to such close agreement that their combined evidence is single rather than threefold. They are full of gross blunders and palpable corruptions, and the attempt to pit their evidence against the many thousands of Greek, Latin, and other MSS., is anything but scientific. If the evidence were reversed, Catholics would be held up to ridicule if they ascribed the Magnificat to Mary. The three MSS. gain little or no support from the internal evidence of the passage. The Magnificat is a cento from the song of Anna (I Kings, ii), the Psalms, and other places of the Old Testament. If it were spoken by Elizabeth it is remarkable that the portion of Anna's song that was most applicable to her is omitted: "The barren hath borne many: and she that had many children is weakened." See, on this subject, Emmet in "The Expositor" (Dec., 1909); Bernard, ibid. (March, 1907); and the exhaustive works of two Catholic writers: Ladeuze, "Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique" (Louvain, Oct., 1903); Bardenhewer, "Mariä Verkündigung" (Freiburg, 1905).

IX. The Census of Quirinius.—No portion of the New Testament has been so fiercely attacked as Luke, ii, 1–5. Schürer has brought together, under six heads, a formidable array of all the objections that can be urged against it. There is not space to refute them here; but Ramsay in his "Was Christ born in Bethlehem?" has shown that they all fall to the ground:—

(1) St. Luke does not assert that a census took place all over the Roman Empire before the death of Herod, but that a decision emanated from Augustus that regular census were to be made. Whether they were carried out in general, or not, was no concern of St. Luke's. If history does not prove the existence of such a decree it certainly proves nothing against it. It was thought for a long time that the system of Indictions was inaugurated under the early Roman emperors; it is now known that they owe their origin to Constantine the Great (the first taking place fifteen years after his victory of 312), and this in spite of the fact that history knew nothing of the matter. Kenyon holds that it is very probable that Pope Damasus ordered the Vulgate to be regarded as the only authoritative edition of the Latin Bible; but it would be difficult to prove it historically. If "history knows nothing" of the census in Palestine before 4 B. C., neither did it know anything of the fact that under the Romans in Egypt regular personal census were held every fourteen years, at least from A. D. 20 till the time of Constantine. Many of these census papers have been discovered, and they were called ἀπογραφαί, the name used by St. Luke. They were made without any reference to property or taxation. The head of the household gave his name and age, the name and age of his wife, children, and slaves. He mentioned how many were included in the previous census, and how many born since that time. Valuation returns were made every year. The fourteen years' cycle

did not originate in Egypt (they had a different system before 19 B. C.), but most probably owed its origin to Augustus, 8 B. C., the fourteenth year of his *tribunitia potestas*, which was a great year in Rome, and is called the Year I in some inscriptions. Apart from St. Luke and Josephus, history is equally ignorant of the second enrolling in Palestine, A. D. 6. So many discoveries about ancient times, concerning which history has been silent, have been made during the last thirty years that it is surprising modern authors should brush aside a statement of St. Luke's, a respectable first century writer, with a mere appeal to the silence of history on the matter.

(2) The first census in Palestine, as described by St. Luke, was not made according to Roman, but Jewish, methods. St. Luke, who travelled so much, could not be ignorant of the Roman system, and his description deliberately excludes it. The Romans did not run counter to the feelings of provincials more than they could help. Jews, who were proud of being able to prove their descent, would have no objection to the enrolling described in Luke, ii. Schürer's arguments are vitiated throughout by the supposition that the census mentioned by St. Luke could be made only for taxation purposes. His discussion of imperial taxation is learned but beside the mark (cf. the practice in Egypt). It was to the advantage of Augustus to know the number of possible enemies in Palestine, in case of revolt.

(3) King Herod was not as independent as he is described for controversial purposes. A few years before Herod's death Augustus wrote to him. Josephus, "Ant.", XVI, ix, 3, has: "Cæsar [Augustus] . . . grew very angry, and wrote to Herod sharply. The sum of his epistle was this, that whereas of old he used him as a friend, he should now use him as his subject." It was after this that Herod was asked to number his people. That some such enrolling took place we gather from a passing remark of Josephus, "Ant.", XVII, ii, 4, "Accordingly, when all the people of the Jews gave assurance of their good will to Cæsar [Augustus], and to the king's [Herod's] government, these very men [the Pharisees] did not swear, being above six thousand." The best scholars think they were asked to swear allegiance to Augustus.

(4) It is said there was no room for Quirinius, in Syria, before the death of Herod in 4 B. C. C. Sentius Saturninus was governor there from 9–6 B. C.; and Quintilius Varus, from 6 B. C. till after the death of Herod. But in turbulent provinces there were sometimes two Roman officials of equal standing. In the time of Caligula the administration of Africa was divided in such a way that the military power, with the foreign policy, was under the control of the lieutenant of the emperor, who could be called a *ἡγεμών* (as in St. Luke), while the internal affairs were under the ordinary proconsul. The same position was held by Vespasian when he conducted the war in Palestine, which belonged to the province of Syria—a province governed by an officer of equal rank. Josephus speaks of Volumnius as being *Καίσαρος ἡγεμών*, together with C. Sentius Saturninus, in Syria (9–6 B. C.): "There was a hearing before Saturninus and Volumnius, who were then the presidents of Syria" (Ant., XVI, ix, 1). He is called *procurator* in "Bel. Jud.", I, xxvii, 1, 2. Corbulo commanded the armies of Syria against the Parthians, while Quadratus and Gallus were successively governors of Syria. Though Josephus speaks of Gallus, he knows nothing of Corbulo; but he was there nevertheless (Mommsen, "Röm. Gesch.", V, 382). A similar position to that of Corbulo must have been held by Quirinius for a few years between 7 and 4 B. C.

The best treatment of the subject is that by Ramsay "Was Christ Born in Bethlehem?" See also the valuable essays of two Catholic writers: Marucchi in "Il Bessarione" (Rome, 1897); Bour, "L'Inscription de Quirinius et le Recensement de S. Luc" (Rome, 1897). Vigouroux, "Le N. T. et les Découvertes Modernes" (Paris, 1890), has a good deal of useful information. It has been suggested that Quirinius is a copyist's error for Quintilius (Varus).

X. SAINT LUKE AND JOSEPHUS.—The attempt to prove that St. Luke used Josephus (but inaccurately) has completely broken down. Belser successfully refutes Krenkel in "Theol. Quartalschrift", 1895, 1896. The differences can be explained only on the supposition of entire independence. The resemblances are sufficiently accounted for by the use of the Septuagint and the common literary Greek of the time by both. See Bebb and Headlam in Hast., "Dict. of the Bible", s. vv. "Luke, Gospel of" and "Acts of the Apostles", respectively. Schürer (Zeit. für W. Th., 1876) brushes aside the opinion that St. Luke read Josephus. When Acts is compared with the Septuagint and Josephus, there is convincing evidence that Josephus was not the source from which the writer of Acts derived his knowledge of Jewish history. There are numerous verbal and other coincidences with the Septuagint (Cross in "Expository Times", XI, 538, against Schmiedel and the exploded author of "Sup. Religion"). St. Luke did not get his names from Josephus, as contended by this last writer, thereby making the whole history a concoction. Wright in his "Some New Test. Problems" gives the names of fifty persons mentioned in St. Luke's Gospel. Thirty-two are common to the other two Synoptics, and therefore not taken from Josephus. Only five of the remaining eighteen are found in him, namely, Augustus Cæsar, Tiberius, Lysanias, Quirinius, and Annas. As Annas is always called Ananus in Josephus, the name was evidently not taken from him. This is corroborated by the way the Gospel speaks of Caiphas. St. Luke's employment of the other four names shows no connexion with the Jewish historian. The mention of numerous countries, cities, and islands in Acts shows complete independence of the latter writer. St. Luke's preface bears a much closer resemblance to those of Greek medical writers than to that of Josephus. The absurdity of concluding that St. Luke must necessarily be wrong when not in agreement with Josephus is apparent when we remember the frequent contradictions and blunders in the latter writer.

GENERAL.—One of the best critical commentaries, in English, is that by PLUMMER in *Int. Crit. Com.* (Edinburgh, 1906). A first-rate Catholic commentary is SCHANZ, *Commentar über das Evangel. d. h. Lucas* (Tübingen, 1883)—cf. also MALDONATUS, KNABENBAUER, FILLION, MCEVILLY, WARD (London, 1897); WRIGHT, *The Gospels in Greek* (London, 1900); *Acta SS.* (18 Oct.).

AUTHENTICITY.—PLUMMER, *op. cit.*; HARNACK, *Luke the Physician;* IDEM, *The Acts of the Apostles* (tr. London, 1907, 1909); SALMON, *Intr. to the N. Test.*, and the usual Introductions such as CORNELY; JACQUIER, *N. Test.*, II (Paris, 1906); BELSER; ZAHN, etc.; WESTCOTT, *The Canon of the New Test.* (London, 1906); LIGHTFOOT, *Essays on Supernatural Religion* (London, 1880); HOBART, *The Medical Language of St. Luke* (Dublin and London, 1882).

SOURCES; SYNOPTIC PROBLEM.—BUONACCORSI, *Critica Litteraria* (Bologna, 1905); PEAKE, *Critical Introd. to the N. Test.* (London, 1909); WESTCOTT, *Introd. to the Study of the Gospels* (London, 1881); SALMON, *op. cit.*; IDEM, *The Human Element in the Gospels* (London, 1907); RUSHBROOKE, *Synopticon* (London —); HAWKINS, *Horæ Synopticæ* (new ed., Oxford, 1909); IDEM in *Expository Times*, XIV, 18, 90, 137; WRIGHT, *op. cit.*

SAINT LUKE'S ACCURACY.—RAMSAY, *St. Paul the Traveller*, and other works mentioned at the end of art. GALATIANS, EPISTLE TO THE; IDEM, *Was Christ Born in Bethlehem?* (3rd ed., London, 1905); IDEM in *Expositor* (April and June, 1897); *ibid.* (Nov., 1901); VIGOUROUX, *Le N. Test. et les Découvertes Modernes* (Paris, 1890); KNOWLING, *Acts* in *Expositor's Greek Test.* (London, 1900). See ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

C. AHERNE.

Luke Kirby, BLESSED. See WILLIAM FILBY, BLESSED.

Lulé Indians.—A name which has given rise to considerable confusion and dispute in Argentine ethnology, owing to the fact, now established, that it was applied at different periods to two very different

peoples, neither of which now exists under that name, while the vocabulary which could settle the affinity of the earlier tribe is now lost. The name itself, meaning "inhabitants", conveys no ethnic significance, being a term applied indiscriminately by the invading Mátaco from the East to the tribes which they found already in occupancy of the country.

The Lulé of the earlier period appear to have been the tribe more definitely known under their Quichua name of *Cacana*, "mountaineers", occupying the hill ranges of the upper Salado River in the provinces of Catamarca and Western Tucuman, Argentina. They were of the stock of the Calchaqui, the southernmost tributaries of the historic Quichua of Peru, from whom they had absorbed a high degree of aboriginal culture. Owing to their relations with the Quichua on the one hand and with the neighbouring Toconoté (also Tonocoté), or Matará, on the other hand, they were familiar also with these languages as well as with their own, a fact which has served much to increase the confusion. By the Jesuit missionary Alonso Bárcena (or Barzana) the Lulé (Cacana) were gathered, in 1589, into a mission settlement on the Salado, near the Spanish town of Talavera or Esteco. The Matará, or Toconoté, were evangelized at the same time. Here, within the following twenty years, they were visited also by St. Francis Solano. In 1692 the region was devastated by a terrible earthquake which destroyed the towns of Esteco and Concepciòn, together with the missions, in consequence of which the terror-stricken neophytes fled into the forests of the great Chaco wilderness north of the Salado, and became lost to knowledge, while the grammar and vocabulary which Father Bárcena had composed of the Toconoté language disappeared likewise.

The Lulé of the later period are better known, being the principal of a group of cognate tribes constituting the Lulean stock, formerly ranging over the central and western Chaco region in Argentina, chiefly between the Salado and the Vermejo, in the Province of Salta. Although the classification of the Argentine dialects is still incomplete and in dispute, the following existent or extinct tribes seem to come within the Lulean linguistic group: Lulé proper (so called by the Mátaco), calling themselves *Pelé*, "men", and believed by Hervas to be the Oristiné of the earliest missionary period; Toconoté, called Matará by the Quichua, and incorrectly identified by Machoni with the Mátaco of another stock; Isistiné; Toquistiné; Chulupí, Chunupí or Cinipí; Vilelo, called Quiatzu by the Mátaco, with sub-tribes Guamaica and Tequeté; Omoampa, with sub-tribes Iya and Yeconoampa; Juri; Pasainé.

In general the Lulean tribes were below medium stature, pedestrian in habit, peaceful and unwarlike, except in self-defense, living partly by hunting and partly by agriculture, contrasting strongly with the athletic and predatory equestrian tribes of the eastern Chaco represented by the Abipone and Mátaco. The still wild Chulupí of the Pilcomayo, however, resemble the latter tribes in physique and warlike character. In consequence of the ceaseless inroads of the wild Chaco tribes upon the Spanish settlements, Governor Urizar, about the year 1710, led against them a strong expedition from Tucuman which for a time brought to submission those savages who were unable to escape beyond his reach. As one result, the Lulé were, in 1711, gathered into a mission called San Estéban, at Miraflores on the Salado, about one hundred miles below Salta, under the charge of the Jesuit Father Antonio Machoni. Machoni prepared a grammar and dictionary of their language (Madrid, 1732), for which reason it is sometimes known as the "Lulé of Machoni", to distinguish it from the Cacana Lulé of the earlier period. San José, or Petaca, was established among the Vilelo in 1735. In consequence of the inroads of the wild tribes, these missions were temporarily abandoned, but were re-established in 1751–52. In 1751 the cognate Isistiné and Toquistiné were gathered into the new mission of San Juan Bautista at Valbuena, a few miles lower down the Salado River. In 1763 Nuestra Señora del Buen Consejo, or Ortega, was established for the Omoampa and their subtribes, and Nuestra Señora de la Columna, or Macapillo, for the Pasainé, both on the Salado below Miraflores, and all five being within the province of Salta. In 1767, just before the expulsion of the Jesuits, the five missions of the cognate Lulean tribes had a population of 2346 Indians, almost all Christians, served by eleven priests, among them being Father José Iolis, author of a history of the Chaco.

Notwithstanding the civilizing efforts of the missionaries, the Lulé shared in the general and swift decline of the native tribes consequent upon the advent of the whites, resulting in repeated visitations of the smallpox scourge—previously unknown—the wholesale raids of Portuguese slave-hunters (*Mamelucos*), and the oppressions of the forced-labour system under the Spaniards. The mission Indians were the special prey both of the slave-hunters and of the predatory wild tribes. On the withdrawal of the Jesuits, the mission property was confiscated or otherwise wasted, while the Indians who were not reduced to practical slavery fled into the forests. At present the cognate Lulean tribes are represented chiefly by some Vilelo living among the Mátaco on the middle Vermejo and by the uncivilized Chulupí on the Pilcomayo.

BRINTON, *American Race* (New York, 1891); DOBRIZHOFFER, *Abipones*, tr., III (London, 1822); HERVAS, *Catálogo de las lenguas*, I (Madrid, 1800) (principal authority); PAGE, *La Plata* (New York, 1859); QUEVEDO, *La Lengua Vilela o Chulupí* and other papers in *Boletín del Instituto Geográfico Argentino*, XVI-XVII (Buenos Aires, 1895–96). JAMES MOONEY.

Lully, JEAN-BAPTISTE, composer, b. near Florence in 1633; d. at Paris, 22 March, 1687. He was brought to France when quite a child by Mlle de Montpensier. Having great natural gifts as a violinist, he was soon promoted to be one of the king's band of twenty-four violins, and leader of the private band. He composed a number of popular songs, including "Au clair de la lune", as well as much dance music and violin solos, and he revolutionized the orchestra by his methods. After a study of theory and composition under celebrated masters he set music for the court ballets, and was appointed composer to the king, and music master to the royal family. After his marriage in 1662, he became on very intimate terms with Molière, with whom he collaborated in ballets until 1671. A clever diplomatist and thorough courtier, he completely won the royal favour, and in March, 1672, he succeeded in ousting Abbé Perrin from the directorship of the Academy of Music. Thenceforward his success as founder of modern French opera was unquestioned, although Cambert, in 1671, paved the way. From 1672 to 1686 Lully produced twenty operas, showing himself a master of various styles. His "Isis", "Thésée", "Armide", and "Atys" are good specimens of oper-

atic work, and he not only improved recitative but invented the French overture. Nor did he concentrate his abilities wholly on the stage: he wrote much church music. As an artist he was in the first rank, though as a man his ethical code was not of the strictest. His death was caused while conducting a "Te Deum" to celebrate the king's recovery, as, when beating time, he struck his foot inadvertently, causing an abscess which proved fatal. At his decease he left four houses, and property valued at £14,000, and he occupied the coveted post of *Secrétaire du Roi*, as well as *Surintendant* to Louis XIV.

Fetis, *Biographie Universelle des Musiciens* (Paris, 1860–1865); Eitner, *Quellen Lexikon* (Leipzig, 1900–1904); Grove, *Dict. of Music*, new ed. (London, 1906); Lee, *Story of Opera* (London, 1909).

W. H. Grattan-Flood.

Lully, Raymond. See Raymond Lully.

Lumen Christi, the versicle chanted by the deacon on Holy Saturday as he lights the triple candle. After the new fire has been blessed outside the church a light is taken from it by an acolyte. The procession then moves up the church, the deacon in a white dalmatic carrying the triple candle. Three times the procession stops, the deacon lights one of the candles from the taper and sings, "Lumen Christi", on one note (*fa*), dropping a minor third (to *re*) on the last syllable. The choir answers, "Deo gratias", to the same tone. Each time it is sung at a higher pitch. As it is sung, all genuflect. Arrived at the altar, the deacon begins the blessing of the Paschal Candle (*Exultet*). The meaning of this rite is obvious: a light must be brought from the new fire to the Paschal Candle; out of this the ceremony grew and attracted to itself symbolic meaning, as usual. The triple candle was at first, no doubt, merely a precaution against the light blowing out on the way. At one time there were only two lights. The Sarum Consuetudinary (about the year 1210) says: "Let the candle upon the reed be lighted, and let another candle be lighted at the same time, so that the candle upon the reed can be rekindled if it should chance to be blown out" (Thurston, "Lent and Holy Week", 416). A miniature of the eleventh century shows the Paschal Candle being lighted from a double taper (ibid., 419). The triple candle appears first in the twelfth and fourteenth Roman Ordines (P. L., LXXVIII, 1076, 1218), about the twelfth century. Father Thurston suggests a possible connexion between it and the old custom of procuring the new fire on three successive days (p. 416). But precaution against the light blowing out accounts for several candles, and the inevitable mystic symbolism of the number three would naturally apply here too. Durandus, in his chapter on the Paschal Candle (Rationale, VI, 80), does not mention the triple candle. In the Sarum Rite only one candle was lighted. While it was carried in procession to the Paschal Candle, a hymn, "Inventor rutili dux bone luminis", was sung by two cantors, the choir answering the first verse after each of the others ("Missale Sarum", Burntisland, 1861–83, 337). In the Mozarabic Rite the bishop lights and blesses one candle; while it is brought to the altar an antiphon, "Lumen verum illuminans omnem hominem", etc., is sung (Missale Mixtum, P. L., LXXXV, 459). At Milan, in the middle of the Exultet a subdeacon goes out and brings back a candle lit from the new fire without any further ceremony. He hands this to the deacon, who lights the Paschal Candle (and two others) from it, and then goes on with the Exultet (Missale Ambrosianum, editio typica, Milan, 1902, Repertorium at end of the book, p. 40).

Thurston, *Lent and Holy Week* (London, 1904), 414–17.

Adrian Fortescue.

Luminare (a word which gives in the plural *luminaria* and has hence been incorrectly written in the singular *luminarium*) is the name applied to the shafts with which we find the roof of the passages and chambers of the Catacombs occasionally pierced for the admission of light and air. These chimney-like openings have in many cases a considerable thickness of soil to traverse before they reach the surface of the ground. They generally broaden out below, but contract towards the summit, being sometimes circular but more frequently square in section. As a rule they reach down to the second or lower story of the catacomb, passing through the first. Sometimes they are so contrived as to give light to two or even more chambers at once, or to a chamber and gallery together.

Of the existence of these light-shafts we have historical as well as archæological evidence. For example, St. Jerome, in a well-known passage, writes of his



Section of Chambers in Catacomb of Saints Marcellinus and Peter, showing lower end of shaft of the Luminare, with dove painted on it

experience in Rome when he was a boy, about A. D. 360. "I used", he says, "every Sunday, in company with other boys of my own age and tastes, to visit the tombs of the Apostles and martyrs and to go into the crypts excavated there in the bowels of the earth. The walls on either side as you enter are full of the bodies of the dead, and the whole place is so dark as to recall the words of the prophet, 'let them go down alive into Hades'. Here and there a little light admitted from above suffices to give a momentary relief to the horror of darkness" (In Ezech., lx). This "little light" undoubtedly was admitted through the *luminaria*. Again, less than half a century later we have the testimony of the poet Prudentius, whose language is more explicit. "Not far from the city walls", he informs us, "among the well-trimmed orchards there lies a crypt buried in darksome pits. Into its secret recesses a steep path with winding stairs directs one, even though the turnings shut out the light. The light of day, indeed, comes in through the doorway, and illuminates the threshold of the portico; and when, as you advance further, the darkness as of night seems to get more and more obscure throughout the mazes of the cavern, there occur at intervals apertures cut in the roof which convey the bright radiance of the sun down into the cave. Although the recesses, winding at random this way and that, form narrow chambers with darksome galleries, yet a considerable quantity of light finds its way through the pierced vaulting down into the hollow bowels of the mountain. And thus throughout the subterranean crypt it is possible to perceive the brightness and enjoy the light of the absent sun" (Prudentius, Peristeph., xi). Although the word *luminare* itself is not employed by either of these writers, it is not a term of modern coinage. In the Cemetery of St. Callistus we have a rather famous inscription set up by the Deacon Severus which begins thus:—

Cubiculum duplex cum arcosoliis et *luminare*
Jussu papæ sui Marcellini diaconus iste
Severus fecit mansionen in pace quietam . . .

(The Deacon Severus made this double cubiculum, with its arcosolia and luminare by order of his Pope Marcellinus as a quiet abode in peace for himself and his family.) Pope Marcellinus lived from A. D. 296 to 308, and we may be fairly sure that the date of this construction preceded the Diocletian persecution of 303. Again, in the crypt of St. Eusebius in the same Cemetery of Callistus was discovered an inscription in these terms:—

Fortunius et Matrona se vivis fecerunt bisomum ad luminare

(Fortunius and Matrona constructed this double tomb for themselves in their lifetime beside the light-shaft). This is how De Rossi (Roma Sotterranea, II, 162; III, 109) reads the lettering on the broken slab, and, though several of the other words are wanting and are supplied by him conjecturally, the last, viz., *luminare*, is perfectly unmistakable.

The majority of the luminaria as we find them existing in the Catacombs to-day were constructed after the age of persecution was over, during the course of the fourth and early fifth century, when the tide of devotion still set strongly towards the Catacombs as the favourite burying-places of the Christian population of the city, but there were also other luminaria of earlier date. Occasionally the Acts of the Martyrs speak of poor victims being thrown down these apertures and stoned by the pagans. (See Acts of Marcellinus and Petrus in A. SS., 2 June, n. 10.) At the later period the existence of a large and well-constructed light-shaft constitutes a tolerably safe presumption that the chamber into which it opened contained the last resting-place of martyrs specially honoured by popular devotion. The fact that these tombs attracted a concourse of people made it desirable, when the need for secrecy had passed away, that more provision should be made for lighting the chamber. A large shaft was accordingly constructed communicating with the outer air, and a certain amount of decoration in the way of frescoes was often applied to it internally. On the other hand these orifices upon the surface of the ground, unless they were protected by a parapet and constantly looked after, became the channels by which soil and rubbish of all kinds were washed into the chambers below. In some cases this accumulation of earth and sand has protected and hidden that portion of the catacomb which is vertically underneath and thus rescued many precious memorials from the ill-considered attentions, or outrages, of earlier explorers. De Rossi (Rom. Sott., III, 423) has left an interesting account of his patient opening-up of the luminare which was the only means of access to the original burial-chamber of St. Cecilia. Often, again, when churches were built over portions of the Catacombs, as in the time of Pope Damasus or earlier, it would seem that a sort of luminare or *fenestra* was made, through which it was possible for the devout worshippers in the church above to look down into the crypt where the martyr was buried. A story told by St. Gregory of Tours about the crypt of Sts. Chrysanthus and Darius (De Glor. Mart., 37) seems clearly to illustrate some such arrangement.

(The Crypt of St. Cecilia, with its large luminare, will be found figured among the illustrations in the article CATACOMBS, ROMAN.)

DE WAAL in KRAUS, *Real Encyclopädie*, II (Freiburg, 1886), 345–47; MARUCCHI, *Eléments d'Archéologie*, II (Rome, 1902), 158 and passim; NORTHCOTE AND BROWNLOW, *Roma Sotterranea*, I (2nd ed., London, 1879), 9–10, 349–350 and passim; DE ROSSI, *Roma Sotterranea*, III (Rome, 1876), 423 sq. And cf. bibliography to the articles CEMETERIES; CATACOMBS.

HERBERT THURSTON.

Lummi Indians (abbreviated from *Nuglummi*, about equivalent to "people", the name used by themselves), the principal one of more than twenty small Salishan tribes originally holding the lower shores, islands, and eastern hinterland of Puget Sound, Washington; by the Treaty of Point Elliott (1855), gathered upon five reservations within the same territory under the jurisdiction of Tulalip Agency. The Lummi occupied several villages about the mouth of Lummi river, Whatcom County. Their language is the same as that spoken, with dialectic variations, by the Samish and Klalam to the south, the Semiamu on the north, in British Columbia, and the Songish, Sanetch, and Sooke of Vancouver Island, B. C. Together with the other tribes of the Tulalip Agency, they have been entirely Christianized through the labours of the Rev. Casimir Chirouse and later Oblates beginning about 1850. In 1909 the Indians upon the Lummi reservation, including several smaller bands, numbered altogether 435 souls, a decrease of one-half in forty years. (See TULALIP.)

JAMES MOONEY.

Lumper, GOTTFRIED, Benedictine patristic writer, b. 6 Feb., 1747, at Füssen in Bavaria; d. 8 March, 1800 (Hefele says 1801), at the Abbey of St. George at Billingen in the Black Forest. At an early age he commenced his education at the abbey school, received in the course of time the habit of the order, made his solemn profession in 1764, and was ordained priest in 1771. After this he never left the monastery except for occasional assistance in the sacred ministry. He was appointed director of the gymnasium, and professor of church history and dogmatic theology. Later he was made prior of his monastery. He was a man of irreproachable character, whom nothing could move from the path of duty, and at the same time possessed profound learning and untiring diligence. All his spare time he employed in the study of early Christian literature, and Catholic Germany owes him grateful remembrance especially for his great work, "Historia theologico-critica de vita, scriptis atque doctrina SS. Patrum aliorumque scriptorum eccl. trium priorum sæculorum", which he published in thirteen volumes at Augsburg between 1783 and 1789. Of less importance are his smaller works: A translation of "Historia religionis in usum prælectionum catholicarum" of Matthew Schröckh, of which two editions appeared at Augsburg in 1788 and 1790; also the two works in German, "Die römisch-kath. hl. Messe in deutscher Sprache", with various additional prayers (Ulm, 1784), and "Der Christ in der Fasten, d. i. die Fasten-Evangelia nach dem Buchstaben und sittlichen Sinne" (Ulm, 1786). He also gave valuable assistance in the publication of the periodical "Nova Bibliotheca Eccl. Friburgensis".

KLÜPFEL, *Necrolog. sodal. et amic. lit.* (Freiburg, 1809), p. 250; *Allgem. deut. Biog.*, XIX, 635; HEFELE in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.; HURTER, *Nomenclator*, III (Innsbruck, 1895), 341.

FRANCIS MERSHMAN.

Luna, PEDRO DE, antipope under the name of Benedict XIII, b. at Illueca, Aragon, 1328; d. at the Peñiscola, near Valencia, Spain, either 29 Nov., 1422, or 23 May, 1423. He was elected 28 Sept., 1394, deposed at the Council of Constance 26 July, 1417. Pedro Martini belonged to the family of de Luna; he studied law at Montpellier, where he obtained his doctor's degree, and later taught canon law at that university. On 30 Dec., 1375, Gregory XI made him cardinal deacon of S. Maria in Cosmedin. The pope was attracted to him by his noble lineage, his austere life, and great learning, as well as by his untiring energy and great prudence. Cardinal Pedro de Luna returned to Rome with Gregory XI, after whose death in 1378 he took part in the conclave which was attacked by the Romans, and which elected Urban VI, for whom he voted. He showed great courage at the unexpected attack upon the conclave, and would not take flight, declaring "Even if I must die, I will fall here". He was among the first cardinals to return to the Vatican on 9 April, in order to continue the election of Urban VI. At first he distinctly and decidedly

took sides for this pope (Valois, "La France et le grand schisme d'occident", I, 72–74). About 24 June, 1378, he joined the other non-Italian cardinals at Anagni, where he became convinced of the invalidity of the vote for Urban VI. He took part in the election of Robert of Geneva (Clement VII) at Fondi on 20 Sept., 1378, and became a zealous adherent of this antipope whose legality he energetically defended, and to whom he rendered great service.

Clement VII sent him as legate to Spain for the Kingdoms of Castile, Aragon, Navarre, and Portugal, in order to win them over to the obedience of the Avignon pope. Owing to his powerful relations, his influence in the Province of Aragon was very great. In 1393 Clement VII appointed him legate to France, Brabant, Flanders, Scotland, England, and Ireland. As such he stayed principally in Paris, but he did not confine his activities to those countries that belonged to the Avignon obedience. He did not then oppose the union; on the contrary, he familiarized himself with the endeavours of the University of Paris, which strove to suppress the schism, in consequence of which, on his return to the Curia at Avignon, a coolness arose between Clement VII and himself. When the latter died, 16 Sept., 1394, Pedro de Luna was unanimously chosen, 23 Sept., to succeed him. His desire to put an end to the schism, even if he had to renounce the papal dignity (*via cessionis*) was a strong inducement for the cardinals of the Avignon obedience to unite their votes in his favour. After his election he solemnly renewed his promises given during the conclave, to work for the re-establishment of unity, and if necessary to renounce the papacy in order to put an end to the schism. As he was only a deacon, he was made a priest on 3 Oct., and on 11 Oct. was consecrated bishop and enthroned as pope. He took the name of Benedict XIII.

The choice of Cardinal de Luna was welcomed by the French court, and by the University of Paris; they hoped that the new pope, who was much esteemed because of his austere life and personal ability, would by his own efforts restore Church unity. Nevertheless Benedict XIII sought to preserve entire freedom of action in his relations with the King of France and the University of Paris. The assembly of the French clergy which took place 3 Feb., 1395, and lasted until 18 Feb., in order to confer on a means of putting an end to the schism, agreed that the only way was for both popes to abdicate (*via cessionis*), and the French court believed it could arbitrarily put this expedient in practice. A brilliant embassy, headed by three of the most powerful French princes, brought this resolution to Benedict XIII, and sought to gain his consent. But the pope obstinately opposed it, in spite of the fact that the cardinals sided with the embassy. He insisted that personal negotiations between both popes was the best course to pursue (*via discussionis*), and tenaciously clung to his opinion. Upon which the French court and the University of Paris sought to win over the secular princes to the support of the *via cessionis*. But the different embassies of the year 1396 met with little success. Meanwhile Benedict XIII sought to enter into an alliance with the Roman pope Boniface IX. Ambassadors were sent from Avignon to Rome and vice versa; but Boniface IX refused to entertain the idea of resigning, being as firmly convinced as Benedict that he was the legitimate pope.

The Avignon pope had possessions in Italy, which he held on to with all his power; seeking not only to prejudice the kings and princes of Scotland, Castile, and Aragon who belonged to his obedience against the action of the French court, but to win them over to his own cause; he also tried to win back the King of France. Another assembly of the French clergy met 16 Aug., 1396. They again decided in favour of the abdication of both popes; this time the ambassadors of the French court met with greater success at the foreign courts. However, neither the pope of Rome nor the pope of Avignon would consent to this way, so that the schism remained as heretofore, while general discontent reigned in all Christian countries. An embassy undertaken by Pierre d'Ailly, Bishop of Cambrai, to Benedict, by order of Charles VI of France, and Wenceslaus of Germany, accomplished nothing. In May, 1398, a third assembly of the French clergy took place, and they resolved to withdraw from the obedience of Benedict. This resolution was published 27 July, 1398, and immediately took effect. On 1 Sept., two royal commissioners publicly announced the withdrawal of the obedience at Villeneuve, near Avignon, inviting all the French clergy to leave Benedict's curia, under penalty of the forfeiture of their benefices in France. Also those who were not French lost their benefices in France if they still remained with the pope at Avignon. On 2 Sept. seventeen cardinals left Avignon and took up their abode at Villeneuve, on French territory. They sent an envoy to Benedict, summoning him to agree to the *via cessionis*. But he declared that he would rather suffer death. Then eighteen cardinals left him and withdrew their obedience; only five cardinals remained faithful to him.

Geoffroy Boucicout occupied Avignon with troops, and besieged the pope in his palace, but failed to take the papal fortress by storm. Benedict was at last obliged to treat with his enemies; in an understanding with his cardinals he pledged himself to renounce the papacy if the Roman pope would do likewise. Nevertheless on 9 May, 1399, the pope had a notary, in the presence of two witnesses, draw up a protest opposing these stipulations as obtained from him by force, which proceedings he repeated later on. The negotiations as to the custodians of the pope in his palace at Avignon were long drawn out, owing to Benedict's clever policy; at last Louis of Orléans was chosen. Meanwhile a change took place in the public opinion in favour of the pope who was considered to be ill-used. Advances were made between the latter and the cardinals, and many theologians, among them Gerson and Nicholas de Clémanges, began to attack as unlawful the aforesaid withdrawal of the French obedience. The negotiations which France had carried on with the different princes in order to end the schism met with no success. On 12 March, 1403, Benedict secretly took flight from Avignon, and reached territory belonging to Louis II of Anjou, where he was safe. Avignon immediately submitted again to him, and his cardinals likewise recognized him, so that in a short time his obedience was re-established in the whole of France.

Benedict XIII now renewed the interrupted negotiations with the Roman pope, and in 1404 sent four envoys to Rome, to suggest to Boniface IX that some safe spot should be chosen for a meeting between the two popes and both colleges of cardinals, and thus by mutual agreement put an end to the schism. To this proposition Boniface would not listen. After the latter's death (1 Oct., 1404) Benedict's envoys continued to parley with the Roman cardinals. These however on 17 Oct., elected Innocent VII, who also declined any further negotiations. Meanwhile Benedict XIII was trying to strengthen his position through extension of his obedience. In May, 1405, he went to Genoa, in order to enter into new negotiations with Innocent VII, but again without results. Benedict understood how to gain new adherents, and now hoped with their aid to drive his adversary from Rome and thus keep the field as the only pope. However, his position in Italy again became critical. While his attitude in France caused great dissatisfaction, partly because of his taxation of benefices, and partly because of his indifference to the restoration of ecclesiastical unity; also because of his departure from Avignon. He returned to Marseilles by way of Nice, and declared

himself ready to assemble a council of the Avignon obedience. Another assembly of the French clergy took place at the end of 1406; they wished to revoke the pope's right to tax the French benefices. Though Benedict was severely censured, he also found zealous partisans. But no palpable results were obtained.

When Innocent VII died, 6 Nov., 1406, it was hoped, in case a new pope was not chosen at Rome, that Benedict would at last fulfil his promise of abdication, so as to open the way for a new and unanimous election; but as he gave only evasive answers to such suggestions, Gregory XII was chosen pope 30 Nov., at Rome. The latter wrote immediately to Benedict, and announced that he was ready to abdicate on condition that Benedict would do likewise, and that afterwards the cardinals of Avignon would unite with those of Rome for a unanimous papal election. Benedict replied 31 Jan., 1407, accepting the proposition. Further endeavours were now made, in order to induce both popes to secede, and for this purpose a meeting was planned at Savona between Benedict and Gregory. But it never took place. Benedict, indeed, arrived at Savona, 24 Sept., but Gregory did not appear. The position of the Avignon pope grew worse; on 23 Nov., 1407, his principal protector in France, Louis of Orléans, the king's brother, was murdered. The pope no longer received any revenues from French benefices, and when he wrote a threatening letter to King Charles VI, the latter tore it up. On 25 May, 1408, the king declared that France was neutral towards both papal pretenders. Soon a number of cardinals belonging to both obediences met for the purpose of convening a universal council (see PISA, COUNCIL OF). Benedict XIII fled to Roussillon, and on his side called a council at Perpignan which opened on 21 Nov., 1408. Both popes were deposed at the Council of Pisa. The delegation that Benedict sent thither arrived too late. In spite of this, the Avignon pope was still recognized by Scotland, Aragon, Castile, and the Island of Sicily.

The territory of Avignon was seized in 1411 for the Pisan pope (Alexander V). Since 1408 Benedict had resided at Perpignan. Emperor Sigismund went there, 19 Sept., 1415, from the Council of Constance, in order to urge the abdication of Benedict, but without avail. Later it was decided to hold a conference at Narbonne in Dec., 1415, between the representatives of those countries who until then had acknowledged Benedict, for the purpose of withdrawing their obedience on account of his obstinacy. Thereupon, Benedict retired to the castle of Peñiscola (near Valencia, in Spain) which belonged to his family. An embassy to him from the Council of Constance failed to soften his stubbornness, and he was deposed by the council 26 July, 1417. He never submitted to the decision of the council, but continued to consider himself the only legitimate pope, and compared Peñiscola to Noah's Ark. Four cardinals who remained with him, later acknowledged Martin V as rightful pope. Benedict maintained that in 1418 one of the latter's ambassadors had tried to poison him. The date of Pedro de Luna's death has never been ascertained. It is difficult to decide between 29 Nov., 1422, and 23 May, 1423; the date generally given [1424] is incorrect. His few adherents gave him a successor, Muñoz, who for a time continued the schism. Pedro de Luna wrote one or two treatises on canon law ("De concilio generali"; "De novo schismate") edited only in part (Ehrle in "Archiv für Literatur- und Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters", VII, 515 sqq.).

BALUZE, *Vitæ paparum Avenionensium* (Paris, 1693); DE ALPARTIL, *Chronica actitatorum temporibus dom. Benedicti XIII*, ed. EHRLE, I (Paderborn, 1906); EHRLE, *Aus den Akten des Afterkonzils von Perpignan 1408* (*Archiv für Literatur- und Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters*, V, 387–492). IDEM, *Neue Materialien zur Geschichte Peters von Luna* (*ibid.*, VI, 139–308); HEFELE, *Konziliengeschichte*, VI, 2nd ed., and VII; VALOIS, *La France et le grand schisme d'Occident* (4 vols., Paris, 1896–1902); see bibliography, CONSTANCE, COUNCIL OF.

J. P. KIRSCH.

Lund [LUNDA; LONDUNUM (LONDINUM) GOTHORUM (SCANORUM, SCANDINORUM, or DANORUM)], in the Län of Malmöhus—ancient Catholic diocese. The city is now the capital of the former Danish province Skaane (Scania), and is situated on an elevated wooded site in a fertile country, about eight miles from the Sound and twenty-four miles east of Copenhagen. It has a university with a large library containing about 200,000 volumes, and over 2,000 manuscripts, a high school, and a school of languages, arts, and sciences, astronomical observatory, botanical gardens, historical museum, several hospitals, insane asylum, important industries, breweries, and numerous factories for the manufacture of cloth, linen, leather, hardware, bricks, and tiles. It is now a Protestant see. Its superb Romanesque cathedral (its crypt dates from the eleventh or twelfth century) was restored in 1833–78. Of the other numerous medieval churches (21 parish, 9 monastic churches) there now remains only St. Peter's church (monastery of Benedictine nuns) which dates from the middle of the twelfth century. A new All Saints' church was built in 1888–1891. The city has four large public squares and many small irregular streets, the names of which occasionally recall the Catholic past. Of especial interest are the cathedral square and the adjoining "Lundagaard", so called after the former royal castle which stood there, its ancient tower alone remaining. In the Middle Ages Lund was famous as the principal city of the north (*metropolis Daniæ, caput ipsius regni*). Through the centuries (1172, 1234, 1263, 1287, 1678, 1711) the city suffered much from fire and the devastations of war; the kings in their quarrels with the archbishop exhibiting the temper of Vandals. In 1452 Lund was destroyed by the Swedish king, Charles Knutsson, and never recovered from this disaster. The city declined steadily from the beginning of the Reformation and had well nigh lost all its importance when by the Treaty of Roskilde (1658) Denmark was obliged to cede the Provinces of Skaane, Halland, and Blekinge to Sweden. Even the establishment (1666) and endowment of a university (1668) did not raise Lund to its former influential position. In the beginning of the eighteenth century the population had decreased to six hundred and eighty souls; thenceforth it grew slowly until towards the end of the century it numbered three thousand souls. In the nineteenth century trade, commerce and industries greatly increased, and the population grew from 8,385 in 1858, to 19,464 in 1908, nearly all Lutherans.

HISTORY.—Lund brings us back to the heathen and fabulous period of Scandinavia. Nothing authentic is known about the origin of the city but it is certain that as early as the ninth century Lund was a place of great commercial importance. The insignificant stream Hajeaa which now flows near Lund and empties into the Lomma Bay in the south-west was for one thousand years navigable by large vessels. The name Lund (a small wood or grove) is derived from a heathen sacrificial grove which lay to the east of the city, and where the deities of the North, Odin, Thor, Frigga, were honoured. Lund is first mentioned in the Icelandic saga, which tells us that the city, surrounded by a wooden rampart, was plundered and burnt in 940 by the Vikings. The conversion of the North to Christianity was begun a century earlier by Archbishop Ebbo of Reims and St. Anschar, Archbishop of Hamburg-Bremen, his successor in this apostolic work; both worked here personally and also sent missionaries. But the results were neither notable nor lasting, at least in Sweden. Heathenism was not easily uprooted, and in many places was strong enough to prevent the building of churches and the foundation of sees. The missionaries succeeded only in Jutland, where they established the sees of Schleswig, Ribe, and Aarhus (946) as suffragans of Hamburg-Bremen. It was only under King Svend Tves-

kæg (960–1014) and his son Canute (Knud) the Great (1014–1035) that Christianity made any headway in Denmark. They reigned over England also, hence the growing English influence in religion, education, and commerce. Svend obtained English missionaries for Skaane, among them was Gotebald (d. about 1021), first Bishop of Roskilde. Besides other religious houses and monasteries in Denmark Svend erected also the first church in Lund, and dedicated it to the Blessed Trinity. During his reign the See of Odense was established on the Island of Fünen (988).

Canute did still more for the Scandinavian countries, especially for the development of Lund; he encouraged industries and trade and erected at Lund the first mint in Scandinavia. Perhaps Adam of Bremen was right when he said: "Cuius (sc. Sconiæ) metropolis civitas Lundona quam victor Angliæ Chnud Britannicæ Londonæ æmulam jussit esse" (Pertz, "Monum. Germ.", VII, 371), i. e., Canute desired to make Scandinavian Lund the rival of English London. At least he laid the foundation for the growing importance of Lund as the medieval metropolis of Scandinavia. In later centuries Lund was again a royal residence and even more important than Roskilde and Ringsted. Canute VI celebrated at Lund in 1177 his marriage with Henry the Lion's daughter, Gertrude of Saxony; Waldemar the Victorious was crowned there in 1202 and it was there in 1409 that took place the marriage between Eric of Pomerania and Philippa of England. Soon also it became a place of great ecclesiastical importance. The first Bishop of Lund was Bernard, who had been for five years in Iceland and was sent by Canute to Lund in 1022. Canute also filled other sees in Denmark with men who had been consecrated bishops in England, in violation of the right of the Metropolitan of Hamburg; therefore when Gerbrand, consecrated Bishop of Roskilde at Canterbury, repaired to Denmark, he was seized by Archbishop Unvan of Hamburg-Bremen and set free only on submitting to the archbishop as his metropolitan (1022). The king now saw that he was obliged to recognize the privileges of the Archbishop of Hamburg-Bremen, and in this he was followed by the Kings of Sweden and Norway. Adam of Bremen concluded from this that the supremacy of the See of Hamburg was respected as a matter of fact in all Scandinavian countries; every Danish, Swedish, and Norwegian bishop, he says, was obliged to report to Archbishop Libentius II (1029–32) the progress of Christianity in their respective countries (Pertz, "Monum. Germ.", VII, 328).

Lund, however, was not properly a see until Svend Estridsen, the successor of Canute, separated Skaane ecclesiastically from Roskilde (1048) and created two sees, Lund and Dalby. After the death of the unworthy bishop, Henry of Lund, Dalby and Lund were united (1060) but there still remained at Dalby a college of regular canons with a provost. The Province of Skaane must have numbered at that time about three hundred churches (Pertz, "Monum. Germ.", VII, 370). The building of a new stone cathedral which was to be dedicated to St. Lawrence was zealously furthered by the saintly King Canute (1086). Through richly endowed foundations he sought to maintain God's service worthily, and can therefore rightly be called the founder of the cathedral. His deed of gift for this (21 May, 1085) was done apparently on the occasion of the consecration of the church and is the oldest extant Danish royal deed on record in the original.

Later donations were so numerous that the cathedral became the richest church in the North. Lund was also the foremost, though one of the most recent, sees in the Scandinavian Church, only Viborg and Börglum in Jutland being later foundations (1065). Contemporaneously there began for Denmark an epoch of great prosperity, which is still the national pride. This prosperous development was owing to the new ecclesiastical autonomy and independence of the Scandinavian countries, formerly under the Archbishop of Hamburg-Bremen. By several papal Bulls missionary work in the heathen North had been originally assigned to the Archbishop of Hamburg-Bremen, also the jurisdiction over those countries when converted to Christianity. Later, however, several sees were created in Denmark which had already endeavoured to establish a direct union with Rome and to do away with a foreign and troublesome intermediary authority. This was all the more reasonable from the moment that the Bremen prelates, as worldly princes, began to be occupied with affairs of State to the neglect of their duties as spiritual shepherds. They undertook to consecrate their dependent suffragan bishops, or at least reserved to themselves the right of ratification of those bishops when named by the king.

For Denmark the danger was imminent that the powerful Bremen Metropolitan might misuse his influence and by interference in the internal affairs of the country endanger its political liberty and independence. Canute had already planned the establishment of a Scandinavian church province; but it was only under his successor Svend Estridsen ("cuius industria Dania in octo episcopatus divisa est", Langebek, "Script. rer. dan.", III, 444) that negotiations were begun at Rome. Adalbert of Bremen opposed the independence of these northern sees, except on condition that his own metropolitan see were promoted to the dignity of a patriarchate over the whole North. After the death of Adalbert (1072) his successor Liemar sided with Henry IV in the Investitures conflict and Gregory VII invited King Svend to resume the former negotiations. Svend died, however, about 1075 and the Northern Church question rested for some time till Eric Ejegod, the second successor of St. Canute, took up the affair anew and brought it to a close. Apparently, at the Synod of Bari in which Anselm of Canterbury also took part, Eric obtained from Urban II two requests: the establishment of an archbishopric, and the canonization of his brother Canute. Under Paschal II (1100) the efforts of Eric were crowned with success, and the canonization of Canute was solemnized in Odense, all the bishops of the country being present. Shortly after this Eric died in the Island of Cyprus (1103), while on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land. At the same time Cardinal Alberich repaired to Denmark as papal legate to select an appropriate see for the new metropolitan. His choice fell on Lund, and the local bishop, Asger (Adzer), a friend of Anselm of Canterbury, received the pallium and the archiepiscopal dignity (1104). In this way the Northern Church was freed from its dependence on Bremen-Hamburg. Adalbero of Bremen, after the Concordat of Worms (1128), was very anxious to revive the old metropolitan rights in their plenitude, and for this purpose did not shrink from forging papal Bulls.

Emperor Lothair III, in the hope of gaining politically by the civil war which in the meanwhile had broken out in Denmark, supported at Rome Adalbero's request. In fact Innocent II restored the authority of the Archbishop of Bremen over all the northern sees, as is shown by several contemporary letters to Adalbero, to Archbishop Asger, and to the Kings of Sweden and Denmark. Asger, however, held fast to his rights, encouraged by his nephew Eskil, then provost of the cathedral of Lund, who sent Hermann, a canon of Lund, and a Rhinelander, to Rome where he defended successfully the rights of the Metropolitan of Lund guaranteed fully to him thirty years before. This ended for all time the ambitious plans of domination long cherished by the Prelate of Bremen; the lofty dream of a Patriarchate of the North toppled; even the authority of a Frederick Barbarossa (1158) could not revive it. Later Hermann became Bishop of Schleswig; he is buried in the crypt of the cathedral at



UNIVERSITY (1666 OR 1668)
ROMANESQUE CATHEDRAL (RESTORED 1833–78)

LUND

CATHEDRAL CRYPT (XI–XII CENTURY)
APSE OF CATHEDRAL

Lund. In 1134 Asger was confirmed in his dignity by Innocent II, through the papal legate Cardinal Martin. In 1139 his successor Eskil (q. v.) held at Lund the first Northern National Council under the presidency of Cardinal Theodignus. The high altar of the cathedral was solemnly consecrated by Eskil in 1145, making in all with those of the crypt sixty-four consecrated altars. When in 1152 a separate ecclesiastical province was established at Trondhjem (Nidaros) for Norway with bishops of the Faroe Islands, Iceland, and Greenland as suffragans, the Archbishop of Lund received the honour of papal legate with the title of Primate of Denmark and Sweden. Under Eskil's reign the ecclesiastical law of Skaane (1162) and Zeeland (1171) was codified, numerous monasteries founded and the Archbishopric of Upsala established (1164). After the conquest of Rügen (1169) the See of Roskilde was divided and the jurisdiction of Lund was enlarged. Later the North German sees of Lübeck, Ratzeburg, Schwerin, and Cammin were added to Lund as suffragans.

Under Archbishops Absalon (1177–1201) (q. v.), and Andreas Sunesön, 1201–23, Lund was at the zenith of its power. Absalon was equally prominent as prince of the Church and as statesman and continues to be reckoned one of the most prominent men of medieval Denmark. Both he and Eskill encouraged monastic life and were patrons of the arts and sciences. During his reign the famous historian Saxo Grammaticus was provost of Roskilde (1208). Absalon rendered service to the Church by strict discipline and the introduction of celibacy among the clergy. His successor Andreas was a zealous and saintly man highly educated and the most learned medieval theologian of Denmark. The epic "Hexaëmeron" and several hymns testify to his gifts as a classical scholar. He took part personally in the crusades against the heathens in Livonia and Esthonia and established three new suffragan sees in Reval, Leal, and Virland which were lost by the sale of Esthonia to the Teutonic Order (1346). Under him the first Dominican monastery was established in Lund (1221). He was probably present at the Lateran Council and is said to have been the only Dane who ever received a cardinal's hat. He died in 1228 after he had resigned about 1223 on account of ill-health; it has been suggested on account of leprosy.

The second half of this century was saddened by weary strifes between the archbishops and Kings Christopher I and Eric Menved. Archbishops Jacob Erlandsen and Jens Grand were cruelly imprisoned and the country fell under an interdict. Jens Grand escaped from his prison to Rome and Boniface VIII removed the interdict from Lund. The archbishop lived several years in Paris, received in 1307 the See of Bremen and died at Avignon, 1326. The disorders of the time were responsible for the decline of Lund in secular and ecclesiastical affairs. The Province of Skaane passed (1332–1360) to Sweden, was reconquered and was definitely lost by the Peace of Roskilde (1658). At the same time the Archbishop of Lund's influence disappeared for the Archbishop of Upsala assumed complete authority over Lund, thereby depriving the dignity of Primate of Sweden of all meaning. During the time just preceding the Reformation church affairs were in a very bad way in Denmark. Archbishop Birger (1519) rendered valuable service by having the "Missale lundense", the "Breviarium ecclesiæ lundensis", the "Statuta provincialia" as well as the "Historia danica" of Saxo Grammaticus printed at Paris. After his death there were complications and dissensions between Christian II and the cathedral chapter. The originally elected Aage Sparre who was withdrawn to favour the king's choice, Jörgen Skodborg, succeeded (1523) in occupying the archiepiscopal chair but resigned in 1532, powerless to stay the advances of the Reformation. The last Catholic archbishop, Torben Bille, who, however, was never consecrated, was imprisoned by command of Christian III in 1536, church property was confiscated by the crown, and the Reformation was established. A superintendent took the place of the archbishop and the incumbent has had the title of bishop since the incorporation with Sweden in 1658.

Eight years later, Charles X founded a university, solemnly opened in 1668. In 1676 the Danes gave bloody battle near Lund and made in 1709 another fruitless attempt to reconquer Skaane. Charles VII made Lund his head-quarters after his return from Turkey in 1716–1718. In the course of its existence the university has been threatened in several ways, but since the beginning of the nineteenth century it has not been imperilled. It comprises four faculties and received in 1878–82 the gift of a new building from the State. In 1908 there were about one hundred professors stationed there, the number of students being three hundred and twenty-two. A new library was built in 1907. The famous poet, Esaias Tegnér, lived there several years (1812–24) as professor of æsthetics and Greek and died in 1846 as Bishop of Vexiö.

LANGEBEK, *Scriptores rerum danicarum*, I–VII (Copenhagen, 1772–92); *Necrologium Lundense*, III, 422–73; *Liber danicus lundensis*, III, 473; III, 473–579; IV, 26–68; *Saxonis Grammatici historia Danica*, ed. MÜLLER (Copenhagen, 1839); PERTZ, *Mag. Adami Gesta hammenburgensis ecclesiæ Pontificum*, in *Mon. Germ. hist.*, VII (Hanover, 1846), 267–392; SOMMELIUS, *De initiis archiepiscopatus lundensis* (Lund, 1767); NEUMANN, *De fatis Primatus lundensis* (Copenhagen, 1799); THRIGE, *De bremiske Erkebiskoppers Bestræbelser for at vedligeholde deres Höjhed over den nordiske Kirke* (Copenhagen, 1845); CAWALLIN, *Lunds Stifts Herdaminne*, I (Lund, 1854), 1–15; BERLING, *Lund* (Lund, 1859–68); JÖRGENSEN, *Den nordiske Kirkes Grundlæggelse og forste Udvikling*, I, III (Copenhagen, 1862); AHLENIUS, *Sverige, Geografisk, Topografisk, statistisk Beskrifning*, I (Stockholm, Upsala, 1908), 261–83; HUITFELDT, *Danmarks Rigis Krönike*, I, II (Copenhagen, 1652); OERNHJELM, *Historiæ Svenonum Gothorumque ecclesiasticæ libri quatuor priores* (Stockholm, 1689); PONTOPPIDAN, *Annales ecclesiæ danicæ*, I–IV (Copenhagen, 1741, sq.); SUHM, *Historie af Danmark*, II–XIV (Copenhagen, 1784–1828); DAUGAARD, *Om de danske Klostre i Middelalderen* (Copenhagen, 1830); MÜNTER, *Kirchengeschichte von Dänemark und Norwegen* (Leipzig, 1831); REUTERDAHL, *Svenska kyrkans historie* (till 1533), I–IV (Lund, 1836–66); LAPPENBERG, *Hamburgische Urkundenbuch* (Hamburg, 1842); HELVEG, *Den danske Kirkes Historie til Reformationen* I, II (Copenhagen, 1862); JÖRGENSEN, *Historiske Afhandlinger*, I (Copenhagen, 1828), 5–58, 86–179, 202–234; OLRIK, *Konge og Præstestand* (Copenhagen, 1898); IDEM, *Den ældste Danmarkskrönike* (Copenhagen, 1898).

PHILIPP VON KETTENBURG.

Lunette, known in Germany as the lunula and also as the melchisedech, is a crescent-shaped clip made of gold or of silver-gilt which is used for holding the Host in an upright position when exposed in the monstrance. The crescent which holds the Host is securely attached to a small stand or frame and the receptacle of the monstrance is usually provided with a groove into which the stand fits so as to be held firmly in its place. Most commonly, however, nowadays as a precaution against accidents, the Host is not merely fixed between two crescent-shaped strips of metal but is enclosed in a pyx with two glass faces and this pyx is itself inserted bodily into the receptacle of the monstrance. The lunette was certainly in use before the Reformation and it is to be found in many of the monstrances of the fifteenth century which are still preserved to us (see the list in Otte-Wernicke, "Handbuch", I, 243). Already in 1591 Jakob Müller in his "Kirchengeschmuck" gives a detailed description of the lunette, or "mönlein", and points out the desirability that the two strips of metal that form the clip should be separable so as to permit of their being thoroughly purified when the Host is changed. If a glass pyx is used it ought to be possible so to fix the Host that it does not remain in contact with the glass (Decree of S. Cong. of Rites, 4 Feb., 1871).

SCHROD in *Kirchenlexikon*, s. v. *Monstranz;* OTTE-WERNICKE, *Handbuch der kirchlichen Kunst-Archäologie*, I (Leipzig, 1883), 240–4; BARBIER DE MONTAULT, *Traité pratique de l'ameublement des églises*, I (Paris, 1878), 331–3; MÜLLER, *Kirchengeschmuck* (Munich, 1591), 36.

HERBERT THURSTON.

Luni-Sarzana-Brugnato, DIOCESE OF, in the province of Genoa. Luni (originally Luna) was an Etruscan city, but was seized by the Ligurians. At an uncertain date it was taken by the Romans under Domitius Calvinus. In 177 B. C., and under the Second Triumvirate, Roman colonies were established there. The port, though far from the city (the modern port of Spezia), was very important even in antiquity, and the marble of Luna, known to-day as Carrara marble, was very renowned. In the fifth century Luna was sacked by the Vandals, and in 650 by the Lombards. From the ninth century onwards it suffered the depredations of the Saracens, the last time in 1016 under Mogehit, who, however, was conquered the same year (8 June) by the Genoese and Pisan fleets. The city never recovered, however, and in 1058 the inhabitants emigrated to the modern Sarzana. Ruins are still visible of an amphitheatre, a semicircular theatre, a circus, and an aquarium. Numerous sixth century inscriptions, some of which are Christian, have been found at Luni. The sole record of its ancient importance survives in the name of Lunigiana. Sarzana (supposed to be derived from Sergiana) is a small city on the right bank of the River Magras, nearly four miles from the sea. It is first mentioned in 963. The temporal jurisdiction of Sarzana was vested in the bishops of Luni, though it was often contested by the Malaspina marquesses. Later it passed to the Pisans and to the Genoese. In 1353 a congress of princes and representatives of the republics of Italy was held at Sarzana. In the Middle Ages it was an important strategic point; the walls and bastions are still visible, while the citadel, which was erected in 1263 by the Pisans and destroyed and rebuilt by Lorenzo de' Medici (1488) and by Charles VIII (1496), serves to-day as a prison. The cathedral was built after 1200, and was several times restored (1355, 1474, and in 1664 by Cardinal Calandrini). It contains pictures by Salimbene, Fiesella (called "Il Sarzana"), Balletti (Coronation of Frederick III), and sculptures by Baratta. The ceiling in carved wood is the work of Pietro Giambelli. In a precious reliquary is preserved a lacrimatory in which, according to a pious legend, Nicodemus collected some drops of the Blood of Christ. The archives of the cathedral contain the precious "Codex Pallavicinus", a collection of notarial documents and deeds made in 1226 by Bishop Guglielmo Pallavicino. The church of S. Francesco is also important.

The episcopal see dates at least from the fifth century. In the sixth century St. Terentius and St. Venantius, a friend of St. Gregory the Great, flourished. Under Bishop Felerandus the above-mentioned relic of the Blood of Christ is said to have been brought to Luni. St. Ceccardus (892) was murdered by barbarians. When Luni was abandoned, the episcopal see was fixed at Sarzana, then at Sarzanello, and finally at Castelnuovo. In 1202 Innocent III transferred the see to Sarzana, Gualtiero being the bishop. In 1306 Dante went to Sarzana, and succeeded in settling a dispute between Bishop Antonio Camulla and the Marquess Malaspina. The poet's sojourn here inspired a few "terzine" of the "Divine Comedy". In 1355 Charles IV conferred on the bishops of Luni the title of prince of the Holy Roman Empire, Antonio M. Parentuccelli (1495), a cousin of Nicholas V, built the episcopal palace and the church of S. Maria delle Grazie. Other illustrious bishops were Cardinal Simone Pasqua (1561); Giovanni Selvaco (1590), the founder of the seminary; Giulio Cesare Lomellino (1757), the reformer of the diocese; Vincenzo M. Maggioli (1795), put to flight by the Jacobins. In 1787 the Diocese of Pontremoli, and in 1821 that of Massa Ducale were separated from Luni-Sarzana, but the Diocese of Brugnato, separated from Luni by Innocent II in 1133, was added in 1822. The diocese of Luni-Sarzana is directly subject to the Holy See. but Brugnato is a suffragan of Genoa; the united diocese has 107 parishes with 165,000 souls, 10 religious houses of men, and 25 of women, 6 schools for boys and 8 for girls, and a Catholic periodical.

CAPPELLETTI, *Le Chiese d'Italia* (Venice, 1857), XIII; PROMIS, *Memorie dell' antica città di Luni* (Massa, 1887); MUSSI, *Cenni storici della Lunigiana* (Castellamare, 1903).

U. BENIGNI.

Lupus (SERVATUS LUPUS, LOUP), Abbot of Ferrières, French Benedictine writer, b. in the Diocese of Sens, about 805; d. about 862. He assumed the surname of Servatus in commemoration of his miraculous escape from danger either in a serious illness or on the battlefield. He began his education at Ferrières under Aldric and completed it at Fulda under Rabanus Maurus. During his residence at Fulda (c. 830–36) he became an intimate friend and disciple of the learned Einhard. Even before he returned to his native land he had become favourably known at court and was especially esteemed by the Empress Judith, the second wife of Louis the Pious. To her and her son Charles the Bald, whose political interests he always defended, he owed his nomination as Abbot of Ferrières (22 November, 840). Subsequently he took a prominent part in contemporary political and ecclesiastical events, even assuming active command on the battlefield several times. During the war between Charles the Bald and Pepin of Aquitaine he was captured and held prisoner for a short time (844). The same year he was sent to Burgundy to carry out the monastic reforms decreed by the Synod of Germigny (843), and attended the Council of Verneuil on the Oise, the Acts of which have been written by him. He was also present at several other councils, notably that of Soissons in 853, and played an important part in the contemporary controversy regarding predestination. He believed in a twofold predestination, not indeed in the sense that God predestined some men to damnation, but that he foreknew the sins of men and foreordained consequent punishment. The closing years of the life of Lupus were saddened by the threatened devastation of his monastery by the invading Normans. He occupies a prominent place in medieval literary history, being one of the most cultured and refined men of the ninth century. His letters, of which we possess 132, are distinguished for literary elegance and valuable historical information. As a hagiographer he has left us a "Life of St. Maximin", Bishop of Trier (d. 349) and a "Life of St. Wigbert", Abbot of Fritzlar in Hesse (d. 747). In the controversy on predestination he wrote his "De tribus quæstionibus", a work which treated of the threefold question of free will, predestination, and the universality of redemption. To illustrate the teaching of the Church on these topics he brought together pertinent passages from the Fathers in his "Collectaneum de tribus quæstionibus."

The first complete scientific edition of the works of Lupus was published by BALUZE (Paris, 1644, Antwerp, 1710), reprint in P. L., CXIX, 423–700; new edition of the letters in *Mon. Germ. Hist.: Epp.*, (ed. DÜMMLER), VI (Berlin, 1902), 7–114; *Life of St. Maximin, ibid., Script. Rer. Merov.* (ed.. KRUSCH), III (Hanover, 1896), 74–82; *Life of St. Wigbert, ibid., Scriptores* (ed. HOLDER-EGGER), XV (Hanover, 1887), 37–43. See also SPROTTE, *Biographie des Abtes Servatus Lupus* (Ratisbon, 1880); LEVILLAIN, *Étude sur les lettres de Loup de Ferrières* in *Biblioth. de l'Ecole des Chartes*, LXII (1901), 445–509; LXIII (1902), 69–118, 289–330, 537–86; NEANDER, *Church History*, tr. TORREY, III (Boston, 1859), 482–85; for further bibliographical details, see CHEVALIER, *Bio-Bibliog.*, II, 2901–02.

N. A. WEBER.

Lupus (WOLF), CHRISTIAN, historian, b. at Ypres (Flanders), 23 July, 1612; d. at Louvain, 10 July, 1681. He joined the Augustinian Order at the age of fifteen, and on the completion of his studies, was appointed lecturer in theology, to the younger members of the order at Cologne. While occupying this position he won the confidence of the nuncio, Fabio Chigi, afterwards Alexander VII. In 1640 Lupus was appointed professor of theology at Louvain, but, owing to his zeal for the teaching of St. Augustine, was sus-

pected of Jansenism. The nuncio at Brussels accused him of it, and would not permit the University of Louvain to confer a doctor's degree upon him; only after the pope's mediation was it given to him. When the accusation was renewed, Alexander VII called him to Rome, where for the next five years he devoted himself under papal protection to the study of ecclesiastical history. He returned to Louvain in 1660, and was elected provincial of the Belgian province; in 1667 he returned to Rome, accompanied by several professors of the theological faculty of Louvain, to obtain the censure of a number of erroneous moral doctrines. Innocent XI condemned sixty-five of the propositions denounced by him. On his return to Louvain he was appointed regius professor of theology, the first time a religious had ever held this office. His writings were published in thirteen parts, the first twelve at Venice, 1724–1729, in six folio volumes, the thirteenth at Bologna, in 1742. The first six under the title "Synodorum generalium et provincialium statuta et canones cum notis et historicis dissertationibus" (1665–1673) contain a detailed history of the councils, with many learned dissertations. The seventh part contains: "Ad Ephesinum concilium variorum patrum epistolas, item commonitorium Cœlestini papæ, titulos decretorum Hilarii papæ" (Louvain, 1682). He also wrote critical replies to Quesnel, Boileau, and Gerbais. His writings, however, are mostly collections of historical materials, usually but little elaborated by him.

HURTER, *Nomenclator*, II (1893), 514–521.

PATRICIUS SCHLAGER.

Lusatia. See SAXONY, VICARIATE APOSTOLIC OF.

Luscinius (NACHTGALL), OTTMAR, an Alsatian Humanist, b. at Strasburg, 1487; d. at Freiburg, 1537. After receiving instruction at Strasburg from Jacob Wimpheling, he went in 1508 to Paris, where he studied Latin under Faustus Andrelini and Greek under Hieronymus Aleander. He then studied canon law at Louvain, Padua, and Vienna, and in the last city music also under Wolfgang Grefinger. Subsequently, he travelled in Greece and Asia Minor, returning to Strasburg in 1514. Here he became associated with Wimpheling and Sebastian Brant and mingled in literary circles. In 1515 he was appointed organist at the church of St. Thomas, and also received a vicariate, as he was a priest. In addition he taught both in the school of the Knights Hospitallers and in the cathedral school. He spread in Strasburg his own enthusiasm for the Greek language and literature, and published Greek manuals, collections of examples, and an edition of Lucian with a translation. In 1515 he also published a book on the elements of music (Institutiones musicæ), and in 1516 issued a revised edition of the "Rosella" of Baptista Trovamala's compendium of cases of conscience. The most important of his later works are: (1) an edition (1518) of the Commentary on the Pauline Epistles, then ascribed to Bishop Haimo of Halberstadt. In the introduction Luscinius condemns Scholasticism and champions the study of the Bible; (2) an exposition and translation of the Psalms (1524); (3) a harmony of the Gospels in Latin and German (1523–25); (4) the dialogue "Grunnius sophista" (1522), a defence of Humanistic studies; (5) a collection of anecdotes called "Loci ac sales mire festivi" (1524), written chiefly for scholarly circles and intended rather to entertain than to be satirical. It contains extracts from Greek and Roman authors, quotations from the Bible and the Fathers of the Church, and moral applications which consort but ill with the many coarse jests.

Luscinius went to Italy and there received the degree of Doctor of Law. In 1520 he lost his position at St. Thomas's, and failed to obtain a prebend which he had expected, but he was soon made a canon of St. Stephen's at Strasburg. In 1523 he went to Augsburg, and there became a teacher of the Bible and of Greek at the monastery of St. Ulrich. Although a zealous Humanist and an opponent of Scholasticism, Luscinius did not become a supporter of the Reformation. For a time, however, he certainly seems to have been friendly to it, and to have approved of the doctrine of salvation by faith alone. But disputes, which he held to be specious quibbling over words, were distasteful to him, and thus at the beginning he avoided taking sides. After 1525, however, he was regarded as a reliable adherent of the ancient Church. The Fugger made him preacher at the church of St. Moriz, and he became the most important champion of Catholicism at Augsburg, his sermons arousing the ill-will of the Evangelical party. In 1528, after he had repeatedly called the Evangelical preachers heretics, he was arrested and confined to his own house. In 1529 he was made cathedral preacher at Freiburg im Breisgau. Towards the end of his life he wished to enter the Carthusian monastery near Freiburg, but he was prevented by death. Luscinius was a very talented and versatile man—theologian, jurist, musician, and a widely known scholar in "the three languages".

SCHMIDT, *Hist. littéraire de l'Alsace*, II (Paris, 1879), 174–208, 412–8, where a list of his 33 publications and editions is given; GEIGER in *Allgem. deutsche Biogr.*, XIX (Leipzig, 1884), 655–7; KNEPPER, *Das Schul- u. Unterrichtswesen in Elsass* (Strasburg, 1905), passim; SCHRÖDER, *Beiträge zum Lebensbilde Dr. Ottmar Nachtgalls* in *Histor. Jahrb. der Görresgesellschaft*, XIV (1893), 83–106; ROTH, *Augsburgs Reformationsgesch. 1517–30* (2nd ed., Munich, 1901), 16, 130–2, 306–9.

KLEMENS LÖFFLER.

Lusignan, JEAN-BAPTISTE-ALPHONSE, a French-Canadian writer, b. at St-Denis on the Richelieu, P. Q., 27 September, 1843; d. 5 January, 1893; son of Jean-Baptiste Lusignan, a merchant, and Onésime Masse. He was educated at St-Hyacinthe College, and studied theology there and at Montreal Seminary. Judging after three years that he was not called to the Church, he studied law at St-Hyacinthe and at Laval University, Quebec, and practised in the former city for a few years. He contributed to several newspapers and was chief editor (1865–68) of "Le Pays", the principal organ of the French-Canadian Liberal party at the time, a paper the attitude of which in politico-religious questions, notably the so-called undue influence of the clergy in politics, was frequently at variance with the views of ecclesiastical authority. Lusignan published (1872), as a continuation of a similar work by Judge Ramsay, a "Digest of Reported cases"; "Coups d'œil et coups de plume" (1884). He was an ardent patriot and a thorough student of the French tongue, ever zealous by his criticism and by his example to preserve its purity. All his Canadian contemporaries looked upon him as a master of the language, his lexicographical erudition being unrivalled in Canada. All the delicacies and intricacies of French grammar and phraseology were familiar to him. His style, remarkably deft and fluent, would have given him a foremost rank had he been placed in a more favourable field. He was elected (1885) a member of the Royal Society of Canada.

MACLEAN ROSE, *Cyclopedia of Canadian Biography* (Toronto, 1886); *A la mémoire d'Alphonse Lusignan* (Montreal, 1892).

LIONEL LINDSAY.

Lussy, MELCHIOR, statesman, b. at Stans, Canton of Unterwalden, Switzerland, 1529; d. there 14 Nov., 1606. Even in his youth he filled various offices, took part in the campaigns of 1557 and 1573, and was afterwards ten times high bailiff of his native canton. He was often an emissary of the Confederacy at Stans, as well as in France, Spain, etc. In particular he represented, along with Abbot Joachim Eichhorn of Einsiedeln, the Catholic cantons of Switzerland at the Council of Trent. He arrived there 16 March, 1562, and stayed till June, 1563. He promised on oath, in the name of the Catholic confederates, to adopt and maintain the decisions and regulations of the council.

Always mindful of this and filled with zeal for the improvement of the Church's condition, he was from that time tirelessly engaged in bringing about the full accomplishment of the council's decrees in Switzerland. Already in 1564 he resolutely made himself responsible for them; and afterwards he never lost sight of these matters, and never failed to raise a warning voice. Lussy was a friend of St. Charles Borromeo, with whom he had much correspondence, and who also invited him in 1570 to Stans. Lussy zealously arranged the establishment of a papal nunciature to Switzerland, and when Bishop Giovanni Francesco Borromeo of Vercelli arrived in 1579 as nuncio and visitator, Lussy vigorously supported him. He also always gave hearty support to subsequent nuncios. In 1583 he made a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, of which he published an account. Lussy founded the Capuchin monastery at Stans. After 1596 he retired from active office and piously prepared himself for death.

MAYER, *Das Konzil von Trient und die Gegenreformation in der Schweiz*, II (Stans, 1903), 295 sq.; FELLER, *Ritter M. Lussy* (Stans, 1908–09).

F. G. MAYER.

Lust, the inordinate craving for, or indulgence of, the carnal pleasure which is experienced in the human organs of generation. The wrongfulness of lust is reducible to this: that venereal satisfaction is sought for either outside of wedlock or, at any rate, in a manner which is contrary to the laws that govern marital intercourse. Every such criminal indulgence is a mortal sin, provided, of course, it be voluntary in itself and fully deliberate. This is the testimony of St. Paul in the Epistle to the Galatians, v, 19: "Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are fornication, uncleanness, immodesty, luxury, . . . Of the which I foretell you, as I have foretold to you, that they who do such things shall not obtain the kingdom of God." Moreover, if it be true that the gravity of the offences may be measured by the harm they work to the individual or the community, there can be no doubt that lust has in this respect a gravity all its own. Transgressions against virtues other than purity frequently admit of a minor degree of malice, and are accounted venial. Impurity has the evil distinction that, whenever there is a direct conscious surrender to any of its phases the guilt incurred is always grievous. This judgment, however, needs modifying when there is question of some impure gratification for which a person is responsible, not immediately, but because he had posited its cause, and to which he has not deliberately consented. The act may then be only venially sinful. For the determination of the amount of its wickedness much will depend upon the apprehended proximate danger of giving way on the part of the agent, as well as upon the known capacity of the thing done to bring about venereal pleasure. This teaching applies to external and internal sins alike: "Whosoever shall look on a woman to lust after her, hath already committed adultery with her in his heart" (Matt., v, 28). However the case may stand as to the extent of the obligation under which one lies to refrain in certain circumstances from actions whose net result is to excite the passions, moralists are at one as to the counsel they give. They all emphasize the perils of the situation, and point out the practical dangers of a failure to refrain. It matters not that there is not, as we suppose, any initial sinful intent. The sheerest prudence and most rudimentary self-knowledge alike demand abstinence, where possible, from things which, though not grievously bad in themselves, yet easily fan into flame the unholy fire which may be smouldering, but is not extinct.

Lust is said to be a capital sin. The reason is obvious. The pleasure which this vice has as its object is at once so attractive and connatural to human nature as to whet keenly a man's desire, and so lead him into the commission of many other disorders in the pursuit of it. Theologians ordinarily distinguish various forms of lust in so far as it is a consummated external sin, e. g., fornication, adultery, incest, criminal assault, abduction, and sodomy. Each of these has its own specific malice—a fact to be borne in mind for purposes of safeguarding the integrity of sacramental confession.

RICKABY, *The Moral Teaching of St. Thomas* (London, 1896); SLATER, *Moral Theology* (New York, 1908); BALLERINI, *Opus Theologicum Morale* (Prato, 1899).

JOSEPH F. DELANY.

Luther, MARTIN, leader of the great religious revolt of the sixteenth century in Germany, b. at Eisleben, 10 November, 1483; d. at Eisleben, 18 February, 1546. His father, Hans Luther, was a miner, a rugged, stern, irascible character. In the opinion of many of his biographers, it was an exhibition of uncontrolled rage, an evident congenital inheritance transmitted to his eldest son, that compelled him to flee from Möhra, the family seat, to escape the penalty or odium of homicide. This, though first charged by Wicelius, a convert from Lutheranism has found admission into Protestant history and tradition (Mayhew, "German Life and Manners in Saxony", I, London, 1865, 7–113; Böttcher, "Germania Sacra", 1874, 174; Thierisch, "Luther, Gustav Adolf u. Maximilian I von Bayern", Nördlingen, 1869, 165; Schenkel, "Martin Luther", Berlin, 1870, 7; Thou, "Schloss Wartburg", Gotha, 1792, 133; Karl Luther, "Geschichtliche Notizen über M. Luther's Vorfahren", Wittenberg, 1869, 30; Ortmann, "Möhra, Der Stammort D. M. Luthers", Salzung, 1844; Bayne, "Martin Luther", I, London, 1887, 92; in explanation: Köstlin, "Stud. u. Kritik.", 1871, 24–31; Köstlin-Kawerau, "Martin Luther", I, Berlin, 1903, 15; *Am. Cath. Quart., Jan., 1910, "Was Luther's Father a Homicide?", also published in pamphlet form; *Histor. polit. Blätter, CXX, 415–25). His mother, Margaret Ziegler, is spoken of by Melanchthon as conspicuous for "modesty, the fear of God, and prayerfulness" ("Corpus Reformatorum", ed. Bretschneider, VI, Halle, 1834, 156). Extreme simplicity and inflexible severity characterized their home life, so that the joys of childhood were virtually unknown to him. His father once beat him so mercilessly that he ran away from home and was so "embittered against him, that he had to win me to himself again" (Tischreden, Frankfort, 1567, fol. 314 a). His mother, "on account of an insignificant nut, beat me till the blood flowed, and it was this harshness and severity of the life I led with them that forced me subsequently to run away to a monastery and become a monk" (ibid.). The same cruelty was the experience of his earliest school-days, when in one morning he was punished no less than fifteen times (Kroker, "Luthers Tischreden", Leipzig, 1903, 627). The meagre data of his life at this period make it a work of difficulty to reconstruct his childhood. His schooling at Mansfeld, whither his parents had returned, was uneventful. He attended a Latin school, in which the Ten Commandments, "Child's Belief", the Lord's Prayer, the Latin grammar of Donatus were taught, and which he learned "industriously and quickly" (Mathesius, "Historien . . . D. Martin Luthers", Nuremberg, 1588, fol. 3 a). In his fourteenth year (1497) he entered a school at Magdeburg, where, in the words of his first biographer, like many children "of honourable and well-to-do parents, he sang and begged for bread—*panem propter Deum*" (Mathesius, op. cit.). In his fifteenth year we find him at Eisenach. At eighteen (1501) he entered the University of Erfurt, with a view to studying jurisprudence at the request of his father. In 1502 he received the degree of Bachelor of Philosophy, being the thirteenth among fifty-seven candidates. On Epiphany (6 Jan., 1505), he was advanced to the master's degree, being second among seventeen applicants. His philosophical studies were no doubt made under Jodocus Trutvetter

von Eisenach, then rector of the university, and Bartholomäus Arnoldi von Usingen (q. v.). The former was pre-eminently the *Doctor Erfordiensis*, and stood without an admitted rival in Germany. Luther addresses him in a letter (1518) as not only "the first theologian and philosopher", but also the first of contemporary dialecticians (*Kampschulte, "Die Universität Erfurt", I, Trier, 1858, 43). Usingen was an Augustinian friar, and second only to Trutvetter in learning, but surpassing him in literary productivity (ibid.). Although the tone of the university, especially that of the students, was pronouncedly, even enthusiastically, humanistic, and although Erfurt led the movement in Germany, and in its theological tendencies was supposedly "modern", nevertheless "it nowise showed a depreciation of the currently prevailing [Scholastic] system" (ibid., I, 37). Luther himself, in spite of an acquaintance with some of the moving spirits of humanism, seems not to have been appreciably affected by it, lived on its outer fringe, and never qualified to enter its "poetic" circle.

Luther's sudden and unexpected entrance into the Augustinian monastery at Erfurt occurred 17 July, 1505. The motives that prompted the step are various, conflicting, and the subject of considerable debate. He himself alleges, as above stated, that the brutality of his home and school life drove him into the monastery. Hausrath, his latest biographer and one of the most scholarly Luther specialists, unreservedly inclines to this belief. The "house at Mansfeld rather repelled than attracted him" (Beard, "Martin Luther and the Germ. Ref.", London, 1889, 146), and to "the question 'Why did Luther go into the monastery?' the reply that Luther himself gives is the most satisfactory" (Hausrath, "Luthers Leben", I, Berlin, 1904, 2, 22). He himself again, in a letter to his father, in explanation of his defection from the old Church, writes, "when I was terror-stricken and overwhelmed by the fear of impending death, I made an involuntary and forced vow" (De Wette, "Dr. Martin Luthers Briefe", II, Berlin, 1825, 101). Various explanations are given of this episode. Melanchthon ascribes his step to a deep melancholy, which attained a critical point "when at one time he lost one of his comrades by an accidental death" (Corp. Ref., VI, 156). Cochlæus, Luther's opponent, relates "that at one time he was so frightened in a field, at a thunderbolt, as is commonly reported, or was in such anguish at the loss of a companion, who was killed in the storm, that in a short time to the amazement of many persons he sought admission to the Order of St. Augustine" (*Cochlæus, "Historia D. M. Luthers", Dillingen, 1571, 2). Mathesius, his first biographer, attributes it to the fatal "stabbing of a friend and a terrible storm with a thunder clap" (op. cit., fol. 4 b). Seckendorf, who made careful research, following Bavarus (Beyer), a pupil of Luther, goes a step farther, calling this unknown friend Alexius, and ascribes his death to a thunderbolt (Seckendorf, "Ausführliche Historie des Lutherthums", Leipzig, 1714, 51). D'Aubigné changes this Alexius into Alexis and has him assassinated at Erfurt (D'Aubigné, "History of the Reformation", New York, s. d., I, 166). Oerger ("Vom jungen Luther", Erfurt, 1899, 27–41) has proved the existence of this friend, his name of Alexius or Alexis, his death by lightning or assassination, a mere legend, destitute of all historical verification. Köstlin-Kawerau (I, 45) states that returning from his "Mansfeld home he was overtaken by a terrible storm, with an alarming lightning flash and thunderbolt. Terrified and overwhelmed he cries out: 'Help, St. Anna, I will be a monk'." "The inner history of the change is far less easy to narrate. We have no direct contemporary evidence on which to rely; while Luther's own reminiscences, on which we chiefly depend, are necessarily coloured by his later experiences and feelings" (Beard, op. cit., 146).

MARTIN LUTHER
Lukas Cranach, Uffizi Gallery, Florence

Of Luther's monastic life we have little authentic information, and that is based on his own utterances, which his biographers frankly admit are highly exaggerated, frequently contradictory, and commonly misleading. Thus the alleged custom by which he was forced to change his baptismal name Martin into the monastic name Augustine, a proceeding he denounces as "wicked" and "sacrilegious", certainly had no existence in the Augustinian Order (Oerger, op. cit., 75; Kolde, "Die deutsche Augustiner Congregation", Gotha, 1879, 21). His accidental discovery in the Erfurt monastery library of the Bible, "a book he had never seen in his life" (Mathesius, op. cit., fol. 5 a), or Luther's assertion that he had "never seen a Bible until he was twenty years of age" (Lauterbach, "Tagebuch", Dresden, 1872, 36), or his still more emphatic declaration that when Carlstadt was promoted to the doctorate "he had as yet never seen a Bible and I alone in the Erfurt monastery read the Bible" (Bindseil, "D. Martini Lutheri Colloquia", II, 1863–66, 240), which, taken in their literal sense, are not only contrary to demonstrable facts, but have perpetuated misconception, bear the stamp of improbability written in such obtrusive characters on their face, that it is hard, on an honest assumption, to account for their longevity. The Augustinian rule lays especial stress on the monition that the novice "read the Scripture assiduously, hear it devoutly, and learn it fervently" ("Constitutiones Ordinis Fratr. Eremit. Sti Augustini", Rome, 1551, cap. xvii). At this very time Biblical studies were in a flourishing condition at the university, so that its historian states that "it is astonishing to meet such a great number of Biblical commentaries, which force us to conclude that

there was an active study of Holy Writ" (*Kampschulte, op. cit., I, 22). Protestant writers of repute have abandoned the legend altogether (Köhler, "Katholizismus u. Reformation", Giessen, 1905; Walther, "Die deutschen Bibelübersetzungen des Mittelalters," Brunswick, 1892; Geffken, "Der Bilderkatechismus des fünfzehnten Jahrhunderts", Leipzig, 1855; Grimm, "Kurzgefasste Gesch. der luther. Bibelübersetzung", Jena, 1884; Thudichum, "Die deutsche Reformation", I, Leipzig, 1907, 225–235; "Cambridge History: The Reformation", II, 164; Dobschütz, "Der deutsche Rundschau", CIV, 61–75; Maurenbrecher, "Studien u. Skizzen", 221; Kolde, op. cit., 161; Kropatscheck, "Das Schriftprincip der luther. Kirche", 163 sq.). Parenthetical mention must be made of the fact that the denunciation heaped on Luther's novice-master by Mathesius, Ratzeberger, and Jürgens, and copied with uncritical docility by their transcribers—for subjecting him to the most abject menial duties and treating him with outrageous indignity—rests on no evidence. These writers are "evidently led by hearsay, and follow the early legendary stories that have been spun about the person of the reformer" (Oerger, op. cit., 80). The nameless novice-master, whom even Luther designates as "an excellent man, and without doubt even under the damned cowl, a true Christian" (Beard, op. cit., 151), must "have been a worthy representative of his order" (Oerger, op. cit.).

Luther was ordained to the priesthood in 1507. The precise date is uncertain. A strange oversight, running through three centuries, placed the date of his ordination and first Mass on the same day, 2 May, an impossible coincidence. Köstlin, who repeated it (Luther's Leben, I, 1883, 63) drops the date altogether in his latest edition. Oerger (op. cit., 90) fixes on 27 February. This allows the unprecedented interval of more than two months to elapse between the ordination and first Mass. Could he have deferred his first Mass on account of the morbid scrupulosity, which played such a part in the later periods of his monastic life?

There is no reason to doubt that Luther's monastic career thus far was exemplary, tranquil, happy; his heart at rest, his mind undisturbed, his soul at peace. The metaphysical disquisitions, psychological dissertations, pietistic maunderings about his interior conflicts, his theological wrestlings, his torturing asceticism, his chafing under monastic conditions, can have little more than an academic, possibly a psychopathic value. They lack all basis of verifiable data. Unfortunately Luther himself in his self-revelation can hardly be taken as a safe guide. Moreover, with an array of evidence, thoroughness of research, fullness of knowledge, and unrivalled mastery of monasticism, scholasticism, and mysticism, Denifle has removed it from the domain of debatable ground to that of verifiable certainty (*Luther u. Lutherthum, Mainz, 1904). "What Adolf Hausrath has done in an essay for the Protestant side, was accentuated and confirmed with all possible penetration by Denifle; the young Luther according to his self-revelation is unhistorical; he was not the discontented Augustinian, nagged by the monastic life, perpetually tortured by his conscience, fasting, praying, mortified, and emaciated—no, he was happy in the monastery, he found peace there, to which he turned his back only later" (Köhler, op. cit., 68–69).

During the winter of 1508–1509 he was sent to the University of Wittenberg, then in its infancy (founded 2 July, 1502), with an enrolment of one hundred and seventy-nine students. The town itself was a poor insignificant place, with but three hundred and fifty-six taxable properties, and accredited the most bibulous town of the most bibulous province (Saxony) of Germany (Beard, op. cit., 168). While teaching philosophy and dialectics he also continued his theological studies. On 9 March, 1509, under the deanship of Staupitz, he became *Baccalaureus Biblicus* in the theological course, as a stepping-stone to the doctorate. His recall to Erfurt occurred the same year.

His mission to Rome, extending over an estimated period of five months, one of which he spent in the city of Rome, which played so important a part in his early biographies, and even now is far from a negligible factor in Reformation research, occurred in 1511, or, as some contend, 1510. Its true object has thus far baffled all satisfactory investigation. Mathesius makes him go from Wittenberg on "monastic business"; Melanchthon attributes it to a "monkish squabble"; Cochlæus, and he is in the main followed by Catholic investigators, makes him appear as the delegated representative of seven allied Augustinian monasteries to voice a protest against some innovations of Staupitz, but as deserting his clients and siding with Staupitz (*Paulus in "Histor. Jahresbuch", XVI, 73; XXII, 110–113; XXIV, 72–74; *"Hist. pol. Blätter", CXLII, 738). Protestants say he was sent to Rome as the advocate of Staupitz (Köstlin-Kawerau, I, 89–95; Kawerau, "Von Luther's Romfahrt", Halle, 1901; Else, "Luther's Reise nach Rom", Breslau, 1889; Hausrath, "Martin Luther's Romfahrt", Berlin, 1894). Luther himself expressly states that it was a pilgrimage in fulfilment of a vow to make a general confession in the Eternal City (Bindseil, "Colloquia", III, 169; Jürgens, "Luther von seiner Geburt", II, Leipzig, 1846, 271). The outcome of the mission, like its object, still remains shrouded in mystery (Kolde, op. cit., 241). What was the effect of this Roman visit on his spiritual life or theological thought? Did "this visit turn his reverence for Rome into loathing"? Did he find it "a sink of iniquity, its priests infidels, the papal courtiers men of shameless lives?" (Lindsay, "Luther and the German Reformation", New York, 1900). "He returned from Rome as strong in the faith as he went to visit it. In a certain sense his sojourn in Rome even strengthened his religious convictions" (Hausrath, op. cit., 98). "In his letters of those years he never mentions having been in Rome. In his conference with Cardinal Cajetan, in his disputations with Dr. Eck, in his letters to Pope Leo, nay, in his tremendous broadside of invective and accusation against all things Romish, in his 'Address to the German Nation and Nobility', there occurs not one unmistakable reference to his having been in Rome. By every rule of evidence we are bound to hold that when the most furious assailant Rome has ever known described from a distance of ten years upwards the incidents of a journey through Italy to Rome, the few touches of light in his picture are more trustworthy than its black breadths of shade" (Bayne, "Martin Luther", I, 234). His whole Roman experience as expressed in later life is open to question. "We can really question the importance attached to remarks which in a great measure date from the last years of his life, when he was really a changed man. Much that he relates as personal experience is manifestly the product of an easily explained self-delusion" (Hausrath, op. cit., 79). One of the incidents of the Roman mission, which at one time was considered a pivotal point in his career, and was calculated to impart an inspirational character to the leading doctrine of the Reformation, and is still detailed by his biographers, was his supposed experience while climbing the Scala Santa. According to it (Köstlin-Kawerau, I, 98, 749), while Luther was in the act of climbing the stairs on his knees, the thought suddenly flashed through his mind: "The just shall live by faith", whereupon he immediately discontinued his pious devotion. The story rests on an autograph insertion of his son Paul in a Bible, now in possession of the library of Rudolstadt. In it he claims that his father told him the incident. Its historic value may be gauged by the considerations that it is the personal recollections of an immature lad (b. 28 Jan., 1533) recorded twenty years

after the event, to which neither his father, his early biographers, nor his table companions before whom it is claimed the remark was made, allude, though it would have been of primary importance (Boehmer, "Luther im Lichte der neueren Forschung", Leipzig, 1906, 27). "It is easy to see the tendency here to date the (theological) attitude of the Reformer back into the days of his monastic faith" (Hausrath, op. cit., 48).

Having acquitted himself with evident success, and in a manner to please both parties, Luther returned to Wittenberg in 1512, and received the appointment of sub-prior. His academic promotions followed in quick succession. On 4 October he was made licentiate, and on 19 October, under the deanship of Carlstadt—successively friend, rival, and enemy—he was advanced to the doctorate, being then in his thirtieth year. On 22 October he was formally admitted to the senate of the faculty of theology, and received the appointment as lecturer on the Bible in 1513. His further appointment as district vicar in 1515 made him the official representative of the vicar-general in Saxony and Thuringia. His duties were manifold and his life busy. Little time was left for intellectual pursuits, and the increasing irregularity in the performance of his religious duties could only bode ill for his future. He himself tells us that he needed two secretaries or chancellors, wrote letters all day, preached at table, also in the monastery and parochial churches, was superintendent of studies, and as vicar of the order had as much to do as eleven priors; he lectured on the Psalms and St. Paul, besides the demand made on his economic resourcefulness in managing a monastery of twenty-two priests, twelve young men, in all forty-one inmates (De Wette, op. cit., I, 41). His official letters breathe a deep solicitude for the wavering, gentle sympathy for the fallen; they show profound touches of religious feeling and rare practical sense, though not unmarred with counsels that have unorthodox tendencies. The plague which afflicted Wittenberg in 1516 found him courageously at his post, which, in spite of the concern of his friends, he would not abandon.

But in Luther's spiritual life significant, if not ominous, changes were likewise discernible. Whether he entered "the monastery and deserted the world to flee from despair" (Jürgens, op. cit., I, 522) and did not find the coveted peace; whether the expressed apprehensions of his father that the "call from heaven", to the monastic life might be "a satanic delusion" stirred up thoughts of doubt; whether his sudden, violent resolve was the result of one of those "sporadic overmastering torpors which interrupt the circulatory system or indicate arterial convulsion" (Hausrath, "Luthers Leben", I, 22), a heritage of his depressing childhood, and a chronic condition that clung to him to the end of his life; or whether deeper studies, for which he had little or no time, created doubts that would not be solved and aroused a conscience that would not be stilled, it is evident that his vocation, if it ever existed, was in jeopardy, that the morbid interior conflict marked a drifting from old moorings, and that the very remedies adopted to re-establish peace all the more effectually banished it. This condition of morbidity finally developed into formal scrupulosity. Infractions of the rules, breaches of discipline, distorted ascetic practices followed in quick succession and with increasing gravity; these, followed by spasmodic, convulsive reactions, made life an agony. The solemn obligation of reciting the daily Office, an obligation binding under the penalty of mortal sin, was neglected to allow more ample time for study, with the result that the Breviary was abandoned for weeks. Then in paroxysmal remorse Luther would lock himself into his cell and by one retroactive act make amends for all he neglected; he would abstain from all food and drink, torture himself by harrowing mortifications, to an extent that not only made him the victim of insomnia for five weeks at one time, but threatened to drive him into insanity (Seckendorf, op. cit., I, fol. 21 b). The prescribed and regulated ascetical exercises were arbitrarily set aside. Disregarding the monastic regulations and the counsels of his confessor, he devised his own, which naturally gave him the character of singularity in his community. Like every victim of scrupulosity, he saw nothing in himself but wickedness and corruption. God was the minister of wrath and vengeance. His sorrow for sin was devoid of humble charity and childlike confidence in the pardoning mercy of God and Jesus Christ. This anger of God, which pursued him like his shadow, could only be averted by "his own righteousness", by the "efficacy of servile works". Such an attitude of mind was necessarily followed by hopeless discouragement and sullen despondency, creating a condition of soul in which he actually "hated God and was angry at him", blasphemed God, and deplored that he was ever born (Jürgens, op. cit., I, 577–585). This abnormal condition produced a brooding melancholy, physical, mental, and spiritual depression, which later, by a strange process of reasoning, he ascribed to the teaching of the Church concerning good works, while all the time he was living in direct and absolute opposition to its doctrinal teaching and disciplinary code.

Of course this self-willed positiveness and hypochondriac asceticism, as usually happens in cases of morbidly scrupulous natures, found no relief in the sacraments. His general confessions at Erfurt and Rome did not touch the root of the evil. His whole being was wrought up to such an acute tension that he actually regretted his parents were not dead, that he might avail himself of the facilities Rome afforded to save them from purgatory. For religion's sake he was ready to become "the most brutal murderer",—"to kill all who even by syllable refused submission to the pope" (Sämmtliche Werke, XXXX, Erlangen, 284). Such a tense and neurotic physical condition demanded a reaction, and, as frequently occurs in analogous cases, it went to the diametric extreme. The undue importance he had placed on his own strength in the spiritual process of justification, he now peremptorily and completely rejected. He convinced himself that man, as a consequence of original sin, was totally depraved, destitute of free will, that all works, even though directed towards the good, were nothing more than an outgrowth of his corrupted will, and in the judgments of God in reality mortal sins. Man can be saved by faith alone. Our faith in Christ makes His merits our possession, envelopes us in the garb of righteousness, which our guilt and sinfulness hide, and supplies in abundance every defect of human righteousness. "Be a sinner and sin on bravely, but have stronger faith and rejoice in Christ, who is the victor of sin, death, and the world. Do not for a moment imagine that this life is the abiding place of justice: sin must be committed. To you it ought to be sufficient that you acknowledge the Lamb that takes away the sins of the world, the sin cannot tear you away from him, even though you commit adultery a hundred times a day and commit as many murders" (Enders, "Briefwechsel", III, 208). The new doctrine of justification by faith, now in its inchoate stage, gradually developed, and was finally fixed by Luther as one of the central doctrines of Christianity. The epoch-making event connected with the publication of the papal Bull of Indulgences in Germany, which was that of Julius II renewed in adaptable form by Leo X, to raise funds for the construction of St. Peter's Church in Rome, brought his spiritual difficulties to a crisis.

Albert of Brandenburg was heavily involved in debt, not, as Protestant and Catholic historians relate, on account of his pallium (*Pastor, "History of the Popes", VII, 1908, 330), but to pay a bribe to an unknown agent in Rome, to buy off a rival, in order that the archbishop might enjoy a plurality of ecclesiastical

offices. For this payment, which smacked of simony, though the Protestant historian, Kalkoff ("Archiv. für Reform. Geschichte", I, 381), claims such a charge to be untenable, the pope would allow an indemnity, which in this case took the form of an indulgence (Kawerau, "Stud. u. Kritik", 1898, 584–85; Kalkoff, op. cit.; *Schulte, "Die Fugger in Rom.", Leipzig, I, 1904, 93, 140). By this ignoble business arrangement with Rome, a financial transaction unworthy of both pope and archbishop, the revenue should be partitioned in equal halves to each, besides a bonus of 10,000 gold ducats, which should fall to the share of Rome. John Tetzel, a Dominican monk with an impressive personality, a gift of popular oratory, and the repute of a successful indulgence preacher, was chosen by the archbishop as general-subcommissary. History presents few characters more unfortunate and pathetic than Tetzel. Among his contemporaries the victim of the most corrosive ridicule, every foul charge laid at his door, every blasphemous utterance placed in his mouth, a veritable literature of fiction and fable built about his personality, in modern history held up as the proverbial mountebank and oily harlequin, denied even the support and sympathy of his own allies—Tetzel had to await the light of modern critical scrutiny, not only for a moral rehabilitation, but also for vindication as a soundly trained theologian and a monk of irreproachable deportment (*Paulus, "Johann Tetzel", Mainz, 1899; *Hermann, "Johann Tetzel", Frankfort, 1882; *Gröne, "Tetzel und Luther", Soest, 1860). It was his preaching at Jüterbog and Zerbst, towns adjoining Wittenberg, that drew hearers from there, who in turn presented themselves to Luther for confession, that made him take the step he had in contemplation for more than a year. It is not denied that a doctrine like that of indulgences, which in some aspects was still a disputable subject in the schools, was open to misunderstanding and misconception by the laity; that the preachers in the heat of rhetorical enthusiasm fell into exaggerated statements, or that the financial considerations attached, though not of an obligatory character, led to abuse and scandal (*Janssen, "Geschichte des deutsch. Volkes", II, Freiburg, 1892, 78; *"Hist. Jahresbuch", XII, 320, 321). The opposition to indulgences, not to the doctrine—which remains the same to this day—but to the mercantile methods pursued in preaching them, was not new or silent. Duke George of Saxony prohibited them in his territory, and Cardinal Ximenes, as early as 1513, forbade them in Spain (Ranke, "Deutsche Gesch. im Zeit. der Reformation", I, Berlin, 1839, 307).

On 31 October, 1517, the vigil of All Saints', Luther affixed to the castle church door, which served as the "black-board" of the university, on which all notices of disputations and high academic functions were displayed (Beard, op. cit., 213), his Ninety-five Theses. The act was not an open declaration of war, but simply an academic challenge to a disputation. "Such disputations were regarded in the universities of the Middle Ages partly as a recognized means of defining and elucidating truth, partly as a kind of mental gymnastic apt to train and quicken the faculties of the disputants. It was not understood that a man was always ready to adopt in sober earnest propositions which he was willing to defend in the academic arena; and in like manner a rising disputant might attack orthodox positions, without endangering his reputation for orthodoxy" (Beard, op. cit.). The same day he sent a copy of the Theses with an explanatory letter to the archbishop. The latter in turn submitted them to his councillors at Aschaffenburg (*Pastor, op. cit., 242) and to the professors of the University of Mainz. The councillors (*Pastor, op. cit.) were of the unanimous opinion that they were of an heretical character, and that proceedings against the Wittenberg Augustinian should be taken. This report, with a copy of the Theses, was then transmitted to the pope. It will thus be seen that the first judicial procedure against Luther did not emanate from Tetzel. His weapons were to be literary.

Tetzel, more readily than some of the contemporary brilliant theologians, divined the revolutionary import of the Theses, which while ostensibly aimed at the abuse of indulgences, were a covert attack on the whole penitential system of the Church and struck at the very root of ecclesiastical authority. Luther's Theses impress the reader "as thrown together, somewhat in haste", rather than showing "carefully digested thought, and deliberate theological intention"; they "bear him one moment into the audacity of rebellion and then carry him back to the obedience of conformity" (Beard, 218, 219). Tetzel's anti-theses were maintained partly in a disputation for the doctorate at Frankfort-on-the-Oder (20 Jan., 1518), and issued with others in an unnumbered list, and are commonly known as the One Hundred and Six Theses. They, however, did not have Tetzel for their author, but were promptly and rightfully attributed to Conrad Wimpina, his teacher at Leipzig. That this fact argues no ignorance of theology or unfamiliarity with Latin on the part of Tetzel, as has been generally assumed, is frankly admitted by Protestant writers (Lämmer, "Die vortridentinische katholische Theologie", Berlin, 1858, 8). It was simply a legitimate custom pursued in academic circles, as we know from Melanchthon himself (Hausleiter, "Aus der Schule Melanchthons", Griefswald, 1897, 5; Beard, op. cit., 224). Tetzel's Theses—for he assumed all responsibility—opposed to Luther's innovations the traditional teaching of the Church; but it must be admitted that they at times gave an uncompromising, even dogmatic, sanction to mere theological opinions, that were hardly consonant with the most accurate scholarship. At Wittenberg they created wild excitement, and an unfortunate hawker who offered them for sale, was mobbed by the students, and his stock of about eight hundred copies publicly burned in the market square —a proceeding that met with Luther's disapproval. The plea then made, and still repeated, that it was done in retaliation for Tetzel burning Luther's Theses, is admittedly incorrect, in spite of the fact that it has Melanchthon as sponsor (Beard, op. cit., 225, note; *Paulus, op. cit., 52). Instead of replying to Tetzel, Luther carried the controversy from the academic arena to the public forum by issuing in popular vernacular form his "Sermon on Indulgences and Grace". It was really a tract, where the sermon form was abandoned and twenty propositions laid down. At the same time his Latin defence of the Theses, the "Resolutiones", was well under way. In its finished form, it was sent to his ordinary, Bishop Scultetus of Brandenburg, who counselled silence and abstention from all further publications for the present. Luther's acquiescence was that of the true monk: "I am ready, and will rather obey than perform miracles in my justification" (Köstlin-Kawerau, I, 170).

At this stage a new source of contention arose. Johann Eck, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Ingolstadt, by common consent acknowledged as one of the foremost theological scholars of his day, endowed with rare dialectic skill and phenomenal memory, all of which Luther (De Wette, op. cit., I, 100) candidly admitted before the Leipzig disputation took place, innocently became involved in the controversy. At the request of Bishop von Eyb, of Eichstätt, he subjected the Theses to a closer study, singled out eighteen of them as concealing the germ of the Hussite heresy, violating Christian charity, subverting the order of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, and breeding sedition. These "Obelisci" ("obelisks", the old printer's device for noting doubtful or spurious passages) were submitted to the bishop in manuscript form, passed around among intimates, and not intended for publication. In one of their transcribed

forms, they reached Luther and wrought him up to a high pitch of indignation. Eck in a letter of explanation sought to mollify the ruffled tempers of Carlstadt and Luther and in courteous, urgent tones begged them to refrain from public disputation either by lecture or print (Löscher, "Reformations Acta", II, Leipzig, 1723, 64–65; De Wette, op. cit., I, 125). In spite of the fact that Carlstadt forestalled Luther, the latter gave out his "Asterisci" (10 Aug., 1518). This skirmish led to the Leipzig Disputation. Sylvester Prierias, like Tetzel, a Dominican friar, domestic theologian of the Court of Rome, in his official capacity as *Censor Librorum* of Rome, next submitted his report "In præsumtuosas M. Lutheri Conclusiones Dialogus". In it he maintained the absolute supremacy of the pope, in terms not altogether free from exaggeration, especially stretching his theory to an unwarrantable point in dealing with indulgences. This evoked Luther's "Responsio ad Silv. Prierietatis Dialogum". Hoogstraten, whose merciless lampooning in the "Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum" was still a living memory, likewise entered the fray in defence of papal prerogatives, only to be dismissed by Luther's "Schedam contra Hochstratanum", the flippancy and vulgarity of which one of Luther's most ardent students apologetically characterizes as being "in tone with the prevailing taste of the time and circumstances, but not to be commended as worthy of imitation" (Löscher, op. cit., II, 325).

Before the "Dialogus" of Prierias reached Germany, a papal citation reached Luther (7 Aug.) to appear in person within sixty days in Rome for a hearing. He at once took refuge in the excuse that such a trip could not be undertaken without endangering his life; he sought influence to secure the refusal of a safe-conduct through the electorate and brought pressure to bear on the Emperor Maximilian and Elector Frederick to have the hearing and judges appointed in Germany. The university sent letters to Rome and to the nuncio Miltitz sustaining the plea of "infirm health" and vouching for his orthodoxy (De Wette, op. cit., I, 131). His literary activity continued unabated. His "Resolutiones", which were already completed, he also sent to the pope (30 May). The letter accompanying them breathes the most loyal expression of confidence and trust in the Holy See, and is couched in such terms of abject subserviency and fulsome adulation (De Wette, op. cit., 119–122), that its sincerity and frankness, followed as it was by such an almost instantaneous revulsion, is instinctively questioned. Moreover before this letter had been written his anticipatory action in preaching his "Sermon on the Power of Excommunication" (16 May), in which it is contended that visible union with the Church is not broken by excommunication, but by sin alone, only strengthens the surmise of a lack of good faith. The inflammatory character of this sermon was fully acknowledged by himself (De Wette, op. cit., I, 130).

Influential intervention had the effect of having the hearing fixed during the Diet of Augsburg, which was called to effect an alliance between the Holy See, the Emperor Maximilian, and King Christian of Norway, Denmark, and Sweden, in the war against the Turks. In the official instructions calling the Diet, the name or cause of Luther does not figure.

The papal legate, Cajetan, and Luther met face to face for the first time at Augsburg on 11 Oct. Cajetan (b. 1470) was "one of the most remarkable figures woven into the history of the Reformation on the Roman side . . . a man of erudition and blameless life" (Weizsäcker); he was doctor of philosophy and theology before he was twenty-one, at this early age filling chairs with distinction in both sciences at some of the leading universities; in humanistic studies he was so well versed as to enter the dialectic arena against Pico della Mirandola when only twenty-four. Surely no better qualified man could be detailed to adjust the theological difficulties. But the audiences were doomed to failure. Cajetan came to adjudicate, Luther to defend; the former demanded submission, the latter launched out into remonstrance; the one showed a spirit of mediating patience, the other mistook it for apprehensive fear; the prisoner at the bar could not refrain from bandying words with the judge on the bench. The legate, with the reputation of "the most renowned and easily the first theologian of his age", could not fail to be shocked at the rude, discourteous, bawling tone of the friar, and having exhausted all his efforts, he dismissed him with the injunction not to call again until he recanted. Fiction and myth had a wide sweep in dealing with this meeting and have woven such an inextricable web of obscurity about it that we must follow either the highly coloured narrative of Luther and his friends, or be guided by the more trustworthy criterion of logical conjecture.

The papal Brief to Cajetan (23 Aug.), which was handed to Luther at Nuremberg on his way home, in which the pope, contrary to all canonical precedents, demands the most summary action in regard to the uncondemned and unexcommunicated "child of iniquity", asks the aid of the emperor, in the event of Luther's refusal to appear in Rome, to place him under forcible arrest, was no doubt written in Germany, and is an evident forgery (Beard, op. cit., 257–258; Ranke, "Deutsche Gesch.", VI, 97–98). Like all forged papal documents, it still shows a surprising vitality, and is found in every biography of Luther.

Luther's return to Wittenberg occurred on the anniversary of his nailing the Theses to the castle church door (31 Oct., 1518). All efforts towards a recantation having failed, and now assured of the sympathy and support of the temporal princes, he followed his appeal to the pope by a new appeal to an œcumenical council (28 Nov., 1518), which, as will be seen later, he again, denying the authority of both, followed by an appeal to the Bible.

The appointment of Karl von Miltitz, the young Saxon nobleman in minor orders, sent as nuncio to deliver the Golden Rose to the Elector Frederick, was unfortunate and abortive. The Golden Rose was not offered as a sop to secure the good graces of the elector, but in response to prolonged and importunate agitation on his part to get it (Hausrath, "Luther", I, 276). Miltitz not only lacked prudence and tact, but in his frequent drinking-bouts lost all sense of diplomatic reticence; by continually borrowing from Luther's friends he placed himself in a position only to inspire contempt. It is true that his unauthorized overtures drew from Luther an act, which if it "is no recantation, is at least remarkably like one" (Beard, op. cit., 274). In it he promised: (1) to observe silence if his assailants did the same; (2) complete submission to the pope; (3) to publish a plain statement to the public advocating loyalty to the Church; (4) to place the whole vexatious cause in the hands of a delegated bishop. The whole transaction closed with a banquet, an embrace, tears of joy, and a kiss of peace—only to be disregarded and ridiculed afterwards by Luther. The nuncio's treatment of Tetzel was severe and unjust. When the sick and ailing man could not come to him on account of the heated public sentiment against him, Miltitz on his visit to Leipzig summoned him to a meeting, in which he overwhelmed him with reproaches and charges, stigmatized him as the originator of the whole unfortunate affair, threatened the displeasure of the pope, and no doubt hastened the impending death of Tetzel (11 Aug., 1519).

While the preliminaries of the Leipzig Disputation were pending, a true insight into Luther's real attitude towards the papacy, the subject which would form the main thesis of discussion, can best be gleaned from his own letters. On 3 March, 1519, he writes Leo X: "Before God and all his creatures, I bear testimony that I neither did desire, nor do desire

to touch or by intrigue undermine the authority of the Roman Church and that of your holiness" (De Wette, op. cit., I, 234). Two days later (5 March) he writes to Spalatin: "It was never my intention to revolt from the Roman Apostolic chair" (De Wette, op. cit., I, 236). Ten days later (13 March) he writes to the same: "I am at a loss to know whether the pope be antichrist or his apostle" (De Wette, op.cit., I, 239). A month before this (20 Feb.) he thanks Scheurl for sending him the foul "Dialogue of Julius and St. Peter", a most poisonous attack on the papacy, saying he is sorely tempted to issue it in the vernacular to the public (De Wette, op. cit., I, 230). "To prove Luther's consistency—to vindicate his conduct at all points, as faultless both in veracity and courage—under those circumstances, may be left to myth-making simpletons" (Bayne, op. cit., I, 457).

The Leipzig disputation was an important factor in fixing the alignment of both disputants, and forcing Luther's theological evolution. It was an outgrowth of the "Obelisci" and "Asterisci", which was taken up by Carlstadt during Luther's absence at Heidelberg in 1518. It was precipitated by the latter, and certainly not solicited or sought after by Eck. Every obstacle was placed in the way of its taking place, only to be brushed aside. The Bishops of Merseburg and Brandenburg issued their official inhibitions; the theological faculty of the Leipzig University sent a letter of protest to Luther not to meddle in an affair that was purely Carlstadt's, and another to Duke George to prohibit it (Seidemann, "Leipziger Disputation", Dresden and Leipzig, 1843, 126). Scheurl, then an intimate of Luther's, tried to dissuade him from the meeting; Eck, in terms pacific and dignified, replied to Carlstadt's offensive, and Luther's pugnacious letters, in fruitless endeavour to avert all public controversy either in print or lecture (Löscher, op. cit., II, 64–65); Luther himself, pledged and forbidden all public discourse or print, begged Duke Frederick to make an endeavour to bring about the meeting (De Wette, op. cit., I, 175) at the same time that he personally appealed to Duke George for permission to allow it, and this in spite of the fact that he had already given the theses against Eck to the public. In the face of such urgent pressure Eck could not fail to accept the challenge. Even at this stage Eck and Carlstadt were to be the accredited combatants, and the formal admission of Luther into the disputation was only determined upon when the disputants were actually at Leipzig.

The disputation on Eck's twelve, subsequently thirteen, theses, was opened with much parade and ceremony on 27 June, and the university *aula* being too small, was conducted at the Pleissenburg Castle. The wordy battle was between Carlstadt and Eck on the subject of Divine grace and human free will. As is well known, it ended in the former's humiliating discomfiture. Luther and Eck's discussion, 4 July, was on papal supremacy. The former, though gifted with a brilliant readiness of speech, lacked—and his warmest admirers admit it—the quiet composure, curbed self-restraint, and unruffled temper of a good disputant. The result was that the imperturbable serenity and unerring confidence of Eck had an exasperating effect on him. He was "querulous and censorious", "arbitrary and bitter" (Mosellanus), which hardly contributed to the advantage of his cause, either in argumentation or with his hearers. Papal supremacy was denied by him, because it found no warrant in Holy Writ or in Divine right. Eck's comments on the "pestilential" errors of Wiclif and Hus condemned by the Council of Constance was met by the reply, that, so far as the position of the Hussites was concerned, there were among them many who were "very Christian and evangelical". Eck took his antagonist to task for placing the individual in a position to understand the Bible better than the popes, councils, doctors, and universities, and in pressing his argument closer, asserting that the condemned Bohemians would not hesitate to hail him as their patron, elicited the ungentle remonstrance "that is a shameless lie". Eck, undisturbed and with the instinct of the trained debater, drove his antagonist still further, until he finally admitted the fallibility of an œcumenical council, upon which he closed the discussion with the laconic remark: "If you believe a legitimately assembled council can err and has erred, then you are to me as a heathen and publican" (Köstlin-Kawerau, op. cit., I, 243–50). This was 15 July. Luther returned sullen and crestfallen to Wittenberg, from what had proved to him an inglorious tournament (De Wette, op. cit., I, 284–89; 290–306; "Lutheri Opp. Lat.; Erl.", III, 487; Scheurl, "Briefbuch", II, Potsdam, 1867, 92).

The disastrous outcome of the disputation (Maurenbrecher, "Gesch. der Kath. Reform", Nordlingen, 1880, 171; Köhler, "Denifles Luther", 9) drove him to reckless, desperate measures. He did not scruple, at this stage, to league himself with the most radical elements of national humanism and freebooting knighthood, who in their revolutionary propaganda hailed him as a most valuable ally. His comrades in arms now were Ulrich von Hutten and Franz von Sickingen, with the motley horde of satellites usually found in the train of such leadership. With Melanchthon, himself a humanist, as an intermediary, a secret correspondence was opened with Hutten (De Wette, I, 451), and to all appearances Sickingen was directly or indirectly in frequent communication (op. cit., I, 451, 460). Hutten, though a man of uncommon talent and literary brilliancy, was, nevertheless, a moral degenerate, without conscience or character (Maurenbrecher, "Geschichte der katholisch. Reformation", 199; Menzel, "Neuere Gesch. der Deutschen", II, Breslau, 1826, 255; Paulsen, "Gesch. des gelehrten Unterrichts", Leipzig, 1885, 51; Vorreiter, "Luthers Ringen mit den anti-christl. Princip. der Revolution", Halle, 1860, 55). Sickingen, the prince of *condottieri*, was a sordid mercenary and political marplot, whose daring deeds and murderous atrocities form a part of German legendary lore. With his three impregnable fastnesses, Ebernburg, Landstuhl, and Hohenburg, with their adventurous soldiery, fleet-footed cavalry, and primed artillery, "who took to robbery as to a trade and considered it rather an honour to be likened to wolves" (Cambridge Hist., II, 154), a menace to the very empire, he was a most useful adjunct. With Luther they had little in common, for both were impervious to all religious impulses, unless it was their deadly hatred of the pope, and the confiscation of church property and land (op. cit., 155). The disaffection among the knights was particularly acute. The flourishing condition of industry made the agrarian interests of the small landowners suffer; the new methods of warfare diminished their political importance; the adoption of the Roman law while it strengthened the territorial lords, threatened to reduce the lower nobility to a condition of serfdom. A change, even though it involved revolution, was desired, and Luther and his movement were welcomed as the psychological man and cause. Hutten offered his pen, a formidable weapon: Sickingen his fortress, a haven of safety; the former assured him of the enthusiastic support of the national humanists, the latter "bade him stand firm and offered to encircle him with . . . swords" (Bayne, op. cit., II, 59). The attack would be made on the ecclesiastical princes, as opposed to Lutheran doctrines and knightly privileges. In the meantime Luther was saturating himself with published and unpublished humanistic anti-clerical literature so effectually that his passionate hatred of Rome and the pope, his genesis of Antichrist, his contemptuous scorn for his theological opponents, his effusive professions of patriotism, his acquisition of

the literary amenities of the "Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum", even the bodily absorption of Hutten's arguments, not to allude to other conspicuous earmarks of his intercourse and association with the humanistic-political agitators, can be unerringly traced here (Hausrath, op. cit., I, 341; Kampschulte, op. cit., II, 73–105). It was while living in the atmosphere surcharged with these influences, that he issued his first epochal manifesto, "Address to the German Nobility". It is in "its form an imitation of Hutten's circular letter to the emperor and German nobility", and the greater part of its contents is an abstract of Hutten's "Vadiscus or Roman Trinity", from his "Lament and Exhortation", and from his letters to the Elector Frederick of Saxony (Meiners, "Lebensbeschreib. berühmter Männer.", Zurich, III, 1797, 371). This seems to be admitted by competent Lutheran specialists (Maurenbrecher, "Studien u. Skizzen", Leipzig, 1874, 254; Werckhagen, "Luther u. Hutten", Wittenberg, 1888, 44–87; Kolde, "Luthers Stellung zu Konzil u. Kirche", 69; Benrath, "An den christl. Adel deutsch. Nation", No. 4, "Schrift für Reform. Gesch.", 1884). He steps from the arena of academic gravity and verbal precision to the forum of the public in "an invective of dazzling rhetoric". He addresses the masses; his language is that of the populace; his theological attitude is abandoned; his sweeping eloquence fairly carries the emotional nature of his hearers—while even calm, critical reason stands aghast, dumbfounded; he becomes the hieratic interpreter, the articulate voice of latent slumbering national aspirations. In one impassioned outburst, he cuts from all his Catholic moorings—the merest trace left seeming to intensify his fury. Church and State, religion and politics, ecclesiastical reform and social advancement, are handled with a flaming, peerless oratory. He speaks with reckless audacity; he acts with breathless daring. War and revolution do not make him quail—has he not the pledged support of Ulrich von Hutten, Franz von Sickingen, Sylvester von Schaumburg? Is not the first the revolutionary master spirit of his age—cannot the second make even an emperor bow to his terms? The "gospel", he now sees "cannot be introduced without tumult, scandal, and rebellion"; "the word of God is a sword, a war, a destruction, a scandal, a ruin, a poison" (De Wette, op. cit., I, 417). As for pope, cardinals, bishops, "and the whole brood of Roman Sodom", why not attack it "with every sort of weapon and wash our hands in its blood" (Walch, XVIII, 245).

Luther the reformer had become Luther the revolutionary; the religious agitation had become a political rebellion (Maurenbrecher, op. cit., 155, 394; Treitschke, "Preussische Jahrbücher", LII, 476; Paulsen, op. cit., 173; Weizsäcker, "Göttingen Gelehrt. Anzeigen", 1881, 846; Droysen, "Gesch. der preuss. Politik", I, 145, 178; Barkhausen, "Gesch. der Philosophie", III, 258; Hansen, "Sind wir noch Lutheraner", Copenhagen, 1885, 9, 10, 13, 86; "Athenæum", 2 Feb., 1884, 146; "Academy", 26 Jan., 1884, 54; Creighton, "Hist. of the Papacy", VI, 1891, 169; Bayne, op. cit., II, 165; "Cambridge Hist.", II, 166).

Luther's theological attitude at this time, as far as a formulated cohesion can be deduced, was as follows: The Bible is the only source of faith; it contains the plenary inspiration of God; its reading is invested with a quasi-sacramental character. Human nature has been totally corrupted by original sin, and man, accordingly, is deprived of free will. Whatever he does, be it good or bad, is not his own work, but God's. Faith alone can work justification, and man is saved by confidently believing that God will pardon him. This faith not only includes a full pardon of sin, but also an unconditional release from its penalties. The hierarchy and priesthood are not Divinely instituted or necessary, and ceremonial or exterior worship is not essential or useful. Ecclesiastical vestments, pilgrimages, mortifications, monastic vows, prayers for the dead, intercession of saints, avail the soul nothing. All sacraments, with the exception of baptism, Holy Eucharist, and penance, are rejected, but their absence may be supplied by faith. The priesthood is universal; every Christian may assume it. A body of specially trained and ordained men to dispense the mysteries of God is needless and a usurpation. There is no visible Church or one specifically established by God whereby men may work out their salvation. The emperor is appealed to in his three primary pamphlets, to destroy the power of the pope, to confiscate for his own use all ecclesiastical property, to abolish ecclesiastical feasts, fasts, and holidays, to do away with Masses for the dead, etc. In his "Babylonian Captivity", particularly, he tries to arouse national feeling against the papacy, and appeals to the lower appetite of the crowd by laying down a sensualized code of matrimonial ethics, little removed from paganism, which "again came to the front during the French Revolution" (Hagen, "Deutsche literar. u. religiöse Verhältnisse", II, Erlangen, 1843, 235). His third manifesto, "On the Freedom of a Christian Man", more moderate in tone, though uncompromisingly radical, he sent to the pope.

In April, 1520, Eck appeared in Rome, with the German works, containing most of these doctrines, translated into Latin. They were submitted and discussed with patient care and critical calmness. Some members of the four consistories, held between 21 May and 1 June, counselled gentleness and forbearance, but those demanding summary procedure prevailed. The Bull of excommunication, "Exsurge Domine", was accordingly drawn up 15 July. It formally condemned forty-one propositions drawn from his writings, ordered the destruction of the books containing the errors, and summoned Luther himself to recant within sixty days or receive the full penalty of ecclesiastical punishment. Three days later (18 July) Eck was appointed papal prothonotary with the commission to publish the Bull in Germany. The appointment of Eck was both unwise and imprudent. Luther's attitude towards him was that of implacable personal hatred; the dislike of him among the humanists was decidedly virulent; his unpopularity among many Catholics was also well known. Moreover, his personal feelings, as the relentless antagonist of Luther, could hardly be effaced, so that a cause which demanded the most untrammelled exercise of judicial impartiality and Christian charity would hardly find its best exponent in a man in whom individual triumph would supersede the pure love of justice. Eck saw this, and accepted the duty only under compulsion (Wiedmann, op. cit., 153). His arrival in Germany was signalized by an outburst of popular protest and academic resentment, which the national humanists and friends of Luther lost no time in fanning to a fierce flame. He was barely allowed to publish the Bull in Meissen (21 Sept.), Merseburg (25 Sept.), and Brandenburg (29 Sept.), and a resistance almost uniform greeted him in all other parts of Germany. He was subjected to personal affronts, mob violence. The Bull itself became the object of shocking indignities. Only after protracted delays could even the bishops be induced to show it any deference. The crowning dishonour awaited it at Wittenberg (Stud. u. Krit., 1901, 460), where (10 Dec.), in response to a call issued by Melanchthon, the university students assembled at the Elster Gate, and amid the jeering chant of "Te Deum laudamus", and "Requiem æternam", interspersed with ribald drinking songs, Luther in person consigned it to the flames.

The Bull seemingly affected him little. It only drove him to further extremes and gave a new momentum to the revolutionary agitation. As far back as 10 July, when the Bull was only under discussion, he scornfully defied it. "As for me, the die is cast: I despise alike the favour and fury of Rome; I do not

wish to be reconciled with her, or ever to hold any communion with her. Let her condemn and burn my books; I, in turn, unless I can find no fire, will condemn and publicly burn the whole pontifical law, that swamp of heresies" (De Wette, op. cit., I, 466).

The next step, the enforcement of the provisions of the Bull, was the duty of the civil power. This was done, in the face of vehement opposition now manifesting itself, at the Diet of Worms, when the young newly-crowned Charles V was for the first time to meet the assembled German Estates in solemn deliberation. Charles, though not to be ranked with the greatest characters of history, was "an honourable Christian gentleman, striving in spite of physical defect, moral temptations, and political impossibilities, to do his duty in that state of life to which an unkind Providence had called him" (Armstrong, "The Emperor Charles V", II, London, 1902, 383). Great and momentous questions, national and religious, social and economic, were to be submitted for consideration—but that of Luther easily became paramount. The pope sent two legates to represent him—Marino Carricioli, to whom the political problems were entrusted, and Jerome Aleander, who should grapple with the more pressing religious one. Aleander was a man of brilliant, even phenomenal, intellectual and linguistic endowments (Hausrath, "Aleander u. Luther", Berlin, 1897, 49), "a man of the world almost modern in his progressive ideas" (Armstrong, op. cit., I, 61), a trained statesman, not altogether free from the "zeal and cunning" which at times enter the game of diplomacy. Like his staunch supporter, the Elector George of Saxony, he was not only open-minded enough to admit the deplorable corruption of the Church, the grasping cupidity of Roman curial procedure, the cold commercialism and deep-seated immorality that infected many of the clergy, but, like him, he was courageous enough to denounce them with freedom and point to the pope himself. His problem, by the singular turn of events, was to become the gravest that confronted not only the Diet, but Christendom itself. Its solution or failure was to be pregnant with a fate that involved Church and State, and would guide the course of the world's history. Germany was living on a politico-religious volcano. All walks of life were in a convulsive state of unrest that boded ill for Church and State. Luther by his inflammatory denunciation of pope and clergy let loose a veritable hurricane of fierce, uncontrollable racial and religious hatred, which was to spend itself in the bloodshed of the Peasants' War and the orgies of the Sack of Rome; his adroit juxtaposition of the relative powers and wealth of the temporal and spiritual estates fostered jealousy and fed avarice; the chicanery of the revolutionary propagandists and pamphleteering poetasters lit up the nation with rhetorical fireworks, in which sedition and impiety, artfully garbed in Biblical phraseology and sanctimonious platitudes, posed as "evangelical" liberty and pure patriotism; the restive peasants, victims of oppression and poverty, after futile sporadic uprisings, lapsed into stifled but sullen and resentful malcontents; the unredressed wrongs of the burghers and labourers in the populous cities clamoured for a change, and the victims were prepared to adopt any method to shake off disabilities daily becoming more irksome; the increasing expense of living, the decreasing economic advancement, goaded the impecunious knights to desperation, their very lives since 1495 being nothing more than a struggle for existence (Maurenbrecher, "Studien u. Skizzen", 246); the territorial lords cast envious eyes on the teeming fields of the monasteries and the princely ostentation of church dignitaries, and did not scruple in the vision of a future German autonomy to treat even the "Spanish" sovereign with dictatorial arrogance or tolerant complacency. The city of Worms itself was within the grasp of a reign of lawlessness, debauchery, and murder (*Janssen, op. cit., II, 162). From the bristling Ebernburg, Sickingen's lair, only six miles from the city, Hutten was hurling his truculent philippics, threatening with outrage and death the legate (whom he had failed to waylay), the spiritual princes and church dignitaries, not sparing even the emperor, whose pension as a bribe to silence had hardly been received. Germany was in a reign of terror; consternation seemed to paralyze all minds. A fatal blow was to be struck at the clergy, it was whispered, and then the famished knights would scramble for their property. Over all loomed the formidable apparition of Sickingen. He was in Aleander's opinion "sole king in Germany now; for he has a following, when and as large as he wishes. The emperor is unprotected, the princes are inactive; the prelates quake with fear. Sickingen at the moment is the terror of Germany before whom all quail" (Brieger, "Aleander u. Luther", Gotha, 1884, 125). "If a proper leader could be found, the elements of revolution were already at hand, and only awaited the signal for an outbreak" (Maurenbrecher, op. cit., 246).

Such was the critical national and local ferment, when Luther at the psychological moment was projected into the foreground by the Diet of Worms, where "the devils on the roofs of the houses were rather friendly . . . than otherwise" (Cambridge Hist., II, 147), to appear as the champion against Roman corruption, which in the prevailing frenzy became the expression of national patriotism. "He was the hero of the hour solely because he stood for the national opposition to Rome" (ibid., 148; cf. Strobel, "Leben Thomas Münzers", Nuremberg, 1795, 166). His first hearing before the Diet (17 April) found him not precisely in the most confident mood. Acknowledging his works, he met the further request that he recall them by a timid reply, "in tones so subdued that they could hardly be heard with distinctness in his vicinity", that he be given time for reflection. His assurance did not fail him at the second hearing (18 April) when his expected steadfastness asserted itself, and his refusal was uttered with steady composure and firm voice, in Latin and German, that, unless convinced of his errors by the Scriptures or plain reason, he would not recant. "I neither can nor will recant anything, for it is neither safe nor right to act against one's conscience", adding in German—"God help me, Amen." The emperor took action the next day (19 April) by personally writing to the Estates, that true to the traditions of his Catholic forefathers, he placed his faith in the Christian doctrine and the Roman Church, in the Fathers, in the councils representing Christendom, rather than in the teaching of an individual monk, and orders Luther's departure. "The word which I pledged him", he concludes, "and the promised safe-conduct he will receive. Be assured, he will return unmolested whence he came" (Förstemann, "Neues Urkundenbuch", I, Hamburg, 1842, 75). All further negotiations undertaken in the meantime to bring about an adjustment having failed, Luther was ordered to return, but forbidden to preach or publish while on the way. The edict, drafted (8 May) was signed 26 May, but was only to be promulgated after the expiration of the time allowed in the safe-conduct. It placed Luther under the ban of the empire and ordered the destruction of his writings.

It may not be amiss to state that the historicity of Luther's famed declaration before the assembled Diet, "Here I stand. I can not do otherwise. So help me, God. Amen", has been successfully challenged and rendered inadmissible by Protestant researches. Its retention in some of the larger biographies and histories, seldom if ever without laborious qualification, can only be ascribed to the deathless vitality of a sacred fiction or an absence of historical rectitude on the part of the writer (Burkhardt, "Theologische Studien und Kritiken", 1869, 517–531; Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte, VI, 248; Elter, "Luther und

der Wormser Reichstag", Bonn, 1885, 67–72; Maurenbrecher, "Geschichte der katholisch. Reformation", I, 398; Wrede, "Deutsche Reichsakten unter Kaiser Karl V", II, Gotha, 1896, 555, note; Kalkoff, "Die Depeschen des N. Aleander," Halle, 1897, 174, note 2; Köstlin-Kawerau, op. cit., I, 419; Kolde, "Luther in Worms", Munich, 1897, 21; Hausrath, "Aleander und Luther", 271. The latter three make only tacit admissions).

He left Worms 26 April, for Wittenberg, in the custody of a party consisting mainly, if not altogether, of personal friends. By a secret agreement, of which he was fully cognizant (De Wette, op. cit., I, 588–89), being apprised of it the night before his departure by the Elector Frederick, though he was unaware of his actual destination, he was ambushed by friendly hands in the night of 4 May, and spirited to the Castle of Wartburg, near Eisenach.

The year's sojourn in the Wartburg marks a new and decisive period in his life and career. Left to the seclusion of his own thoughts and reflections, undisturbed by the excitement of political and polemical agitation, he became the victim of an interior struggle that made him writhe in the throes of racking anxiety, distressing doubts and agonizing reproaches of conscience. With a directness that knew no escape, he was now confronted by the poignant doubts aroused by his headlong course: was he justified in his bold and unprecedented action; were not his innovations diametrically opposed to the history and experience of spiritual and human order as it prevailed from Apostolic times; was he, "he alone", the chosen vessel singled out in preference to all the saints of Christendom to inaugurate these radical changes; was he not responsible for the social and political upheaval, the rupture of Christian unity and charity, and the consequent ruin of immortal souls (De Wette, op. cit., II, 2, 10, 16, 17, 22, 23)? To this was added an irrepressible outbreak of sensuality which assailed him with unbridled fury (De Wette, op. cit., II, 22), a fury that was all the more fierce on account of the absence of the approved weapons of spiritual defence (*Denifle, op. cit., I, 377), as well as the intensifying stimulus of his imprudent gratification of his appetite for eating and drinking. And, in addition to this horror, his temptations, moral and spiritual, became vivid realities; satanic manifestations were frequent and alarming; nor did they consist in mere verbal encounter but in personal collision. His disputation with Satan on the Mass (Walch, XIX, 1489–1490), has become historical. His life as Juncker George, his neglect of the old monastic dietetic restrictions, racked his body in paroxysms of pain, "which did not fail to give colour to the tone of his polemical writings" (Hausrath, op. cit., I, 476), nor sweeten the acerbity of his temper, nor soften the coarseness of his speech. However, many writers regard his satanic manifestations as pure delusions (*Denifle-Weiss, "Luther u. Luthertum", II, 1909, 215 sq.).

It was while he was in these sinister moods that his friends usually were in expectant dread that the flood of his exhaustless abuse and unparalleled scurrility would dash itself against the papacy, Church, and monasticism. "I will curse and scold the scoundrels until I go to my grave, and never shall they hear a civil word from me. I will toll them to their graves with thunder and lightning. For I am unable to pray without at the same time cursing. If I am prompted to say: 'hallowed be Thy name', I must add: 'cursed, damned, outraged be the name of papists'. If I am prompted to say: 'Thy Kingdom come', I must perforce add: 'cursed, damned, destroyed must be the papacy'. Indeed I pray thus orally every day and in my heart without intermission" (Sämmtl. W., XXV, 108). Need we be surprised that one of his old admirers, whose name figured with his on the original Bull of excommunication, concludes that Luther "with his shameless, ungovernable tongue, must have lapsed into insanity or been inspired by the Evil Spirit" (Pirkheimer, ap. *Döllinger, "Die Reformation", Ratisbon, I, 1846–48, 533–34)?

While at the Wartburg, he published his tract "On Confession", which cut deeper into the mutilated sacramental system he retained by lopping off penance. This he dedicated to Franz von Sickingen. His replies to Latomus of Louvain and Emser, his old antagonist, and to the theological faculty of the University of Paris, are characterized by his proverbial spleen and discourtesy. Of the writings of his antagonists he invariably "makes an arbitrary caricature and he belabours them in blind rage . . . he hurls at them the most passionate replies" (Lange, "Martin Luther, ein religiöses Characterbild", Berlin, 1870, 109). His reply to the papal Bull "In cœna Domini", written in colloquial German, appeals to the grossest sense of humour and sacrilegious banter.

His chief distinction while at the Wartburg, and one that will always be inseparably connected with his name, was his translation of the New Testament into German. The invention of printing gave a vigourous impetus to the multiplication of copies of the Bible, so that fourteen editions and reprints of German translations from 1466 to 1522 are known to have existed. But their antiquated language, their uncritical revision, and their puerile glosses, hardly contributed to their circulation. To Luther the vernacular Bible became a necessary adjunct, an indispensable necessity. His subversion of the spiritual order, abolition of ecclesiastical science, rejection of the sacraments, suppression of ceremonies, degradation of Christian art, demanded a substitute, and a more available one than the "undefiled Word of God", in association with "evangelical preaching" could hardly be found. In less than three months the first copy of the translated New Testament was ready for the press. Assisted by Melanchthon, Spalatin, and others whose services he found of use, with the Greek version of Erasmus as a basis, with notes and comments charged with polemical animus and woodcuts of an offensively vulgar character supplied by Cranach, and sold for a trivial sum, it was issued at Wittenberg in September. Its spread was so rapid that a second edition was called for as early as December. Its linguistic merits were indisputable; its influence on national literature most potent. Like all his writings in German, it was the speech of the people; it struck the popular taste and charmed the national ear. It unfolded the affluence, clarity, and vigour of the German tongue in a manner and with a result that stands almost without a parallel in the history of German literature (Pietsch, "M. Luther u. die hochdeutsche Sprache", Breslau, 1883; Kluge, "Von Luther bis Lessing", Strasburg, 1888; Franke, "Grundzüge der Schriftsprache Luthers", Görlitz, 1888). That he is the creator of the new High German literary language is hardly in harmony with the facts and researches of modern philological science (*Janssen, II, 530–75). While from the standpoint of the philologist it is worthy of the highest commendation, theologically it failed in the essential elements of a faithful translation. By attribution and suppression, mistranslation and wanton garbling, he made it the medium of attacking the old Church, and vindicating his individual doctrines (*Döllinger, op. cit., III, 139–73; "Cambridge Hist.", II, 164–65).

A book that helped to depopulate the sanctuary and monastery in Germany, one that Luther himself confessed to be his most unassailable pronouncement, one that Melanchthon hailed as a work of rare learning, and which many Reformation specialists pronounce, both as to contents and results, his most important work, had its origin in the Wartburg. It was his "Opinion on Monastic Orders". Dashed off at white heat and expressed with that whirlwind impetuosity that made him so powerful a leader, it made the bold

proclamation of a new code of ethics: that concupiscence is invincible, the sensual instincts irrepressible, the gratification of sexual propensities as natural and inexorable as the performance of any of the physiological necessities of our being. It was a trumpet call to priest, monk, and nun to break their vows of chastity and enter matrimony. The "impossibility" of successful resistance to our natural sensual passions was drawn with such dazzling rhetorical fascination that the salvation of the soul, the health of the body, demanded an instant abrogation of the laws of celibacy. Vows were made to Satan, not to God; the devil's law was absolutely renounced by taking a wife or husband. The consequences of such a moral code were immediate and general. They are evident from the stinging rebuke of his old master, Staupitz, less, than a year after its promulgation, that the most vociferous advocates of his old pupil were the frequenters of notorious houses, not synonymous with a high type of decency (Enders, op. cit., III, 406). To us the whole treatise would have nothing more than an archaic interest were it not that it inspired the most notable contribution to Reformation history written in modern times, Denifle's "Luther und Lutherthum" (Mainz, 1904). In it Luther's doctrines, writings, and sayings have been subjected to so searching an analysis, his historical inaccuracies have been proved so flagrant, his conception of monasticism such a caricature, his knowledge of Scholasticism so superficial, his misrepresentation of medieval theology so unblushing, his interpretation of mysticism so erroneous, and this with such a merciless circumstantial mastery of detail, as to cast the shadow of doubt on the whole fabric of Reformation history.

In the middle of the summer of this year (4 Aug.) he sent his reply to the "Defence of the Seven Sacraments" by King Henry VIII. Its only claim to attention is its tone of proverbial coarseness and scurrility. The king is not only an "impudent liar", but is deluged with a torrent of foul abuse, and every unworthy motive is attributed to him (Walch, XIX, 295–346). It meant, as events proved, in spite of Luther's tardy and sycophantic apologies, the loss of England to the German Reformation movement (Planck, "Gesch. des protest. Lehrbegriffs", II, Leipzig, 1783, 102; Hausrath, op. cit., II, 71; Thudichum, op. cit., I, 238). About this time he issued in Latin and German his broadside, "Against the falsely called spiritual state of Pope and Bishops", in which his vocabulary of vituperation attains a height equalled only by himself, and then on but one or two occasions. Seemingly aware of the incendiary character of his language, he tauntingly asks: "But they say, 'there is fear that a rebellion may arise against the spiritual Estate'. Then the reply is 'Is it just that souls are slaughtered eternally, that these mountebanks may disport themselves quietly'? It were better that all bishops should be murdered, and all religious foundations and monasteries razed to the ground, than that one soul should perish, not to speak of all the souls ruined by these blockheads and manikins" (Sämmtl. W., XXVIII, 148).

During his absence at the Wartburg (3 Apr., 1521–6 March, 1522) the storm centre of the reform agitation veered to Wittenberg, where Carlstadt took up the reins of leadership, aided and abetted by Melanchthon and the Augustinian Friars. In the narrative of conventional Reformation history Carlstadt is made the scapegoat for all the wild excesses that swept over Wittenberg at this time; even in more critical history he is painted as a marplot, whose officious meddling almost wrecked the work of the Reformation. Still, in the hands of cold scientific Protestant investigators, his character and work have of late undergone an astounding rehabilitation, one that calls for a reappraisement of all historical values in which he figures. He appears not only as a man of "extensive learning, fearless intrepidity . . . glowing enthusiasm for the truth" (Thudichum, op. cit., I, 178), but as the actual pathbreaker for Luther, whom he anticipated in some of his most salient doctrines and audacious innovations. Thus, for example, this new appraisal establishes the facts: that as early as 13 April, 1517, he published his 152 theses against indulgences; that on 21 June, 1521, he advocated and defended the right of priests to marry, and shocked Luther by including monks; that on 22 July, 1521, he called for the removal of all pictures and statuary in sanctuary and church; that on 13 May, 1521, he made public protest against the reservation of the Blessed Sacrament, the elevation of the Host, and denounced the withholding of the Chalice from the laity; that so early as 1 March, 1521, while Luther was still in Wittenberg, he inveighed against prayers for the dead and demanded that Mass be said in the vernacular German (Barge, "Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt", Leipzig, 1905, I–II, passim; Thudichum, op. cit., I, 178–83; Barge, "Frühprotestant. Gemeindechristentum", Leipzig, 1909). While in this new valuation he still retains the character of a disputatious, puritanical polemist, erratic in conduct, surly in manner, irascible in temper, biting in speech, it invests him with a shrinking reluctance to adopt any action however radical without the approval of the congregation or its accredited representatives. In the light of the same researches, it was the mild and gentle Melanchthon who prodded on Carlstadt until he found himself the vortex of the impending disorder and riot. "We must begin sometime", he expostulates, "or nothing will be done. He who puts his hand to the plough should not look back" (Barge, op. cit., I, 323).

The floodgates once opened, the deluge followed. On 9 October, 1521, thirty-nine out of the forty Augustinian Friars formally declared their refusal to say private Mass any longer; Zwilling, one of the most rabid of them, denounced the Mass as a devilish institution; Justus Jonas stigmatized Masses for the dead as sacrilegious pestilences of the soul; Communion under two kinds was publicly administered. Thirteen friars (12 Nov.) doffed their habits, and with tumultuous demonstrations fled from the monastery, with fifteen more in their immediate wake; those remaining loyal were subjected to ill-treatment and insult by an infuriated rabble led by Zwilling; mobs prevented the saying of Mass; on 4 Dec., forty students, amid derisive cheers, entered the Franciscan monastery and demolished the altars; the windows of the house of the resident canons were smashed, and it was threatened with pillage. It was clear that these excesses, uncontrolled by the civil power, unrestrained by the religious leaders, were symptomatic of social and religious revolution. Luther, who in the meantime paid a surreptitious visit to Wittenberg (between 4 and 9 Dec.), had no words of disapproval for these proceedings (Sämmtl. W., VI, 213–33; Thudichum, op. cit., I, 185); on the contrary he did not conceal his gratification. "All I see and hear", he writes to Spalatin, 9 Dec., "pleases me immensely" (Enders, op. cit., III, 253). The collapse and disintegration of religious life kept on apace. At a chapter of Augustinian Friars held at Wittenberg, 6 Jan., 1522, six resolutions, no doubt inspired by Luther himself (Reindell, "Doktor Wenzeslaus Linck", I, Leipzig, 1902, 162), were unanimously adopted, which aimed at the subversion of the whole monastic system; five days later the Augustinians removed all altars but one from their church, and burnt the pictures and holy oils. On 19 Jan., Carlstadt, now forty-one years of age, married a young girl of fifteen, an act that called forth the hearty endorsement of Luther (De Wette, op. cit., II, 123); on 9 or 10 Feb., Justus Jonas, and about the same time Johann Lange, prior of the Augustinian monastery at Erfurt, followed his example. On Christmas Day (1521) Carlstadt, "in civilian dress, without any vestment", ascended the pulpit, preached the "evangeli-

cal liberty" of taking Communion under two kinds, held up confession and absolution to derision, and railed against fasting as an unscriptural imposition. He next proceeded to the altar and said Mass in German, omitting all that referred to its sacrificial character, left out the Elevation of the Host, and in conclusion extended a general invitation to all to approach and receive the Lord's Supper, by individually taking the Hosts in their hands and drinking from the Chalice. The advent of the three Zwickau prophets (27 Dec.), with their communistic ideas, direct personal communication with God, extreme subjectivism in Bible interpretation, all of which impressed Melanchthon forcibly ("Corp. Ref.", I, 513, 514, 515, 534; Barge, op. cit., I, 401), only added fuel to the already fiercely burning flame. They came to consult Luther, and with good reason, for "it was he who taught the universal priesthood of all Christians, which authorized every man to preach; it was he who announced the full liberty of all the sacraments, especially baptism, and accordingly they were justified in rejecting infant baptism" (Thudichum, op. cit., I, 220). That they associated with Carlstadt intimately at this time is doubtful; that he fully subscribed to their teachings improbable, if not impossible (Barge, op. cit., I, 402).

What brought Luther in such hot haste to Wittenberg? The character given Carlstadt as an instigator of rebellion, the leader of the devastating "iconoclastic movement", has been found exaggerated and untrue in spite of its universal adoption (Barge, op. cit., I, 398–405; "Corp. Ref.", I, 545, 553; Thudichum, op. cit., I, 193, who brands it "as a shameless lie"); the assertion that Luther was requested to come to Wittenberg by the town council or congregation, is dismissed as "untenable" (Thudichum, op. cit., I, 197). Nor was he summoned by the elector, "although the elector had misgivings about his return, and inferentially did not consider it necessary, so far as the matter of bringing the reformatory zeal of the Wittenbergers into the bounds of moderation was concerned; he did not forbid Luther to return, but expressly permitted it" (Thudichum, op. cit., I, 199; Barge, op. cit., I, 435). Did perhaps information from Wittenberg portend the ascendancy of Carlstadt, or was there cause for alarm in the propaganda of the Zwickau prophets (Barge, op. cit., I, 434–35)? At all events on 3 March, Luther on horseback, in the costume of a horseman, with buckled sword, full grown beard, and long hair, issued from the Wartburg. Before his arrival at Wittenberg, he resumed his monastic habit and tonsure, and as a fully groomed monk he entered the deserted monastery. He lost no time in preaching on eight consecutive days (9–17 March) sermons mostly in contravention of Carlstadt's innovations, every one of which, as is well known, he subsequently adopted. The Lord's Supper again became the Mass; it is sung in Latin, at the high altar, in rubrical vestments, though all allusions to a sacrifice are expunged; the elevation is retained; the Host is exposed in the monstrance; the adoration of the congregation is invited. Communion under one kind is administered at the high altar—but under two kinds is allowed at a side altar. The sermons characterized by a moderation seldom found in Luther, exercised the thrall of his accustomed eloquence,—but proved abortive. Popular sentiment, intimidated and suppressed, favoured Carlstadt. The feud between Luther and Carlstadt was on,—and it showed the former "glaringly in his most repellent form" (Barge, I, op. cit., VI), and was only to end when the latter, exiled and impoverished through Luther's machinations, went to eternity accompanied by Luther's customary benediction on his enemies.

Luther had one prominent trait of character, which in the consensus of those who have made him a special study, overshadowed all others. It was an overweening confidence and unbending will, buttressed by an inflexible dogmatism. He recognized no superior, tolerated no rival, brooked no contradiction. This was constantly in evidence, but now comes into obtrusive eminence in his hectoring course pursued to drag Erasmus, whom he long watched with jealous eye, into the controversial arena (De Wette, op. cit., II, 199–201, 352–353). Erasmus, like all devotees of humanistic learning, lovers of peace and friends of religion, was in full and accordant sympathy with Luther when he first sounded the note of reform (Stichart, "Erasmus von Rotterdam", Leipzig, 1870, 308–326). But the bristling, ungoverned character of his apodictic assertions, the bitterness and brutality of his speech, his alliance with the conscienceless political radicalism of the nation, created an instinctive repulsion, which, when he saw that the whole movement "from its very beginning was a national rebellion, a mutiny of the German spirit and consciousness against Italian despotism" (Thudichum, op. cit., I, 304; Stichart, op. cit., 351–382) he, timorous by nature, vacillating in spirit, eschewing all controversy, shrinkingly retired to his studies. Popular with popes, honoured by kings, extravagantly extolled by humanists, respected by Luther's most intimate friends, he was in spite of his pronounced rationalistic proclivities, his withering contempt for monks, and what was a convertible term, Scholasticism, unquestionably the foremost man of learning in his day. His satiric writings, which according to Kant, did more good to the world than the combined speculations of all metaphysicians and which in the minds of his contemporaries laid the egg which Luther hatched—gave him a great vogue in all walks of life. Such a man's convictions were naturally supposed to run in the same channel as Luther's—and if his co-operation, in spite of alluring overtures, failed to be secured—his neutrality was at all hazards to be won. Prompted by Luther's opponents, still more goaded by Luther's militant attitude, if not formal challenge, he not only refused the personal request to refrain from all participation in the movement, and become a mere passive "spectator of the tragedy" (De Wette, op. cit., II, 498–501; Enders, op. cit., IV, 319–323), but came before the public with his Latin treatise "On Free Will". In it he would investigate the testimony afforded by the Old and New Testament as to man's "free will", and to establish the result, that in spite of the profound thought of philosopher or searching erudition of theologian, the subject is still enshrouded in obscurity, and that its ultimate solution could only be looked for in the fulness of light diffused by the Divine Vision. It was a purely scholastic question involving philosophical and exegetical problems, which were then, as they are now, arguable points in the schools. In no single point does it antagonize Luther in his war with Rome (Thudichum, op. cit., I, 313). The work received a wide circulation and general acceptance. Melanchthon writes approvingly of it to the author and Spalatin (Corp. Ref., I, 675, 673–674). After the lapse of a year Luther gave his reply in Latin "On the Servitude of the Will". Luther "never in his whole life had a purely scientific object in view, least of all in this writing" (Hausrath, op. cit., II, 75). It consists of "a torrent of the grossest abuse of Erasmus" (Thudichum, op. cit., I, 315; Walch, op. cit., XVIII, 2049–2482—gives it in German translation),—and evokes the lament of the hounded humanist, that he, the lover of peace and quiet, must now turn gladiator and do battle with "wild beasts" (Stichart, op. cit., 370). His pen portraiture of Luther and his controversial methods, given in his two rejoinders, are masterly, and even to this day find a general recognition on the part of all unbiassed students. His sententious characterization that where "Lutheranism flourishes the sciences perish", that its adherents then, were men "with but two objects at heart, money and women", and that the "Gospel which relaxes the reins" and allows everyone to do as he pleases (Epist. 1006, London, 1901–04),

amply proves that something more deep than Luther's contentiousness (Stichart, op. cit., 380) made him an alien to the movement. Nor did Luther's subsequent efforts to re-establish amicable relations with Erasmus, to which the latter alludes in a letter (11 April, 1526), meet with anything further than a curt refusal.

The times were pregnant with momentous events for the movement. The humanists one after the other dropped out of the fray. Mutianus Rufus, Crotus Rubianus, Beatus Rhenanus, Bonifacius Amerbach, Sebastian Brant, Jacob Wimpheling, who played so prominent a part in the battle of the Obscure Men, now formally returned to the allegiance of the Old Church (Hausrath, op. cit., II, 68, 88). Ulrich Zasius, of Freiburg, and Christoph Scheurl, of Nürnberg, the two most illustrious jurists of Germany, early friends and supporters of Luther, with the statesmen's prevision detected the political complexion of affairs, could not fail to notice the growing religious anarchy, and, hearing the distant rumblings of the Peasants' War, abandoned his cause. The former found his preaching mixed with deadly poison for the German people, the latter pronounced Wittenberg a sink of error, a hothouse of heresy (Köstlin-Kawerau, I, 652–653). Sickingen's last raid on the Archbishop of Trier (27 Aug., 1522) proved disastrous to his cause and fatal to himself. Deserted by his confederates, overpowered by his assailants, his lair—the fastness Landstuhl—fell into the hands of his enemies, and Sickingen himself horribly wounded died after barely signing its capitulation (30 Aug., 1523). Hutten, forsaken and solitary, in poverty and neglect, fell a victim to his protracted debauchery (Aug., 1523) at the early age of thirty-five. The loss sustained by these defections and deaths was incalculable for Luther, especially at one of the most critical periods in German history.

The peasant outbreaks, which in milder forms were previously easily controlled, now assumed a magnitude and acuteness that threatened the national life of Germany. The primary causes that now brought on the predicted and inevitable conflict (Cambridge Hist., II, 174) were the excessive luxury and inordinate love of pleasure in all stations of life, the lust of money on the part of the nobility and wealthy merchants, the unblushing extortions of commercial corporations, the artificial advance in prices and adulteration of the necessities of life, the decay of trade and stagnation of industry resulting from the dissolution of guilds, above all, the long endured oppression and daily increasing destitution of the peasantry, who were the main sufferers in the unbroken wars and feuds that rent and devastated Germany for more than a century. A fire of repressed rebellion and infectious unrest burned throughout the nation. This smouldering fire Luther fanned to a fierce flame by his turbulent and incendiary writings, which were read with avidity by all, and by none more voraciously than the peasant, who looked upon "the son of a peasant" not only as an emancipator from Roman impositions, but the precursor of social advancement. "His invectives poured oil on the flames of revolt" (Cambridge Hist., II, 193). True, when too late to lay the storm he issued his "Exhortation to Peace", but it stands in inexplicable and ineffaceable contradiction to his second, unexampled blast "Against the murderous and robbing rabble of Peasants". In this he entirely changes front, "dipped his pen in blood" (Lang, 180), and "calls upon the princes to slaughter the offending peasants like mad dogs, to stab, strangle and slay as best one can, and holds out as a reward the promise of heaven. The few sentences in which allusions to sympathy and mercy for the vanquished are contained, are relegated to the background. What an astounding illusion lay in the fact, that Luther had the hardihood to offer as apology for his terrible manifesto, that God commanded him to speak in such a strain!" (Schreckenbach, "Luther u. der Bauernkrieg", Oldenburg, 1895, 44; "Sämmtl. W.", XXIV, 287–294). His advice was literally followed. The process of repression was frightful. The encounters were more in the character of massacres than battles. The undisciplined peasants with their rude farming implements as weapons, were slaughtered like cattle in the shambles. More than 1000 monasteries and castles were levelled to the ground, hundreds of villages were laid in ashes, the harvests of the nation destroyed, and 100,000 killed. The fact that one commander alone boasted that "he hanged 40 evangelical preachers and executed 11,000 revolutionists and heretics" (Keim, "Schwäbische Reformations Geschichte", Stuttgart, 1855, 46), and that history with hardly a dissenting voice fastens the origin of this war on Luther, fully shows where its source and responsibility lay (Schreckenbach, op. cit., 5, 44; Thudichum, op. cit., II, 1–64; Bezold, "Gesch. der deutsch. Reform.", Berlin, 1890, 447; Maurenbrecher, "Gesch. der kath. Reform.", I, 527; Seebohm, "The Protestant Revolution", London, 1894, 148; Bayne, op. cit., II, 264; Creighton, "Hist. of the Papacy", VI, 303–305; Bax, "The Peasants' War in Germany", London, 1899, 278–279; Beard, "The Reformation", London, 1883, 199–200; Armstrong, "The Emperor Charles V", I, 207, 215; "Cambridge Modern Hist.", II, 192–194; Planck, "Gesch. des protest. Lehrbegriffs", II, 176–177; Barge, "Karlstatt", II, 357; Idem, "Frühprotestantisches Gemeindechristentum . . .", 332–335).

While Germany was drenched in blood, its people paralyzed with horror, the cry of the widow and wail of the orphan heard throughout the land, Luther then in his forty-second year was spending his honeymoon with Catharine von Bora, then twenty-six (married 13 June, 1525), a Bernardine nun who had abandoned her convent. He was regaling his friends with some coldblooded witticisms about the horrible catastrophe (De Wette, op. cit., III, 1) uttering confessions of self-reproach and shame (De Wette, op. cit., III, 3), and giving circumstantial details of his connubial bliss irreproducible in English (De Wette, op. cit., III, 18). Melanchthon's famous Greek letter to his bosom friend Camerarius, 16 June, 1525 (*Kirsch, "Melanchthons Brief an Camerarius", Mainz, 1900) on the subject, reflected his personal feelings, which no doubt were shared by most of the bridegroom's sincere friends.

This step, in conjunction with the Peasants' War, marked the point of demarcation in Luther's career and the movement he controlled. "The springtide of the Reformation, had lost its bloom. Luther no longer advanced, as in the first seven years of his activity, from success to success . . . The plot of a complete overthrow of Roman supremacy in Germany, by a torrential popular uprising, proved a chimera" (Hausrath, op. cit., II, 62). Until after the outbreak of the social revolution, no prince or ruler, had so far given his formal adhesion to the new doctrines. Even the Elector Frederick (d. 5 May, 1525), whose irresolution allowed them unhampered sway, did not, as yet separate from the Church. The radically democratic drift of Luther's whole agitation, his contemptuous allusions to the German princes, "generally the biggest fools and worst scoundrels on earth" (Walch, op. cit., X, 460–464), were hardly calculated to curry favour or win allegiance. The reading of such explosive pronouncements as that of 1523 "On the Secular Power" (Walch, op. cit., XXII, 59–105) or his disingenuous "Exhortation to Peace" in 1525 (Idem, op. cit., XXIV, 257–286), especially in the light of the events which had just transpired, impressed them as breathing the spirit of insubordination, if not insurrection. Luther, "although the mightiest voice that ever spoke in the German language, was a *vox et præterea nihil*" (Cambridge Hist., II, 162), for it is admitted that he possessed none of the constructive qualifications of statesmanship, and proverbially lacked the prudential attribute of consistency. His championship of the

"masses seems to have been limited to those occasions when he saw in them a useful weapon to hold over the heads of his enemies" (ibid., 193). The tragic failure of the Peasants' War now makes him undergo an abrupt transition, and this at a moment when they stood in helpless discomfiture and pitiful weakness, the especial objects of counsel and sympathy (Menzel, "Gesch. der Deutschen", 581). He and Melanchthon, now proclaim for the first time the hitherto unknown doctrine of the unlimited power of the ruler over the subject; demand unquestioning submission to authority; preach and formally teach the spirit of servility and despotism (Thudichum, op. cit., II, 60–61; Beard, "The Reformation", 101). The object lesson which was to bring the enforcement of the full rigour of the law to the attention of the princes was the Peasants' War. The masses were to be laden down with burdens to curb their refractoriness; the poor man was to be "forced and driven, as we force and drive pigs or wild cattle" (Sämmtl. W., XV, 276). Melanchthon found the Germans such "a wild, incorrigible, bloodthirsty people" (Corp. Ref., VII, 432–433) that their liberties should by all means be abridged and more drastic severity measured out (Cambridge Hist., II, 193). The same autocratic power was not to be confined to mere political concerns, but the "Gospel" was to become the instrument of the princes to extend it into the domain of religious affairs.

Luther by the creation of his "universal priesthood of all Christians", by delegating the authority "to judge all doctrines" to the "Christian assembly or congregation", by empowering it to appoint or dismiss teacher or preacher, sought the overthrow of the old Catholic order. It did not strike him, that to establish a new Church, to ground an ecclesiastical organization on so precarious and volatile a basis, was in its very nature impossible (Maurenbrecher, "Studien u. Skizzen", 334–336). The seeds of inevitable anarchy lay dormant in such principles. Momentarily this was clear to himself, when at this very time (1525) he does not hesitate to make the confession, that there are "nearly as many sects as there are heads" (De Wette, op. cit., III, 61). This anarchy in faith was concomitant with the decay of spiritual, charitable, and educational activities. Of this we have a fairly staggering array of evidence from Luther himself (Beard, op. cit., 145; *Döllinger, "Die Reformation", I, 280–348). The whole situation was such, that imperative necessity forced the leaders of the reform movement to invoke the aid of the temporal power. Thus "the whole Reformation was a triumph of the temporal power over the spiritual. Luther himself, to escape anarchy, placed all authority in the hands of the princes" (Menzel, op. cit., 623). This aid was all the more readily given, since there was placed at the disposition of the temporal power the vast possessions of the old Church, and only involved the pledge, to accept the new opinions and introduce them as a state or territorial religion. The Free Cities could not resist the lure of the same advances. They meant the exemption from all taxes to bishops and ecclesiastical corporations, the alienation of church property, the suspension of episcopal authority, and its transfer to the temporal power. Here we find the foundation of the national enactment of the Diet of Augsburg, 1555, "eternally branded with the curse of history" (Menzel, op. cit., 615) embodied in the axiom *Cujus regio, ejus religio*, the religion of the country is determined by the religion of its ruler, "a foundation which was but the consequence of Luther's well-known politics" (Idem, loc. cit.). Freedom of religion became the monopoly of the ruling princes, it made Germany "little more than a geographical name, and a vague one withal" (Cambridge Hist., II, 142); naturally "serfdom lingered there longer than in any civilized country save Russia" (ibid., 191), and was "one of the causes of the national weakness and intellectual sterility which marked Germany during the latter part of the sixteenth century" (ibid.), and just as naturally we find "as many new Churches as there were principalities or republics" (Menzel, op. cit., 739).

A theological event, the first of any real magnitude, that had a marked influence in shaping the destiny of the reform movement, even more than the Peasants' War, was caused by the brooding discontent aroused by Luther's peremptory condemnation and suppression of every innovation, doctrinal or disciplinary, that was not in the fullest accord with his. This weakness of character was well-known to his admirers then, as it is fully admitted now (Planck, op. cit., II, 131). Carlstadt, who by a strange irony, was forbidden to preach or publish in Saxony, from whom a recantation was forced (Thudichum, op. cit., II, 68–69), and who was exiled from his home for his opinions—to the enforcement of all which disabilities Luther personally gave his attention—now contumeliously set them at defiance. What degree of culpability there was between Luther doing the same with even greater recklessness and audacity while under the ban of the Empire,—or Carlstadt doing it tentatively while under the ban of a territorial lord, did not seem to have caused any suspicion of incongruity. However, Carlstadt precipitated a contention that shook the whole reform fabric to its very centre. The controversy was the first decisive conflict that changed the separatists' camp into an internecine battleground of hostile combatants. The *casus belli* was the doctrine of the Eucharist. Carlstadt in his two treatises (26 Feb. and 16 March, 1525), after assailing "the new Pope", gave an exhaustive statement of his doctrine of the Lord's Supper (see Barge, "Karlstadt", II, 144–296; Thudichum, op. cit., II, 65–68; Hausrath, op. cit., II, 198–201). The literal interpretation of the institutional words of Christ "this is my body" is rejected, the bodily presence flatly denied. Luther's doctrine of consubstantiation, that the body is in, with, and under the bread, was to him devoid of all Scriptural support. Scripture neither says the bread "is" my body, nor "in" the bread is my body, in fact it says nothing about bread whatever. The demonstrative pronoun "this", does not refer to the bread at all, but to the body of Christ, present at the table. When Jesus said "this is my body", He pointed to Himself, and said "this body shall be offered up, this blood shall be shed, for you." The words "take and eat" refer to the proffered bread,—the words "this is my body" to the body of Jesus. He goes further, and maintains that "this is" really means "this signifies". Accordingly grace should be sought in Christ crucified, not in the sacrament. Among all the arguments advanced none proved more embarrassing than the deictic "this is". It was the insistence on the identical interpretation of "this" referring to the present Christ, that Luther used as his most clenching argument in setting aside the primacy of the pope (Matt., xvi, 18) at the Leipzig Disputation (Löscher, "Reformations Acta", III, 369; Hausrath, "Luthers Leben", II, 200). Carlstadt's writings were prohibited, with the result that Saxony, as well as Strasburg, Basle, and now Zurich forbade their sale and circulation. This brought the leader of the Swiss reform movement, Zwingli, into the fray, as the apologist of Carlstadt, the advocate of free speech and unfettered thought, and *ipso facto* Luther's adversary.

The reform movement now presented the spectacle of Rome's two most formidable opponents, the two most masterful minds and authoritative exponents of contemporary separatistic thought, meeting in open conflict, with the Lord's Supper as the gage of war. Zwingli shared Carlstadt's doctrines in the main, with some further divergencies, that need no amplification here. But what gave a mystic, semi-inspirational importance to his doctrine of the Lord's Supper, was the account he gave of his difficulties and

doubts concerning the institutional words finding their restful solution in a dream. Unlike Luther at the Wartburg, he did not remember whether this apparition was in black or white [*Monitor iste ater an albus fuerit nihil memini* (Planck, op. cit., II, 256)]. Whether Luther followed his own custom of never reading through "the books that the enemies of truth have written against me" (Mörikofer, "Ulrich Zwingli", II, Leipzig, 1869, 205), whether there was a tinge of jealousy "that the Swiss were anxious to be the most prominent" in the reform movement, the mere fact that Zwingli was a confederate of Carlstadt and had an unfortunately dubious dream, afforded subject matter enough for Luther to display his accustomed dialectic methods at their best. A "scientific discussion was not to be conducted with Luther, since he attributed every disagreement with his doctrine to the devil" (Hausrath). This poisoned the controversy at its source, because, "with the devil he would make no truce" (Hausrath, op. cit., II, 188–223). That the eyes of the masses were turning from Wittenberg to Zurich, was only confirmatory evidence of devilish delusion. Luther's replies to Zwingli's unorthodox private letter to Alber (16 Nov., 1524) and his nettling treatises came in 1527 (Walch, op. cit., XX, 950–1118) and 1528 (Idem, op. cit., 1118–1386). They showed that "the injustice and barbarity of his polemics" (Harnack, "Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte", III, Freiburg, 1890, 733) was not reserved for the pope, monks, or religious vows. "In causticity and contempt of his opponent [they] surpassed all he had ever written", "they were the utterances of a sick man, who had lost all self-control". The politics of Satan and the artful machinations of the Prince of Evil are traced in a chronological order from the heretical incursions into the primitive Church to Carlstadt, Œcolampadius, and Zwingli. It was these three satanic agencies that raised the issue of the Lord's Supper to frustrate the work of the "recovered Gospel". The professions of love and peace held out by the Swiss, he curses to the pit of hell, for they are patricides and matricides. "Furious the reply can no longer be called, it is disgraceful in the manner in which it drags the holiest representations of his opponents through the mire." Indiscriminate and opprobrious epithets of pig, dog, fanatic, senseless ass, "go to your pigsty and roll in your filth" ("Sämmtl. W.", XXX, 68; Hausrath, op. cit., II, 218; Thudichum, op. cit., II, 79; Lange, "M. Luther", 216–249) are some of the polemical coruscations that illuminate this reply. Yet, in few of his polemical writings do we find more conspicuous glimpses of a soundness of theological knowledge, appositeness of illustration, familiarity with the Fathers, reverence for tradition—remnants of his old training—than in this document, which caused sorrow and consternation throughout the whole reform camp. "The hand which had pulled down the Roman Church in Germany made the first rent in the Church which was to take its place" (Cambridge History, II, 209).

The attempt made by the Landgrave Philip, to bring the contending forces together and effect a compromise at the Marburg Colloquy, 1–3 Oct., 1529 (Hausrath, op. cit., II, 229–256; Schirrmacher, "Briefe u. Acten . . . Religiongespräche zu Marburg", Gotha, 1876; Mörikofer, "Zwingli", II, 226–246) was doomed to failure before its convocation. Luther's iron will refused to yield to any concession, his parting salutation to Zwingli, "your spirit is not our spirit" (De Wette, op. cit., IV, 28) left no further hope of negotiations, and the brand he affixed on this antagonist and his disciples as "not only liars, but the very incarnation of lying, deceit, and hypocrisy" (Idem, op. cit.) closed the opening chapter of a possible reunion. Zwingli returned to Zurich to meet his death on the battlefield of Kappel (11 October, 1531). The damnation Luther meted out to him in life "accompanied his hated rival also in death" (Mörikofer, op. cit., II, 420; Menzel, II, 420). The next union of the two reform wings was when they became brothers in arms against Rome in the Thirty Years War.

While occupied with his manifold pressing duties, all of them performed with indefatigable zeal and consuming energy, alarmed at the excesses attending the upheaval of social and ecclesiastical life, his reform movement generally viewed from its more destructive side, he did not neglect the constructive elements designed to give cohesion and permanency to his task. These again showed his intuitional apprehension of the racial susceptibilities of the people and his opportune political sagacity in enlisting the forces of the princes. His appeal for schools and education ("An die Bürgermeister und Rathsherren", 1524; "Sämmtl. W.", XXIV, 168–199) was to counteract the intellectual chaos created by the suppression and desertion of the monastic and church schools (*Schulmann, "Die Volksschule vor und nach Luther", Trier, 1903; *Döllinger, "Die Ref.", I, 425–449); his invitation to the congregation to sing in the vernacular German in the liturgical services ("Sammlung geistlicher Gesänge u. Psalmen", 1524; "Sämmtl. W.", LVI, 291–366) in spite of the record of more than 1400 vernacular hymns before the Reformation (Wackernagel, "Das deutsche Kirchenlied", Leipzig, 1867, II, 1–1168) proved a masterstroke and gave him a most potent adjunct to his preaching; the Latin Mass, which he retained, more to chagrin Carlstadt (Lang, 151) than for any other accountable reason, he now abandoned, with many excisions and modifications for the German ("Deutsche Messe u. Ordnung des Gottesdienstes", 1526; "Sämmtl. W.", XXII, 226–244). Still more important and far-reaching was the plan which Melanchthon, under his supervision, drew up to supply a workable regulative machinery for the new Church ("Unterricht der Visitatoren u. die Pfarrherren im Kurfürstlichen Sachsen", 1527). To introduce this effectively "the evangelical princes with their territorial powers stept in" (Köstlin-Kawerau, op. cit., II, 24). The Elector of Saxony especially showed a disposition to act in a summary, drastic manner, which met with Luther's full approval. "Not only were priests, who would not conform, to lose their benefices, but recalcitrant laymen, who after instruction were still obstinate, had a time allowed within which they were to sell their property and then leave the country" (Beard, op. cit., 177). The civil power was invoked to decide controversies among preachers, and to put down theological discussion with the secular arm (Corp. Ref., I, 819). The publication of a popular catechism ["Kleiner Katechismus", 1529 (Sämmtl. W., XXI, 5–25); "Grosser Katechismus", 1529 (op. cit., 26–155)] in simple idiomatic, colloquial German, had an influence, in spite of the many Catholic catechetical works already in existence (*Moufang, "Katholische Kathechismen des Sechzehnten Jahrhunderts in deutscher Sprache", Mainz, 1881; *Janssen, op. cit., I, 42–52) that can hardly be over-estimated.

The menacing religious war, between the adherents of the "Gospel" and the fictitious Catholic League (15 May, Breslau), ostensibly formed to exterminate the Protestants, which with a suspicious precipitancy on the part of its leader, Landgrave Philip, had actually gone to a formal declaration of war (15 May, 1528), was fortunately averted. It proved to be based on a rather clumsily forged document of Otto von Pack, a member of Duke George's chancery. Luther, who first shrank from war and counselled peace, by one of those characteristic reactions "now that peace had been established, began a war in real earnest about the League" (Planck, op. cit., II, 434) in whose existence, in spite of unquestionable exposure, he still firmly believed (*Janssen, op. cit., III, 128–130, note).

The Diet of Speyer (21 Feb.–22 April, 1529), presided over by King Ferdinand, as the emperor's deputy, like that held in the same city three years

earlier, aimed at a religious compromise. The two "Propositions" or "Instructions" (Walch, op. cit., XVI, 318–323) submitted, were expected to accomplish this. The decree allowed the Lutheran Estates the practice and reform of the new religion within their territorial boundaries, but claimed the same rights for those who should continue to adhere to the Catholic Church. Melanchthon expressed his satisfaction with this and declared that they would work no hardship for them, but even "protect us more than the decrees of the earlier Diet" (Speyer, 1526; Corp. Ref., I, 1059). But an acceptance, much less an effective submission to the decrees, was not to be entertained at this juncture, and five princes most affected, on 19 April, handed in a protestation which Melanchthon in alarm called "a terrible affair" (Corp. Ref., I, 1060). This protest has become historic, since it gave the specific nomenclature *Protestant* to the whole oppositional movement to the Catholic Church. "The Diet of Speyer inaugurates the actual division of the German Nation" (*Janssen, op. cit., III, 51).

In spite of the successful Hungarian invasion of the Turks, political affairs, by the reconciliation of pope and emperor (Barcelona, 29 June, 1529), the peace with Francis I (Cambrai, 5 Aug., 1529), shaped themselves so happily, that Charles V was crowned emperor by his whilom enemy, Clement VII (Bologna, 24 Feb., 1530). However, in Germany, affairs were still irritant and menacing. To the hostility of Catholics and Protestants was now added the acrimonious quarrel between the latter and the Zwinglians; the late Diet of Speyer was inoperative, practically a dead letter, the Protestant princes privily and publicly showed a spirit that was not far removed from open rebellion. Charles again sought to bring about religious peace and harmony by taking the tangled skein into his own hands. He accordingly summoned the Diet of Augsburg, which assembled in 1530 (8 April–19 November), presided over it in person, arranged to have the disaffected religious parties meet, calmly discuss and submit their differences, and by a compromise or arbitration, re-establish peace. Luther being under the ban of the Empire, for "certain reasons" (De Wette, op. cit., III, 368) did not make his appearance, but was harboured in the fortress of Coburg, about four days journey distant. Here he was in constant touch and confidential relations with Melanchthon and other Protestant leaders. It was Melanchthon who, under the dominant influence of Luther and availing himself of the previously accepted Articles of Marburg (5 Oct., 1529), Schwabach (16 Oct., 1529), Torgau (20 March, 1530), and the Large Catechism, drew up the first authoritative profession of the Lutheran Church. This religious charter was the Augsburg Confession (*Confessio Augustana*), the symbolical book of Lutheranism.

In its original form it met with Luther's full endorsement (De Wette, op. cit., IV, 17). It consists of an introduction, or preamble, and is in two parts. The first, consisting of twenty-one Articles, gives an exposition of the principal doctrines of the Protestant creed, and aims at an amicable adjustment; the second, consisting of seven Articles, deals with "abuses", and concerning these there is a "difference". The Confession as a whole is irenic (Corp. Ref., II, 122) and is more of an invitation to union than a provocation to disunion. Its tone is dignified, moderate, and pacific. But it allows its insinuating concessions to carry it so far into the boundaries of the vague and indefinite as to leave a lurking suspicion of artifice. Doctrinal differences, fundamental and irreconcilable, are pared down or slurred over to an almost irreducible degree (Harnack, "Dogmengesch.", III, 584–585; Hausrath, op. cit., II, 273–274; Ranke, op. cit., III, 244–245; *Döllinger, "Die Reform.", III, 277–296). No one was better qualified by temper or training to clothe the blunt, apodictic phraseology of Luther in the engaging vesture of truth than Melanchthon. The Articles on original sin, justification by faith alone, and free will—though perplexingly similar in sound and terminology, lack the ring of the true Catholic metal. Again, many of the conceded points, some of them of a surprising and startling character, even abstracting from their suspected ambiguity, were in such diametric conflict with the past teaching and preaching of the petitioners, even in contradiction to their written and oral communications passing at the very moment of deliberation, as to cast suspicion on the whole work. That these suspicions were not unfounded was amply proved by the aftermath of the Diet. The correction of the so-called abuses dealt with in Part II under the headings: Communion under both kinds, the marriage of priests, the Mass, compulsory confession, distinction of meats and tradition, monastic vows, and the authority of bishops, for obvious reasons, was not entertained, much less agreed to. Melanchthon's advances for still further concessions were promptly and peremptorily rejected by Luther (De Wette, op. cit., IV, 52, 54). The "Confession" was read at a public session of the Diet (25 June) in German and Latin, was handed to the emperor, who in turn submitted it to twenty Catholic theologians, including Luther's old antagonists Eck, Cochlæus, Usingen, and Wimpina, for examination and refutation. The first reply, on account of its prolixity, and bitter and irritating tone, was quickly rejected, nor did the emperor allow the "Confutation of the Augsburg Confession" to be read before the Diet (3 Aug.) until it had been pruned and softened down by no less than five revisions. Melanchthon's "Apology for the Augsburg Confession", which was in the nature of a reply to the "Confutation", and which passes as of equal official authority as the "Confession" itself ("Realencyclop. Protest. Theol. u. Kirche", Leipzig, 1897, II, 249; Winckelmann, "Der Schmalkald. Bund", Strasburg, 1892, 197–204), was not accepted by the emperor. All further attempts at a favourable outcome proving unavailing, the imperial edict condemning the Protestant contention was published (22 Sept.). It allowed the leaders until 15 April, 1532, for reconsideration (Kolde, "Die Augsburg. Konfession", Gotha, 1896; Plitt, "Einleitung . . . die Augustana", Erlangen, 1867; Rückert, "Luthers Verhältniss z. Augsb. Bekentniss", Jena, 1854; Heppe, "Die Konfess. Entwickel. der altprot. Kirch. Deutschlands", Marburg, 1854; Kalinich, "Luther u. die Augsb. Konfession", Leipzig, 1861; Knaake, "Luthers Antheil . . . der Augsb. Konfession", Berlin, 1863; *Pastor, "Die kirchliche Reunionsbestreb.", Freiburg, 1879, 17–90; Hausrath, op. cit., II, 257–332; Thudichum, op. cit., II, 315–333; *Janssen, op. cit., III, 173–220; Schaff, "Creeds of Christendom", I–III, New York, 1887; "Cambridge Hist.", II, 211–224; Armstrong, op. cit., I, 232–259).

The recess was read (13 Oct.) to the Catholic Estates, who at the same time formed the Catholic League. To the Protestants it was read 11 Nov., who rejected it and formed the Smalkaldic League (29 March, 1531), an offensive and defensive alliance of all Lutherans. The Zwinglians were not admitted. Luther, who returned to Wittenberg in a state of great irritation at the outcome of the Diet, was now invoked to prepare the public mind for the position assumed by the princes, which at first blush looked suspiciously like downright rebellion. He did this in one of his paroxysmal rages, one of those ruthless outpourings when calm deliberation, religious charity, political prudence, social amenities are openly and flagrantly set at defiance. The three popular publications were: "Warning to his dear German People" (Walch, op. cit., XVI, 1950–2016), "Glosses on the putative Imperial Edict" (Idem, op. cit., 2017–2062), and, far outstripping these, "Letter against the Assassin at Dresden" (Idem, op. cit., 2062–2086), which his chief biographer characterizes as "one of the most savage

and violent of his writings" (Köstlin-Kawerau, op. cit., II, 252). All of them, particularly the last, indisputably established his controversial methods as being "literally and wholly without decorum, conscience, taste or fear" (Mozley, "Historical Essays", London, 1892, I, 375–378). His mad onslaught on Duke George of Saxony, "the Assassin of Dresden", whom history proclaims "the most honest and consistent character of his age" (Armstrong, op. cit., I, 325), "one of the most estimable Princes of his age" (Cambridge Hist., II, 237), was a source of mortification to his friends, a shock to the sensibilities of every honest man, and has since kept his apologists busy at vain attempts at vindication. The projected alliance with Francis I, Charles's deadly enemy, met with favour. Its patriotic aspects need not be dwelt upon. Henry VIII of England, who was now deeply concerned with the proceedings of his divorce from Catharine of Aragon, was approached less successfully (Gairdner, "Lollardy and the Reform. in England", London, 1908, I, 315–316). The opinion about the divorce, asked from the universities, also reached that of Wittenberg, where Robert Barnes, an English Augustinian friar who had deserted his monastery, brought every influence to bear to make it favourable. The opinion was enthusiastically endorsed by Melanchthon (Corp. Ref., II, 520, 552), Osiander, and Œcolampadius. Luther also in an exhaustive brief maintained that "before he would permit a divorce, he would rather that the king took unto himself another queen" (De Wette, op. cit., IV, 296). However, the memorable theological passage at arms the king had had with Luther, the latter's subsequent cringing apology, left such a feeling of aversion, if not contempt, in the soul of his rival reformer, that the invitation was to all intents ignored.

In the beginning of 1534, Luther after twelve years of intermittent labour, completed and published in six parts his German translation of the entire Bible.

For years the matter of a general council had been agitated in ecclesiastical circles. Charles V constantly appealed for it, the Augsburg Confession emphatically demanded it, and now the accession of Paul III (13 Oct., 1534), who succeeded Clement VII (d. 25 Sept., 1534), gave the movement an impetus, that for once made it loom up as a realizable accomplishment. The pope sanctioned it, on condition that the Protestants would abide by its decisions and submit their *credenda* in concise, intelligible form. With a view of ascertaining the tone of feeling at the German Courts, he sent Vergerius there as legate. He, in order to make the study of the situation as thorough as possible, did not hesitate, while passing through Wittenberg on his way to the Elector of Brandenburg, to meet Luther in person (7 Nov., 1535). His description of the jauntily groomed reformer "in holiday attire, in a vest of dark calmet, sleeves with gaudy atlas cuffs . . . coat of serge lined with fox pelts . . . several rings on his fingers, a massive gold chain about his neck" (Köstlin-Kawerau, op. cit., II, 370–376; Hausrath, op. cit., II, 665), shows him in a somewhat unusual light. The presence of the man who would reform the ancient Church decked out in so foppish a manner, made an impression on the mind of the legate that can readily be conjectured. Aware of Luther's disputatious character, he dexterously escaped discussion, by disclaiming all profound knowledge of theology, and diverted the interview into the commonplace. Luther treated the interview as a comedy, a view no doubt more fully shared by the keen-witted Italian (Sixt, "Petrus Paulus Vergerius", Brunswick, 1855, 36–45).

The question was raised as to what participation the Protestants should assume in the council, which had been announced to meet at Mantua. After considerable discussion Luther was commissioned to draw up a document, giving a summary of their doctrines and opinions. This he did, after which the report was submitted to the favourable consideration of the elector and a specially appointed body of theologians. It contained the Articles of Smalkald (1537; Walch, op. cit., XVI, 2326–2390) "a real oppositional record against the Roman Church" (Guericke), eventually incorporated in the "Concordienformel" and accepted as a symbolical book. It is on the whole such a brusque rejection and coarse philippic against the pope as "Antichrist", that we need not marvel that Melanchthon shrank from affixing his unqualified signature to it (Walch, op. cit., XVI, 2366).

Luther's serious illness during the Smalkaldic Convention, threatened a fatal termination to his activities, but the prospect of death in no way seemed to mellow his feelings towards the papacy. It was when supposedly on the brink of eternity (24 Feb., 1537) that he expressed the desire to one of the elector's chamberlains to have his epitaph written: "Pestis eram vivus, moriens ero mors tua, Papa" [living I was a pest to thee, O Pope, dying I will be thy death (Köstlin-Kawerau, op. cit., II, 389)]. True, the historicity of this epitaph is not in chronological agreement with the narrative of Mathesius, who maintains he heard it in the house of Spalatin, 9 Jan., 1531 (Köstlin-Kawerau, op. cit., II, 244), or with the identical words found in his "Address to the Clergy assembled at the Augsburg Diet" (7 Jan., 1530; "Sämmtl. W.", XXIV, 369), in which he hurled back the gibes flung at the priests who had enrolled under his banner and married. Nevertheless it is in full consonance with the parting benediction the invalid gave from his wagon to his assembled friends when about to start on his homeward journey: "May the Lord fill you with His blessings and with hatred of the pope" (Köstlin-Kawerau, op. cit., II, 390), and the verbatim sentiments chalked on the wall of his chamber, the night before his death (Ratzeberger, "Luther u. seine Zeit", Jena, 1850, 137).

Needless to add, the Protestant Estates refused the invitation to the council, and herein we have the first public and positive renunciation of the papacy.

"What Luther claimed for himself against Catholic authority, he refused to Carlstadt and refused to Zwingli. He failed to see that their position was exactly as his own, with a difference of result, which indeed was all the difference in the world to him" (Tulloch, "Leaders of the Reformation", Edinburgh and London, 1883, 171). This was never more manifest than in the interminable Sacramentarian warfare. Bucer, on whom the weight of leadership fell, after Zwingli's death, which was followed shortly by that of Œcolampadius (24 Nov., 1531), was unremitting in bringing about a reunion, or at least an understanding on the Lord's Supper, the main point of cleavage between the Swiss and German Protestants. Not only religiously, but politically, would this mean a step towards the progress of Zwinglianism. At its formation the Swiss Protestants were not admitted to the Smalkaldic League (29 March, 1531); its term of six years was about to expire (29 March, 1537) and they now renewed their overtures. Luther, who all the time could not conceal his opposition to the Zwinglians (Hausrath, op. cit., II, 353–363; De Wette, op. cit., IV, 207–208, 222–223, 224, 235–236), even going to the extent of directing and begging Duke Albrecht of Prussia, not to tolerate any of Münzer's or Zwingli's adherents in his territory (De Wette, op. cit., IV, 349), finally yielded to the assembling of a peace conference. Knowing their predicament, he used the covert threat of an exclusion from the league as a persuasive to drive them to the acceptance of his views (Thudichum, op. cit., II, 485). This conference which, owing to his sickness, was held in his own house at Wittenberg, was attended by eleven theologians of Zwinglian proclivities and seven Lutherans. It resulted in the theological compromise, reunion it can hardly be called, known as the Concord of Wittenberg (21–29 May, 1536; Walch, op. cit., XVII, 2529–2532). The re-

monstrants, technically waiving the points of difference, subscribed to the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper, infant baptism, and absolution. That the Zwinglian theologians "who subscribed to the Concord and declared its contents true and Scriptural, dropped their former convictions and were transformed into devout Lutherans, no one who was acquainted with these men more intimately can believe" (Thudichum, op. cit., II, 489). They simply yielded to the unbending determination of Luther, and "subscribed to escape the hostility of the Elector John Frederick who was absolutely Luther's creature, and not to forfeit the protection of the Smalkaldic League; they submitted to the inevitable to escape still greater dangers" (Idem, op. cit.). As for Luther, the "poor, wretched Concord" as he designates it, received little recognition from him. In 1539, he coupled the names of Nestorius and Zwingli (Sämmtl. W., XXV, 314) in a way that gave deep offence at Zurich (Kolde, "Analecta", 344). At Wittenberg, Zwingli and Œcolampadius became convertible terms for heretics (Sämmtl. W., XXXV, 46), and with Luther's taunting remark that "he would pray and teach against them until the end of his days" (De Wette, op. cit., V, 587), the rupture was again completed.

The internal controversies of the Lutheran Church, which were to shatter its disjointed unity with the force of an explosive eruption after his death, and which now only his dauntless courage, powerful will, and imperious personality held within the limits of murmuring restraint, were cropping out on all sides, found their way into Wittenberg, and affected even his bosom friends. Though unity was out of the question, an appearance of uniformity had at all hazards to be maintained. Cordatus, Schenck, Agricola, all veterans in the cause of reform, lapsed into doctrinal aberrations that caused him much uneasiness. The fact that Melanchthon, his most devoted and loyal friend, was under a cloud of suspicion for entertaining heterodox views, though not as yet fully shared by him, caused him no little irritation and sorrow (Köstlin-Kawerau, op. cit. II, 445–473). But all these domestic broils were trivial and lost sight of, when compared to one of the most critical problems that thus far confronted the new Church, which was suddenly sprung upon its leaders, focussing more especially on its hierophant. This was the double marriage of Landgrave Philip of Hesse.

Philip the Magnanimous (b. 23 Nov., 1504) was married before his twentieth year to Christina, daughter of Duke George of Saxony, who was then in her eighteenth year. He had the reputation of being "the most immoral of princelings", who ruined himself, in the language of his court theologians, by "unrestrained and promiscuous debauchery" (Kolde, "Analecta", 354). He himself admits that he could not remain faithful to his wife for three consecutive weeks (Lenz, "Briefwechsel . . . Philipps und Bucer", Leipzig, 1880–1887, I, 361). The malignant attack of venereal disease, which compelled a temporary cessation of his profligacy, also directed his thoughts to a more ordinate gratification of his passions. His affections were already directed to Margaret von der Saal, a seventeen year old lady-in-waiting, and he concluded to avail himself of Luther's advice to enter a double marriage. Christina was "a woman of excellent qualities and noble mind, to whom, in excuse of his infidelities, he [Philip] ascribed all sorts of bodily infirmities and offensive habits" (Schmidt, "Melanchthon," 367). She had borne him seven children. The mother of Margaret would only entertain the proposition of her daughter becoming Philip's "second wife" on condition that she, her brother, Philip's wife, Luther, Melanchthon, and Bucer, or at least, two prominent theologians be present at the marriage. Bucer was entrusted with the mission of securing the consent of Luther, Melanchthon, and the Saxon princes. In this he was eminently successful. All was to be done under the veil of the profoundest secrecy. This secrecy Bucer enjoined on the landgrave again and again, even when on his journey to Wittenberg (3 Dec., 1539) that "all might redound to the glory of God" (Lenz, op. cit., I, 119). Luther's position on the question was fully known to him. The latter's unfailing opportunism in turn grasped the situation at a glance. It was a question of expediency and necessity more than propriety and legality. If the simultaneous polygamy were permitted, it would prove an unprecedented act in the history of Christendom; it would, moreover, affix on Philip the brand of a most heinous crime, punishable under recent legislation with death by beheading. If refused, it threatened the defection of the landgrave, and would prove a calamity beyond reckoning to the Protestant cause (Hausrath, op. cit., II, 398).

Evidently in an embarrassing quandary, Luther and Melanchthon filed their joint opinion (10 Dec., 1539). After expressing gratification at the landgrave's last recovery, "for the poor, miserable Church of Christ is small and forlorn, and stands in need of truly devout lords and rulers", it goes on to say that a general law that a "man may have more than one wife" could not be handed down, but that a dispensation could be granted. All knowledge of the dispensation and the marriage should be buried from the public in deadly silence. "All gossip on the subject is to be ignored, as long as we are right in conscience, and this we hold is right", for "what is permitted in the Mosaic law, is not forbidden in the Gospel" (De Wette-Seidemann, VI, 239–244; "Corp. Ref.", III, 856–863). The nullity and impossibility of the second marriage while the legality of the first remained untouched was not mentioned or hinted at. His wife, assured by her spiritual director "that it was not contrary to the law of God" (Corp. Ref., III, 884), gave her consent, though on her deathbed she confessed to her son that her consent was feloniously wrung from her (Rommel, "Gesch. von Hessen", Gotha-Kassel, 1852–1858, V, 20–21). In return Philip pledged his princely word that she would be "the first and supreme wife" and that his matrimonial obligations "would be rendered her with more devotion than before". The children of Christina "should be considered the sole princes of Hesse" (Rommel, op. cit.). After the arrangement had already been completed, a daughter was born to Christina, 13 Feb., 1540 (Rockwell, "Die Doppelehe Phillip's von Hessen", Marburg, 1904, 32). The marriage took place (4 March, 1540) in the presence of Bucer, Melanchthon, and the court preacher Melander who performed the ceremony. Melander was "a bluff agitator, surly, with a most unsavoury moral reputation" (Hausrath, op. cit., II, 397), one of his moral derelictions being the fact that he had three living wives, having deserted two without going through the formality of a legal separation (Idem, op. cit., II, 396). Philip lived with both wives, both of whom bore him children, the landgravine two sons and a daughter, and Margaret six sons (Menzel, "Neuere Geschichte der Deutschen", II, 191). How can this "darkest stain" (Bezold) on the history of the German Reformation be accounted for? Was it "politics, biblicism, distorted vision, precipitancy, fear of the near approaching Diet [Ratisbon] that played such a rôle in the sinful downfall of Luther?" (Hausrath, op. cit., II, 400). Or was it the logical sequence of premises he had maintained for years in speech and print ("Opp. Lat.," Erlangen, V, 95, 100; De Wette, op. cit., II, 459; IV, 241, 296; VI, 243), not to touch upon the ethics of that extraordinary sermon on marriage (Sämmtl. W., XX, 57–86)? He himself writes defiantly that he "is not ashamed of his opinion" (Lauterbach, op. cit., 198). The marriage in spite of all precautions, injunctions, and pledges of secrecy leaked out, caused a national sensation and scandal, and set in motion an

extensive correspondence between all intimately concerned, to neutralize the effect on the public mind. Melanchthon "nearly died of shame, but Luther wished to brazen the matter out with a lie" (Cambridge Hist., II, 241). The secret "yea" must "for the sake of the Christian church remain a public nay" (De Wette-Seidemann, op. cit., VI, 263). "What harm would there be, if a man to accomplish better things and for the sake of the Christian Church, does tell a good thumping lie" (Lenz, "Briefwechsel", I, 382; Kolde, "Analecta", 356), was his extenuating plea before the Hessian counsellors assembled at Eisenach (1540), a sentiment which students familiar with his words and actions will remember is in full agreement with much of his policy and many of his assertions. "We are convinced, that the papacy is the seat of the real and actual Antichrist, and believe that against its deceit and iniquity everything is permitted for the salvation of souls" (De Wette, op. cit., I, 478).

Charles V involved in a triple war, with a depleted exchequer, with a record of discouraging endeavours to establish religious peace in Germany, found what he thought was a gleam of hope in the concession half-heartedly made by the Smalkaldic assembly of Protestant theologians (1540), in which they would allow episcopal jurisdiction provided the bishops would tolerate the new religion ("Corp. Ref.", III, 188). Indulging this fond, but delusive expectation, he convened a religious colloquy to meet at Speyer (6 June, 1540). The tone of the Protestant reply to the invitation left little prospect of an agreement. The deadly epidemic raging at Speyer compelled its transference to Hagenau, whence after two months of desultory and ineffectual debate (1 June–28 July), it adjourned to Worms (28 Oct.). Luther from the beginning had no confidence in it, it "would be a loss of time, a waste of money, and a neglect of all home duties" (De Wette, op. cit., V, 308). It proved an endless and barren word-tilting of theologians, as may be inferred from the fact that after three months constant parleying, an agreement was reached on but one point, and that barnacled with so many conditions, as to make it absolutely valueless (*Pastor, "Die Kirchl. Reunionsbestrebungen", 217). The emperor's relegation of the colloquy to the Diet of Ratisbon (5 April–22 May), which he, as well as the papal legate Contarini, attended in person, met with the same unhappy result. Melanchthon, reputed to favour reunion, was placed by the elector, John Frederick, under a strict police surveillance, during which he was neither allowed private interviews, private visits, or even private walks ("Corp. Ref.", IV, 123–132; Schmidt, "Melanchthon", 385; Hausrath, op. cit., II, 410). The elector, as well as King Francis I, fearing the political ascendancy of the emperor, placed every barrier in the way of compromise (*Pastor, op. cit., 251), and when the rejected articles were submitted by a special Protestant embassy to Luther, the former not only warned him by letter against their acceptance, but rushed in hot haste to Wittenberg, to throw the full weight of his personal influence into the frustration of all plans of peace.

Luther's life and career were drawing to a close. His marriage to Catharine von Bora, was on the whole, as far as we can infer from his own confession and public appearances, a happy one. The Augustinian monastery, which was given to him after his marriage by the elector, became his homestead. Here six children were born to them: John (7 June, 1526), Elizabeth (10 Dec., 1527; d. 3 Aug., 1528), Magdalen (4 May, 1529), Martin (9 Nov., 1531), and Paul (28 Jan., 1533), and Margaret (17 Dec., 1534). Catharine proved to be a plain, frugal, domestic housewife; her interest in her fowls, piggery, fish-pond, vegetable garden, home-brewery, were deeper and more absorbing than in the most gigantic undertakings of her husband. Occasional bickerings with her neighbours and the enlistment of her husband's intervention in personal interests and biases, were frequent enough to engage the tongue of public censure. She died at Torgau (20 Dec., 1552) in comparative obscurity, poverty, and neglect (Hoffmann, "Catharina von Bora", Leipzig, 1845, 126–138; Kroker, "Katharina von Bora", Leipzig, s. d., 117, 250–264), having found Wittenberg cold and unsympathetic to the reformer's family. This he had predicted,—"after my death the four elements in Wittenberg will not tolerate you after all." Luther's rugged health began to show marks of depleting vitality and unchecked inroads of disease. Prolonged attacks of dyspepsia, nervous headaches, chronic granular kidney disease, gout, sciatic rheumatism, middle ear abscesses, above all vertigo and gall stone colic were intermittent or chronic ailments that gradually made him the typical embodiment of a supersensitively nervous, prematurely old man (Küchenmeister, "Luthers Krankengesch.", Leipzig, 1881). These physical impairments were further aggravated by his notorious disregard of all ordinary dietetic or hygienic restrictions. Even prescinding from his congenital heritage of inflammable irascibility and uncontrollable rage, besetting infirmities that grew deeper and more acute with age, his physical condition in itself would measurably account for his increasing irritation, passionate outbreaks, and hounding suspicions, which in his closing days became a problem more of pathological or psychopathic interest, than biographic or historical importance.

It was this "terrible temper" (Boehm) which brought on the tragedy of alienation, that drove from him his most devoted friends and zealous co-labourers. Every contradiction set him ablaze (Ranke, op. cit., II, 408–415). "Hardly one of us", is the lament of one of his votaries, "can escape Luther's anger and his public scourging" (Corp. Ref., V, 314). Carlstadt parted with him in 1522, after what threatened to be a personal encounter (Walch, op. cit., XV, 2423); Melanchthon in plaintive tones speaks of his passionate violence, self-will, and tyranny, and does not mince words in confessing the humiliation of his ignoble servitude ("Corp. Ref.", III, 594; VI, 879); Bucer, prompted by political and diplomatic motives, prudently accepts the inevitable "just as the Lord bestowed him on us"; Zwingli "has become a pagan, Œcolampadius . . . and the other heretics have indevilled, through-devilled, over-devilled corrupt hearts and lying mouths, and no one should pray for them", all of them "were brought to their death by the fiery darts and spears of the devil" (Walch, op. cit., XX, 223); Calvin and the Reformed are also the possessors of "in-devilled, over-devilled, and through-devilled hearts"; Schurf, the eminent jurist, was changed from an ally to an opponent, with a brutality that defies all explanation or apology; Agricola fell a prey to a repugnance that time did not soften; Schwenkfeld, Amsdorf, Cordatus, all incurred his ill will, forfeited his friendship, and became the butt of his stinging speech. "The Luther, who from a distance was still honoured as the hero and leader of the new church, was only tolerated at its centre in consideration of his past services" (Ranke, op. cit., II, 421). The zealous band of men, who once clustered about their standard-bearer, dwindled to an insignificant few, insignificant in number, intellectuality, and personal prestige. A sense of isolation palled the days of his decline. It not alone affected his disposition, but played the most astonishing pranks with his memory. The oftener he details to his table companions, the faithful chroniclers who gave us his "Tischreden", the horrors of the papacy, the more starless does the night of his monastic life appear. "The picture of his youth grows darker and darker. He finally becomes a myth to himself. Not only do dates shift themselves, but also facts. When the old man drops into telling tales, the past attains the plasticity

of wax. He ascribes the same words promiscuously now to this, now to that friend or enemy" (Hausrath, op. cit., II, 432).

It was this period that gave birth to the incredibilities, exaggerations, distortions, contradictions, inconsistencies, that make his later writing an inextricable web to untangle and for three hundred years have supplied uncritical historiography with the cock-and-bull fables which unfortunately have been accepted on their face value (Idem, op. cit., II, 430–449). Again the dire results of the Reformation caused him "unspeakable solicitude and grief". The sober contemplation of the incurable inner wounds of the new Church, the ceaseless quarrels of the preachers, the galling despotism of the temporal rulers, the growing contempt for the clergy, the servility to the princes, made him fairly writhe in anguish. Above all the disintegration of moral and social life, the epidemic ravages of vice and immorality, and that in the very cradle of the Reformation, even in his very household (Köstlin-Kawerau, op. cit., II, 595), nearly drove him frantic. "We live in Sodom and Babylon, affairs are growing daily worse", is his lament (De Wette, op. cit., V, 722). In the whole Wittenberg district, with its two cities and fifteen parochial villages, he can find "only one peasant and not more, who exhorts his domestics to the Word of God and the catechism, the rest plunge headlong to the devil" (Lauterbach, "Tagebuch", 113, 114, 135; *Döllinger, "Die Reformation", I, 293–438). Twice he was on the verge of deserting this "Sodom", having commissioned his wife (28 July, 1545) to sell all their effects (De Wette, op. cit., V, 753). It required the combined efforts of the university, Bugenhagen, Melanchthon, and the burgomaster to make him change his mind (Köstlin-Kawerau, op. cit., II, 607). And again in December, only the powerful intervention of the elector prevented him carrying out his design (Burkhardt, "Luthers Briefwechsel", 475–476; 482). Then again came those soul-torturing assaults of the Devil, which left "no rest for even a single day". His nightly encounters "exhausted and martyred him to an intensity, that he was barely able to gasp or take breath". Of all the assaults "none were more severe or greater than about my preaching, the thought coming to me: All this confusion was caused by you" (Sämmtl. W., LIX, 296; LX, 45–46; 108–109, 111; LXII, 494). His last sermon in Wittenberg (17 Jan., 1546) is in a vein of despondency and despair. "Usury, drunkenness, adultery, murder, assassination, all these can be noticed, and the world understands them to be sins, but the devil's bride, reason, that pert prostitute struts in, and will be clever and means what she says, that it is the Holy Ghost" (op. cit., XVI, 142–148). The same day he pens the pathetic lines "I am old, decrepit, indolent, weary, cold, and now have the sight of but one eye" (De Wette, op. cit., V, 778). Nevertheless peace was not his.

It was while in this agony of body and torture of mind, that his unsurpassable and irreproducible coarseness attained its culminating point of virtuosity in his anti-Semitic and antipapal pamphlets. "Against the Jews and their Lies" was followed in quick succession by his even more frenzied fusillade "On the Schem Hamphoras" (1542) and "Against the Papacy established by the Devil" (1545). Here, especially in the latter, all coherent thought and utterance is buried in a torrential deluge of vituperation "for which no pen, much less a printing press should have ever been found" (Menzel, op. cit., II, 352). His mastery in his chosen method of controversy remained unchallenged. His friends had "a feeling of sorrow. His scolding remained unanswered, but also unnoticed" (Ranke, op. cit., II, 421). Accompanying this last volcanic eruption, as a sort of illustrated commentary "that the common man, who is unable to read, may see and understand what he thought of the papacy" (Förstemann), were issued the nine celebrated caricatures of the pope by Lucas Cranach, with expository verses by Luther. These "the coarsest drawings that the history of caricature of all times has ever produced" (Lange, "Der Papstesel", Göttingen, 1891, 89), were so inexpressibly vile that a common impulse of decency demanded their summary suppression by his friends.

His last act was, as he predicted and prayed for, an attack on the papacy. Summoned to Eisleben, his native place, a short time after, to act as an arbiter in a contention between the brothers Albrecht and Gebhard von Mansfeld, death came with unexpected speed, but not suddenly, and he departed this life about three o'clock in the morning, 18 February, 1546, in the presence of a number of friends (*Paulus, "Luthers Lebensende", Freiburg, 1899, 96). The body was taken to Wittenberg for interment, and was buried on the 22 Feb., in the castle church, where it now lies with that of Melanchthon.

In this article the citations are mainly from Protestant authorities. Catholic authorities are indicated by an asterisk.*

WORKS:—Seven so-called complete editions of Luther's works exist: (1) *Wittenberg Ed.* (1539–1558), 19 folio vols., 12 German and 7 Latin; (2) *Jena Ed.* (1555–1558), 12 fol. vols., 8 German, 4 Latin, 2 supplementary vols. (Eisleben, 1564–1565); (3) *Altenburg Ed.* (1661–1664), 10 fol. vols., 1 supplementary vol. (1702); (4) *Leipzig Ed.* (1729–1740), 23 fol. vols.; (5) *Walch Ed.* (1740–1753), 24 quarto vols., tr. into German, edited, and published by J. G. WALCH. A reprint of this edition, in course of publication at St. Louis, Mo., U. S. A., has reached its twenty-first vol.; (6) *Erlangen Ed.* [Sämmtliche Werke (1826–1857)], 67 octavo vols. in German: *Opera exegetica latina*, 31 vols.; *Opera latina varii argumenti*, 7 vols. This series includes ENDERS, *Dr. Martin Luthers Briefwechsel* (Kalw and Stuttgart, 1884), which has reached its eleventh vol.; (7) *Weimar Ed.* (Kritisch Gesamtausgabe, 1883– in course of publication, having reached (1909) vol. XXXVI.

LETTERS: DE WETTE and SEIDEMANN, *Luthers Briefe, Sendschreiben u. Bedenken* (Berlin, 1825–56), 6 vols.; BURKHARDT, *Luthers Briefwechsel* (Leipzig, 1866).

TABLE TALK: *Luther's Table Talk* in *Am. Eccl. Rev.* (1906), 1–18. All editions are more or less variants of AURIFABER, *Colloquia Dr. Martini Lutheri* (Eisleben, 1566): German tr. (Frankfort, 1567, 1568, 1569); FÖRSTEMANN and BINDSEIL, *Tischreden*, etc. (Berlin, 1844–1848), 4 vols.: Latin tr. (Lemgo, 1863–1866), 3 vols.; PREGER, *Luthers Tischreden* (Leipzig, 1888), after Schlaginhaufen (1531–1532); LÖSCHE, *Analecta Lutherana* (Gotha, 1892); KROKER, *Luthers Tischreden* (Leipzig, 1903), after Mathesius; LAUTERBACH, *Tagebuch (1538)* (Dresden, 1872); BELL, *Familiar Discourse of Dr. Martin Luther* (London, 1840), 2 vols., a worthless caricature.

BIOGRAPHY: The biographies of MELANCHTHON, MATHESIUS, RATZEBERGER, KEIL, UCKERT, SPICKERT, LEDDERHOSE, PFIZER, JÄCKEL, MEURER, PLITT, JÜRGENS (in part still useful), not to prolong the list, have been superseded, and can hardly be accepted on their unsupported statements. The more modern biographies of KOLDE, *Martin Luther* (Gotha, 1884–1893), 2 vols.; the last edition of KÖSTLIN, *Martin Luther, sein Leben u. seine Schriften* (Berlin, 1903), 2 vols., edited by KAWERAU; HAUSRATH, *Luthers Leben* (Berlin, 1904), 2 vols., are the most important. The Köstlin-Kawerau life is superbly documented, but marred by the inclusion of the legendary and mythical. Hausrath in a great measure avoids this pitfall, but unfortunately is destitute of all citations. The works of the Tübingen professor THUDICHUM, *Die Reformation 1517–1537* (Leipzig, 1907–1909), 2 vols., of BARGE, *Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt*, (Leipzig, 1905), 2 vols., and the latter's *Frühprotestantisches Gemeindechristentum in Wittenberg u. Orlamünde* (Leipzig, 1909), are indispensable in the light of recent research. In English: BEARD, *Martin Luther* (London, 1889), is decidedly the best. Unfortunately it remains an uncompleted fragment, and only reaches 1522; LINDSAY, *Luther and the German Reformation* (New York, 1900), is sophomoric and inaccurate [cf. *Luther's Latest Biographer* in *The Messenger Magazine* (Nov., 1902)—also in pamphlet form]; BAYNE, *Martin Luther* (London, 1887), 2 vols., is a brilliant literary performance, but historically of no account; JACOBS, *Martin Luther*, (New York, 1908), a work of mediocrity, never rising above the conventional. From the Catholic standpoint *COCHLÆUS, *ULENBERG, *EVERS, etc., though useful in part, can hardly be called true biographies. However, no better life of Luther can be found than that contained in *JANSSEN, *Geschichte des deutschen Volkes* (Freiburg, im Br.), II–III, English tr., *History of the German People* (St. Louis, 1896—). The portraiture of certain aspects and periods of Luther's life by *DENIFLE, *Luther u. Lutherthum* (Mainz, 1904), II, ed. WEISS (Mainz, 1905–1906); supplementary vol. II, *WEISS (Mainz, 1909); *DENIFLE, *Die abenduandischen Schriftausleger bis Luther über Justitia Dei und Justificatio* (Mainz, 1905); IDEM, *Luther, in rationalistischer und christlicher Beleuchtung* (Mainz, 1904); *WEISS, *Lutherpsychologie als Schlüssel zur Lutherlegende* (Mainz, 1906); *DÖLLINGER, *Die Reformation* (Ratisbon, 1846–1848) 3 vols., still remains an unanswered and unanswerable arraignment of Luther and his work. The detached articles of *NICHOLAS PAULUS, probably the most competent and authoritative Reformation historian on the Catholic side now living, which

appeared, and continue to appear in various German magazines and publications, are of a most scholarly character.

Cf. MAURENBRECHER, *Zur Lutherliteratur* in *Studien u. Skizzen*, 205–238; *Luther and his Protestant Biographers* in *Am. Cath. Quart. Rev.* (1901), 582–601. H. G. GANSS.

Lutheranism, the religious belief held by the oldest and in Europe the most numerous of the Protestant sects, founded by the Wittenberg reformer, Martin Luther. The term *Lutheran* was first used by his opponents during the Leipzig Disputation in 1519, and afterwards became universally prevalent. Luther preferred the designation "Evangelical", and today the usual title of the sect is "Evangelical Lutheran Church". In Germany, where the Lutherans and the Reformed have united (since 1817), the name Lutheran has been abandoned, and the state Church is styled the Evangelical or the Evangelical United.

I. DISTINCTIVE TEACHINGS.—In doctrine official Lutheranism is part of what is called orthodox Protestantism, since it agrees with the Catholic and the Greek Churches in accepting the authority of the Scriptures and of the three most ancient creeds (the Apostles' Creed, the Nicene Creed, and the Athanasian Creed). Besides these formulæ of belief, Lutheranism acknowledges six specific confessions which distinguish it from other churches: (1) the unaltered Augsburg Confession (1530), (2) the Apology of the Augsburg Confession (1531), (3) Luther's Large Catechism (1529), (4) Luther's Catechism for Children (1529), (5) the Articles of Smalkald (1537), and (6) the Form of Concord (1577). These nine symbolical books (including the three Creeds) constitute what is known as the "Book of Concord", which was first published at Dresden in 1580 by order of Elector Augustus of Saxony (see FAITH, PROTESTANT CONFESSIONS OF). In these confessions the Scriptures are declared to be the only rule of faith. The extent of the Canon is not defined, but the bibles in common use among Lutherans have been generally the same as those of other Protestant denominations (see CANON OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES). The symbols and the other writings not contained in Scripture do not possess decisive authority, but merely show how the Scriptures were understood and explained at particular times by the leading theologians (Form of Concord). The chief tenet of the Lutheran creed, that which Luther called "the article of the standing and falling Church", has reference to the justification of sinful man. Original sin is explained as a positive and total depravity of human nature, which renders all the acts of the unjustified, even those of civil righteousness, sinful and displeasing to God. Justification, which is not an internal change, but an external, forensic declaration by which God imputes to the creature the righteousness of Christ, comes only by faith, which is the confidence that one is reconciled to God through Christ. Good works are necessary as an exercise of faith, and are rewarded, not by justification (which they presuppose), but by the fulfilment of the Divine promises (Apology Aug. Conf.).

Other distinctive doctrines of the Lutheran Church are: (1) consubstantiation (although the symbols do not use this term), i. e. the real, corporeal presence of Christ's Body and Blood during the celebration of the Lord's Supper, in, with, and under the substance of bread and wine, in a union which is not hypostatic, nor of mixture, nor of local inclusion, but entirely transcendent and mysterious; (2) the omnipresence of the Body of Christ, which is differently explained by the commentators of the Symbolical Books. Since the official formulæ of faith claim no decisive authority for themselves, and on many points are far from harmonious, the utmost diversity of opinion prevails among Lutherans. Every shade of belief may be found among them, from the orthodox, who hold fast to the confessions, to the semi-infidel theologians, who deny the authority of the Scriptures.

II. HISTORY.—Lutheranism dates from 31 October, 1517, when Luther affixed his theses to the church door of the castle of Wittenberg. Although he did not break with the Catholic Church until three years later, he had already come substantially to his later views on the plan of salvation. The new teachings, however, underwent a great change after Luther's return from Wartburg (1521). Before he died (18 Feb., 1546), his teachings had been propagated in many states of Germany, in Poland, in the Baltic Provinces, in Hungary, Transylvania, the Netherlands, Denmark, and Scandinavia. From these European countries Lutheranism has been carried by emigration to the New World, and in the United States it ranks among the leading Protestant denominations.

(1) *The Lutherans in Germany.*—(a) First Period: From the appearance of Luther's Theses to the adoption of the Formula of Concord (1517–80).—Favoured by the civil rulers, Lutheranism spread rapidly in Northern Germany. After the Diet of Speyer (1526) the Elector of Saxony and other princes established Lutheran state Churches. An alliance between these princes was concluded at Torgau in 1526, and again at Smalkald in 1531. The Protestant League was continually increased by the accession of other states, and a religious war broke out in 1546, which resulted in the Peace of Augsburg (1555). This treaty provided that the Lutherans should retain permanently what they then possessed, but that all officials of ecclesiastical estates, who from that time forth should go over to Protestantism, would be deposed and replaced by Catholics. This latter provision, known as the "Reservatum Ecclesiasticum", was very unsatisfactory to the Protestants, and its constant violation was one of the causes that lead up to the Thirty Years War (1618–48). At the time of the Peace of Augsburg Lutherans predominated in the north of Germany, while the Zwinglians or Reformed were very numerous in the south. Austria, Bavaria, and the territories subject to spiritual lords were Catholic, although many of these afterwards became Protestant. Several attempts were made to effect a reunion. In 1534 Pope Paul III invited the Protestants to a general council. Emperor Charles V arranged conferences between Catholic and Lutheran theologians in 1541, 1546, and 1547. His successor, Ferdinand I (1556–64), and many private individuals, such as the Lutheran Frederick Staphylus and Father Contzen, laboured much for the same end. All these efforts, however, proved fruitless. Melanchthon, Crusius, and other Lutheran theologians made formal proposals of union to the Greek Church (1559, 1574, 1578), but nothing came of their overtures. From the beginning bitter hostility existed between the Lutherans and the Reformed. This first appeared in the Sacramentarian controversy between Luther and Zwingli (1524). They met in conference at Marburg in 1529, but came to no agreement. The hopes of union created by the compromise formula of 1536, known as the *Concordia Wittenbergensis*, proved delusive. Luther continued to make war on the Zwinglians until his death. The Sacramentarian strife was renewed in 1549, when the Zwinglians accepted Calvin's view of the Real Presence. The followers of Melanchthon, who favoured Calvin's doctrine (Philippists, Crypto-Calvinists), were also furiously denounced by the orthodox Lutherans. During these controversies the state Church of the Palatinate, where Philippism predominated, changed from the Lutheran to the Reformed faith (1560). From the beginning Lutheranism was torn by doctrinal disputes, carried on with the utmost violence and passion. They had reference to the questions of sin and grace, justification by faith, the use of good works, the Lord's Supper, and the Person and work of Christ. The bitterest controversy was the Crypto-Calvinistic. To effect harmony the Form of Concord, the last of the

Lutheran symbols, was drawn up in 1577, and accepted by the majority of the state Churches. The document was written in a conciliatory spirit, but it secured the triumph of the orthodox party.

(b) Second Period: From the Adoption of the Form of Concord to the Beginning of the Pietistic Movement (1580–1689).—During this period Lutheranism was engaged in bitter polemics with its neighbours in Germany. Out of these religious discords grew the horrors of the Thirty Years War, which led many persons to desire better relations between the churches. A "charitable colloquy" was held at Thorn in 1645 by Catholic, Lutheran, and Calvinist theologians, but nothing was accomplished. The proposal of the Lutheran professor, George Calixtus, that the confessions organize into one church with the consensus of the first five centuries as a common basis (Syncretism), aroused a storm of indignation, and, by way of protest, a creed was accepted by the Saxon universities which expressed the views of the most radical school of Lutheran orthodoxy (1655). The Lutheran theologians of this period imitated the disorderly arrangement of Melanchthon's "Loci Theologici", but in spirit they were with few exceptions loyal supporters of the Form of Concord. Although the writings of Luther abound with diatribes against the speculative sciences, his followers early perceived the necessity of philosophy for controversial purposes. Melanchthon developed a system of Aristoteleanism, and it was not long before the Scholastic method, which Luther had so cordially detested, was used by the Evangelical theologians, although the new Scholasticism was utterly different from the genuine system. Lutheran dogmatics became a maze of refined subtleties, and mere logomachy was considered the chief duty of the theologian. The result was a fanatical orthodoxy, whose only activity was heresy-hunting and barren controversy. New attempts were made to unite the Evangelical Churches. Conferences were held in 1586, 1631, and 1661; a plan of union was proposed by the Heidelberg professor Pareus (1615); the Reformed Synod of Charenton (1631) voted to admit Lutheran sponsors in baptism. But again the doctrine of the Lord's Supper proved an obstacle, as the Lutherans would agree to no union that was not based upon perfect dogmatic consensus. By the Peace of Westphalia (1648) the concessions which had been made to the Lutherans in 1555 were extended to the Reformed.

(c) Third Period: From the Beginning of the Pietistic Movement to the Evangelical Union (1689–1817).—Pietism, which was a reaction against the cold and dreary formalism of Lutheran orthodoxy, originated with Philip Spener (1635–1705). In sermons and writings he asserted the claims of personal holiness, and in 1670, while dean at Frankfort-on-the-Main, he began to hold little reunions called *collegia pietatis* (whence the name Pietist), in which devotional passages of the Scriptures were explained and pious conversation carried on by those present. His follower, August Francke, founded in 1694 the University of Halle, which became a stronghold of Pietism. The strict Lutherans accused the Pietists of heresy, a charge which was vigorously denied, although in fact the new school differed from the orthodox not only in practice, but also in doctrine. The first enthusiasm of the Pietists soon degenerated into fanaticism, and they rapidly lost favour. Pietism had exercised a beneficial influence, but it was followed by the Rationalistic movement, a more radical reaction against orthodoxy, which effected within the Lutheran, as in other Protestant communions, many apostasies from Christian belief. The philosophy of the day and the national literature, then ardently cultivated, had gradually undermined the faith of all classes of the people. The leaders in the Church adjusted themselves to the new conditions, and soon theological chairs and the pulpits were filled by men who rejected not only the dogmatic teaching of the Symbolical Books, but every supernatural element of religion. A notable exception to this growing infidelity was the sect of Herrnhuters or United Brethren, founded in 1722 by Count von Zinzendorf, a follower of the Pietistic school (see BOHEMIAN BRETHREN). The critical state of their churches caused many Protestants to long for a union between the Lutherans and the Reformed. The royal house of Prussia laboured to accomplish a union, but all plans were frustrated by the opposition of the theologians. There were for a time prospects of a reconciliation of the Hanoverian Lutherans with the Catholic Church. Negotiations were carried on between the Catholic Bishop Spinola and the Lutheran representative Molanus (1691). A controversy on the points at issue followed between Bossuet and Leibniz (1692–1701), but no agreement was reached.

(d) Fourth Period: From the Evangelical Union (1817) to the Present.—The chief events in the Lutheran Churches in Germany during the nineteenth century were the Evangelical Union and the revival of orthodoxy. During the celebration of the tercentenary of the Reformation in 1817, efforts were made in Prussia to unite Lutherans and Reformed. Frederick William III recommended the use of a common liturgy by the two churches, and this proposal gradually won acceptance. There was much opposition, however, to the service-book published by royal authority in 1822. John Scheibel, deacon in Breslau, refused to accept it, and, being deposed from office, founded a separatist sect known as the "Old Lutherans" (1830). The Government used very oppressive measures against these nonconformists, but in 1845 the new king, Frederick William IV, recognized them as an independent Lutheran sect. In 1860 the Old Lutherans were greatly reduced in numbers by the defection of Pastor Diedrich, who organized the independent Immanuel Synod. There were also separatist movements outside of Silesia. Free Lutheran Churches were established by dissenters in Hesse, Hanover, Baden, and Saxony. A supernaturalist movement, which defended the Divinely inspired character of the Bible, started a reaction against the principle of rationalism in theology. The centenary jubilees of 1817 and the following years, which recalled the early days of Lutheranism, brought with them a revival of former orthodoxy. The theological faculties of several universities became strictly Lutheran in their teachings. Since then there has been a persistent and bitter struggle between rationalistic and Evangelical tendencies in the United and Free Churches.

(2) *The Lutherans in Denmark and Scandinavia.*—(a) Denmark.—By the Union of Calmar (1397), Sweden, Norway, and Denmark became a united kingdom under the King of Denmark. The despotic Christian II (1513–23) endeavoured to introduce the Reformation, but was overthrown by his barons. Frederick I of Schleswig-Holstein, his successor, openly professed Lutheranism in 1526. At the Diet of Odense (1527) he obtained a measure which guaranteed equal rights to his coreligionists, and two years later he proclaimed Lutheranism the only true religion. Under his successor, Christian III (1533–59), the Catholic bishops were deprived of their sees, and the Lutheran Church of Denmark was organized with the king as supreme bishop. The Diet of Copenhagen (1546) enacted penal laws, which deprived Catholics of civil rights and forbade priests to remain in Denmark under pain of death. The opposition of Iceland to the new religion was put down by force (1550). German rationalism was propagated in Denmark by Clausen. Among its opponents was Grundtvig, leader of the Grundtvigian movement (1824), which advocated the acceptance of the Apostles' Creed as the sole rule of faith. Freedom of religious worship was granted in 1849.

(b) Norway, which was united with Denmark, be-

came Lutheran during the reigns of Frederick I and Christian III. Rationalism, introduced from Denmark, made great progress in Norway. It was opposed by Hauge and by Norwegian followers of Grundtvig. A Free Apostolic Church was founded by Adolph Lammers about 1850, but later reunited with the state church. Norway passed laws of toleration in 1845, but still excludes the Jesuits.

(c) Sweden was freed from the Danish yoke by Gustavus Vasa in 1521, and two years later the liberator was chosen king. Almost from the outset of his reign he showed himself favourable to Lutherans, and by cunning and violence succeeded in introducing the new religion into his kingdom. In 1529 the Reformation was formally established by the Assembly of Örebro, and in 1544 the ancient Faith was put under the ban of the law. The reign of Eric XIV (1560–8) was marked by violent conflicts between the Lutherans and the Calvinists. The latter party was favoured by the king, and their defeat in 1568 was followed by Eric's dethronement. His successor, John III (1568–92), conferred with Gregory XIII on a reunion of Sweden with the Catholic Church, but, as the pope could not grant all the concessions demanded by the king, the negotiations were unsuccessful. The next king, Sigismund (1592–1604), was a Catholic, but, as he lived in Poland (of which he was king from 1587), the Government of Sweden was administered by his uncle Duke Charles of Sudermanland, a zealous Lutheran, who used the power at his command to secure his proclamation as King Charles IX in the Assembly of Nordkoeping (1604). The successor of Charles was the famous general and statesman, Gustavus Adolphus (1611–32). For the part he took in the Thirty Years War, he is venerated by Lutherans as the religious hero of their Church, but it is now admitted that reasons of state led Gustavus into that conflict. He was succeeded by his only daughter Christina, who became a Catholic and abdicated in 1654. By a law of 1686 all persons in the kingdom were required under severe penalties to conform to the state Church. A law passed in 1726 against religious conventicles was rigidly enforced against the Swedish Pietists (*Läsare*) from 1803 till its repeal in 1853. The law against religious dissidents was not removed from the statute books till 1873. The Swedish Church is entirely controlled by the state, and the strict orthodoxy which was enforced prevented at first any serious inroads of Rationalism. But since 1866 there has formed within the state Church a "progressive party", whose purpose is to abandon all symbols and to laicize the church. The two universities of Upsala and Lund are orthodox. The Grand Duchy of Finland, formerly united to Sweden, but now (since 1809) a Province of Russia, maintains Lutheranism as the national Church.

(3) *Lutheranism in Other Countries of Europe.*—(a) Poland.—Lutheranism was introduced into Poland during the reign of Sigismund I (1501–48) by young men who had made their studies at Wittenberg. The new teachings were opposed by the king, but had the powerful support of the nobility. From Danzig they spread to the cities of Thorn and Elbing, and, during the reign of Sigismund II (1548–72), steadily gained ground. A union symbol was drawn up and signed by the Protestants at Sandomir in 1570, and three years later they concluded a religious peace with the Catholics, in which it was agreed that all parties should enjoy equal civil rights. The peace was not lasting, and during two centuries there was almost continual religious strife which finally led to the downfall of the kingdom. With the connivance of Poland, Lutheranism was established in the territories of the Teutonic Order, East Prussia (1525), Livonia (1539), and Courland (1561).

(b) Hungary, Transylvania and Silesia.—The teachings of Luther were first propagated in these countries during the reign of King Louis II of Hungary and Bohemia (1516–26). The king was strongly opposed to religious innovation, but after his death civil discords enabled the new doctrine to gain headway. In Silesia Lutheranism was protected by the dukes, and in 1524 it was established in Breslau, the capital, by the municipal council. Freedom of worship was granted in Transylvania in 1545, and in Hungary in 1606. The Lutherans were soon involved in quarrels with the Calvinists. The German element among the Protestants favoured the Augsburg Confession, but the Reformed faith had more adherents among the Hungarians and Czechs. In Silesia the Lutherans themselves were divided on the doctrine of justification and the Eucharist. Gaspar Schwenkfeld (d. 1561), one of the earliest disciples of Luther, assailed his master's doctrine on these points, and as early as 1528 Schwenkfeldianism had many adherents among Lutherans. The memory of Schwenkfeld is still held in veneration in Silesia and in some Lutheran communities of Pennsylvania. Lutheranism made some gains in the hereditary states of Austria and in Bohemia during the reigns of Ferdinand I (1556–64) and Maximilian II (1564–76). The Lutherans of Bohemia rebelled against the imperial authority in 1618, but were defeated, and the Catholic Faith was preserved in the Hapsburg dominions. (See AUSTRO-HUNGARIAN MONARCHY; HUNGARY.)

(c) Holland was one of the first countries to receive the doctrines of Luther. Emperor Charles V, anxious to avert the disorders which followed the Reformation in Germany, used great severity against those who propagated Lutheranism in the Netherlands. His son, Philip II of Spain (1556–98), was still more rigorous. The measures he employed were often despotic and unjust, and the people rose in a rebellion (1568), by which Holland was lost to Spain. Meanwhile the relations between the Lutherans and Calvinists were anything but cordial. The Reformed party gradually gained the ascendancy, and, when the republic was established, their political supremacy enabled them to subject the Lutherans to many annoying restrictions. The Dutch Lutherans fell a prey to Rationalism in the eighteenth century. A number of the churches and pastors separated from the main body to adhere more closely to the Augsburg Confession. The liberal party has a theological seminary (founded in 1816) at Amsterdam, while the orthodox provide for theological training by lectures in the university of the same city.

(4) *Lutherans in America.*—(a) Period of Foundation (1624–1742).—Lutherans were among the earliest European settlers on this continent. Their first representatives came from Holland to the Dutch colony of New Netherlands about 1624. Under Governor Stuyvesant they were obliged to conform to the Reformed services, but freedom of worship was obtained when New Amsterdam (New York) was captured by the English in 1664. The second distinct body of Lutherans in America arrived from Sweden in 1637. Two years later they had a minister and organized at Fort Christina (now Wilmington, Delaware), the first Lutheran congregation in the New World. After 1771 the Swedes of Delaware and Pennsylvania dissolved their union with the Mother Church of Sweden. As they had no English-speaking ministers, they chose their pastors from the Episcopalian Church. Since 1846 these congregations have declared full communion with the Episcopalians. The first colony of German Lutherans was from the Palatinate. They arrived in 1693 and founded Germantown, now a part of Philadelphia. During the eighteenth century large numbers of Lutheran emigrants from Alsace, the Palatinate, and Würtemberg settled along the Hudson River. On the Atlantic coast, in New Jersey, Virginia, North and South Carolina, were many isolated groups of German Lutherans. A colony of Lutherans

from Salzburg founded the settlement of Ebenezer, Georgia, in 1734. In Eastern Pennsylvania about 30,000 German Lutherans had settled before the middle of the eighteenth century. Three of their congregations applied to Europe for ministers, and Count Zinzendorf became pastor in Philadelphia in 1741.

(b) Period of Organization (1742–87).—In 1742 Rev. Henry Muhlenberg, a Hanoverian, who is regarded as the patriarch of American Lutheranism, arrived in Philadelphia and succeeded Zinzendorf in the pastorate. During the forty-five years of his ministry in America, Muhlenberg presided over widely separated congregations and erected many churches. He began the work of organization among the Lutherans of America by the foundation of the Synod of Pennsylvania in 1748. He also prepared the congregational constitution of St. Michael's Church, Philadelphia, which became the model of similar constitutions throughout the country. His son, Rev. Frederick Muhlenberg, afterwards speaker in the first House of Representatives, was the originator of the Ministerium of New York, the second synod in America (1773).

(c) Period of Deterioration (1787–1817).—Muhlenberg and the other German pastors of his time were graduates of the University of Halle. The generation that succeeded them had made their studies in the same institution. But the Pietism of the founders of Halle had now made way for the destructive criticism of Semler. The result was soon manifest in the indifferentism of the American Churches. The Pennsylvania Ministerium eliminated all confessional tests in its constitution of 1792. The New York ministerium, led by Dr. Frederick Quitman, a decided Rationalist, substituted for the older Lutheran catechisms and hymn-books works that were more conformable to the prevailing theology. The agenda, or service-book adopted by the Pennsylvania Lutherans in 1818, was a departure from the old type of service and the expression of new doctrinal standards. The transition from the use of German to English caused splits in many congregations, the German party bitterly opposing the introduction of English in the church services. They even felt that they had more in common with the German-speaking Reformed than with the English-speaking Lutherans, and some of them advocated an Evangelical Union such as was then proposed in Prussia.

(d) Period of Revival and Expansion (1817–60).—To prevent the threatened disintegration, a union of all the Lutheran synods in America was proposed. In 1820 the General Synod was organized at Hagerstown, Pennsylvania, but a few of the district synods stood aloof. The new organization was regarded with suspicion by many, and in 1823 the mother synod of Pennsylvania itself withdrew from the general body. From the beginning there was a considerable element within the General Synod which favoured doctrinal compromise with the Reformed Church. To strengthen the conservative party, the Pennsylvania Synod returned to the General Synod in 1853. Meanwhile the General Synod had established the theological seminary at Gettysburg, Pennsylvania (1825), and societies for home and foreign missions. In the West several ecclesiastical organizations were formed by Lutheran emigrants from Saxony, Prussia, Bavaria, and the Scandinavian countries. The Missouri Synod was founded by Rev. Carl Walther in 1847, and the same year opened a theological seminary at St. Louis. A band of Old Lutherans, who resisted the Prussian union, emigrated from Saxony in 1839, and two years later founded the Buffalo Synod. At first a union between the Missouri and the Buffalo synods was expected, but instead their leaders were soon engaged in doctrinal controversies which extended over many years. In 1854 a party within the Missouri Synod, dissatisfied with what it regarded as the extreme congregationalism of that body and its denial of open questions in theology, seceded and formed the Iowa Synod with its theological seminary at Dubuque. Ever since there has been conflict between these two synods. Travelling preachers of the Pennsylvania Ministerium founded in Ohio a conference in connexion with the mother synod in 1805. This conference was reorganized in 1818 into a synod which since 1833 has been known as the Joint Synod of Ohio. The earliest synods formed by Scandinavian emigrants were: (1) the Norwegian Hauge Synod (1846), (2) the Norwegian Synod (1853), and (3) the Scandinavian Augustana Synod (1860), all in the states of the Middle West.

(e) Period of Reorganization (since 1860).—At the beginning of the Civil War the General Synod numbered two-thirds of the Lutherans in the United States, and hopes were entertained that soon all the organizations would be united in one body. These anticipations, however, were doomed to disappointment. In 1863 the General Synod lost the five southern district synods, which withdrew and formed the "General Synod of the Confederate States". A more serious break in the General Synod occurred three years later. The disagreements between the liberal and the conservative elements in that body had not abated with time. In 1864 the Ministerium of Pennsylvania established in Philadelphia a new seminary, thereby greatly reducing the attendance at the Gettysburg seminary of the General Synod. At the next convention (1866) it was declared that the Pennsylvania Synod was no longer in practical union with the General Synod. The Pennsylvania Ministerium at once sent out an invitation to all American and Canadian synods to join with it in forming a new general body. In response to this invitation a convention assembled at Reading the same year, and thirteen synods were consolidated into the "General Council". With the close of the Civil War the Southern Lutherans might have returned to fellowship with their Northern brethren, but the controversy between the Northern synods determined them to perpetuate their own organization. In 1886 they reorganized their general body, taking the name of the "United Synod in the South", and stating their doctrinal position, which is essentially the same as that of the General Council. A fourth general body was formed in 1872, the "Synodical Conference", at present the strongest organization among the Lutheran Churches of America. It takes as its basis the Formula of Concord of 1580, and comprises the Missouri and other Western synods. A controversy on predestination led to the withdrawal of the Ohio Synod in 1881, and of the Norwegian Synod in 1884. There are still many independent synods not affiliated with any of the general organizations. Thus the Lutherans of the United States are divided into various conflicting bodies, each claiming to be a truer exponent of Lutheranism than the others. The membership of the four principal organizations is almost exclusively of German descent. The main cause of separation is diversity of opinion regarding the importance or the interpretation of the official confessions.

III. Organization and Worship.—In the early days of the Reformation the prevalent form of government was that known as the episcopal, which transferred the jurisdiction of the bishops to the civil ruler. It was followed by the territorial system, which recognized the sovereign as head of the church, in virtue of his office, both in administrative and doctrinal matters. The collegial system of Pfaff (1719) asserts the sovereignty and independence of the congregation, which may, however, delegate its authority to the State. In the Lutheran state Churches the secular power is in fact the supreme authority. The practical determination of religious questions rests with the national legislature, or with a consistorium whose

members are appointed by the government. No Divinely constituted hierarchy is recognized, and in orders all the clergy are considered as equals. The Lutheran bishops of Sweden and Denmark, like the "general superintendents" of Germany, are government officials entrusted with the oversight of the pastors and congregations. In Holland and the United States, as among the Free Churches of Germany, the form of organization is synodical, a system of church polity which in its main features has been derived from the Reformed Church. According to this plan, purely congregational matters are decided by the vote of the congregation, either directly or through the church council. In the United States the church council consists of the pastor and his lay assistants, the elders and deacons, all chosen by the congregation. Affairs of more general importance and disputed questions are settled by the district synod, composed of lay and clerical delegates representing such congregations as have accepted a mutual congregational compact. The congregations composing a district synod may unite with other district synods to form a more general body. The powers of a general organization of this kind, in relation to the bodies of which it is composed, are not, however, in all cases the same. The constitution of the Old Lutheran Church in Germany makes its General Synod the last court of appeal and its decisions binding. In the United States a different conception prevails, and in most instances the general assemblies are regarded simply as advisory conferences whose decisions require the ratification of the particular organizations represented.

Lutheran public worship is based on the service-book which Luther published in 1523 and 1526. He retained the first part of the Mass, but abolished the Offertory, Canon, and all the forms of sacrifice. The main Lutheran service is still known as "the Mass" in Scandinavian countries. The singing of hymns became a prominent part of the new service. Many Catholic sequences were retained, and other sacred songs were borrowed from the old German poets. Luther himself wrote hymns, but it is doubtful whether he is really the author of any of the melodies that are usually ascribed to him. Luther wished to retain the Elevation and the use of the Latin language, but these have been abandoned. The Collect, Epistle, and Gospel vary according to the Sundays of the year. The Creed is followed by a sermon on the Scripture lesson of the day, which is the principal part of the service. Ordinarily the Lord's Supper is administered only a few times during the year. It is preceded, sometimes the day before, by the service of public confession and absolution, which consists in the promise of amendment made by the intending communicants, and the declaration of the minister that such as are truly penitent are forgiven. Only two sacraments are recognized by Lutherans, Baptism and the Lord's Supper; but Confirmation, Ordination, and Confession as just described are regarded as sacred rites. There are also ceremonies prescribed for marriage and burial. Christmas, Easter, Pentecost, the feast of the Twelve Apostles, the Commemoration of the Reformation (31 Oct.) are observed with religious services. Pictures are permitted in the churches, and in Denmark vestments and lighted candles are used at the communion service. The first complete ritual or agenda was that prepared for the Duchy of Prussia in 1525. There is no uniform liturgy for the churches. In the United Evangelical Church of Germany the agenda of Frederick William III (1817) is the official form. The services of the American Lutherans were for many years chiefly extemporaneous, but since 1888 a common service based on the liturgies of the sixteenth century has been used by almost all English-speaking Lutherans in this country. It includes, besides the main service, matins and vespers.

IV. Various Lutheran Activities.—(1) *Foreign Missions and Benevolent Organizations.*—Foreign missionary activity has never been a very prominent characteristic of the Lutheran Church. Its pioneer missionaries went from the University of Halle to the East Indies (Tanquebar) at the invitation of Frederick IV of Denmark in 1705. During the eighteenth century Halle sent about sixty missionaries to Tanquebar. In later years the mission was supplied by the Leipzig Lutheran Mission. Another Danish mission was that of Pastor Hans Egede among the Greenlanders in 1721. During the nineteenth century several societies for foreign missions were founded: the Berlin Mission Society (1824), the Evangelical Lutheran Missionary Association of Leipzig (1836), the Hermansburg Society (1854), and a number of similar organizations in the Scandinavian countries. In the United States a German Foreign Missionary Society was founded in 1837. The first Lutheran missionary from the United States was Dr. Heyer, who was sent to India in 1841. At present missions to the heathen in Oceania, India, and East Africa, are maintained under the auspices of various American synods. The sisterhood, known as the Lutheran Deaconesses, was founded by Pastor Fliedner at Kaiserwerth in 1833, its objects being the care of the sick, instruction, etc. They are now very numerous in some parts of Germany. They were introduced in the United States in 1849.

(2) *Sacred Learning and Education.*—The study of exegetics, church history, and theology has been much cultivated by Lutheran scholars. Among the exegetes the following are well known: Solomon Glassius (Philologia Sacra, 1623); Sebastian Schmid (d. 1696), translator and commentator; John H. Michaelis (Biblia Hebraica, 1720); John A. Bengel (Gnomon Novi Testamenti, 1752); Havernick (d. 1845), Hegstenberg (d. 1869), and Delitzsch (d. 1890), commentators. Among the more important church historians may be mentioned: Mosheim (d. 1755), sometimes called the "Father of Modern Church History", Schrockle (d. 1808), Neander (d. 1850), Kurtz (d. 1890), Hase (d. 1890). The "Magdeburg Centuries" (1559) of Flacius Illyricus and his associates, the first church history written by Protestants, is very biased and has no historical value. Numerous dogmatic works have been written by Lutheran theologians. Among the dogmaticians most esteemed by Lutherans are: Melanchthon, whose "Loci Theologici" (1521) was the first Lutheran theology; Martin Chemnitz (d. 1586) and John Gerhard (d. 1637), the two ablest Lutheran theologians; Calovius (d. 1686), champion of the strictest Lutheran orthodoxy; Quenstedt (d. 1688); Hollaz (d. 1713); Luthardt (d. 1902); Henry Schmid, whose dogmatic theology (1st ed., 1843) in its English translation has been much used in the United States. The Lutheran Church still produces many dogmatic works, but very few of the modern divines hold strictly to the old formulæ of faith.

The Lutheran Churches deserve great credit for the importance they have always attached to religious instruction, not only in their many universities, but also and especially in the schools of elementary instruction. In Lutheran countries the education of the children is supervised by the religious authorities, since Lutherans act on the principle that religious training is the most important part of education. The catechism, Biblical study, and church music have a prominent part in the everyday instruction. In the United States the parochial school has been developed with great success among the congregations that still use the German and Scandinavian languages. The Lutherans of Wisconsin and Illinois co-operated with the Catholics in 1890 in an organized resistance against legislation which would have proved injurious to the parochial schools.

V. Influence of Rationalism in the Lutheran Churches.—The popular faith had been overthrown

in the eighteenth century by the philosophy of Wolff (d. 1754) and the criticism of Semler (d. 1791). The principle of the supremacy of reason was used to tear down belief in the inspired character of Holy Writ. The literature and philosophy of the time show how great a blow was dealt to orthodox Lutheranism. Theology, now become the handmaid of philosophy, eagerly accepted amid the prevailing doubt and negation the system of Kant (d. 1804), which made the essence of religion and the whole value of Scripture consist in the teaching of the morality of reason or natural ethics. Against this rationalistic theology there arose about the beginning of the nineteenth century two reactionary movements—Supernaturalism, which declared in favour of the undivided supremacy of faith, and the system of Schleiermacher (d. 1834), which made sentiment or the feelings of the heart the criterion of religious truth. The teachings of Schleiermacher recast the existing theology, and gave it the bent which it afterwards followed. A still more thoroughgoing rationalism appeared in the writings of the Hegelian Strauss (d. 1874) and of the Tübingen school, which aimed at the utter destruction of the Divine basis of Christian faith by explaining all that is supernatural in Scripture as merely natural or mythical. These bold attacks were met by many able scholars, and they have long since been discredited. Since the days of Strauss and Bauer (d. 1860), the method known as Higher Criticism (see CRITICISM, BIBLICAL) has found favour in Germany, both with the rationalistic and the orthodox Protestant. Much that is of permanent value as an aid to the scientific study of the Bible has been accomplished, but at the same time Rationalism has been making constant gains, not only in the universities, but also amongst the masses. The strictly confessional theology of the orthodox revival (1817), the neo-Lutheran movement, whose leanings toward the Catholic Faith gave it the name of German Puseyism, the Compromise Theology, which endeavoured to reconcile believers and Rationalists—all these more or less conservative systems are now to a great extent superseded by the modern or free theology, represented by Pfleiderer (d. 1906), Wilhelm Hermann, Tröltsch, Harnack, Weinel, and others, which teaches a religion without creed or dogma. In Germany, especially in the cities, the Evangelical faith has lost its influence not only with the people, but in great part with the preachers themselves. The same is true to some extent in the Scandinavian countries, where Rationalism is making inroads on Lutheran orthodoxy. In the United States the Lutherans have been more conservative, and thus far have preserved more of their confessional spirit.

VI. STATISTICS.—The number of Lutherans in the world is about fifty millions, a membership which far exceeds that of any other Protestant denomination. The chief Lutheran country to-day, as from the beginning, is Germany. In 1905 the Evangelicals (Lutherans and Reformed) in the German Empire numbered 37,646,852. The membership of the Lutheran churches in other European countries is as follows: Sweden (1900), 5,972,792; Russia, chiefly in Finland and the Baltic Provinces (1905), 3,572,653; Denmark (1901), 2,400,000; Norway (1900), 2,197,318; Hungary (1906), 1,288,942. Austria and Holland have about 494,000 and 110,000 Lutherans respectively. According to a bulletin of the Bureau of the U. S. Census the total membership of the 24 Lutheran bodies in the United States in 1906 was 2,112,494, with 7841 ministers, 11,194 church edifices, and church property valued at $74,826,389. Dr. H. K. Carroll's statistics of the Churches of the United States for 1909 credits the Lutherans with 2,173,047 communicants.

I. JACOBS, *The Book of Concord* (Philadelphia, 1893); SCHAFF, *The Creeds of Christendom* (5th ed., New York, 1890), I, II; SCHMID, *Doct. Theol. of Evang. Luth. Church* (Philadelphia, 1889).

II. For the history of Lutheranism in Europe consult the bibliographies under the religious history of the various countries. For the history of Lutheranism in the United States: JACOBS, *History of the Evang. Lutheran Church in the U. S.* (New York, 1893) in *American Church History Series*, IV (with extensive bibliog.); WOLF, *The Lutherans in America* (New York, 1889).

III. 2. HORN, *Outlines of Liturgies* (Philadelphia, 1890).

V. HURST, *Hist. of Rationalism* (New York, 1865); VIGOUROUX, *Les Livres Saints et la Critique Rationaliste*, II (Paris, 1886), 311–556.

VI. *Kirchliches Jahrbuch* (published at Gütersloh); *Lutheran Church Annual; Lutheran Year Book.*

J. A. MCHUGH.

Lütolf, ALOYS, ecclesiastical historian, b. 23 July, 1824, in Gettnau near Willisau (Switzerland); d. at Lucerne, 8 April, 1879. He made his early studies at the Jesuit College of Schwyz, and at the Lyceum at Lucerne, where he became an enthusiastic student of history. But as the political situation at that time did not permit of serious study, Lütolf, with a number of students of like youthful ardour, placed themselves in 1847 at the disposal of their country. For a time Lütolf was employed as private secretary at Lucerne, and also took part in the expedition of the Sonderbund army into the Canton of Ticino. From 1847 to 1849 he studied theology and history at Freiburg in Baden and at Munich, and in 1850 was ordained priest at Solothurn. After serving on the mission for a time, he taught history from 1852 to 1856 at the Catholic cantonal school of St. Gall. On the suppression of this school, Lütolf became parish priest at Lucerne. In 1864 he was appointed viceregent of the clerical seminary at Solothurn, in 1858 professor of church history, and shortly afterwards canon of St. Leodegar's chapter at Lucerne. In 1859 he began to publish his investigations made at St. Gall. The most important are "Sagen, Gebräuche und Legenden aus den fünf Orten" (Lucerne, 1865) and "Glaubensboten der Schweiz vor St. Gallus" (Lucerne, 1870), a valuable contribution to the ancient history of Switzerland. His "Leben und Bekenntnisse des I. L. S. Schiffmann" (Lucerne, 1861) is a creditable memorial to his former master, Father Schiffman; the book also contains important information about the famous pedagogue, Bishop Sailer, and his school in Switzerland. He also has a work on the historian Kopp, "Jos. Ant. Kopp als Professor, Dichter, Staatsmann und Historiker" (Lucerne, 1868). The latter had shortly before his death given him his historical manuscripts, and commissioned him to complete his partly finished work, "Geschichte der eidgenössischen Bünde".

SCHMIDT, *Erinnerungen an Dr. Al. Lütolf* (Lucerne, 1880).

PATRICIUS SCHLAGER.

Lutzk, Zhitomir, and Kamenetz, DIOCESE OF (LUCEORIENSIS, ZYTOMIRIENSIS, ET CAMENECENSIS), in Little Russia. Its present territory extends over the Governments (provinces) of Volhynia, Kieff, and Podolia. Originally it formed three separate dioceses, but they were eventually united, through successful Russian pressure upon the Holy See, intended to promote governmental authority over the Catholic Church in Russia. The see is theoretically governed by the diocesan bishop, who resides at Zhitomir, assisted by three auxiliary bishops, for the cities of Lutzk, Zhitomir, and Kieff; but at present two are vacant.

Originally this portion of Russia was entirely of the Greek Rite, but with the conquest of Volhynia and Podolia by the Lithuanians in 1320, and the later conquest and union of Lithuania by the Poles in 1569, the Latin Rite became well established, and accordingly Latin bishoprics were founded. Lutzk, in the western part of Volhynia, is perhaps the oldest one; it is said to have been founded in 1358, but the see was then placed further west at Vladimir. In 1428 Bishop Andrew Plawka transferred the see to Lutzk, then one of the principal cities of Volhynia. This occasioned some confusion in 1439 at the Council of Florence, when the Bishop of Lutzk (*Łuck* in Polish) was directed to give up the name *Lucensis* and to write his diocese *Luceoriensis*, to distinguish him from the Bishop of Lugo. Six provincial synods have been held

in this diocese: in 1607, 1621, 1641, 1684, 1720, and 1726; and in the eighteenth century it had 183 churches. The city of Lutzk itself goes back to the time of Vladimir the Great in 1000. It was made the see of an Orthodox bishop in 1288, and it was Cyril Terletzki, Exarch and Bishop of Lutzk, who affixed the first signature to the act of union at the Synod of Brest on 24 June, 1590, and who went to Rome to make his profession of union. In 1350 Lutzk was taken by the Lithuanians, and became a flourishing city. It was afterwards annexed to Poland, and in 1600 the Jews took possession of the city and have ever since held it. At present it has 19,000 inhabitants, of whom 12,000 are Jews. Volhynia was annexed to Russia in 1792, at the Second Partition of Poland, and the Roman Catholic Diocese of Lutzk was suppressed. It remained however a Greek Catholic diocese until 1839. Under Emperor Paul I in 1798 the Diocese of Lutzk was restored, and embraces the whole of the Province of Volhynia, although Zhitomir, the capital city, lies at the eastern border, near the Province of Kieff. The see has been kept vacant for long intervals during the past century. The statistics of the Diocese of Lutzk (1909) are: Catholics, 279,157 (Orthodox, 2,106,960); secular priests, 84; regulars, 6; parish churches, 81.

Zhitomir is situated on the River Teterev, about ten miles from the frontier of the Government of Kieff. It is said to have been founded by Zhitomir, one of the followers of Rurik. In the thirteenth century it was taken by the Tatars and was afterwards subject to Lithuania and Poland. It was annexed to Russia in 1778. The city now has a population of 65,000. The Diocese of Zhitomir is really that of Kieff. When Kieff and Zhitomir were annexed to Russia, the Catholic diocese was suppressed, and the Bishop of Kieff was expelled, but in 1798 when Pius VI, in the Bull "Maximis undique pressi", re-established the Diocese of Kieff, it was transferred by the request of the Russian authorities to Zhitomir, and then later united to Lutzk, in order that no Latin bishop should dispute the See of Kieff with the Orthodox bishop. Theoretically, an auxiliary bishop may reside at Kieff, but none has been allowed for many decades. The diocesan bishop of the united sees resides at Zhitomir. The present (1909) statistics for the Diocese of Zhitomir, which includes a slight strip of Volhynia and the whole of the Government of Kieff, are: Catholics, 220,893 (Orthodox, 2,988,694), with one regular and 105 secular clergy, 70 parish churches, and one seminary. The Latin Bishopric of Kieff is first mentioned in 1321, just after the Lithuanians conquered this part of Little Russia, when Pope John XXII made Heinrich von Porvalle, a Dominican, its first bishop. The next bishop was Jacob, also a Dominican. Naturally the earlier Latin bishops of Kieff were travelling missionary bishops, establishing churches and ecclesiastical institutions of the Latin Rite throughout the land. Clement (d. 1473) is said to have been the first Latin bishop to fix his see permanently within the city of Kieff, where he built a cathedral. In the previous century the Dominicans had built a fine monastery in the lower portion of Kieff called Podol, which was for a long time the finest Roman church in that part of Russia. Bishop Alexander Sokolowsky (1613–1645) had great success in establishing Latin churches, and in 1640 established a deanery at Tchernigoff. In 1626 Bishop John Osga commenced to build an additional cathedral in Zhitomir, which was consecrated by his successor Gaetan Soltyk in 1751, and it is the present cathedral. Two provincial synods were held in this diocese: one in 1640 at Kieff, and the other in 1762 in Zhitomir.

The city of Kieff, "the mother of all the cities of Russia", is really the cradle of Christianity in the Russian Empire. It is said to have been founded by Kii and his brothers Shchek and Khoriv, who were Poliani, the forefathers of the modern Poles; and was taken in conquest by the followers of Rurik in their search for a southern kingdom. Oleg, the successor of Rurik, came to Kieff in 882 and made it his capital. St. Olga was here converted to Christianity, although she was baptized in Constantinople. Later, her successor St. Vladimir, on his conversion to Christianity, married Anna, the sister of the Greek emperors, Basil and Constantine, and on his return from Constantinople in 988 actively set about the conversion of the inhabitants of Kieff, who threw their heathen idols, Perun and the others, into the Dnieper and were baptized as Christians, thus founding the first Christian community within the present confines of Russia. Kieff became under him and his successors the great capital of Russia; it possessed the first Christian church, the first Christian school, and the first library in Russia. It passed through great vicissitudes; for three hundred and seventy-six years it was an independent Russian city, for eighty years it was subject to the Tatars and Mongols, for two hundred and forty-nine years it belonged to the Lithuanian Principality, and for ninety-eight years it was a part of the Kingdom of Poland. It was finally annexed to the present Russian Empire in 1667. Under the Lithuanian rule it rose to great prosperity, and obtained the Magdeburg rights of a free city in 1499, which it enjoyed until they were abolished in 1835. Naturally Kieff became the see of the first Christian bishop in Russia. Michael, who baptized Vladimir, was sent as the chief missionary to the Russians, and became the first Metropolitan of Kieff (988–992). His successors, Leontius, John I, and Theopempt, were also Greeks, but in 1051 Hilarion, the first Russian bishop, was advanced to the dignity of metropolitan, with seven bishops under him. In 1240 the Tatars took the city of Kieff, pillaged it, and established Moslem rule in one of the great shrines of Christendom. The taking of Kieff by the Tatars drove the Russians northwards and eastwards; in 1316 the Metropolitan of Kieff changed his see to Moscow, and thereafter the Church of Russia was ruled from that city. In 1414, after the change of the metropolitan see to Moscow, the seven Russian bishops of the south chose a new Metropolitan of Kieff, who ruled over these southern dioceses. Thus the Russian Church was divided into two great jurisdictions: Moscow and Kieff. Kieff, being of the Greek Rite, was naturally dependent upon Constantinople, the Church of its origin, and gradually followed it into schism. Yet for a long time after the break between Rome and Constantinople it remained in unity with the Holy See. The first four metropolitans of Kieff were Catholics and in union with Rome. Hilarion embraced schismatic views strongly tinctured with nationalism, but his successor George was in correspondence with Pope Gregory VII, while Ephraem (1090–1096) was the Metropolitan of Kieff who established in Russia the feast of the translation of the relics of St. Nicholas (9 May) which was instituted by Pope Urban II, but which was indignantly rejected by the Greeks of Constantinople and the East. During the following century the metropolitans of Kieff followed the schism more closely, yet three or four of them remained in close relation with the Holy See. Maximus (1283–1305) was a Catholic metropolitan, Cyprian (1389–1406) also had close relations with the Roman authorities, while Gregory I (1416–1419) was strongly inclined towards union with Rome. From 1438 to 1442 the Council of Florence was held for the reunion of Christendom. Isidore, Metropolitan of Kieff (1437–1448), with five other Russian bishops, attended the council, signed the act of union, and became one of its greatest advocates. Gregory II (1458–1472), his successor, was consecrated in Rome in the presence of Pope Pius II, and was also an earnest supporter of the union. Misael (1474–1477) and Simeon (1477–1488) were also Catholics. Joseph II (1498–1517) likewise ad-

hered to the union, and was nicknamed "the Latin" by the Moscow Orthodox Greeks. Then followed several metropolitans who renounced the union and adhered to the schism, until the time of Michael Ragosa (1588–1599), who took a definite stand for union with Rome, and who signed the act of union of 2 December, 1594, addressed to the Holy See. It was consummated the following year, and the Ruthenian Greek Catholic Church thus constituted has ever since been in union with Rome. Then follows a line of Catholic metropolitans of Kieff of the Greek Rite: Hypatius (1600–1613), Joseph IV (1614–1637), and Raphael (1637–1641). Then came the great champion of Russian Orthodoxy, the Metropolitan Peter Mogila, who fought the union and turned the Russians away from the Holy See, and who strove to undo the entire work of the united Churches. His task was finally accomplished within the confines of Russia by his successors after the annexation of Kieff in 1667 to the Russian Empire by means of the successive forced "reunions" of the Greek Catholics to the Russian Orthodox Church (see RUSSIA). The city of Kieff (250,000 inhabitants) is beautifully situated upon the River Dnieper, and is divided naturally and historically into three parts: Petchersk, or the city of the grotto-caves; Podol, or the plain, which is now the commercial part; and Staro-Kieff, or old Kieff, upon the heights overlooking the river. The early monks who brought Christianity to Kieff were hermits dwelling in the caves on the hill-sides. Subsequently these were enlarged and others were made, like the catacombs at Rome. The great Petchersky monastery is situated above one of the series of caves, while the church of the Exaltation of the Holy Cross stands above the entrance to the grottoes of St. Anthony, which are a series of catacombs dating back to 1100, when the monk Anthony came from Mount Athos to Kieff. In these catacombs the remains of the monks are enshrined, and there are numerous altars on which Mass according to the Greek Rite is said every day. The grottoes of St. Theodosius are somewhat similar. On a hill fronting the Dnieper is a huge bronze statue of St. Vladimir, who brought Christianity to his subjects at Kieff. The cathedral of St. Sophia, built in 1037 by Jaroslav, is a building remarkable for its mosaics and ancient frescoes in the Byzantine style, some of which date back to the eleventh century. As a counterfoil to this there is the cathedral of St. Vladimir, built at the end of the nineteenth century, containing a magnificent interior richly decorated in the modern Russo-Greek style by the best Russian artists. There are two Roman Catholic churches and one Greek Catholic church in Kieff.

Kamenetz, usually called Kamenetz-Podolski to distinguish it from Kamenetz-Litevsk, is the capital of the Government of Podolia and lies in a beautiful situation upon the River Smotrich near the extreme western border of the Russian Empire, only a few miles from the Austrian frontier. It goes back to the thirteenth century. It grew to considerable importance under the Polish conquest. The Turks held it for twenty-seven years, but the Poles recaptured it in 1699. It was annexed to Russia at the Second Partition of Poland in 1793. Kamenetz is mentioned together with Kieff as a Latin bishopric in 1373. The first Bishop of Kamenetz was William, a Dominican (1375), and the second was Roskosius (1398). Alexander, Bishop of Kamenetz (1411), and his successor Zbigniew (1413) promoted the idea of union with the Greeks. Dominicans and Franciscans comprised the principal Latin clergy of the time, and in the following century the Jesuits were also introduced. When the Latin hierarchy was re-established in Russia by Pius VI in December, 1798, Kamenetz was made a separate diocese, comprising the whole of Podolia. In that same year it was also created an Orthodox see by the Russian Government, under the title of Podolia and Bratslav. In 1815 it was placed under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Lutzk and Zhitomir, and on 3 June, 1866, it was entirely abolished as a separate diocese, and annexed directly to Lutzk and Zhitomir. The city of Kamenetz itself has about 45,000 inhabitants, of whom one-fifth are Catholics. The statistics for the annexed diocese of Kamenetz (1909) are: Catholics, 317,235 (Orthodox, 2,359,630); secular priests, 111, regulars, 3; parish churches, 96. In the whole of the three united dioceses the religious orders have been killed off by the simple process of not allowing any new candidates to enter, while the secular priesthood thrives with extreme difficulty because only natives and Russian subjects are permitted to enter the seminary or to take charge of parishes. Catholic schools and charitable institutions are practically non-existent, owing to the restrictions of the Russian authorities.

ROHRBACHER, *Histoire Universelle de l'Eglise* (Lyons, 1872), XI, XII; PELESZ, *Geschichte der Union*, I (Vienna, 1878); TOLSTOI, *Romanism in Russia* (London, 1874), very anti-Catholic; *Pravoslavniya Encyclopedia*, X (St. Petersburg, 1909); LESCŒUR, *L'Eglise Catholique et le Gouvernement Russe* (Paris, 1903); URBAN, *Statyska katolicyzmu w panstwie rosyiskim* (Krakow, 1906); BATTANDIER, *Annuaire Pontificale* (Paris, 1910).

ANDREW J. SHIPMAN.

Luxemburg, the small remnant of the old duchy of this name and since 11 May, 1867, an independent neutral grand duchy, comprising 998 sq. miles of territory, lying principally between 49° 27′ and 50° 12′ N. lat., and 5° 45′ and 6° 32′ E. long. It is bounded by Belgium on the west, Prussia on the east, Lorraine and (for a short distance) France on the south. It is well wooded, having over 190 sq. miles of forest, and well watered (Moselle, Sure, Our, and Alzett, the first two being navigable to a greater or less extent); it is situated at an elevation of about 1000 feet above the sea level, is mountainous and possesses a temperate healthy climate. The arable lands, including almost half the country, yield abundant crops of grain, and splendid pastures feed numerous herds of cattle and horses. The vine produces annually more than 1,300,000 gallons of wine and the fruit harvest is no less generous. There is an inexhaustible supply of fine building-stone. Especially important are the extensive beds of excellent iron ore (10,000 acres), which are extensively worked. Trades and industries flourish, thanks to the fine network of roads and railways. The population, which numbers about 250,000 souls, is almost entirely of Germanic origin and a dialect is in use which suggests the German of the Palatinate. In one or two districts only Walloon is spoken. In administration and justice, French predominates. In the churches and schools, sermons and instructions are given in High German.

Almost all of Luxemburg is Catholic. Only in the capital city and in the industrial centres (Esch, Dudelingen, Differdingen, Rodingen, Rimmelingen) there are Protestant communities whose entire membership scarcely numbers 3000. Nevertheless they enjoy the same rights as the hundred-times more numerous native inhabitants. Of Jews there are only about 1200, but their number is increasing. The Catholics have had a bishop of their own to preside over them since 1870 (officially recognized in 1873). Originally Luxemburg belonged to various sees (Trier, Liège, Metz, Reims, Verdun, Cologne), from 1795 to 1801 it belonged to Metz, then to Namur. From 1840–70 it was a vicariate Apostolic; in that year it was raised to the dignity of a bishopric, the first bishop being Nicholas Adames. Since 1883 his successor Joseph Koppes has been assisted by a chapter of nine dignitaries (cathedral provost and eight canons) in the administration of the diocese. The former Jesuit church of Our Blessed Lady in the city of Luxemburg is the present cathedral. Parochial duties are performed by 260 priests with 200 additional chaplains assisted by regular clergy of different orders.

The diocese also possesses several institutions for the sick and for educational purposes, and for those preparing to enter the priesthood there is a seminary in the capital. For higher education there is in the same city a flourishing athenæum in which the more advanced classes give the usual university instruction; gymnasia and similar institutions exist in Diekirch, Echternach, etc. Common school education has been obligatory since 1881. The schools (700, with 32,000 children) are non-sectarian and priests are allowed merely to give religious instruction. Children may begin their secondary education only at the age of twelve years. The line which in most states divides the educated from the non-educated has been in this way bridged over, and social

Entrance of the Cathedral, Luxemburg

distinctions are less marked in Luxemburg than elsewhere. Of Catholic organizations we will mention here only the Bonifatius-Verein, which since its establishment in 1850 has collected 200,000 marks which has been almost entirely handed over to German mission stations. The rights of the Church and the people have been upheld (since 1847) by the splendidly conducted journal "Luxemburger Wort". Among the lesser newspapers the "Moselzeitung," which appears in Grevenmacher, has a large circulation. The editors of the well-known periodicals "Stimmen aus Maria Laach" and "Die Katholischen Missionen" (Fathers Frick and Huonder, S.J.) direct them from Luxemburg.

The grand duchy is a constitutional monarchy, the sovereignty being vested in the House of Nassau, the so-called Walramic line, according to the law of primogeniture. As the present grand duke, William, has no son by his marriage with Maria Anna of Braganza, the crown will revert on his death (according to the law of 1907) to his eldest daughter, who like her sisters belongs to the Catholic Church. The parliament consists of 51 members elected for six years, part of which is chosen every three years. The Government consists of a president (minister) and three directors general, and is responsible to the Chamber, but submits bills only after obtaining the opinions of fifteen councillors of state, named by the reigning prince. The country is divided into three administrative districts, twelve cantons, and 130 communes. Justice is administered by a supreme court, two circuit courts and a criminal court in every canton. The armed force (one company of volunteers, one company of gendarmes) is concerned merely with the maintenance of order. The financial system (modelled on the French both as to the coins and the weights and measures) is in flourishing condition. The national debt is small. Receipts and expenditures balance, so that there is no lack of means for promotion of culture. The national colours are red, white, and blue. There are several orders, the most widely distributed being the Order of the Crown of Oak (5 classes, 2 medals). The capital of the grand duchy, also called Luxemburg, is very ancient, and was formerly strongly fortified, but is now dismantled, and beautifully laid out. It is rich in fine ecclesiastical and secular buildings (churches, castles, government buildings, etc.), as well as in scientific institutions and industrial plants. It has over 25,000 inhabitants. Among the other towns that of Echternach is interesting for its primitive basilica, which contains the tomb of the Frisian apostle, St. Willibrord. The procession that takes place annually is unique and is the last of the "Springing processions", the origin of which seems doubtful.

The first written account of this country and people is found in the fifth book of Cæsar's "Commentarii de Bello Gallico". On the Lower Moselle and its tributaries dwelt at that time (53 B. C.) the powerful race of the Treviri, who, in alliance with the people under their protection (for example the Eburones under Ambiorix), at first gave the Romans great trouble, but they were soon compelled to yield to superior numbers and gradually attained the highest civilization. Under Emperor Constantine (323–337) Trier (*Augusta Trevirorum*) became the capital of the province Belgica prima, and later the residence of the prefects of Gaul. The Christian Faith was introduced at a very early period. Since 316 the town was the see of a bishop. As more than half of the subsequent Duchy of Lorraine belonged for centuries to the Diocese of Trier, it is a logical conclusion that the Christianization of the Ardennes proceeded principally from there. During the Germanic migration the north-eastern provinces of the Roman Empire suffered greatly. Devastated and depopulated, they were occupied by the victorious Franks. In the division of Charlemagne's empire (843) the provinces in question fell to the share of the Emperor Lothair. In the middle of the tenth century (963?) the feudal lord, Siegfried, who held rich possessions in the Forest of Ardennes, acquired the Castellum Lucilini (supposed to have been built by the Romans) with the lands in its vicinity, and styled himself Graf von Lützelburg. From the marriage of this great and good man descended Empress Saint Cunigunde, wife of Henry II, the Saint.

The last of Siegfried's male descendants, Conrad II, died about 1126. His dominions passed first to the counts of Namur and subsequently to Ermesinde, who reigned from 1196 to 1247. She was especially noted for the impulse she gave to religious life by the foundation of monasteries. Her son and successor, Henry V (1247–81), showed the influence of his noble mother. He took part in Saint Louis's crusade against Tunis. His successor, Henry VI, remained until nearly 1288 at war near Woringen. His wife, Beatrice, had borne him two sons, both of whom attained the highest honours and excellence: Baldwin, afterwards Archbishop of Trier, and Henry, who obtained the Roman imperial crown as Henry VII (1309). The advancement of the reigning family brought no advantage to the country, as the counts wandered farther and farther from home, and concerned themselves only with the affairs of the Empire or the Kingdom of Bo-

hemia. They endeavoured to compensate for this in a measure by raising Luxemburg to a duchy, but could not prevent part of it from crumbling away and the whole (1444) falling to Burgundy by conquest. From the House of Valois, which became extinct on the death of Charles the Bold, in 1477, the country passed to Austria, and was subject to the Spanish Habsburgs (1556–1714); then to the German Habsburgs (1714–95), and finally to the French (until 1814). The last rule was attended with pernicious results, especially as regards religion and morals, the brutalities of the French to the Church and her servants left sad memories. Even the worship of the goddess of reason prevailed for a time in place of the Catholic religion.

After the overthrow of Napoleon, better times began for Luxemburg. The Congress of Vienna decided that as an appendage of the newly created Kingdom of the Netherlands with the rank of grand duchy, it should become a part of the German Confederation. The Belgian revolution of 1830 soon exercised a momentous influence on the territorial stability of the country. The entire western (Walloon) part (larger in extent, but more sparsely populated and less fertile than the remainder) was separated from the German Confederation and annexed to the new Belgian Kingdom. The King of Holland established a regency in the part which remained to him (only under personal union) and in 1842 as Lord of Luxemburg joined the German *Zollverein*. Until 1866 the country enjoyed quiet and increasing prosperity. The garrisoning of the city and castle of Luxemburg by Prussian troops for the first time introduced Protestants into the grand duchy. After the Prussian victories in Bohemia (1866) and the foundation of the North German Confederation, Luxemburg was drawn into the political whirlpool. Napoleon III thought of annexing the little country and the King of Holland declared himself ready to discuss the matter. Even Bismarck favoured the plan. But when the German nation declared unanimously against it, and the danger of a Franco-German war became imminent, the great powers interfered and regulated the "Luxemburg question" at a conference assembled in London, which decreed that the fortress of Luxemburg should be abandoned and dismantled and the "country declared neutral and under the protection of Europe". Luxemburg, however, remained a member of the German *Zollverein*. On the death of William III of Holland, Luxemburg passed, as the result of a family agreement made by the two Nassovian houses in 1783, to the Nassau Walram branch. The old Duke of Nassau, Adolf, who had been deposed in 1866 by Prussia, assumed the regency on 23 November, 1890, as grand duke. It has been settled in detail that in case his son and successor leaves no male heir, the crown will descend to the eldest daughter.

PIRENNE, *Bibliographie de l'hist. de Belgique . . . jusqu'en 1830* (Ghent, 1902); MOLINIER, *Les sources de l'histoire de France* (Paris, 1901 sqq.); SCHOTTER, *Gesch. des Luxemburger Landes* (Luxemburg, 1882); GLAESENER, *Le grand-duché de Luxembourg historique et pittoresque* (Diekirch, 1886); *Statistiques historiques publiées par le gouvernement à l'occasion du cinquantenaire de l'indépendance du Grand-Duché* (Diekirch, 1889–1892); VAN DER ELTZ, *Aus Luxemburgs Vergangenheit und Gegenwart* (Trier, 1891); HIMLY, *Hist. de la formation territoriale des états de l'Europe centrale* (Paris, 1894); LAVISSE AND RAMBAUD, *Histoire générale*, X (Paris, 1898), 334, 367; KLEINCLAUSZ, *Histoire de Bourgogne* (Paris, 1909); RUPPERT, *Les lois et règlements sur l'organisation politique, judiciaire et administrative du Grand-Duché de Luxembourg* (Luxemburg, 1885); BERTHOLET, *Hist. eccl^s. et civile du duché de L.* (Luxemburg, 1741–3); PETERS in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.; HERMENS-KOHLSCHMIDT, *Protest. Taschenbuch* (Leipzig, 1905); MARCHAL, *La sculpture et les chefs-d'œuvre de l'orfèvrerie belges* (Brussels, 1895); BEISSEL, *Gesch. der Marienverehrung in Deutschland während des Mittelalters* (Freiburg, 1909); KEITER, *Kath. Lit. Kal.* (Essen, 1910); DERS, *Handbuch der kath. Presse* (Essen, 1910); KLEFFNER-WOKER, *Der Bonifatiusverein* (Paderborn, 1899): EYSCHEN, *Staatsrecht des Grossherzogthums L.* in *Handbuch des öff. Rechts* (Freiburg, 1890).

PIUS WITTMANN.

Luxeuil, ABBEY OF, situated in the Department of Haute-Saône in Franche-Comté, in the Diocese of Besançon. It was founded in 585 by the great Irish monk, St. Columbanus, on the ruins of the Gallo-Roman castle of Luxovium, about eight miles from Aunigray. It was dedicated to St. Peter and soon became the most important and flourishing monastery in Gaul. The community was so large, that choir followed choir in the chanting of the Office, and here for the first time was heard the *laus perennis*, or unceasing psalmody, which went on day and night. Whether St. Columbanus gave this monastery and others dependent on it an oral or a written rule is uncertain. We know it to have been borrowed mostly from that observed in the great Irish monasteries. But for many reasons this rule was not destined to prevail for long. St. Columbanus had all the force and impetuosity of the ardent Irish temperament, great powers of physical endurance, intellectual and moral strength. He seems to have lacked the discretion of St. Benedict. His rule, moreover, did not legislate concerning the abbot's election, his relations with his monks, and the appointment of monastic officials with delegated power. For long the two rules were observed together, St. Benedict's supplying what was lacking in the other, but by the end of the eighth century the rule of St. Columbanus had given way to what had then become the great monastic code of the West. Driven into exile by King Thierry and his grandmother Queen Brunehaut, St. Columbanus was succeeded as abbot by St. Eustace whom he had placed over the schools of Luxeuil. During the abbacy of St. Eustace and that of his successor St. Waldebert, these schools grew to great fame. There came to them many of the young nobles of Gaul, and youths from such cities as Autun, Strasburg, and Lyons. They sent forth many who became great bishops in Gaul and other parts of Europe, and to Luxeuil is largely due the conversion and renewal of the Burgundian empire. It would be difficult to give an adequate account of the monastic colonization for which Luxeuil was responsible. Among its affiliations were such great houses as Bobbio, between Milan and Genoa, of which St. Columbanus himself became abbot, and the monasteries of Saint-Valéry and Remiremont. To Luxeuil came such monks as Conon, Abbot of Lérins, before setting about the reform of his somewhat degenerated monks, and St. Wandrille and St. Philibert who founded respectively the Abbeys of Fontenelle and Jumièges in Normandy, and spent years in studying the rule observed in monasteries which derived their origin from Luxeuil.

In 731 the Vandals in their destructive career of conquest through western Gaul, took possession of Luxeuil and massacred most of the community. The few survivors rebuilt the abbey, and later, under the government of the eighteenth abbot, St. Ansegisus, it appeared as if it were about to recover its former greatness and prosperity. He received the abbey from Louis le Débonnaire, restored the church and monastic buildings, and reformed discipline. Many were the privileges and exemptions accorded by popes and sovereigns of France, but as time went on, it had also to contend with much tribulation and misfortune. Such were the incursions of the Normans and other savage hordes, which were accompanied by the usual pillage and destruction. But it was not till the fifteenth century that the worst evil of all came, namely the institution of commendatory Abbots of Luxeuil and the sure and swift decline of monastic discipline consequent thereon. But this state of things came to an end in 1634. The commendatory abbots ceased, and Luxeuil was joined to the reformed congregation of Saint-Vanne. From the report of the "Commission des Réguliers", drawn up in 1768, the community appears to have been numerous and flourishing, and discipline well kept. At the French Revolution the

monks were dispersed; but the abbey church, built in the purest French Gothic of the fourteenth century, was not destroyed; neither were the cloisters and conventual buildings. Until the passing of the recent laws against the Church in France these buildings were being used as a *grand séminaire* for the Diocese of Besançon. They are now either empty or turned to some secular use. The church itself has for long been used as the parish church of Luxeuil.

Gallia Christiana XV, 1860; Besse, *Les Moines de l'Ancienne France* (Paris, 1906); Lecestre, *Abbayes en France* (Paris, 1902); David, *Grands Abbayes de l'Occident* (Paris, 1909); Heimbucher, *Orden und Kongregationem*, I (Paderborn, 1900); Malnory, *Quid Luxovienses monachi discipuli S. Columbani ad regulam monasteriorum contulerint* (Paris, 1895).

Urban Butler.

Luxor. See Thebes, Diocese of.

Lwow. See Lemberg, Diocese of.

Lycopolis, a titular see in Thebais Prima, suffragan of Antinoë. As Siout or Siaout it played a minor rôle in Egyptian history. After the fall of the sixth dynasty, its princes, freed from the supremacy of Memphis, bore alternately the yoke of the kings of Heracleopolis or Thebes. The principal object of worship was the jackal Apouaitou, whence the Greek Lycopolis, or city of the wolf. It subsequently became the capital of the Principality of Terebinthos, and later of the nome of that name. Among the ancient bishops of Lycopolis (Lequien, "Oriens Christianus", II, 597) were Alexander, author of a treatise against the Manichæans; Meletius, author of the (Egyptian) Meletian schism, and opponent of Peter of Alexandria; Volusianus, who attended the Council of Nicæa in 325, and others. It is now the see of a Coptic schismatic bishop. Theodosius the Great threatened to destroy the town after a fratricidal war, and it was saved only by the intervention of St. John of Lycopolis, one of its most celebrated citizens. Plotinus, the third-century neo-Platonic philosopher, was born at Siout. Under the Arabs the town was very prosperous, became the capital of Said, and the rendezvous of caravans for Darfur. It also possessed a flourishing slave market. To-day it is the capital of a province, numbers 40,000 inhabitants, a few of whom are Catholics, and is chiefly noted for its bazaar, its Arabian cemetery, and its ancient necropolis.

Amélineau, *La géographie de l'Egypte à l'époque copte* (Paris, 1893), 462–6; Joanne, *L'Egypte* (Paris), 422–6.

S. Vailhé.

Lydda, a titular see of Palestina Prima in the Patriarchate of Jerusalem. The town was formerly called Lod, and was founded by Samad of the tribe of Benjamin (I Par., viii, 12). Some of its inhabitants were taken in captivity to Babylon, and some of them returned later (I Esd., ii, 33; II Esd., vii, 37; xi, 34). About the middle of the second century B. C., the city was given by the kings of Syria to the Machabees, who held it until the coming of Pompey to Judea (I Mach., xi, 34, 57; Josephus, "Antiquities", XIV, x, 6). Julius Cæsar in 48 B. C. gave Lydda to the Jews, but Cassius in 44 sold the inhabitants, who two years later were set at liberty by Antony (Josephus, "Jewish War", I, xi, 2; "Antiquities", XIV, xii, 2–5). The city also experienced civil wars and the revolt of the Jews against the Romans in the first century of our era; it was then officially called Diospolis, but the popular name always remained Lod or Lydda. There were Christians in this locality from the first, and St. Peter, having come to visit them, there cured the paralytic Eneas (Acts, ix, 32–5). The earliest known bishop is Aetius, a friend of Arius; the episcopal title of Lydda has existed since that time in the Greek Patriarchate of Jerusalem. In December, 415, a council was held here which absolved the heretic Pelagius, at the same time condemning his errors. Lydda has been surnamed Georgiopolis in honour of the martyr St. George, who is said to have been a native of this town. The pilgrim Theodosius is the first to mention (about 530) the tomb of the martyr. A magnificent church, erected above this tomb, was rebuilt by the Crusaders, and partly restored in modern times by the Greeks, to whom the sanctuary belongs. On the arrival of the Crusaders in 1099 Lydda became the seat of a Latin see, many of whose titulars are known. At present the city contains 6800 inhabitants, of whom 4800 are Mussulmans, 2000 schismatic Greeks, and a few Protestants. The Catholics have a parish of 250 faithful in the neighbouring town of Ramléh.



John Lydgate in His Study
From an old manuscript

Lequien, *Oriens Christ.*, III, 581–8, 1271–6; Du Cange, *Les Familles d'Outremer* (Paris, 1869), 799–802; Eubel, *Hierarchia catholica*, I (Munich, 1898), 318; II (1901), 196; Guérin, *Description de la Palestine: Judée*, I, 322–34; Schürer, *Gesch. des jüd. Volkes*, I and II, passim; Vigouroux, *Dict. de la Bible*, s. v.

S. Vailhé.

Lydgate, John, b. at Lydgate, Suffolk, about 1370; d. probably about 1450. He entered the Benedictine abbey at Bury when fifteen and may have been educated earlier at the school of the Benedictine monks there and have been afterwards at the Benedictine house of studies at Oxford. It is possible, as Bale asserts, that he studied at both Oxford and Cambridge, and it is fairly certain that he travelled in France, and perhaps in Italy. He was ordained priest in 1397. Bale (Scriptorum Summarium) says he opened a school for sons of the nobility probably in the monastery of Bury. His verses seem to have been much in request by noble lords and ladies, and having been court poet he wrote a ballad for the coronation of Henry VI. For eleven years (1423–1434) he was prior of Hatfield Broadoak, but is said not to have busied himself much with his duties there. He then returned to Bury. At various times he received as rewards for his poetry some land and a pension. Many of these details of his career can only be vaguely asserted, but his poetic

work is not vague. It is certain that he was a learned and industrious poet who wrote much verse on varied subject-matter. His poetry, however, though interesting from other points of view than the poetical, never rises much above mediocrity. A blight seemed at that period to have fallen upon poetry in England, though in Scotland the Chaucerian tradition was followed still with dignity and force. The writings of Lydgate are very numerous. Ritson, in his "Bibliographica Poetica", numbers 251 poems, some of them of enormous length, such as the Troy Book of 30,000 lines. It is fairly certain, too, that much of what he wrote has been lost. A good deal of his existing work is still in MS. He is said to have written one piece of prose—an account of Cæsar's wars and death. Most modern critics agree as to the general mediocrity of his work, but Lydgate has not wanted admirers in the past such as Chatterton, who imitated him, and Gray, who was impressed by the carefulness of his phraseology and the smoothness of his verse. Among his poetical compositions may be mentioned:—

"Falls of Princes," "Troy Book", "Story of Thebes", narrative poems; "The Life of Our Lady" and "The Dance of Death", devotional poems; "The Temple of Glass", and imitations of Chaucer. The well-known poem of "London Lackpenny", which has been for long reckoned as Lydgate's, is now almost certainly proved not to be by him.

LEE in *Dict. Nat. Biog.* s. v. (London, 1909); SCHICK, *Preface* to the *Temple of Glass* in Early English Text Soc. Series (London, 19—); MACCRACKEN, *The Lydgate Canon* in *Philological Soc. Transactions* (London, 1908); SAINTSBURY in *Cambridge Hist. Eng. Lit.*, vol. II, art. Lydgate (Cambridge, 1908.)

K. M. WARREN.

Lying, as defined by St. Thomas Aquinas, is a statement at variance with the mind. This definition is more accurate than most others which are current. Thus a recent authority defines a lie as a false statement made with the intention of deceiving. But it is possible to lie without making a false statement and without any intention of deceiving. For if a man makes a statement which he thinks is false, but which in reality is true he certainly lies inasmuch as he intends to say what is false, and although a well-known liar may have no intention of deceiving others—for he knows that no one believes a word he says—yet if he speaks at variance with his mind he does not cease to lie. Following St. Augustine and St. Thomas, Catholic divines and ethical writers commonly make a distinction between (1) injurious, or hurtful, (2) officious, and (3) jocose lies. Jocose lies are told for the purpose of affording amusement. Of course what is said merely and obviously in joke cannot be a lie: in order to have any malice in it, what is said must be naturally capable of deceiving others and must be said with the intention of saying what is false. An officious, or white, lie is such that it does nobody any injury: it is a lie of excuse, or a lie told to benefit somebody. An injurious lie is one which does harm.

It has always been admitted that the question of lying creates great difficulties for the moralist. From the dawn of ethical speculation there have been two different opinions on the question as to whether lying is ever permissible Aristotle, in his "Ethics", seems to hold that it is never allowable to tell a lie, while Plato, in his "Republic", is more accommodating; he allows doctors and statesmen to lie occasionally for the good of their patients and for the common weal. Modern philosophers are divided in the same way. Kant allowed a lie under no circumstance. Paulsen and most modern non-Catholic writers admit the lawfulness of the lie of necessity. Indeed the pragmatic tendency of the day, which denies that there is such a thing as absolute truth, and measures the morality of actions by their effect on society and on the individual, would seem to open wide the gates to all but injurious lies. But even on the ground of pragmatism it is well for us to bear in mind that white lies are apt to prepare the way for others of a darker hue. There is some difference of opinion among the Fathers of the Christian Church. Origen quotes Plato and approves of his doctrine on this point (Stromata, VI). He says that a man who is under the necessity of lying should diligently consider the matter so as not to exceed. He should gulp the lie as a sick man does his medicine. He should be guided by the example of Judith, Esther, and Jacob. If he exceed, he will be judged the enemy of Him who said, "I am the Truth". St. John Chrysostom held that it is lawful to deceive others for their benefit, and Cassian taught that we may sometimes lie as we take medicine, driven to it by sheer necessity.

St. Augustine, however, took the opposite side, and wrote two short treatises to prove that it is never lawful to tell a lie. His doctrine on this point has been generally followed in the Western Church, and it has been defended as the common opinion by the Schoolmen, and by modern divines. It rests in the first place on Holy Scripture. In places almost innumerable Holy Scripture seems to condemn lying as absolutely and unreservedly as it condemns murder and fornication. Innocent III gives expression in one of his decretals to this interpretation, when he says that Holy Scripture forbids us to lie even to save a man's life. If, then, we allow the lie of necessity, there seems to be no reason from the theological point of view for not allowing occasional murder and fornication when these crimes would procure great temporal advantage; the absolute character of the moral law will be undermined, it will be reduced to a matter of mere expediency. The chief argument from reason which St. Thomas and other theologians have used to prove their doctrine is drawn from the nature of truth. Lying is opposed to the virtue of truth or veracity. Truth consists in a correspondence between the thing signified and the signification of it. Man has the power as a reasonable and social being of manifesting his thoughts to his fellow-men. Right order demands that in doing this he should be truthful. If the external manifestation is at variance with the inward thought, the result is a want of right order, a monstrosity in nature, a machine which is out of gear, whose parts do not work together harmoniously. As we are dealing with something which belongs to the moral order and with virtue, the want of right order, which is of the essence of a lie, has a special moral turpitude of its own. There is precisely the same malice in hypocrisy, and in this vice we see the moral turpitude more clearly. A hypocrite pretends to have a good quality which he knows that he does not possess. There is the same want of correspondence between the mind and the external expression of it that constitutes the essence of a lie. The turpitude and malice of hypocrisy are obvious to everybody. If it is more difficult to realize the malice of a lie, the partial reason, at least, may be because we are more familiar with it. Truth is primarily a self-regarding virtue: it is something which man owes to his own rational nature, and no one who has any regard for his own dignity and self-respect will be guilty of the turpitude of a lie. As the hypocrite is justly detested and despised, so should the liar be. As no honest man would consent to play the hypocrite, so no honest man will ever be guilty of a lie.

The absolute malice of lying is also shown from the evil consequences which it has for society. These are evident enough in lies which injuriously affect the rights and reputations of others. But mutual confidence, intercourse, and friendship, which are of such great importance for society, suffer much even from officious and jocose lying. In this, as in other moral questions, in order to see clearly the moral quality of an action we must consider what the effect would be if the action in question were regarded as perfectly right and were commonly practised. Applying this test,

we can see what mistrust, suspicion, and utter want of confidence in others would be the result of promiscuous lying, even in those cases where positive injury is not inflicted. Moreover, when a habit of untruthfulness has been contracted, it is practically impossible to restrict its vagaries to matters which are harmless: interest and habit alike inevitably lead to the violation of truth to the detriment of others. And so it would seem that, although injury to others was excluded from officious and jocose lies by definition, yet in the concrete there is no sort of lie which is not injurious to somebody. But if the common teaching of Catholic theology on this point be admitted, and we grant that lying is always wrong, it follows that we are never justified in telling a lie, for we may not do evil that good may come: the end does not justify the means. What means, then, have we for protecting secrets and defending ourselves from the impertinent prying of the inquisitive? What are we to say when a dying man asks a question, and we know that if we tell him the truth it will kill him outright? We must say something, if his life is to be preserved: he would at once detect the meaning of silence on our part. The great difficulty of the question of lying consists in finding a satisfactory answer to such questions as these.

St. Augustine held that the naked truth must be told whatever the consequences may be. He directs that in difficult cases silence should be observed if possible. If silence would be equivalent to giving a sick man unwelcome news that would kill him, it is better, he says, that the body of the sick man should perish rather than the soul of the liar. Besides this one, he puts another case which became classical in the schools. If a man is hid in your house, and his life is sought by murderers, and they come and ask you whether he is in the house, you may say that you know where he is, but will not tell: you may not deny that he is there. The Scholastics, while accepting the teaching of St. Augustine on the absolute and intrinsic malice of a lie, modified his teaching on the point which we are discussing. It is interesting to read what St. Raymund of Pennafort wrote on the subject in his "Summa", published before the middle of the thirteenth century. He says that most doctors agree with St. Augustine, but that others say that one should tell a lie in such cases. Then he gives his own opinion, speaking with hesitation and under correction. The owner of the house where the man lies concealed, on being asked whether he is there, should as far as possible say nothing. If silence would be equivalent to betrayal of the secret, then he should turn the question aside by asking another—How should I know?—or something of that sort. Or, says St. Raymund, he may make use of an expression with a double meaning, an equivocation, such as: *Non est hic, id est, Non comedit hic*—or something like that. An infinite number of examples induced him to permit such equivocations, he says. Jacob, Esau, Abraham, Jehu, and the Archangel Raphael made use of them. Or, he adds, you may say simply that the owner of the house ought to deny that the man is there, and, if his conscience tells him that this is the proper answer to give, then he will not go against his conscience, and so he will not sin. Nor is this direction contrary to what Augustine teaches, for if he gives that answer he will not lie, for he will not speak against his mind ("Summa", lib. I, "De Mendacio").

The gloss on the chapter, "Ne quis" (causa xxii, q. 2) of the Decretum of Gratian, which reproduces the common teaching of the schools at the time, adopts the opinion of St. Raymund, with the added reason that it is allowable to deceive an enemy. Lest the doctrine should be unduly extended to cases to which it does not apply, the gloss warns the student that a witness who is bound to speak the naked truth may not use equivocation. When the doctrine of equivocation had once been introduced into the schools it was difficult to keep it within proper bounds. It had been introduced in order to furnish a way of escape from serious difficulties for those who held that it was never allowed to tell a lie. The seal of confession and other secrets had to be preserved, this was a means of fulfilling those necessary duties without telling a lie. Some, however, unduly stretched the doctrine. They taught that a man did not tell a lie who denied that he had done something which in truth he had done, if he meant that he had not done it in some other way, or at some other time, than he had done it. A servant, for example, who had broken a window in his master's house, on being asked by his master whether he had broken it, might without lying assert that he had not done so, if he meant thereby that he had not broken it last year, or with a hatchet. It has been reckoned that as many as fifty authors taught this doctrine, and among them were some of the greatest weight, whose works are classical. There were of course many others who rejected such equivocations, and who taught that they were nothing but lies, as indeed they are. The German Jesuit, Laymann, who died in the year 1625, was of this number. He refuted the arguments on which the false doctrine was based and conclusively proved the contrary. His adversaries asserted that such a statement was not a lie, inasmuch as it was not at variance with the mind of the speaker. Laymann saw no force in this argument; the man knew that he had broken the window, and nevertheless he said he had not done it; there was an evident contradiction between his assertion and his thought. The words used meant that he had not done it; there were no external circumstances of any sort, no use or custom which permitted of their being understood in any but the obvious sense. They could only be understood in that obvious sense, and that was their only true meaning. As it was at variance with the knowledge of the speaker, the statement was a lie. Laymann explains that he did not wish to reject all mental reservations.

Sometimes a statement receives a special meaning from use and custom, or from the special circumstances in which a man is placed, or from the mere fact that he holds a position of trust. When a man bids the servant say that he is not at home, common use enables any man of sense to interpret the phrase correctly. When a prisoner pleads "Not guilty" in a court of justice, all concerned understand what is meant. When a statesman, or a doctor, or a lawyer is asked impertinent questions about what he cannot make known without a breach of trust, he simply says, "I don't know", and the assertion is true, it receives the special meaning from the position of the speaker: "I have no communicable knowledge on the point." The same is true of anybody who has secrets to keep, and who is unwarrantably questioned about them. Prudent men only speak about what they should speak about, and what they say should be understood with that reservation. Catholic writers call statements like the foregoing mental reservations, and they qualify them as wide mental reservations in order to distinguish them from strict mental reservations. These latter are equivocations whose true sense is determined solely by the mind of the speaker, and by no external circumstance or common usage. They were condemned as lies by the Holy See on 2 March, 1679. Since that time they have been rejected as unlawful by all Catholic writers. It should be observed that when a wide mental reservation is employed the simple truth is told, there is no statement at variance with the mind. For not merely the words actually used in a statement must be considered, when we desire to understand its meaning, and to get at the true mind of the speaker. Circumstances of place, time, person, and manner form part of the statement and external expression of the thought. The words, "I am not guilty", derive the special meaning which they have in the mouth of a prisoner on his trial from the circumstances in which

he is placed. It is a true statement of fact whether in reality he be guilty or not. This must be understood of all mental restrictions which are lawful. The virtue of truth requires that, unless there is some special reason to the contrary, one who speaks to another should speak frankly and openly, in such a way that he will be understood by the person addressed. It is not lawful to use mental reservations without good reason. According to the common teaching of St. Thomas and other divines, the hurtful lie is a mortal sin, but merely officious and jocose lies are of their own nature venial.

The doctrine which has been expounded above reproduces the common and universally accepted teaching of the Catholic schools throughout the Middle Ages until recent times. From the middle of the eighteenth century onwards a few discordant voices have been heard from time to time. Some of these, as Van der Velden and a few French and Belgian writers, while admitting that in general a lie is intrinsically wrong, yet argued that there are exceptions to the rule. As it is lawful to kill another in self-defence, so in self-defence it is lawful to tell a lie. Others wished to change the received definition of a lie. A recent writer in the Paris series, "Science et Religion", wishes to add to the common definition some such words as "made to one who has a right to the truth". So that a false statement knowingly made to one who has not a right to the truth will not be a lie. This, however, seems to ignore the malice which a lie has in itself, like hypocrisy, and to derive it solely from the social consequence of lying. Most of these writers who attack the common opinion show that they have very imperfectly grasped its true meaning. At any rate they have made little or no impression on the common teaching of the Catholic schools.

(See also MENTAL RESERVATION.)

ST. THOMAS, *Summa*, II–II, Q. CX; RAYMUND OF PENNAFORT, *Summa* (Rome, 1603); LAYMANN, *Theologia moralis* (Munich, 1634); NEWMAN, *Apologia*, Appendix 8 (London, 1864); WAFFELAERT, *Dissertation sur le Mensonge* (Bruges, 1884); SLATER, *A Manual of Moral Theology*, I (New York, 1908); and the moralists generally.

T. SLATER.

Lynch, JOHN, historian, b. at Galway, Ireland, 1599; d. in France, 1673; was the son of Alexander Lynch, who kept a classical school at Galway. In such repute was this school held that there were no less than 1200 students, nor were they confined to Connaught alone but came from every province in Ireland. For a Catholic to keep a public school in those days was a serious offence, and when Ussher visited Galway in 1615, calling Lynch before him he severely reprimanded him, compelled him to close his school at once, and bound him under heavy bail not to reopen it. Young Lynch received his early education from his father and from him imbibed his love of classical learning. Feeling a call to the priesthood he left Galway for France, pursued his studies under the Jesuits there, in due time was ordained priest, and returned to his native town in 1622. He established a classical school, which like his father's was attended by many students. Penal legislation compelled him to exercise his ministry by stealth, and to say Mass in secret places and private houses. But after 1642 the churches were open and he was free to say Mass in public, and exercise his ministry in the light of day. More of a scholar and of a student than of a politician, Lynch took no prominent part in the stirring events of the next ten years. His opinions however were well known. Like so many others of the Anglo-Irish, though he abhorred the penal laws against his creed and had suffered from them, he was loyal to England. He therefore condemned the rebellion of 1641, viewed with no enthusiasm the Catholic Confederation, approved of the cessation of 1643 and of the peace of 1646 and 1648, and entirely disapproved of the policy of the nuncio and of the conduct of Owen Roe O'Neill. The date at which he became archdeacon of Tuam is uncertain. Driven from Galway after the capture of the city by the Puritans in 1652, he lived the remainder of his life in exile in France. During these years he wrote a biography of his uncle Dr. Kirwan, Bishop of Killala, and a work called "Alithonologia", giving an account of the Anglo-Irish under Elizabeth. But his greatest work is "Cambrensis Eversus", published in 1662. Written in vigorous Latin and characterized by great learning and research, its declared object was to expose the calumnies of Gerald Barry about Ireland, and without doubt Lynch completely vindicates his country "against the aspersions of her slanderer."

Cambrensis Eversus, ed. KELLY (Dublin, 1848); WARE, *Irish Writers* (Dublin, 1762); HARDIMAN, *History of Galway* (Dublin, 1820).

E. A. D'ALTON.

Lyndwood, WILLIAM, Bishop of St. David's and the greatest of English canonists, b. about 1375; d. in 1446. He had a distinguished ecclesiastical career, being appointed "Official" of the Archbishop of Canterbury (i. e. his principal adviser and representative in matters of ecclesiastical law) in 1414, and Dean of the Arches in 1426, while holding at the same time several important benefices and prebends. In 1434 he was made Archdeacon of Stow in the Diocese of Lincoln, and in 1442, after an earnest recommendation from King Henry VI himself, he was promoted by the pope to the vacant See of St. David's. During these years many other matters besides the study of canon law had occupied Lyndwood's attention. He had been closely associated with Archbishop Henry Chichele in his proceedings against the Lollards. He had also several times acted as the chosen representative of the English clergy in their discussions with the Crown over subsidies, but more especially he had repeatedly been sent abroad upon diplomatic missions—e. g., to Portugal, France, the Netherlands, etc.—besides acting as the king's proctor at the Council of Basle in 1433 and taking a prominent part as negotiator in arranging political and commercial treaties Despite the fact that so much of Lyndwood's energies were spent upon purely secular concerns nothing seems ever to have been said against his moral or religious character. He was buried in the crypt of St. Stephen's, Westminster, where his body was found in 1852, wrapped in a cere-cloth and almost without signs of corruption.

Lyndwood, however, is chiefly remembered for his great commentary upon the ecclesiastical decrees enacted in English provincial councils under the presidency of the Archbishops of Canterbury. This elaborate work, commonly known as the "Provinciale", follows the arrangement of the titles of the Decretals of Gregory IX in the "Corpus Juris", and forms a complete gloss upon all that English legislation with which, in view of special needs and local conditions, it was found necessary here, as elsewhere, to supplement the common law (*jus commune*) of the Church. Lyndwood's gloss affords a faithful picture of the views accepted among the English clergy of his day upon all sorts of subjects. In particular, the much vexed question of the attitude of the *Ecclesia Anglicana* towards the jurisdiction claimed by the popes there finds its complete solution. Prof. F. W. Maitland some years ago produced a profound sensation by appealing to Lyndwood against the pet historical figment of modern Anglicans, that the "Canon Law of Rome, though always regarded as of great authority in England, was not held to be binding on the English ecclesiastical courts" (Eng. Hist. Rev., 1896, p. 446). How successfully Maitland, armed with the irrefragable evidence which Lyndwood supplies, has demolished this legend, may be proved by a reference to one of the most authoritative legal works of recent date, viz., "The Laws of England" edited by Lord Chancellor Halsbury (vol. XI, 1910, p. 377). "In pre-

Reformation times", we there read, "no dignitary of the Church, no archbishop, or bishop could repeal or vary the Papal decrees"; and, after quoting Lyndwood's explicit statement to this effect, the account continues: "Much of the Canon Law set forth in archiepiscopal constitutions is merely a repetition of the Papal canons, and passed for the purpose of making them better known in remote localities; part was *ultra vires*, and the rest consisted of local regulations which were only valid in so far as they did not contravene the 'jus commune', i. e. the Roman Canon Law."

Lyndwood's great work was frequently reprinted in the early years of the sixteenth century, but the best edition is that produced at Oxford in 1679.

RIGG in *Dict. of Nat. Biog.*, s. v. *Lyndwood;* MAITLAND, *Roman Canon Law in the Church of England* (London, 1898); *Archæologia*, XXXLV (London.) 406 sq.; THURSTON in *Am. Cath. Q.* (April, 1899), 120–141; GALANTE, *L'Efficacia del Diritto Canonico in Inghilterra* in *Mélanges Federico Ciccagliano* (Catania, 1909).

HERBERT THURSTON.

Lyons, ARCHDIOCESE OF (LUGDUNENSIS), comprises the Departments of the Rhône (except the Canton of Villeurbanne, which belongs to the Diocese of Grenoble) and of the Loire. The Concordat of 1801 assigned as the boundaries of the Archdiocese of Lyons the Departments of the Rhône, the Loire, and the Ain and as suffragans the Dioceses of Mende, Grenoble, and Chambéry. The Archbishop of Lyons was authorized by Letters Apostolic of 29 November, 1801, to unite with his title the titles of the suppressed metropolitan Sees of Vienne and Embrun (see GRENOBLE; GAP). In 1822 the Department of Ain was separated from the Archdiocese of Lyons to form the Diocese of Belley; the title of the suppressed church of Embrun was transferred to the Archdiocese of Aix, and the Archdiocese of Lyons and Vienne had henceforth as suffragans Langres, Autun, Dijon, St. Claude, and Grenoble.

History.—It appears to have been proved by Mgr Duchesne, despite the local traditions of many Churches, that in all three parts of Gaul in the second century there was but a single organized Church, that of Lyons. The "Deacon of Vienne", martyred at Lyons during the persecution of 177, was probably a deacon installed at Vienne by the ecclesiastical authority of Lyons. The confluence of the Rhône and the Saône, where sixty Gallic tribes had erected the famous altar to Rome and Augustus, was also the centre from which Christianity was gradually propagated throughout Gaul. The presence at Lyons of numerous Asiastic Christians and their almost daily communications with the Orient were likely to arouse the susceptibilities of the Gallo-Romans. A persecution arose under Marcus Aurelius. Its victims at Lyons numbered forty-eight, half of them of Greek origin, half Gallo-Roman, among others St. Blandina (q. v.), and St. Pothinus, first Bishop of Lyons, sent to Gaul by St. Polycarp about the middle of the second century. The legend according to which he was sent by St. Clement dates from the twelfth century and is without foundation. The letter addressed to the Christians of Asia and Phrygia in the name of the faithful of Vienne and Lyons, and relating the persecution of 177, is considered by Ernest Renan as one of the most extraordinary documents possessed by any literature; it is the baptismal certificate of Christianity in France. The successor of St. Pothinus was the illustrious St. Irenæus (q. v.), 177–202.

The discovery on the Hill of St. Sebastian of ruins of a *naumachia* capable of being transformed into an amphitheatre, and of some fragments of inscriptions apparently belonging to an altar of Augustus, has led several archæologists to believe that the martyrs of Lyons suffered death on this hill. Very ancient tradition, however, represents the church of Ainay as erected at the place of their martyrdom. The crypt of St. Pothinus, under the choir of the church of St. Nizier was destroyed in 1884. But there are still revered at Lyons the prison cell of St. Pothinus, where Anne of Austria, Louis XIV, and Pius VII came to pray, and the crypt of St. Irenæus built at the end of the fifth century by St. Patiens, which contains the body of St. Irenæus. There are numerous funerary inscriptions of primitive Christianity in Lyons; the earliest dates from the year 334. In the second and third centuries the See of Lyons enjoyed great renown throughout Gaul, witness the local legends of Besançon (q. v.) and of several other cities relative to the missionaries sent out by St. Irenæus. Faustinus, bishop in the second half of the third century, wrote to St. Cyprian and Pope Stephen I, in 254, regarding the Novatian tendencies of Marcian, Bishop of Arles. But when Diocletian by the new provincial organization had taken away from Lyons its position as metropolis of the three Gauls, the prestige of Lyons diminished for a time.

At the end of the empire and during the Merovingian period several saints are counted among the Bishops of Lyons: St. Justus (374–381) who died in a monastery in the Thebaid and was renowned for the orthodoxy of his doctrine in the struggle against Arianism (the church of the Machabees, whither his body was brought, was as early as the fifth century a place of pilgrimage under the name of the collegiate church of St. Justus), St. Alpinus and St. Martin (disciple of St. Martin of Tours; end of fourth century); St. Antiochus (400–410); St. Elpidius (410–422); St. Sicarius (422–33); St. Eucherius (c. 433–50), a monk of Lérins and the author of homilies, from whom doubtless dates the foundation at Lyons of the "hermitages" of which more will be said below; St. Patiens (456–98) who successfully combated the famine and Arianism, and whom Sidonius Apollinarus praised in a poem; St. Lupicinus (491–94); St. Rusticus (494–501); St. Stephanus (d. before 515), who with St. Avitus of Vienne, convoked a council at Lyons for the conversion of the Arians; St. Viventiolus (515–523), who in 517 presided with St. Avitus at the Council of Epaone; St. Lupus, a monk, afterwards bishop (538–42), probably the first archbishop, who when signing in 438 the Council of Orléans added the title of "metropolitanus"; St. Sardot or Sacerdos (549–542), who presided in 549 at the Council of Orléans, and who obtained from King Childebert the foundation of the general hospital; St. Nicetius or Nizier (552–73), who received from the pope the title of patriarch, and whose tomb was honoured by miracles. The prestige of St. Nicetius was lasting; his successor St. Priscus (573–588) bore the title of patriarch, and brought the council of 585 to decide that national synods should be convened every three years at the instance of the patriarch and of the king; St. Ætherius (588–603), who was a correspondent of St. Gregory the Great and who perhaps consecrated St. Augustine, the Apostle of England; St. Aredius (603–615); St. Annemundus or Chamond (c. 650), friend of St. Wilfrid, godfather of Clotaire III, put to death by Ebroin together with his brother, and patron of the town of Saint-Chamond; St. Genesius or Genes (660–679 or 680), Benedictine Abbot of Fontenelle, grand almoner and minister of Queen Bathilde; St. Lambertus (c. 680–690), also Abbot of Fontenelle.

At the end of the fifth century Lyons was the capital of the Kingdom of Burgundy, but after 534 it passed under the domination of the kings of France. Ravaged by the Saracens in 725, the city was restored through the liberality of Charlemagne who established a rich library in the monastery of Ile Barbe. In the time of St. Patiens and the priest Constans (d. 488) the school of Lyons was famous; Sidonius Apollinaris was educated there. The letter of Leidrade to Charlemagne (807) shows the care taken by the emperor for the restoration of learning in Lyons. With the aid of the deacon Florus he made the school so

prosperous that in the tenth century Englishmen went thither to study. Under Charlemagne and his immediate successors, the Bishops of Lyons, whose ascendancy was attested by the number of councils over which they were called to preside, played an important theological part. Adoptionism had no more active enemies than Leidrade (798–814) and Agobard (814–840). When Felix of Urgel continued rebellious to the condemnations pronounced against Adoptionism from 791–799 by the Councils of Ciutad, Friuli, Ratisbon, Frankfort, and Rome, Charlemagne conceived the idea of sending to Urgel with Nebridius, Bishop of Narbonne, and St. Benedict, abbot of the monastery of Aniane, Archbishop Leidrade, a native of Nuremberg and Charlemagne's librarian. They preached against Adoptionism in Spain, conducted Felix in 799 to the Council of Aachen, where he seemed to submit to the arguments of Alcuin, and then brought him back to his diocese. But the submission of Felix was not complete; Agobard, "Chorepiscopus" of Lyons, convicted him anew of Adoptianism in a secret conference, and when Felix died in 815 there was found among his papers a treatise in which he professed Adoptionism. Then Agobard, who had become Archbishop of Lyons in 814 after Leidrade's retirement to the monastery of St. Médard of Soissons, composed a long treatise which completed the ruin of that heresy.

Agobard displayed great activity as a pastor and a publicist in his opposition to the Jews and to various superstitions. His rooted hatred for all superstition led him in his treatise on images into certain expressions which savoured of Iconoclasm. The five historical treatises which he wrote in 833 to justify the deposition of Louis the Pious, who had been his benefactor, are a stain on his life. Louis the Pious having been restored to power, caused Agobard to be deposed in 835 by the Council of Thionville, but three years later gave him back his see, in which he died in 840. During the exile of Agobard the See of Lyons had been for a short time administered by Amalarius of Metz, whom the deacon Florus charged with heretical opinions regarding the "triforme corpus Christi", and who took part in the controversies with Gottschalk on the subject of predestination. Amolon (841–852) and St. Remy (852–75) continued the struggle against the heresy of Gottschalk. St. Remy presided over the Council of Valence, which condemned this heresy, and also was engaged in strife with Hincmar. From 879–1032 Lyons formed part of the Kingdom of Provence and afterwards of the second Kingdom of Burgundy. When in 1302 Rudolph III, the Sluggard, ceded his states to Conrad the Salic, Emperor of Germany, the portion of Lyons situated on the left bank of the Saône became, at least nominally, an imperial city. Finally Archbishop Burchard, brother of Rudolph, claimed rights of sovereignty over Lyons as inherited from his mother, Mathilde of France; in this way the government of Lyons instead of being exercised by the distant emperor, became a matter of dispute between the counts who claimed the inheritance and the successive archbishops.

Lyons attracted the attention of Cardinal Hildebrand, who held a council there in 1055 against the simoniacal bishops. In 1076, as Gregory VII, he deposed Archbishop Humbert (1063–76) for simony. Saint Gebuin (Jubinus), who succeeded Humbert was the confidant of Gregory VII and contributed to the reform of the Church by the two councils of 1080 and 1082, at which were excommunicated Manasses of Reims, Fulk of Anjou, and the monks of Marmoutiers. It was under the episcopate of Saint Gebuin that Gregory VII (20 April, 1079) established the primacy of the Church of Lyons over the Provinces of Rouen, Tours, and Sens, which primacy was specially confirmed by Callistus II, despite the letter written to him in 1126 by Louis VI in favour of the church of Sens. As far as it regarded the Province of Rouen this letter was later suppressed by a decree of the king's council in 1702, at the request of Colbert, Archbishop of Rouen. Hugh (1081–1106), the successor of St. Gebuin, the friend of St. Anselm, and for a while legate of Gregory VII in France and Burgundy, had differences later on with Victor III, who excommunicated him for a time, also with Paschal II. The latter pope came to Lyons in 1106, consecrated the basilica of Ainay, and dedicated one of its altars in honour of the Immaculate Conception. The Feast of the Immaculate Conception was solemnized at Lyons about 1128, perhaps at the instance of St. Anselm of Canterbury, and St. Bernard wrote to the canons of Lyons to complain that they should have instituted a feast without consulting the pope. As soon as Thomas á Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury, had been proclaimed Blessed (1173), his cult was instituted at Lyons. Lyons of the twelfth century thus has a glorious place in the history of Catholic liturgy and even of dogma, but the twelfth century was also marked by the heresy of Peter Waldo and the Waldenses, the Poor Men of Lyons, who were opposed by Jean de Bellème (1181–1193), and by an important change in the political situation of the archbishops.

The Cathedral of Saint-Jean, Lyons

In 1157 Frederick Barbarossa confirmed the sovereignty of the Archbishops of Lyons; thenceforth there was a lively contest between them and the counts. An arbitration effected by the pope in 1167 had no result, but by the treaty of 1173 Guy, Count of Forez, ceded to the canons of the primatial church of St. John his title of count of Lyons and his temporal authority. Then came the growth of the Commune, more belated in Lyons than in many other cities, but in 1193 the archbishop had to make some concession to the citizens. The thirteenth century, was a period of conflict. Three times, in 1207, 1269, and 1290, grave troubles broke out between the partisans of the archbishop who dwelt in the château of Pierre Seize, those of the count-canons, who lived in a separate quarter near the cathedral, and those of the townsfolk. Gregory X attempted, but without success, to restore peace by two Acts, 2 April, 1273, and 11 Nov., 1274. The kings of France

were always inclined to side with the commune; after the siege of Lyons by Louis X (1310) the treaty of 10 April, 1312, definitively attached Lyons to the Kingdom of France, but, until the beginning of the fifteenth century the Church of Lyons was allowed to coin its own money.

If the thirteenth century had imperilled the political sovereignty of the archbishops, it had on the other hand made Lyons a kind of second Rome. Gregory X was a former canon of Lyons, while Innocent V, as Peter of Tarantaise, was Archbishop of Lyons from 1272 to 1273. The violence of the Hohenstaufen towards the Holy See forced Innocent IV and Gregory X to seek refuge at Lyons and to hold there two general councils (see LYONS, COUNCILS OF). A free and independent city of the Kingdom of France as well as of the Holy Empire, located in a central position between Italy, Spain, France, England, and Germany, Lyons possessed in the thirteenth century important monasteries which naturally sheltered distinguished guests and their numerous followers. For several years Innocent IV dwelt there with his court in the buildings of the chapter of Saint Justus. Local tradition relates that it was on seeing the red hat of the canons of Lyons that the courtiers of Innocent IV conceived the idea of obtaining from the Council of Lyons its decree that the cardinals should henceforth wear red hats. The sojourn of Innocent IV at Lyons was marked by numerous works of public utility, to which the pope gave vigorous encouragement. He granted indulgences to the faithful who should assist in the construction of the bridge over the Rhône, replacing that destroyed about 1190 by the passage of the troops of Richard Cœur de Lion on their way to the Crusade. The building of the churches of St. John and St. Justus was pushed forward with activity; he sent delegates even to England to solicit alms for this purpose and he consecrated the high altar in both churches. At Lyons were crowned Clement V (1305) and John XXII (1310); at Lyons in 1449 the antipope Felix V renounced the tiara; there, too, was held in 1512, without any definite conclusion, the last session of the schismatical Council of Pisa against Julius II. In 1560 the Calvinists took Lyons by surprise, but they were driven out by Antoine d'Albon, Abbot of Savigny and later Archbishop of Lyons. Again masters of Lyons in 1562 they were driven thence by the Maréchal de Vieuville. At the command of the famous Baron des Adrets they committed numerous acts of violence in the region of Montbrison. It was at Lyons that Henry IV, the converted Calvinist king, married Marie de Medicis (9 December, 1600).

The principal Archbishops of Lyons during the modern period were: Guy III d'Auvergne, Cardinal de Bologne (1340–1342), who as a diplomat rendered great service to the Holy See; Cardinal Jean de Lorraine (1537–1539); Hippolyte d'Este, Cardinal of Ferrara (1539–1550), whom Francis I named protector of the crown of France at the court of Paul III, and a patron of scholars; Cardinal François de Tournon (1550–1562), who negotiated several times between Francis I and Charles V, combated the Reformation and founded the Collège de Tournon, which the Jesuits later made one of the most celebrated educational establishments of the kingdom; Antoine d'Albon (1562–1574), editor of Rufinus and Ausonius; Pierre d'Epinac (1573–1599), active auxiliary of the League; Cardinal Alphonse Louis du Plessis de Richelieu (1628–1653), brother of the minister of Louis XIII; Cardinal de Tencin (1740–1758); Antoine de Montazet (1758–1788), a prelate of Jansenist tendencies, whose liturgical works will be referred to later, and who had published for his seminary by the Oratorian Joseph Valla, six volumes of "Institutiones theologicæ" known as "Théologie de Lyon", and spread throughout Italy by Scipio Ricci until condemned by the Index in 1792; Marbeuf (1788–1799), who died in exile at Lübeck in 1799 and whose vicar-general Castillon was beheaded at Lyons in 1794; Antoine Adrien Lamourette (1742–1794), deputy to the Constitutional Assembly, who brought about by a curious speech (7 July, 1792) an understanding between all parties, to which was given the jesting name of "Baiser Lamourette", and who was constitutional Bishop of Lyons from 27 March, 1791, to 11 January, 1794, the date of his death on the scaffold. Among the archbishops subsequent to the Concordat must be mentioned: Joseph Fesch (q. v.) under whose episcopate Pius VII twice visited Lyons, in Nov., 1804, and April, 1805, and in 1822 the Society for the Propagation of the Faith was founded; Maurice de Bonald (1840–1870), son of the philosopher; Ginoulhiac (1870–1875), known by his "Histoire du dogme catholique pendant les trois premiers siècles".

Chapters and Colleges.—At the end of the old regime the primatial chapter consisted of 32 canons, each able to prove 32 degrees of military nobility; each of these canons bore the title of Count of Lyons. The Chapter of Lyons has the honour of numbering among its canons four popes (Innocent IV, Gregory X, Boniface VIII, and Clement V), 20 cardinals, 20 archbishops, more than 80 bishops, and finally 3 persons of officially recognized sanctity, St. Ismidon of Sassenage, later Bishop of Die (d. about 1116), Blessed Louis Aleman (q. v.) and Blessed François d'Estaing, later Bishop of Rodez (d. in 1501). The city of Lyons numbered 5 collegiate churches and the diocese 14 others. There were 4 chapters of noble canonesses. The Jesuits had at Lyons the Collège de la Trinité, founded in 1527 by a lay confraternity which ceded it to them in 1565, the Collège Notre Dame, founded in 1630, a house of probation, a professed house, and other colleges in the diocese. Convents were perhaps more numerous here than in any other part of France. The Petites Ecoles founded in 1670 by Démia, a priest of Bourg, contributed much to primary instruction at Lyons. Since the law of 1875 concerning higher education Lyons possesses Catholic faculties of theology, letters, sciences, and law.

Principal Saints.—The Diocese of Lyons honours as saints: St. Epipodius and his companion St. Alexander, probably martyrs under Marcus Aurelius; the priest St. Peregrinus (third century); St. Baldonor (Galmier), a native of Aveizieux, at first a locksmith, whose piety was remarked by the bishop, St. Viventiolus; he became a cleric at the Abbey of St. Justus, then subdeacon, and died about 760; the thermal resort of "Aquæ Segestæ", in whose church Viventiolus met him, has taken the name of St. Galmier; St. Viator (d. about 390), who followed the Bishop, St. Justus, to the Thebaid; Sts. Romanus and Lupicinus (fifth century), natives of the Diocese of Lyons who lived as solitaries within the present territory of the Diocese of St. Claude; St. Consortia, d. about 578, who according to a legend, criticized by Tillemont, was a daughter of St. Eucherius; St. Rambert, soldier and martyr in the seventh century, patron of the town of the same name; Blessed Jean Pierre Néel, b. in 1832 at Ste Catherine sur Riverie, martyred at Kay-Tcheou in 1862.

Among the natives of Lyons must be mentioned Sidonius Apollinaris (430–489); Abbé Morellet, litterateur (1727–1819); the Christian philosopher Ballanche (1776–1847); the religious painter Hippolyte Flandrin (1809–1864); Puvis de Chavannes, painter of the life of Ste Geneviève (1824–1898). The diocese of Lyons is also the birthplace of the Jesuit Père Coton (1564–1626), confessor of Henry IV and a native of Néronde, and Abbé Terray, controller general of finance under Louis XVI, a native of Boen (1715–1778). Gerson, whose old age was spent at Lyons in the cloister of St. Paul, where he instructed poor children, died there in 1429. St. Francis de Sales died at

Lyons, 28 December, 1622. The Curé Colombet de St. Amour was celebrated at St. Etienne in the seventeenth century for the generosity with which he founded the Hôtel-Dieu (the charity hospital), also free schools, and fed the workmen during the famine of 1693.

M. Guigue has catalogued the eleven "hermitages" (eight of them for men and three for women) which were distinctive of the ascetical life of Christian Lyons in the Middle Ages; these were cells in which persons shut themselves up for life after four years of trial. The system of hermitages along the lines described by Grimalaius and Olbredus in the ninth century flourished especially from the eleventh to the thirteenth century, and disappeared completely in the sixteenth. These hermitages were the private property of a neighbouring church or monastery, which installed therein for life a male or female recluse. The general almshouse of Lyons, or charity hospital, was founded in 1532 after the great famine of 1531 under the supervision of eight administrators chosen from among the more important citizens. The institution of the jubilee of St. Nizier dates beyond a doubt to the stay of Innocent IV at Lyons. This jubilee, which had all the privileges of the secular jubilees of Rome, was celebrated each time that Low Thursday, the feast of St. Nizier, coincided with 2 April, i. e. whenever the feast of Easter itself was on the earliest day allowed by the paschal cycle, namely 22 March. In 1818, the last time this coincidence occurred, the feast of St. Nizier was not celebrated. But the cathedral of St. John also enjoys a great jubilee each time that the feast of St. John, the Baptist, coincides with Corpus Christi, that is, whenever the feast of Corpus Christi falls on 24 June. It is certain that in 1451 the coincidence of these two feasts was celebrated with special splendour by the population of Lyons, then emerging from the troubles of the Hundred Years' War, but there is no document to prove that the jubilee indulgence existed at that date. However, Lyonnese tradition places the first great jubilee in 1451; the four subsequent jubilees took place in 1546, 1666, 1734 and 1886.

Liturgy.—Some authors have held that the Gallican Liturgy was merely the Liturgy of Ephesus, brought to Gaul by the founders of the Church of Lyons. Mgr Duchesne considers that during the two centuries after Emperor Constantine the prestige of the Church of Lyons was not such that it could dictate a liturgy across the Pyrenees, the Channel and the Alps, and lure from Roman influence half the Churches of Italy. In his opinion it was not Lyons, but Milan, which was the centre of the diffusion of the Gallican Liturgy. Under Leidrade and Agobard the Church of Lyons, although fulfilling the task of purifying its liturgical texts exacted by the Holy See, upheld its own traditions. "Among the Churches of France", wrote St. Bernard to the canons of Lyons, "that of Lyons has hitherto had ascendancy over all the others, as much for the dignity of its see as for its praiseworthy institutions. It is especially in the Divine Office that this judicious Church has never readily acquiesced in unexpected and sudden novelties, and has never submitted to be tarnished by innovations which are becoming only to youth". In the seventeenth century Cardinal Bona, in his treatise "De divina psalmodia", renders similar homage to the Church of Lyons. But in the eighteenth century Bishop Montazet, contrary to the Bull of Pius V on the Breviary, changed the text of the Breviary and the Missal, from which there resulted a whole century of troubles for the Church of Lyons. The efforts of Pius IX and Cardinal Bonald to suppress the innovations of Montazet provoked great resistance on the part of the canons, who feared an attempt against the traditional Lyonnese ceremonies. This culminated in 1861 in a protest on the part of the clergy and the laity, as much with regard to the civil power as to the Vatican. Finally, on 4 Feb., 1864, at a reception of the parish priests of Lyons, Pius IX declared his displeasure at this agitation and assured them that nothing should be changed in the ancient Lyonnese ceremonies; by a Brief of 17 March, 1864, he ordered the progressive introduction of the Roman Breviary and Missal in the diocese. The primatial church of Lyons adopted them for public services 8 December, 1869. One of the most touching rites of the ancient Gallican liturgy, retained by the Church of Lyons, is the blessing of the people by the bishop at the moment of Communion.

Churches.—The cathedral of St. John, begun in the twelfth century on the ruins of a sixth century church,



Notre-Dame de Fourvières, Lyons

was completed in 1476; worthy of note are the two crosses to right and left of the altar, preserved since the council of 1274 as a symbol of the union of the churches, and the Bourbon chapel, built by Cardinal de Bourbon and his brother Pierre de Bourbon, son in-law of Louis XI, a masterpiece of fifteenth century sculpture. The church of Ainay, dating from the tenth and eleventh centuries, is of the Byzantine style. The doorway of St. Nizier's (fifteenth century) was carved in the sixteenth century by Philibert Delorme. The collegiate church of St. John Baptist at St. Chamond, now destroyed, presented a singular arrangement; the belfry was situated below the church, to which those coming from the city could only gain access by climbing two hundred steps; the roof of the church served as pavement for the courtyard of the fortress, the circuit of which might be made in a carriage.

Pilgrimages.—The chief pilgrimages of the diocese are Notre Dame de Fourvières, a sanctuary dating from the time of St. Pothinus, on the site of a temple of Venus. In 1643 the people of Lyons consecrated themselves to Notre Dame de Fourvières and pledged themselves to a solemn procession on 8 September of each year; the new basilica of Fourvières, consecrated in 1896, attracts numerous pilgrims. Notre Dame de Benoite-Vaux at Saint-Etienne, a pilgrimage founded

in 1849 by the Marists who had been miraculously preserved from a flood; Notre Dame de Valfleury, near Saint Chamond, a pilgrimage dating from the eighth century and re-established in 1629 after a plague; Notre Dame de Vernay, near Roanne.

Religious Congregations.—In 1901, before the application of the Associations Law to congregations the Diocese of Lyons possessed Capuchins, Jesuits, Camillians, Dominicans, Carmelites, Oblates of Mary Immaculate, Redemptorists, Sulpicians, Clerics of St. Viator, and three great orders native to the diocese: (1) The Marists, founded by Ven. Colin and approved by Gregory XVI in 1836; they had their mother-house at Lyons, which governed a number of establishments in England, Ireland, Belgium, Spain, America, New Zealand, and Australia, and they were charged with the Vicariates Apostolic of New Caledonia (since 1847), of Central Oceanica (since 1842), Fiji (since 1844), Samoa, and the Prefecture Apostolic of the Solomon Islands. (2) The African missionaries (Missionnaires d'Afrique), an association of secular priests founded in 1856 by Mgr de Marion-Bresillac and charged with the Vicariate Apostolic of Benin (1860), with the five Prefectures Apostolic of Ivory Coast (1895), Gold Coast (1879), Nigeria (1884), Dahomey (1882), and the Delta of the Nile. This congregation has two Apostolic schools, at Clermont-Ferrand and at Cork, Ireland; and two preparatory schools at Nantes and Keer-Maestricht, Holland. (3) The Little Brothers of Mary, founded 2 January, 1817 by Ven. Marcellin Champagnat, vicar at Valla, d. 1840. The mother-house at Saint Genis-Laval, near Lyons, governs 7000 members, 14 novitiates, 25 juniorates, and about 800 schools, either elementary, agricultural or secondary, in France, Belgium, Denmark, Spain, Great Britain, Italy, Switzerland, Turkey, Canada, Mexico, Brazil, the United States, Colombia, Egypt, Cap Haitien, Seychelles, Syria, Arabia, China, Australia, New Zealand, New Caledonia, Central Oceanica.

The Brothers of St. John of God have their mother-house for France at Lyons. The Society of the Priests of St. Irenæus is engaged in teaching and giving diocesan missions. In 1901 the Diocese of Lyons had a diocesan "grand séminaire" and a university seminary at Lyons, a seminary of philosophy at Alix and five "petits séminaires" at St. Jean de Lyon, Duerne, St. Jodard, Vernières, and Montbrison; the first of these was founded under Charlemagne.

The female congregations native to the Diocese of Lyons are numerous; the following deserve special mention: The Sisters of Notre Dame de Fourvières, founded 1732 at Usson, for teaching and nursing, with the mother-house at Lyons; the Sisters of St. Charles, founded 1680 by the Abbé Démia, teaching and nursing, with mother-house at Lyons; the Religious of the Perpetual Adoration of the Sacred Hearts of Jesus and Mary, founded 1820 by the Curé Ribier, with their mother-house at Lajarasse; the Religious of the Five Wounds of Our Lord, founded at Lyons in 1886 as a contemplative, nursing, and teaching order, which has houses in Canada; the Sisters of the Child Jesus, teaching, with their mother-house at Claveisolles, the origin of which dates from the opening of a little school in 1830 by Josephine du Sablon; the Franciscan Sisters of the Propagation of the Faith, founded in 1836 by Mother Moyne for the care of incurables with mother-house at Lyons; the Religious of Jesus-Mary, a teaching congregation, founded in 1818 by the priest André Coindre and Claudine Thevenet, whose mother-house installed at Lyons governs a number of houses abroad; the Ladies of Nazareth, teaching, founded in 1822 at Montmirail (Marne) by the Duchesse de La Rochefoucauld Doudeauville, whose mother-house removed to Oullins in 1854 governs several establishments in Palestine and at London; the Religious of Our Lady of Missions, founded at Lyons in 1861 for the missions of Oceanica; the abbey of the Benedictines of the Holy Heart of Mary, founded 1804, the first house of this congregation to be restored after the Revolution; the Religious of the Holy Family, founded in 1825 by the Curé of St. Bruno les Chartreux for mission work among workmen; the Sisters of St. Francis of Assisi, founded in 1838 by pious working women for education and nursing, with mother-house at Lyons; the Sisters of St. Joseph, founded 1620 at Puy, by Bishop Maupas, reconstituted in 1807 in the Diocese of Lyons for hospital and teaching work, with mother-house at Lyons, also sends subjects to the missions of Armenia and America.

Statistics.—At the end of the nineteenth century the religious congregations maintained in the Diocese of Lyons 2 maternity hospitals, 3 day nurseries, 193 nurseries, 2 children's hospitals, 9 hospitals for incurables, 1 asylum for blind girls, 4 asylums for deaf mutes, 5 boys' orphanages, 49 girls' orphanages, 4 workrooms, 3 industrial schools, 2 schools of apprentices, 5 institutions for the rescue of young women, 1 house of correction for young women, 1 house of correction for boys, 3 institutions for the reform of adults, 61 hospitals, infirmaries, or asylums for the aged, 19 houses for the care of the sick in their homes, 2 homes for convalescents, 5 houses of retreat, 2 insane asylums. In 1908, three years after the Separation Law went into effect, the Archdiocese of Lyons had 1,464,665 inhabitants, 74 parishes, 595 branch churches, 585 vicariates.

Gallia Christiana (nova) IV (1728), 1–211, *instrum.* 1–40; Duchesne, *Fastes Episcopaux*, I, 38–59; II, 156–73; Fisquet, *La France pontificale: Lyon* (Paris, 1868); Charléty, *Histoire de Lyon* (Lyons, 1903); Condamine, *Le premier berceau de l'Apostolat lyonnais et de la propagation de la foi: la prison de St. Pothin* (Lyons, 1890); Hirschfeld, *Zur Geschichte des Christenthums in Lugdunum vor Constantin* in *Sitzungsb. Akademie Wissenschaften* (Berlin, 1895), 381–409; Leblant, *Inscriptions chrétiennes de la Gaule*, 3 vols. (Paris, 1856, 1865, 1892); Martin, *Conciles et bullaires du diocèse de Lyon* (Lyons, 1905); Idem, *Histoire des églises et des chapelles de Lyon* (Lyons, 1909); Meynis, *Grands souvenirs de l'église de Lyon* (Lyons, 1886); Foerster, *Drei Erzbischöfe vor tausend Jahrhundertem: Agobardus von Lyon* (Gutersloh, 1874); Martin, *Une manifestation théologique de l'église de Lyon; l'adoptianisme et les archevêques Leidrad et Agobard* (Université Catholique, 1898); Bernard, *L'église de Lyon et l'Immaculée Conception* (Lyons, 1877); Perrin, *La culture des lettres et les établissements d'instruction à Lyon* [*Mémoires de l'Académie des Sciences, Belles lettres et Arts de Lyon* (1893)]; Guigue, *Recherches sur les recluseries de Lyon, leur origine, leur nombre et le genre de vie des reclus* (Lyons, 1887); Idem, *Cartulaire des fiefs de l'église de Lyon 1173–1521* (Lyons, 1893); Sachet, *Le grand jubilé séculaire de S. Jean de Lyon* (Lyons, 1886); Begule, *Monographie de la cathédrale de Lyon*, (1880); Brightman, *Liturgies, Eastern and Western* (Oxford, 1896); Duchesne, *Origines du culte chrétien*, (a study of Christian liturgy prior to Charlemagne) (2 ed. Paris, 1898): tr. McClure (London, 1906); Bouix, *La liturgie de Lyon au point de vue de l'histoire et du droit* in *Revue des sciences ecclésiastiques* VI (1862); Pothier, *Le chant de l'église de Lyon du VIII au XVIII siècle* in *Revue de l'Art Chrétien XV* (1881); *Cérémonial Romain Lyonnais, published by order of the archbishop* (Lyons, 1897); Beyssac, *Les prévôts de Fourvières*, (Lyons, 1908); Chevalier, *Topo-bibl.* (1788–93).

Georges Goyau.

Lyons, Councils of.—Previous to 1313 the Abbé Martin counts no less than twenty-eight synods or councils held at Lyons or at Anse near Lyons. The pretended colloquy between the Catholic and Arian bishops of Burgundy, said to have been held in 499, is regarded, since the researches of Julien Havet, as apochryphal. This article deals only with the two general councils of 1245 and 1275.

I. General Council of 1245. — Innocent IV, threatened by Emperor Frederick II, arrived at Lyons 2 December, 1244, and early in 1245 summoned the bishops and princes to the council. The chronicle of St. Peter of Erfurt states that two hundred and fifty prelates responded; the annalist Mencon speaks of three patriarchs, three hundred bishops, and numerous prelates. The Abbé Martin without deciding between these figures has succeeded in recovering to a certainty the names of one hundred assistants, prelates or lords, of whom thirty-eight were from France, thirty from Italy, eleven from Germany or the coun-

tries of the North, eight from England, five from Spain, five from the Latin Orient. Baldwin II, Latin Emperor of Constantinople, Raymond VII, Count of Toulouse, Raymond Bérenger IV, Count of Provence, Albert Rezats, Latin Patriarch of Antioch, Berthold, Patriarch of Aquileia, Nicholas, Latin Patriarch of Constantinople, came to the council, which opened 28 June at Saint-Jean. After the "Veni Creator" and the litanies, Innocent IV preached his famous sermon on the five wounds of the Church from the text "Secundum multitudinem dolorum meorum in corde meo, consolationes tuæ lætificaverunt animam meam". He enumerated his five sorrows: (1) the bad conduct of prelates and faithful; (2) the insolence of the Saracens; (3) the Greek Schism; (4) the cruelties of the Tatars in Hungary; (5) the persecution of the Emperor Frederick; and he caused to be read the privilege granted to Pope Honorius III by Frederick when the latter was as yet only King of the Romans. Thaddeus of Suessa, Frederick's ambassador, arose, attempted to make excuses for the emperor, and cited numerous plots against the emperor which, he said, had been instigated by the Church. On 29 June at the request of the procurators of the Kings of France and England, Innocent IV granted Thaddeus a delay of ten days for the arrival of the emperor.

At the second session (5 July) the Bishop of Calvi and a Spanish archbishop attacked the emperor's manner of life and his plots against the Church; again Thaddeus spoke in his behalf and asked a delay for his arrival. Despite the advice of numerous prelates Innocent (9 July) decided to postpone the third session until the seventeenth. On the seventeenth Frederick had not come. Baldwin II, Raymond VII, and Berthold, Patriarch of Aquileia, interceded in vain for him; Thaddeus in his master's name appealed to a future pope and a more general council; Innocent pronounced the deposition of Frederick, caused it to be signed by one hundred and fifty bishops and charged the Dominicans and Franciscans with its publication everywhere. But the pope lacked the material means to execute this decree; the Count of Savoy refused to allow an army sent by the pope against the emperor to pass through his territory, and for a time it was feared that Frederick would attack Innocent at Lyons. The Council of Lyons took several other purely religious measures; it obliged the Cistercians to pay tithes, approved the Rule of the Order of Grandmont, decided the institution of the octave of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin, prescribed that henceforth cardinals should wear a red hat, and lastly prepared thirty-eight constitutions which were later inserted by Boniface VIII in his Decretals, the most important of which, received with protests by the envoys of the English clergy, decreed a levy of a twentieth on every benefice for three years for the relief of the Holy Land (Constitution "Afflicti corde") and a levy for the benefit of the Latin Empire of Constantinople of half the revenue of benefices whose titulars did not reside therein for at least six months of the year (Constitution "Arduis mens occupata negotiis").

II. General Council of 1274.—The second Council of Lyons was one of the most largely attended of conciliar assemblies, there being present five hundred bishops, sixty abbots, more than a thousand prelates or procurators. Gregory X, who presided, had been a canon of Lyons; Peter of Tarentaise, who assisted as Cardinal-Bishop of Ostia, had been Archbishop of Lyons. It opened 7 May, 1274, in the church of St. John. There were five other sessions (18 May, 7 June, 6 July, 16 July, 17 July). At the second session Gregory X owing to the excessive numbers rejected the proxies of chapters, abbots, and unmitred priors, except those who had been summoned by name. Among those who attended the council were James I, King of Aragon, the ambassadors of the Kings of France and England, the ambassadors of the Emperor Michael Palæologus and the Greek clergy, the ambassadors of the Khan of the Tatars. The conquest of the Holy Land and the union of the Churches were the two ideas for the realization of which Gregory X had convoked the council.

(1) *The Crusade.*—Despite the protest of Richard of Mapham, dean of Lincoln, he obtained that during six years for the benefit of the crusade a tithe of all the benefices of Christendom should go to the pope, but when James I, King of Aragon, wished to organize the expedition at once the representatives of the Templars opposed the project, and a decision was postponed. Ambassadors of the Khan of Tatary arrived at Lyons, 4 July, to treat with Gregory X, who desired that during the war against Islam the Tatars should leave the Christians in peace. Two of the ambassadors were solemnly baptized 16 July.

(2) *Union of the Churches.*—Gregory X had prepared for the union by sending in 1273 an embassy to Constantinople to Michael Palæologus and by inducing Charles, King of Sicily, and Philip, Latin Emperor of Constantinople, to moderate their political ambitions. On 24 June, 1274, there arrived at Lyons as representatives of Palæologus, Germanus, Patriarch of Constantinople, Theophanes, Bishop of Nicæa, Georgius Acropolita, senator and great logothete, Nicholas Panaretus, president of the ward-robe, Berrhoéota, chief interpreter, and Georgius Zinuchi. The letter from Palæologus which they presented had been written in the name of fifty archbishops and five hundred bishops or synods. On 29 June, the feast of Sts. Peter and Paul, Gregory X celebrated Mass in the church of St. John, the Epistle, Gospel, and Creed were read or sung in Latin and Greek, the article "qui a patre filioque procedit" was sung three times by the Greeks. On 6 July, after a sermon by Peter of Tarentaise and the public reading of the letter of Palæologus, Georgius Acropolita and the other ambassadors promised fidelity to the Latin Church, abjured twenty-six propositions which it denied, and promised the protection of the emperor to the Christians of the Holy Land. Gregory X intoned the "Te Deum", spoke on the text "Desiderio desideravi hoc pascha manducare vobiscum", and on 28 July wrote joyful letters to Michael, to his son Andronicus, and forty-one metropolitans. Three letters dated February, 1274, written to the pope by Michael and Andronicus, in which they recognized his supremacy, exist as proofs of the emperor's good faith, despite the efforts to throw doubt on it by means of a letter of Innocent V (1276) which seems to point to the conclusion that Georgius Acropolita, who at the council had promised fidelity to the Roman Church, had not been expressly authorized by the emperor.

The Council of Lyons dealt also with the reform of the Church, in view of which Gregory X in 1273 had addressed questions to the bishops and asked of Hubert de Romans, the former general of the Friars Preachers, a certain programme for discussion and of John of Vercelli, the new general of the order, a draft of formal constitutions. Henri of Gölder, Bishop of Liège, Frederick, Abbot of St. Paul without the Walls, the Bishops of Rhodes and of Würzburg were deposed for unworthiness, and certain mendicant orders were suppressed. The council warmly approved the two orders of St. Dominic and St. Francis. Fearing the opposition of the King of Spain who had in his kingdom three religious military orders, the idea was abandoned of forming all military orders into one. Gregory X, to avoid a repetition of the too lengthy vacancies of the papal see, caused it to be decided that the cardinals should not leave the conclave till the pope had been elected. This constitution which

inflicted certain material privations on the cardinals if the election was too long delayed, was suspended in 1276 by Adrian V, and a few months later revoked by John XXI, but was re-established later in many of its articles, and is even yet the basis of legislation on the conclaves. Lastly, the Council of Lyons dealt with the vacancy of the imperial throne. James I of Aragon pretended to it; Gregory X removed him and on 6 June Rudolph I was proclaimed King of the Romans and future emperor. Such was the work of the council during which died the two greatest doctors of the Middle Ages. St. Thomas Aquinas, summoned by the pope, died at Frosinone (7 March, 1274) on his way to Lyons. St. Bonaventure, after important interviews at the Council with the Greek ambassadors, died 15 July, at Lyons, and was praised by Peter of Tarentaise, the future Innocent V, in a touching funeral sermon.

MARTIN, *Bullaire et Conciles de Lyon* (Lyon, 1905) (excellent); MANSI, *Coll. Conciliorum*, XXIII, 605–82, XXIV, 37–136; HEFELE, *History of Christian Councils*, tr. CLARK; HAVET, *Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes*, XLVI, 1885, 233–50; BERGER, *Régistres d'Innocent IV* (in course of publication); GUIRAUD AND CADIER, *Régistres de Grégoire X et Jean XXI* (in course of publication).

GEORGES GOYAU.

Lyrba, a titular see of Pamphylia Prima, known by its coins and the mention made of it by Dionysius, Perieg. 858, Ptolemy, V, 5, 8, and Hierocles. Its exact situation is not known, nor its history; it may be the modern small town of Seidi Shehir, in the vilayet of Konia. The "Notitiæ episcopatuum" mentions Lyrba as an episcopal see, suffragan of Side up to the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Two of its bishops are known: Caius, who attended the Council of Constantinople, 381, and Taurianus at Ephesus, 431 (Le Quien, "Oriens christianus", I, 1009); Zeuxius was not Bishop of Lyrba, as Le Quien states, but of Syedra.

S. PÉTRIDÈS.

Lysias, a titular see of Phrygia Salutaris, mentioned by Strabo, XII, 576, Pliny, V, 29, Ptolemy, V, 2, 23, Hierocles, and the "Notitiæ episcopatuum", probably founded by Antiochus the Great about 200 B. C. Some of its coins are still extant. Ramsay (Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia, 754) traces its original site from still existing ruins between the villages of Oinan and Aresli in the plain of Oinan, a little north-east of Lake Egerdir, in the vilayet of Konia. Lequien (Oriens christianus, I, 845) names three bishops of Lysias suffragans of Synnada: Theagenes, present at the Council of Sardica, 344; Philip, at Chalcedon 451; and Constantine, at Constantinople, 879.

S. PÉTRIDÈS.

Lyster, JOHN. See ACHONRY, DIOCESE OF.

Lystra, a titular see in the Province of Lycaonia, suffragan of Iconium. On his first visit to this town St. Paul healed a lame man, upon which the populace, filled with enthusiasm, wished to offer sacrifice to him and to Barnabas, whom they mistook respectively for Jupiter and Mercury. The two Apostles restrained them with difficulty. These same people, stirred up by Jews from Iconium, afterwards stoned St. Paul (Acts, xiv, 6–19; II Tim., iii, 11). On at least two other occasions the Apostle returned to this city (Acts, xiv, 20; xvi, 1–3), established there a Christian community, and converted his future disciple Timothy, the son of a Jewish mother and a pagan father. The Jews were undoubtedly numerous, though they had no synagogue. Pliny (Historia Naturalis, V, 42), places Lystra in Galatia, Ptolemy (V, 4) locates it in Isauria, and the Acts of the Apostles in Lycaonia. The Vulgate (Acts, xxvii, 5) also mentions it, but the reference is really to Myra in Lycia. Some coins have been found there belonging to a Roman colony founded by Augustus at Lystra "Colonia Julia Felix Gemina Lystra". The exact site of the town has been discovered at Khatum Serâï, twelve miles south of Iconium; it is marked by some ruins on a hill about one mile north of the modern village. Lequien (Oriens Christ., I, 1073–76) mentions five bishops of Lystra between the fourth and the ninth centuries, one of whom, Eubulus, about 630 refuted Athanasius, the Jacobite Patriarch of Antioch.

STERRET, *The Wolfe Expedition to Asia Minor* (Boston, 1888), 142, 219; LEAKE, *Journal of a Tour in Asia Minor* (London, 1824), 101, 103; RAMSAY, *The Church in the Roman Empire* (London, 1894), 47–54; IDEM, *St. Paul the Traveller, and the Roman Citizen* (London, 1895), 114–9; BLASS, *Acta Apostolorum* (Göttingen, 1895), 159–61; BEURLIER in VIG., *Dict. de la Bible*, s. v. *Lystre*.

S. VAILHÉ.

M

Maassen, Friedrich Bernard Christian, professor of law, b. 24 Sept., 1823, at Wismar (Mecklenburg); d. 9 April, 1900, at Wilten near Innsbruck (Tyrol). After completing the humanities in his native city, he studied jurisprudence at Jena, Berlin, Kiel, and Rostock, became, in 1849, an advocate in the last named place, and took his degree at the university there in 1851. He was active in the constitutional conflict of 1848 between the Grand Duke of Mecklenburg-Schwerin and the Diet, defended the rights of the representatives in three pamphlets, and, with Franz von Florencourt, founded the anti-revolutionary "Norddeutscher Korrespondent". Shortly after his graduation he became a convert to the Catholic Faith, and, realizing that, as a Catholic, he was not eligible for public office in his native place, betook himself to Bonn, where he devoted himself to academic teaching. The work by means of which he proved his great teaching ability, "Der Primat des Bischofs von Rom und die alten Patriarchalkirchen" (Bonn, 1853), dealt with the two important questions: whether the Roman primacy existed in the first centuries, and whether the much-discussed sixth canon of the Council of Nicæa bears witness to the primacy. This work won immediate recognition among scholars, and Count Thun invited him to Pesth in 1855 as *professor extraordinarius* of Roman Law. A few months later he was given a professorship of Roman and canon law at Innsbruck, one at Graz in 1860, and one in 1871 at Vienna, where, until he was pensioned in 1894, he attracted many pupils.

In 1873 he became a member of the Vienna Academy of Sciences, in 1885 a life member of the Upper House, and from 1882 till 1897 was a member of the Supreme Court of the Empire. During the Vatican Council he adhered to Döllinger, but was in no real sense an Old Catholic, and in 1882 explicitly retracted all his utterances in favour of that sect. Incited by Savigny's important work on the history of Roman law in the Middle Ages, Maassen began a history of canon law on the same lines. But of this work, which was to have numbered five volumes, he published only the first, "Geschichte der Quellen und der Literatur des kanonischen Rechts im Abendlande bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters" (Graz, 1870). Several of his articles in the Reports (*Sitzungsberichte*) of the Vienna Academy were practically complements of this work. His "Neun Kapitel über freie Kirche und Gewissenfreiheit" (Graz, 1876) is written in a vehement style. It is a sweeping condemnation of the Prussian Kulturkampf. An amplification of the first chapter appeared under the title: "Ueber die Gründe des Kampfes zwischen dem heidnischen Staate und dem Christentum" (Vienna, 1882). In many respects his "Pseudoisidorstudien" (Vienna, 1885) is a continuation of his masterpiece. He also edited in masterly style one volume of the great "Monumenta Germaniæ Historica: Leges", III (Hanover, 1893), being the "Concilia ævi Merovingensis". Noteworthy, also, is his "Zwei Synoden unter Childeric II" (Graz, 1867). Maassen often displayed in politics an aggressive activity. He was an adherent of the so-called *Federalismus*, and strove energetically for the formation of a Catholic Conservative party in Styria, where he belonged for a time to the Diet.

Historisches Jahrbuch, XXI (Munich, 1900), 660–42; *Biographisches Jahrbuch*, V (Berlin, 1903), 242–44.

Patricius Schlager.

Maastricht. See Liège, Diocese of.

Mabillon, Jean, Benedictine monk of the Congregation of Saint-Maur, b. at Saint-Pierremont, between Mouzon and the Chartreuse of Mont-Dieu in Champagne, 23 November, 1632; d. at Paris, 27 December, 1707. He was the fifth child of Estienne Mabillon, a peasant who died in 1692 aged 104, and of his wife, Jeanne Guérin, descended, through her mother's family, from a branch of the seigneurs of Saint-Pierremont. Jean was a precocious child, and easily surpassed his school companions in their studies, while his pleasant disposition made him a general favourite.



At the age of nine, he was sent to his uncle, Jean Mabillon, then parish priest at Neufville, by whom he was well instructed in the "rudiments", and from whom he received a donation to enable him to continue his studies. In 1644 Jean was sent to the Collège des Bons Enfants at Reims. Here, while studying at the university, he lived, half as pupil, half as servant, in the house of Clément Boucher, canon of the cathedral and commendatory Abbot of Tenailles. This patron, in 1650, procured him admission to the diocesan seminary, where he remained for three years. In 1653, however, the scandalous conduct and death of the uncle who had befriended him made the vocation to the secular priesthood distasteful to him, and he withdrew from the seminary. After less than a month of retirement, on 29 August, he became a postulant in the Abbey of St-Remi at Reims. This house had, since 1627, belonged to the reformed Maurist Congregation (see Maurists, Congregation of). He was clothed on 5 September, and, after his year's novitiate, was professed on 6 September, 1654. His devotion to the strict observance, to mortification and to study, was so great that his superiors entrusted him with the direction and teaching of the novices. But the eagerness with which he endeavoured to fulfil his office was greater than his health could endure; he began to suffer from violent headaches and soon became incapable even of reciting his Office. In 1656, his superiors, in the hope that entire rest might restore his health, sent him to Nogent, whence, in July, 1658, he was transferred to the famous Abbey of Corbie. Here, as at Nogent, he occupied his time in the study of antiquities, while holding successively the offices of porter, of *depositarius*, and of cellarer. He was ordained at Amiens in 1660. The tranquil life restored his health and, in 1663, he was transferred to the Abbey of St-Denis, where he became treasurer. But his superiors had already noticed his great gifts and, in 1664, at the request of Dom

D'Achéry (q. v.), he was removed to the Abbey of St-Germain-des-Prés, where he remained for the rest of his life.

When Mabillon first entered its precincts, the commendatory abbot was John Casimir, King of Poland, an eccentric person whose irregular life had but little effect on his abbey; the claustral prior was Dom Ignatius Philibert, and D'Achéry was custodian of its wonderful library. The society to which the young monk was introduced at St-Germain was, perhaps, the most learned of its time in Europe. Every week, on Sundays after Vespers, there met in D'Achéry's room a group of savants that included men like Du Cange, Baluze, d'Herbelot, Cotelier, Renaudot, Fleury, Lamy, Pagi, Tillemont. Mabillon soon became a brilliant member of this group of noted workers. D'Achéry had asked for him to help him in his projected "Lives of the Benedictine Saints", but the first work entrusted to his care was that of editing the works of St. Bernard. This was published within three years (1667), and was at once recognized as a masterly edition. Meanwhile Mabillon had been arranging the materials already brought together by D'Achéry, and the first volume of the "Acta Sanctorum, O.S.B." was published in 1668. A second volume appeared the following year, a third in 1672. The scholarly conscientiousness and critical methods of Mabillon were a source of scandal to some of his less instructed fellow-monks, and in 1677 a petition, violently attacking the "Acta Sanctorum O.S.B.", was presented to the general chapter of the congregation, demanding the suppression of the work (as harmful to the interests of Benedictinism) and an apology from its author. Mabillon defended himself with such humility combined with firmness and learning that all opposition was overcome, and he was encouraged to continue. Meanwhile, in 1672, he had already made the first of those "literary journeys" (this time into Flanders), in search of documents and materials for his work, that were so marked a feature of the latter half of his life, and which had such fruitful results for history and liturgy. In 1675 was published the first of four volumes of "Vetera Analecta" in which he collected the fruits of his travels and some shorter works of historical importance.

But 1675 saw also the occasion of his greatest work. To the second volume of the "Acta SS." for April Daniel Papebroch had prefixed a "Propylæum antiquarium", which was really a first attempt to formulate rules for the discernment of spurious from genuine documents. Therein he had instanced as spurious some famous charters in the Abbey of St-Denis. Mabillon was appointed to draw up a defence of these documents, and he made his defence the occasion of a statement of the true principles of documentary criticism. This is the volume, "De re diplomatica" (1681), a treatise so masterly that it remains to-day the foundation of the science of diplomatics. Papebroch himself readily admitted that he had been confuted by this treatise, though an attempt was made some time later by Germon to disprove Mabillon's theory, thereby provoking a reply from Mabillon in his "Supplementum" of 1704. The admiration excited amongst the learned by Mabillon's great book was widespread. Colbert offered its author a pension of 2000 livres, which Mabillon declined, while requesting Colbert's continued protection for his monastery. In 1682 Mabillon was sent by Colbert into Burgundy to examine certain ancient documents relative to the royal house; and in 1683 he was sent with Dom Michel Germain, at the king's expense, on a journey throughout Switzerland and Germany in search of materials for the history of the Church or of France. During this expedition, which took five months to accomplish, Colbert died and was succeeded as minister by Le Tellier, Archbishop of Reims, who also greatly admired Mabillon. At the instance of this prelate the king, in 1685, required Mabillon to make a tour through the libraries of Italy for the purpose of acquiring books and manuscripts for the Royal Library. More than 3000 rare and valuable volumes were procured. During his travels Mabillon was everywhere received with the utmost honour. Soon after his return he began his famous controversy with De Rancé, Abbot of La Trappe, who had denied that it was lawful for monks to devote themselves to study rather than to manual labour. Mabillon's "Traité des études monastiques" (1691) was a noble defence of monastic learning and laid down the lines that it should follow. De Rancé replied, and Mabillon was forced to publish further "Réflexions sur la Réponse de M. l'Abbé de la Trappe" (1692). De Rancé would have carried the dispute further, but Cardinal le Camus interfered, and the general opinion seems to have been that both parties to the dispute were really in substantial agreement; Mabillon being an instance of regular devotion combined with prodigious learning, De Rancé showing by his writings that learning was not incompatible with devotion to monastic strictness.

In 1698 a storm was raised in Rome by the publication by Mabillon, under the name of "Eusebius Romanus", of a protest against the superstitious veneration of the relics of "unknown saints" from the catacombs. This work was denounced to the Holy Office, and Mabillon was compelled to explain and modify certain passages. In 1700 arose another storm. The Maurists, in spite of the difficulties arising from the current controversies on Jansenism, had determined to publish a critical edition of St. Augustine. To the last volume of this edition Mabillon was required to furnish a preface, defending the methods and critical conclusions of its editors. His first draft was submitted to various critics, and, after receiving their annotations, was rewritten and sent to Bossuet for his opinion. It was largely amended by Bossuet and returned to Mabillon to be rewritten. The result is the "Preface" of the eleventh volume as we now have it. Mabillon now retired to Normandy to avoid the clamour that, as he expected, was aroused by its publication. But the Holy See supported the Maurists, and though the extremists endeavoured to tax the more moderate with heresy they were silenced by the supreme authority. Mabillon did not lack enemies. In 1698 they had spread a report that he had apostatized in Holland, and he felt obliged to write to the Catholics of England denying the charge. But, as his life drew to a close, all men came to recognize his genius and integrity. In 1701 the king appointed him one of the first members of the new Académie Royale des Inscriptions. Two years later appeared the first volume of the "Annales O.S.B.", on which he had been engaged since 1693. He lived to see but four volumes published. In 1707, as he was on his way to Chelles, he fell sick. He was carried back to Paris and after three weeks' illness, on 27 December, having heard Mass at midnight and received Holy Communion, he died. He was buried in the Lady chapel at St-Germain. At the Revolution in 1798, when the Lady chapel of St-Germain was destroyed, the simple tomb of the great historian was removed to the garden of the Musée des Petits-Augustins. At the Restoration, however, it was carried back to St-Germain, where it still remains behind the high altar.

An almost complete list of Mabillon's works will be found in De Lama, *Bibliothèque des écrivains de la Congrégation de Saint-Maur* (Paris, 1882), 76–83; Stein, *Bibliographie chronologique des ouvrages relatifs à Mabillon* (1707–1907). A long list of works relating to Mabillon will be found in *Mélanges et documents publiés à l'occasion du 2e centenaire de la mort de Mabillon* (Paris, 1908), xxxiii–xlviii, of these the more important are:—Bäumer, *Johannes Mabillon* (Augsburg, 1892); *Benedictines of St. Maur: Mabillon* in *Dublin Review* (September, 1846); Berlière, *Mabillon et la Belgique* in *Revue Mabillon*, IV (Paris, 1909) 4–38, 231–242, 289–322; Besse, *Les études ecclésiastiques d'après la méthode de Mabillon* (Paris, 1902); Butler, *Mabillon* in *Downside Review*, XII (Yeovil, 1893), 116–132; De Broglie,

Mabillon et la société de l'abbaye de Saint-Germain-des-Prés, 1664–1707 (Paris, 1888); DIDIO, *La Querelle de Mabillon et de l'abbé De Rancé* (Amiens, 1892); JADART, *Dom Jean Mabillon (1632–1707)* in *Trav. de l'Acad. de Reims, LXIV* (Reims, 1877–8), 49–324; KUKULA, *Die Mauriner Ausgabe des Augustinus* in *Sitzungsberichte des Kais. Akad. der Wissensch. in Wien*, CXXI, CXXII, CXXVII, CXXXVIII (Vienna, 1890–8); LAUBMANN in HERZOG AND HAUCK, *Real-encyklopädie*, s. v.; PEZ, *Bibliotheca Benedictino-Mauriana*, I (Augsburg, 1716), 98–217; RUINART, *Abrégé de la vie de Dom Jean Mabillon* (Paris, 1709); TASSIN, *Histoire Littéraire de la Congrégation de Saint-Maur* (Brussels, 1770), 205–269; WEISS in MICHAUD, *Biographie Universelle*, s. v.

LESLIE A. ST. L. TOKE.

Mabinogion, a collection of medieval Welsh tales in prose. The word is a derivation of *mab*, "son"; *mabinog*, "a student in the bardic caste", *mabinogi* (pl. *mabinogion*), "a tale belonging to the mabinog's repertoire". The Mabinogion are found in the "Red Book of Hergest", a large fourteenth-century manuscript kept at Jesus College, Oxford. The stories were probably drawn up in their present shape towards the end of the twelfth century, but the legends themselves are of much greater antiquity, some belonging even to the more distant past of Celtic paganism and to the period of Gaelo-Breton unity. Only four of the tales in the collections are properly called Mabinogion, but the name is commonly given to the others as well. The "Four Branches of the Mabinogi" (i. e. the Mabinogion strictly so called), consisting of "Pwyll", "Branwen", "Manawyddan", and "Math", belong to the earliest Welsh cycle and have preserved, though in a late and degraded form, a large amount of the mythology of the British Celts. In the "Four Branches" there is no mention of Arthur. Besides these four tales, the Mabinogion includes two from romantic British history, two more interesting ones ("Rhonabwy's Dream" and "Kulhwch and Olwen"), "Taliesin", and, finally, three tales: "Owen and Lunet", "Gereint and Enid", "Peredur ab Evrawc", which, though clearly of Anglo-Norman origin and showing a marked kinship with certain medieval French tales, were undoubtedly worked on a Celtic background. It was formerly believed that the Mabinogion were nothing more than children's stories, but it is now known that they were intended for a more serious purpose and were written by some professional man of letters, whose name we do not know, who pieced them together out of already existing material. They are admirable examples of story-telling and are of the greatest interest to the student of romantic literature and Celtic mythology.

The Welsh text has been printed in a diplomatic edition, "The Red Book of Hergest", by J. Rhys and J. Gwenogfryn Evans (Oxford, 1887), also in the three-volume edition (with English translation) by Lady Charlotte Guest (Llandovery, 1849); the translation alone appeared in an edition of 1879. Lady Guest's translation has been re-edited with valuable notes by Alfred Nutt (London, 1902). This is the most convenient translation; the fullest translation is in French by J. Loth, "Cours de littérature celtique", vols. III and IV (Paris, 1889). The study by I. B. John, "Popular Studies in Mythology, Romance and Folklore", no. 11, 1901, is an excellent introduction to the subject.

JOSEPH DUNN.

Macao, DIOCESE OF (MACAOENSIS), suffragan of Goa, founded 23 January, 1575, by the Bull, "Super Specula Militantis Ecclesiae", of Gregory XIII, with its see in the Portuguese settlement of Macao (or Macau), on the island of Heung-Shan, adjacent to the coast of the Chinese Province of Kwang-tung (see CHINA, *Map*). The name by which this settlement has long been currently known is supposed to be of Chinese origin, compounded of *Ma*, the name of a local divinity, and *gau*, "harbour"; for this native name the Portuguese vainly attempted to substitute the more Christian, but more unwieldly, form, "A Cidade do Santo Nome de Deus de Macau". The commercial prosperity of Macao, once very considerable, has been almost extinguished in modern times by the rival British settlement of Hong Kong, planted, about 40 miles to the east, in the year 1842. The ecclesiastical jurisdiction of Macao, taken from the earlier Diocese of Malacca, at first included the whole of the Chinese and Japanese Empires. This vast territory was reduced by the creation (1588) of the Diocese of Funay for Japan, and in 1676, after the Dioceses of Peking and Nanking and the Vicariate Apostolic of Tonking had been created, the jurisdiction of Macao did not extend beyond the Chinese Provinces of Kwang-Si and Kwang-Tung. This territory has since been still more curtailed, while the jurisdiction of the see has been extended in Malaysia and Further India. The present effective jurisdiction of Macao comprises (1) the city of Macao and some small islands adjacent to it; (2) the District of Heung-Shan and part of that of San Ui; (3) the Prefecture of Shiu-Heng (twelve districts); (4) part of the Christian populations of Malacca and Singapore; (5) all the Portuguese part of the island of Timor.

At the end of the sixteenth century Christianity was making rapid progress at Macao, which city had become an important centre of missionary activity in the Far East. Here the Jesuits, the pioneers in this field, established the two great colleges of St. Paul and St. Joseph; the former—famous in missionary annals as "a seminary of martyrs"—was the principal college of the Province of Japan; the latter, of the Vice-Province of China. The Franciscan and Dominican friars, the Poor Clares, and the Augustinians soon had convents at Macao, the last-named founding the hermitage of Nossa Senhora da Penha (Our Lady of the Peak). Other churches dating from this golden age of religion in Macao are the Cathedral, the Santa Casa de Misericordia, the hermitage of Nossa Senhora de Guia, the sanctuary of St. James at the mouth of the harbour, and the parish churches of St. Anthony and St. Lawrence. A severe blow was dealt to missionary enterprise in these regions by the Portuguese expulsion of the Society of Jesus (1762), in spite of which, however, and in the face of bitter persecutions, the Chinese missions, of which Macao had been the original point of departure, still numbered some 100,000 Christians at the end of the eighteenth century. Since that period the Portuguese Government while continuing its *padroado*, or patronage of the Church, in the Asiatic possessions of Portugal, has at various times adopted a policy hostile to the religious orders in general, which have been, in consequence, expelled from Macao, as from other Portuguese territory (see POMBAL, SEBASTIÃO JOSÉ DE CARVALHO, MARQUES DE; PORTUGAL).

Of the twenty-one bishops of this see, perhaps the most distinguished was the first, Melchior M. Carneiro, who was also one of the earliest fathers of the Society of Jesus. He had been confessor to St. Ignatius Loyola, rector of the college of Evora, and, after holding several other important posts in his order, was made titular Bishop of Nicæa, coadjutor to the Patriarch of Ethiopia, and (1566) administrator of the missions of China and Japan. He occupied the See of Macao from its foundation, in 1575, to 1583, during which period he established the Santa Casa de Misericordia, the hospital of St. Raphael, and the leper-house of St. Lazarus. Among his successors, Dom João do Casal (1690–1735), who lived ninety years and occupied the See of Macao for half his lifetime, assisted in the events which led up to the visit of Tournon, the papal legate, and his death at Macao (see BENEDICT XIV; CHINA, *The Question of Rites;* RICCI, MATTHEW). Bishop Francisco Chacim (1805–28), a Franciscan, founded at Macao several important charitable institutions, reformed the capitular statutes of the see, and made a collection of its valuable documents. The

cathedral was rebuilt and consecrated by Bishop Jeronymo da Matta (1845–59), who also founded a convent for the education of girls and committed the diocesan seminary to the care of the Jesuits. Manuel B. de S. Ennes, Fellow of the University of Coimbra, Bishop of Macao from 1874 to 1883, was noted in his time for the doctoral thesis in which he refuted the sceptical Christology of Friedrich Strauss; it was his task to execute the Letter Apostolic, "Universis Orbis Ecclesiis", giving new boundaries to the diocese. This bishop did much for the missions in the island of Timor, as did also his successor, José M. de Carvalho (1897–1902), who divided that mission into two vicariates, one of which was entrusted to the Society of Jesus. The present (twenty-first) Bishop of Macao, Dom J. P. d'Azevedo e Castro, formerly vice-rector of the seminary of Angra, was installed in 1902. During his incumbency of the see, the change of territory between his diocese and the Prefecture Apostolic of Kwang-Tung, ordered by the pope, has been accomplished in spite of serious difficulties; the Franciscan Missionary Sisters of Mary have been placed in charge of the convent of St. Rose of Lima, the Collegio de Perseverança has been founded for homeless women, under the Canossian Sisters (who have also opened a school for girls at Malacca), and an industrial school for Chinese boys has been opened by the fathers of the Salesian Society.

With an aggregate population of about 8,000,000, of whom only about 50,000 are Christians, the spiritual activities of this diocese necessarily take the form, to a great extent, of preaching to the heathen. In the city of Macao, which is divided into three parishes, the diocesan seminary, under the direction of Jesuit fathers, educates some 120 ecclesiastics, Portuguese and natives. The Society of Jesus and the Salesian Society are the only religious institutes for men now (1910) established in the diocese; religious institutes for women are represented by the Franciscan and Canossian Sisters, the total number of sisters being about 100. There are at present 70 priests in the diocese, including, besides Europeans, a certain number of Eurasians, Chinese, and even natives of India. In Macao itself the race most largely represented is still the Chinese; in Malacca and Singapore, also, many Chinese are still to be found side by side with the native Malays and the other races, including Europeans, collected in those great commercial centres. The missionaries in Timor have to deal, mainly, with two races, the Malay and the Papuan. The full-blooded Malay is usually a Mohammedan, and is rarely converted to Christianity; the Papuan is far more tractable in this direction. A serious difficulty for the missionaries is the vast number of languages and dialects spoken in Timor. The Catholic being the state religion of Portugal, the prisons and the five government hospitals at Macao and in Portuguese Timor are all open to the ministrations of Catholic priests and sisters; three of these hospitals have chaplains of their own. The government also maintains on the islands of Coloane and Dom João, near Macao, two leper-houses, which are frequently visited by missionaries and sisters.

Besides the "League of Suffrages", to aid the souls of those who have departed this life in the service of the missions, numerous pious associations flourish in the diocese—the Sodality of Our Lady, for students; the Sodality of Our Lady of Sorrows, for married women; the Confraternities of the Holy Rosary, Nossa Senhora dos Remedios, the Immaculate Conception, St. Anthony, and O Senhor dos Passos; the Third Order of St. Francis. The Apostleship of Prayer has been canonically erected and is busily engaged at Macao and in many of the missions. Lastly, the pious association of the Bread of St. Anthony is devoted to relieving the sufferings of the poor.

JOÃO PAULINO D'AZEVEDO E CASTRO.

Macarius, SAINT, Bishop of Jerusalem (212–34). The date of Macarius's accession to the episcopate is found in St. Jerome's version of Eusebius's "Chronicle" (ann. Abr. 2330). His death must have been before the council at Tyre, in 335, at which his successor, Maximus, was apparently one of the bishops present. Macarius was one of the bishops to whom St. Alexander of Alexandria wrote warning them against Arius (Epiph., "Hær.", LXIX, iv). The vigour of his opposition to the new heresy is shown by the abusive manner in which Arius speaks of him in his letter to Eusebius of Nicomedia (Theodoret, "H. E.", I, 4). He was present at the Council of Nicæa, and two conjectures as to the part he played there are worth mentioning. The first is that there was a passage of arms between him and his metropolitan, Eusebius of Cæsarea, concerning the rights of their respective sees. The seventh canon of the council—"As custom and ancient tradition show that the bishop of Ælia [Jerusalem] ought to be honoured, he shall have precedence; without prejudice, however, to the dignity which belongs to the Metropolis"—by its vagueness suggests that it was the result of a drawn battle. The second conjecture is that Macarius, together with Eustathius of Antioch, had a good deal to do with the drafting of the Creed finally adopted by the Council of Nicæa. For the grounds of this conjecture (expressions in the Creed recalling those of Jerusalem and Antioch) the reader may consult Hort, "Two Dissertations", etc., 58 sqq.; Harnack, "Dogmengesch.", II (3rd edition), 231; Kattenbusch, "Das Apost. Symbol." (See index in vol. II.)

From conjectures we may turn to fiction. In the "History of the Council of Nicæa" attributed to Gelasius of Cyzicus there are a number of imaginary disputations between Fathers of the Council and philosophers in the pay of Arius. In one of these disputes where Macarius is spokesman for the bishops he defends the Descent into Hell. This, in view of the question whether the Descent into Hell was found in the Jerusalem Creed, is interesting, especially as in other respects Macarius's language is made conformable to that Creed (cf Hahn, "Symbole", 133). Macarius's name appears first among those of the bishops of Palestine who subscribed to the Council of Nicæa; that of Eusebius comes fifth. St. Athanasius, in his encyclical letter to the bishops of Egypt and Libya, places the name of Macarius (who had been long dead at that time) among those of bishops renowned for their orthodoxy. Sozomen (H. E., II, 20) narrates that Macarius appointed Maximus, who afterwards succeeded him, Bishop of Lydda, and that the appointment did not take effect because the people of Jerusalem refused to part with Maximus. He also gives another version of the story, to the effect that Macarius himself changed his mind, fearing that, if Maximus was out of the way, an unorthodox bishop would be appointed to succeed him (Macarius). Tillemont (Mém. Ecclés., VI, 741) discredits this story (1) because Macarius by so acting would have contravened the seventh canon of Nicæa; (2) because Aetius, who at the time of the council was Bishop of Lydda, was certainly alive in 331, and very probably in 349. Of course, if Aetius outlived Macarius, the story breaks down; but if he died shortly after 331, it seems plausible enough. The fact that Macarius was then nearing his end would explain the reluctance, whether on his part or that of his flock, to be deprived of Maximus. Tillemont's first objection carries no weight. The seventh canon was too vague to secure from an orthodox bishop like Macarius very strict views as to the metropolitan rights of a Semi-Arian like Eusebius. St. Theophanes (d. 818) in his "Chronography" makes Constantine, at the end of the Council of Nicæa, order Macarius to search for the sites of the Resurrection and the Passion, and the True Cross. It

is likely enough that this is what happened, for excavations were begun very soon after the council, and, it would seem, under the superintendence of Macarius. The huge mound and stonework with the temple of Venus on the top, which in the time of Hadrian had been piled up over the Holy Sepulchre, were demolished, and "when the original surface of the ground appeared, forthwith, contrary to all expectation, the hallowed monument of our Saviour's resurrection was discovered" (Euseb., Vit. Const., III, 28). On hearing the news Constantine wrote to Macarius giving lavish orders for the erection of a church on the site (Euseb., Ib., III, 30; Theodoret, H. E., I, 16). Later on, he wrote another letter "To Macarius and the rest of the Bishops of Palestine" ordering a church to be built at Mambre, which also had been defiled by a pagan shrine. Eusebius, though he gives the superscription as above, speaks of this letter as "addressed to me", thinking perhaps of his metropolitan dignity (Vit. Const., III, 51–53). Churches were also built on the sites of the Nativity and Ascension.

(For the story of the finding of the True Cross see CROSS AND CRUCIFIX, I, 4.)

Acta SS., 10 March; VENABLES in *Dict. Christ. Biog.*, s. v.

FRANCIS J. BACCHUS.

Macarius Magnes, a Christian apologist of the end of the fourth century. Some authorities regard the words Macarius Magnes as two proper names, while others interpret them to mean either the Blessed Magnes or Macarius the Magnesian, but he is almost generally considered identical with Macarius, Bishop of Magnesia, who at the "Synod of the Oak" (Chalcedon, 403), accused Heraclides, Bishop of Ephesus, of Origenism. He is the author of a work called "Apocritica", purporting to be an account of a dispute between Macarius and a pagan philosopher, who attacks or ridicules passages from the New Testament. There are also extant fragments of an exposition of Genesis which are ascribed to Macarius. Four hundred years after the "Apocritica" was written it was made use of by the Iconoclasts to defend their doctrines. This caused an account of it to be written by Nicephorus (see "Spicilegium Solesmense", I, 305), who until then had evidently never heard of Macarius and only secured the work with great difficulty. It developed that the passage quoted by the Iconoclasts had been distorted to serve their ends, Macarius having had in mind only heathen idolatry.

Subsequent to this Macarius was again forgotten until the end of the sixteenth century, when the Jesuit Turrianus quoted from a copy of the "Apocritica" which he had found in St. Mark's Library, Venice, his quotations being directed against the Protestant doctrines concerning the Holy Eucharist, etc. When this copy was sought it had disappeared from St. Mark's, and it was only in 1867 that it was found at Athens. Blondel, a member of the French school at Athens, prepared it for publication, but he died prematurely, and it was published at Paris in 1876 by Blondel's friend, Foucart. In 1877 Duchesne published a dissertation on Macarius, to which he added the text of Macarius's Homilies on Genesis.

SALMON in *Dict. Christ. Biog.*, s. v.; BARDENHEWER, *Patrology*, tr. SHAHAN (St. Louis, 1908); IDEM in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.; DUCHESNE, *De Macario Magnete et scriptis ejus* (Paris, 1877); BERNARD, *Macarius Magnes* in *Journal of Theol. Studies* (1901).

BLANCHE M. KELLY.

Macarius of Antioch, Patriarch, deposed in 681. Macarius's dignity seems to have been a purely honorary one, for his patriarchate lay under the dominion of the Saracens, and he himself resided at Constantinople. Nothing is known of him before the Sixth General Council which deposed him on account of his Monothelitism, and after the council he disappeared in a Roman monastery. But he has left his mark on ecclesiastical history by bringing about the condemnation of Honorius. In the first session of the council the Roman legates delivered an address, in the course of which they spoke of four successive patriarchs of Constantinople and others as having "disturbed the peace of the world by new and unorthodox expressions". Macarius retorted, "We did not publish new expressions but what we have received from the holy and œcumenical synods and from holy approved fathers". He then went through the names given by the legates, adding to them that of Pope Honorius. In this and the following session Macarius came to grief over a passage from St. Cyril of Alexandria and St. Leo, in which, after the manner of a man who sees everything through coloured glasses, he tried to find Monothelitism. In the third session some documents which he produced as emanating from Mennas and Pope Vigilius were found to be forgeries, surreptitiously introduced into the Acts of the fifth general council. In the fifth and sixth sessions he and his adherents produced three volumes of patristic testimonies which were sealed up for examination later on. In the eighth session he read his *ecthesis*, or "profession of faith", in which the authority of Honorius was appealed to on behalf of Monothelitism. In answer to questions put to him by the emperor he declared that he would rather be cut to pieces and thrown into the sea than admit the doctrine of two wills or operations. In this same session and the following one his patristic testimonies were found to be hopelessly garbled. He was formally deposed at the close of the ninth session.

But Macarius had left the council more work to do. The papal legates seemed determined that Monothelitism should be disposed of once and for all, so, when at the eleventh session the emperor inquired if there was any further business, they answered that there were some further writings presented by Macarius and one of his disciples still awaiting examination. Among these documents was the first letter of Honorius to Sergius. The legates, apparently without any reluctance, accepted the necessity of condemning Honorius. They must have felt that any other course of action would leave the door open for a revival of Monothelitism. Their conduct in this respect is the more noteworthy because the Sixth General Council acted throughout on the assumption that (it is no anachronism to use the language of the Vatician Council) the doctrinal definitions of the Roman Pontiff were *irreformable*. The council had not met to deliberate but to bring about submission to the epistle of Pope St. Agatho—an uncompromising assertion of papal infallibility—addressed to it (see Harnack, "Dogmengesch.", II, 408; 2nd edition). At the close of the council Macarius and five others were sent to Rome to be dealt with by the pope. This was done at the request of the council and not, as Hefele makes it appear, at the request of Macarius and his adherents (History of Councils, V, 179; Eng. trans.). Macarius and three others who still held out were confined in different monasteries (see Liber Pontif., Leo II). Later on Benedict II tried for thirty days to persuade Macarius to recant. This attempt was quoted in the first session of the Seventh General Council as a precedent for the restoration of bishops who had fallen from the Faith. Baronius gives reasons for supposing that Benedict's purpose was to restore Macarius to his patriarchal dignity, the patriarch who had succeeded him having just died (Annales, ann. 685). Before taking leave of Macarius we may call attention to the profession of faith in the Eucharist, in his "Ecthesis", which is, perhaps, the earliest instance of a reference to this doctrine in a formal creed. To Macarius the Eucharist was a palmary argument against Nestorianism. The flesh and blood of which we partake in the Eucharist is not mere flesh and blood, else how would it be life-giving? It is life-giving because it is the *own* flesh and blood of the Word, which being God is by nature Life. Macarius develops this argument in a

manner which shows how shadowy was the line which separated the Monothelite from the Monophysite. (See HONORIUS I; CONSTANTINOPLE, COUNCILS OF, A. III.)

See the Acts of the Sixth General Council in HARDOUIN, *Conciles*, III; MANSI, XI; HEFELE, *History of Church Councils*, V (Eng. trans.); CHAPMAN, *The Condemnation of Pope Honorius*, reprinted from *Dublin Review*, *July*, *1906* (January, 1907), by the English Catholic Truth Society.

F. J. BACCHUS.

McAuley, CATHERINE. See MERCY, SISTERS OF.

McCabe, EDWARD, cardinal, b. in Dublin, 1816; d. at Kingstown, 11 Feb., 1885; he was the son of poor parents, educated at Father Doyle's school on the Quays and at Maynooth College, and was ordained priest in 1839. After his ordination he served successively as curate in Clontarf and at the pro-cathedral, Marlborough St. in Dublin; and such was the zeal and energy he displayed, joined to intellectual capabilities far beyond the ordinary, that he was selected, in 1854, for the See of Grahamstown in South Africa. He was reluctant, however, to take upon himself the burden of the episcopate in an unknown land, and in 1856 became parish priest of St. Nicholas Without, in Dublin. In 1865 he was transferred to the more important parish of Kingstown, and became a member of the chapter and vicar-general. For the twelve following years his was the ordinary life of a zealous, hard-working pastor, ambitious of nothing but to serve the spiritual and temporal needs of his people. Cardinal Cullen had always held him in the highest esteem, and when, in 1877, the burden of years compelled him to seek assistance he selected Dr. McCabe, who was in due course consecrated titular Bishop of Gadara. The following year Cardinal Cullen died, and in 1879 Dr. McCabe became Archbishop of Dublin. Three years later he received the cardinal's hat. These were troubled times in Ireland, the years of the Land League and of the National League, of violent agitation and savage coercion, when secret societies were strong in Dublin, and the Phœnix Park murders and many others of less note were committed. Like his predecessor, Cardinal McCabe had a distrust of popular movements. Brought up in the city, he was unacquainted with agrarian conditions and unable to appreciate the wrongs which the Irish tenants suffered, and he too readily identified with the political movement under Parnell and Davitt the many outrages committed by the people. In pastorals and public speeches he ranged himself against agitation and on the side of government and law, with the result that Nationalist newspapers and public men attacked him as a "Castle" bishop, who favoured coercion and was an enemy of the people. His life was threatened and for a time he was under the protection of the police.

The Times and *The Freeman's Journal*, 12 Feb., 1885; DAVITT, *Fall of Feudalism* (London, 1904).

E. A. D'ALTON.

Maccabees. See MACHABEES.

MacCaghwell (CAVELLUS), HUGH, archbishop and theologian, b. at Saul, Co. Down, 1571; d. 22 Sept., 1626. He received his earliest education in his native place and then passed to a famous school in the Isle of Man. On his return to Ireland he was selected by Hugh, Prince of Tyrone, as tutor to his sons Henry and Hugh. He was sent by the prince as special messenger to the Court of Spain to solicit aid for the Ulster forces. During his stay at Salamanca, where the Court then resided, he frequented the schools of the university and took doctor's degrees in divinity. Soon afterwards he gave up all worldly greatness to enter the Franciscan order. He enjoyed a great reputation as a theologian, and his commentaries on John Duns Scotus were held in high repute. Vernulæus says that he was conspicuous for his virtues and that his holiness of life and profound learning made him the miracle of his time. It was principally due to his great influence at the Spanish Court that the Irish Franciscan College of St. Anthony was founded at Louvain. After his entry into the order, Hugh taught for some time in the University of Salamanca, then he was appointed superior and lecturer at St. Anthony's, Louvain. Among his pupils were John Colgan, Patrick Fleming, Hugh Ward, Anthony Hickey, etc. He was summoned to Rome to lecture in the convent of Aracœli; but his energies were not limited to his work as professor. He was employed by the pope on several commissions. He gave substantial help to Father Luke Wadding in founding and developing St. Isidore's and the Ludovisi colleges for Irish students. On 17 March, 1626, Urban VIII, passing over all the other candidates, nominated Hugh MacCaghwell Archbishop of Armagh and Primate of all Ireland; the consecration took place on 7 June, in the church of St. Isidore. Thomas Walsh, Archbishop of Cashel, was consecrated at the same time. The consecrating prelate was Gabriel, Cardinal de Trejo, a great friend of the Irish. His health had been much weakened by his manifold duties and the great austerities he practised. In making the visitations of the provinces of the order he always travelled on foot, and passed much time in prayer and fasting. While making preparation for his departure for his arduous mission he was seized with fever and died. He was buried in the church of St. Isidore, and his friend Don John O'Neill, Earl of Tyrone, had a monument placed over his grave. Nicolaus Vernulæus delivered an oration before the university commemorating the virtues and learning of the archbishop, which was published at Cologne, 1657.

MacCaghwell's principal works are: "Scoti Commentaria in quatuor libros Sententiarum", 2 vols., folio, Antwerp, 1620 (to this work is prefixed a life of Scotus); "Scoti Commentaria seu Reportata Parisiensia"; "Quæstiones quodlibetales"; "Quæstiones in libros de anima"; "Quæstiones in metaphysicam"; etc. He also wrote a work in Irish, which was printed at the Irish press in the college of St. Anthony, Louvain, in 1618, entitled "Scathain sacramuinthé na Aithrighe", that is, "The Mirror of the Sacrament of Penance".

WADDING-SBARALEA, *Scriptores Ord. Min.* (Rome, 1806); JOANNES A S. ANT., *Bibliotheca Univ. Franciscana* (Madrid, 1732); VERNULÆUS, *Acad. Lovaniensis;* IDEM, *Rhetorum Coll. Parcensis* (Cologne, 1657); WARE's works, ed. HARRIS (Dublin, 1764); O'REILLY, *Irish Writers* (Dublin, 1820); STUART, *Hist. of Armagh;* RENEHAN, *Collections on Irish Cath. History* (Dublin, 1861); MORAN, *Spicilegium Ossoriense*, 1st series; BRADY, *Episcopal Succession in England, Scotland and Ireland* (Rome, 1876); BRENAN, *Ecclesiastical History of Ireland* (Dublin, 1866); MEEHAN, *Irish Hierarchy in the 17th Century* (Dublin, 1877); WEBB, *Compendium of Irish Biography* (Dublin, 1878). Many important documents and letters relating to Hugh MacCaghwell are preserved in the archives of the Franciscan convent, Dublin.

GREGORY CLEARY.

MacCarthy, DENIS FLORENCE, well-known Irish poet of the nineteenth century, b. in Lower O'Connell Street, Dublin, 26 May, 1817; d. at Blackrock, Dublin, 7 April, 1882. His early life, before he devoted himself to literary pursuits, calls for little remark. From a learned priest, who had spent much time in Spain, he acquired that intimate knowledge of Spanish, which he was later to turn to such good advantage. In April, 1834, before he was yet seventeen, he contributed his first verses to the "Dublin Satirist". He was one of that brilliant coterie of writers whose utterances through the "Nation" influenced so powerfully the Irish people in the middle of the last century. In this organ, started by Charles Gavan Duffy in 1842, appeared over the pseudonym of Desmond most of his patriotic verse. In 1846 he was called to the Irish bar, but never practised. In the same year he edited "The Poets and Dramatists of Ireland", which he prefaced with an essay on the early history and religion of his countrymen. He also edited about this time "The Book of Irish Ballads" (by various

authors), with an introductory essay from his pen on ballad poetry in general. In 1850 appeared his "Ballads, Poems, and Lyrics", original and translated. His attention was first directed to Calderon by a passage in one of Shelley's essays, and thenceforward the interpretation of the "Spanish Shakespeare" claimed the greater part of his attention. The first volume of his translations, containing six plays, appeared in 1853, and was followed by further instalments in 1861, 1867, 1870, and 1873. His version of "Daybreak in Capacabana" was completed only a few months before his death. Until 1864 he resided principally on Killiney Hill, overlooking Dublin Bay. The delicate health of some members of his family then rendering a change of climate imperative, he paid a prolonged visit to the Continent, and on his return settled in London, where he published, in addition to his translations, "Shelley's Early Life", which contains an interesting account of that poet's visit to Dublin in 1812. He had already for some months resettled in his native land, when death overtook him on Good Friday, 1882.

His poems are distinguished by a noble sense of harmony and an exquisite sympathy with natural beauty. One of the most graceful of Irish lyrists, he is entirely free from the morbidity and fantastic sentiment so much affected by modern poets. Such poems as "The Bridal of the Year", "Summer Longings", and his long narrative poem, "The Voyage of St. Brendan", seem with the years but to increase in general esteem. The last-mentioned, in which a beautiful paraphrase of the "Ave Maris Stella" is inserted as the evening song of the sailors, is not more clearly characterized by its fine poetic insight than by that earnest religious feeling which marked its author throughout life. But it is by his incomparable version of Calderon that he has most surely won a permanent place in English letters. For this task—always beset with extreme difficulties—of transferring the poetry of one language into the poetry of another without mutilating the spirit or form of the original, he was qualified by the sympathy of his countrymen with the Catholic spirit of the Latin races, and especially with Spain as the mythical cradle of the Irish race. His success is sufficiently testified by Ticknor, who declares in his "History of Spanish Literature" that our author "has succeeded in giving a faithful idea of what is grandest and most effective in his [sc. Calderon's] genius . . . to a degree which I had previously thought impossible. Nothing, I think, in the English language will give us so true an impression of what is most characteristic of the Spanish drama, and of Spanish poetry generally".

Freeman's Journal (Dublin, 10 April, 1882); *Nation* (Dublin, 15 April, 1882); READ, *Cabinet of Irish Literature*, IV, 154; O'DONOGHUE, *Poets of Ireland* (Dublin), 140; CLERKE in *Dublin Review*, XL (1883), 260–93.

THOMAS KENNEDY.

McCarthy, EDWARD J. See HALIFAX, ARCHDIOCESE OF.

MacCarthy, NICHOLAS TUITE, called the Abbé de Lévignac, b. in Dublin on 19 May, 1769; d. at Annécy, Savoy, 3 May, 1833. He was the second son of Count Justin MacCarthy, by Mary Winefrid Tuite, daughter of Nicholas Tuite, Chamberlain to the King of Denmark. At the age of four he was taken by his parents to Toulouse, where, disgusted with English law as administered in Ireland, they took up their permanent abode. Later he was sent to the Collége du Plessis in Paris. At the age of fourteen he received tonsure at the seminary of St-Magloire. He had nearly completed his course of theological studies at the Sorbonne when the Revolution forced him to leave. He retired to Toulouse. His ordination to priesthood was postponed until his forty-fifth year (1814), partly owing to the Revolution, and partly to a weakness of the loins which rendered it impossible for him to stand for any considerable time. Having sufficiently recovered from this infirmity, he entered the seminary of Chambéry, in Savoy, in 1813, and was ordained to priesthood in June, 1814. Toulouse was the scene of his first missionary labours. In a short time he became famous as a preacher. In 1817 he was offered the Bishopric of Montauban, which he refused. He entered the Society of Jesus in 1818, and made his simple vows two years later. He was reserved exclusively for preaching. So noted was his talent in this respect that he was appointed during his novitiate to preach the Advent Station before the Court of France. The fame of his preaching spread throughout the kingdom, and accordingly he was invited to preach in all the principal cities of the country, as well as in Switzerland. He was admitted to the solemn profession of the order in 1828. The Revolution of 1830 led him to retire to Savoy, whence he was summoned to Rome, arriving in October of the same year. While in Rome he preached every Sunday before the most distinguished personages there. After a short time, however, his health, never robust, became greatly impaired; but not even this lessened his spiritual zeal. On leaving Rome he settled in Turin, at a college of his order. At the request of the King of Sardinia—whose brother Charles Emmanuel was a novice in the Society of Jesus—the Abbé MacCarthy conducted a retreat for the Brigade of Savoy, and did much good amongst the military, his time being completely devoted to the pulpit and confessional. He preached the Lenten course of sermons at Annécy, but being soon afterwards taken ill, expired there, in the bishop's palace, and was buried in the cathedral. As a preacher, he was in eloquence inferior only to such men as Bossuet and Massillon; but whilst they spoke principally for a special class of hearers, the Abbé MacCarthy's sermons are for all countries and for all time, and are to be regarded even at the present day, for depth of thought, for piety, and for practical application, as among the best contributions to homiletic literature.

DEPLACE, *Biographical Sketch* prefixed to *Sermons* (Lyons, 1834); MAHONEY, *Biographical Notice* to tr. of *Sermons* (Dublin, 1848); *Dictionary of National Biography* (London, 1893).

P. A. BEECHER.

McCloskey, JOHN, fourth Bishop and second Archbishop of New York, and first American Cardinal, born in Brooklyn, N. Y., 20 March, 1810; died in New York, 10 October, 1885. His parents, Patrick McCloskey and Elizabeth (Hassen), natives of Dungiven, Co. Derry, Ireland, came to America in 1808, soon after their marriage. John McCloskey was sent to the leading classical school in New York kept by Thomas Brady, father of James T. and Judge John R. Brady. In 1822 he entered Mt. St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg, Md. Here under the care of two French priests, Dubois and Bruté, he passed the next twelve years. He was ordained priest in St. Patrick's Cathedral, New York, 12 January, 1834, the first native of New York State to enter the secular priesthood. His studious temperament, his thorough and elegant culture, and gentle bearing destined him for the professor's chair. In February, 1834, he was named professor of philosophy in the new college just opened at Nyack-on-the-Hudson. At this early period he gave promise, afterwards so fully realized, of being an eloquent and graceful pulpit orator. The college was destroyed by fire in its first year.

This accident and the desire of Father McCloskey to build up by travel a much impaired constitution, as well as an ambition to pursue a higher course of reading in Rome, determined him to visit Europe. He sailed from New York 3 November, 1834, for Havre, and reached Rome, 8 February, 1835. A carefully kept diary of the incidents of the journey tells of a man of keen observation and calm practical judgment of men and institutions. He was fortunate in bearing with him letters of introduction to some of the leading

ecclesiastics of the Eternal City, which brought him into personal relations with men who were making history. Amongst his lifelong friends were Cardinals Fesch and Weld, and others who were raised to the purple later, as Monsignori Reisach, Angelo Mai, Mezzofanti, Wiseman, and Dr. Cullen. He saw much of the young Père Lacordaire during this time, for whom he formed a warm friendship. His delicate health would not permit him to enter any of the colleges, but he took rooms in the Convent of the Theatines at S. Andrea della Valle and entered as a student of the Gregorian University under the Jesuits. Here he had as professors men like Perrone and Manera and others worthy to sit in the chairs of Bellarmine and Suarez. His health did not prevent hard study, as he has left reams of written notes and comments on class lectures and the monuments of Rome during the two years of his stay in the centre of the Christian world. From these manuscripts one sees that no influence of that "city of the soul" failed to leave its impression on him; its Christian monuments and pagan ruins, its city and country life, the influence of foreigners on the people of Italy—not always for good—he has left judiciously noted in letters and diaries. "Each day", he writes in a letter to a friend, "affords new sources of pleasure and an intellectual banquet, of which one can never partake to satiety. . . . Oh, what cannot one enjoy who comes to this great classic and holy city with a mind prepared to appreciate its historic and religious charms!" The balance of three years of absence he passed in travel through Italy, Germany, Belgium, France, England, and Ireland.

In Rome his love for and devotion to the Holy See was deepened and became a cult of his after years. As an American he was naturally broad and capable of taking a wide view of peoples and institutions. This was balanced by the events of the time and made him the conservative force he proved to be later on. A spirit of renewed loyalty to the Church was strongly moving European centres of thought. Lacordaire had in 1835 begun his Notre Dame "Conferences", which commanded the attention of all France and drew around his pulpit the sceptical youth of Paris; Dr. Wiseman, as rector of the English College in Rome, was giving his "Lectures on the connexion between Science and Revealed Religion", which gained him the ear of all England; Döllinger by the first and second parts of his "History of the Church", Görres by his "Christian Mysticism", and Möhler by his "Symbolism" had begun to fix the attention of Germany on the power of the Church to hold men of ability. The Catholic Movement under Newman had begun at Oxford; Montalembert had succeeded in forming a Catholic party in France with himself as president. Father McCloskey's intimate knowledge of all these forces, focussed as they were in the Eternal City, gave him ever after a broader and more intelligent interest in the affairs of the Church, especially in Europe, and made his forecast of things singularly accurate in after life. These advantages were enjoyed by few other American clergymen of his time, so that, on his return to his native diocese in the autumn of 1837, his position was determined. Although only twenty-seven and without any experience in administration, he was placed in charge, as pastor, of one of the most important parishes of the diocese, St. Joseph's, Sixth Avenue, New York. Here was one of the strongholds of what was known as "Trusteeism", a form of church government which made bishop and pastor subordinate in all matters not purely spiritual to the laity. Father McCloskey now found a field for the exercise of a marked feature of the man—self-control, the key to the successful control of others with the minimum of friction which distinguished him all through his life. The trustees of St. Joseph's refused to receive him, demanding a pastor of their choice. The pews were given up. "Sunday after Sunday for nine months did I preach when there were not a dozen persons between pulpit and porch in the centre aisle", said the cardinal in telling of those early days. The trustees refused to pay him any salary, and, unwilling to believe that he was the writer of his forcible and eloquent sermons, said they were composed by an older and abler priest. To all this he paid no heed, never even making a passing allusion to it from the pulpit. "Father McCloskey will not fight, but he will conquer", said an old college companion at the time. He did overcome by that "charity which seeketh not its own"; his opponents became his best supporters, and he was wont to say in his old age that the years that followed in St. Joseph's were the happiest of his life.

In 1841 Father McCloskey was appointed by Bishop Hughes first president of St. John's College, Fordham, still retaining charge of St. Joseph's, to which he returned in 1842 after organizing the new college. At the petition of Bishop Hughes for an assistant in his advancing years, Gregory XVI appointed Father McCloskey, and on 10 March, 1844, he was consecrated titular Bishop of Axiere and Coadjutor of New York with the right of succession. During the three years that followed, the young bishop lent efficient aid to the head of the diocese in making the visitations of the vast territory then comprising the whole State of New York and most of New Jersey. The steady growth of the Church in this territory called for a division of the diocese, and the two new sees of Albany and Buffalo were erected, to the former of which Bishop McCloskey was transferred 21 May, 1847. Here his great life-work began, for which he was well prepared by his priestly zeal and scholarship, his eloquence and successful experience in administration. It was no small work to organize a diocese of 30,000 square miles in extent, containing less than 25 churches and 34 priests, 2 orphan asylums and 2 free schools (Shea, vol. 4, p. 126; and "Cath. Alman.", 1848). The Catholics, scattered and poor, numbered 60,000. After seventeen years of his administration of Albany he left behind as a result a noble cathedral, eighty-four priests, one hundred and thirteen churches, eight chapels, forty-four minor stations, eighty-five missionaries, three academies for boys, one for girls, six orphan asylums, fifteen parochial schools, and St. Joseph's Provincial Seminary, Troy, which he, with Archbishop Hughes, was largely instrumental in securing and equipping. He also introduced into the diocese several religious communities, amongst others, the Augustinians, the Jesuits, the Franciscans, the Capuchins, and Oblates. For the care of the young girls under his charge, he provided by inviting the Religious of the Sacred Heart to Kenwood-on-the-Hudson; the Sisters of Charity, the Sisters of Mercy and the Sisters of St. Joseph; and for the boys the Christian Brothers were also introduced.

In January, 1864, the Metropolitan See of New York became vacant by the death of its first Archbishop, John Hughes, and all looked to the Bishop of Albany as the successor. His name was placed first on the *terna* sent to Rome by the bishops of the province. Amongst the bishops, priests and laity, there was only one dissenting voice, that of Bishop McCloskey himself. An impression obtained very generally at the time and for years afterwards as to the bishop's attitude. It was said that, having been consecrated coadjutor with the right of succession to the see of New York, twenty years before, he claimed the right on the vacancy of the see. The injustice of such a suspicion will appear from the following extract of a letter written by him to one of the most influential members of the Congregation of the Propaganda, Cardinal Reisach, the friend of his youth: "I write to implore your Eminence", he says, "in case there should be any danger of my appointment or of my being transferred from Albany to New York, to aid me in preventing

it, and to save me from the humiliation and misery of being placed in a position for the duties and responsibilities of which I feel myself both physically and morally unequal and unfit. After having been appointed and consecrated coadjutor of the Bishop of New York, with the right of succession, I resigned both coadjutorship and right of succession to come to Albany. I then resolved, and still hold to the resolution, that, as far as it depended on any free will or consent of my own, I should never again return to New York. Having been relieved from the prospect of succession, I never thought of afterwards aspiring or being called to it. I speak only from the deepest sincerity of heart and from the strongest conviction of conscience when I say that I possess neither the learning, nor prudence, nor energy, nor firmness, nor bodily health or strength which are requisite for such an arduous and highly responsible office as that of Archbishop of New York. I recoil from the very thought of it with shuddering, and I do most humbly trust that such a crushing load will not be placed upon my weak and unworthy shoulders." This soul-revealing letter tells that the Church still has within her hierarchy men of the stamp of Chrysostom, Basil, and Gregory Nazienzen, men who strained every nerve to avoid honours as much as men of the world strive for them. He was the choice of the Holy See and was promoted to New York, 6 May, 1864.

On leaving Albany, a public dinner was tendered to him by the high officials, and the letter was signed by the most noted citizens, amongst whom were Governor Seymour, Erastus Corning, Rufus King, Thurlow Weed, Philip Ten Eyck, and different members of the Van Rensselaer and Townsend families. The bishop declined the honour; he loved the city where he was the most distinguished citizen, but with his usual modesty shrank from any public demonstration. He was installed in St. Patrick's Cathedral, Mott St., New York, 27 August, 1864. The text of his first sermon to his new charge was the key to his whole after administration: "Peace be to you." He was not given to controversy; in fact the time for this had passed away. He was evidently a man of Providence, destined to garner and give increase to the fruits of his valiant predecessor's conquests. The first of these fruits was the unfinished new cathedral, begun in 1858, but suspended on account of the breaking out of the Civil War. After fifteen years of collecting funds, looking after the construction, visiting Europe to procure windows and altars, and after giving everything he possessed to hasten its completion, he had the consolation on 25 May, 1879, of dedicating it to the service of God.

Distinguished for his eloquence in the pulpit and wisdom in the council-chamber, Archbishop McCloskey was much sought after on great occasions as a preacher and heard in consultation with deep reverence by his brethren. He was present at the Second and Third Plenary Councils of Baltimore, at the latter of which he preached the opening sermon. On entering the pulpit he received a telegram announcing the destruction of his cathedral by fire. During the sermon he gave no evidence of the shock it must have been to him. In the council-chamber, says Cardinal Gibbons, his colleagues always listened with marked attention and respect to his words, and rarely, if ever, did any of them dissent from the views that he expressed. He attended the Vatican Council during its entire length and was a member of one of the most important commissions—that on Discipline. Cardinal Capalti, who presided over this commission, spoke of the wisdom of the Archbishop of New York in terms of the highest admiration. It has been erroneously stated that Archbishop McCloskey was opposed to Infallibility. Nothing could be further from the truth. Cardinal Gibbons, who attended the Vatican Council, writes: "I have a most distinct recollection of the attitude of the different prelates in regard to the question of Infallibility, and I recall most distinctly that Archbishop McCloskey was not opposed to the Infallibility itself, but declared himself against the expediency of declaring it an article of faith *at that time*, an opinion held by many at the Council." The Archbishop was present at the closing session and voted for the definition with the hundreds of other bishops. His attitude on this question is clearly set forth in the following extract from a letter to Pius IX: "Through the grace of God, the Catholics of the United States of North America are one and undivided in an orthodox faith, in an unwavering fidelity to all Catholic doctrines and principles, in an unreserved loyalty and allegiance to the infallible and sovereign authority of the Roman Church, and in ardent filial love and devotion to your Holiness. It is our glory and our joy that we are preserved from error and directed in the sure way of temporal and eternal happiness by our subjection to the infallible teaching and supreme authority of the Mother and Mistress of Churches."

JOHN CARDINAL MCCLOSKEY

During his visit to Rome at the Vatican Council he made the final impression which resulted in his elevation to the cardinalate. Pius IX said of him: "He is a man of princely mien and bearing." He was preconized cardinal in the Consistory of 15 March, 1875. The news of the first American cardinal was received with universal applause; Catholic and Protestant, all felt that no one was more worthy as a representative of the American Church to receive the highest honour in the gift of the pope. It was the passing away forever of old-time prejudice, and pointed attention to the proverbial wisdom of Rome. His investiture took place in the cathedral, Mott St., 27 April, 1875. The biretta was imposed by the Archbishop of Baltimore, James Roosevelt Bayley, as delegate of the Apostolic See. The bearers of the insignia from Rome were Monsignor Roncetti, Dr. Ubaldi, and Count Morafoschi. It was one of the most memorable events in the history of the Church in the United States. The cardinal visited Rome that year in August, where he was received by Pius IX with great affection. He then took possession of his titular church, Santa Maria sopra Minerva. In 1878 he again visited Rome and assisted at the coronation of Leo XIII, from whom he received the cardinal's hat in Consistory, 28 March.

The growth of the diocese and the increasing infirmities of age called for the aid of an assistant, and on 1 October, 1880, Rt. Rev. Michael A. Corrigan,

Bishop of Newark, was named coadjutor of New York with the right of succession, with the title of Archbishop of Petra. The last notable public appearance of Cardinal McCloskey was on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of his ordination, 12 January, 1884. His reply to addresses on that day was very suggestive: "On this occasion I cannot but contrast the scene of to-day with that of fifty years ago in old St. Patrick's Cathedral. There were only one bishop and two priests and not many people in the church. To-day, the fiftieth anniversary of that event, I behold this sanctuary filled with the bishops of my province and the faithful clergy of my diocese, and this great cathedral crowded to overflowing with my devoted people. For all this I have only to thank God Who has spared me in His goodness to witness the glory of this day and the wonderful fruits of the mustard seed. As to all you have said with regard to promotions that have followed one after another, I can only say that not one of them was ever sought by me." These last words reveal the true character of America's first cardinal better than volumes could do. The last public act of Cardinal McCloskey is one for which the American Church will ever feel deeply grateful. The Italian Government's act of spoliation of ecclesiastical property threatened, in March, 1884, to expropriate the American College at Rome. At once the Cardinal laid the matter before President Arthur, appealing for the protection of this institution as the property of American citizens. The Secretary of State, Mr. Frelinghuysen, through the American Minister to the Quirinal, brought the case to the notice of the Italian Government, and the college was saved.

The twenty-one years of his administration as archbishop covered all the sees of New York, New England, and most of New Jersey, his suffragans being Albany, Boston, Brooklyn, Burlington, Buffalo, Hartford, Newark, Portland, Springfield, and the territory later apportioned off for the Dioceses of Fall River, Ogdensburg, Syracuse, and Trenton. To provide for the wants of this vast territory, he held the Fourth Provincial Council of New York in September, 1883, having also held the Third and Fourth Diocesan Synods of New York. Considering his strength, he was perhaps the most hard-working man in his diocese. To minister to the rapidly growing wants of his people, which now numbered 600,000, the priests having grown from 150 to 400, the churches and chapels from 85 to 229, schools and academies from 53 to 97, the pupils in the Catholic schools from 16,000 to 37,000, was a task that called for more than ordinary energy and zeal. The New York Catholic Protectory will ever stand as a striking monument of his foresight in making provision for a class of children much neglected, besides adding to the number of hospitals, homes, and asylums as the growing wants demanded. But perhaps the work which will ever stand out as evidence of his wonderful energy and zeal, no less than of his refined and elevated taste, are the three cathedrals built by him: the Immaculate Conception, Albany; St. Patrick's, Mott St., rebuilt after the fire, and St. Patrick's, Fifth Avenue, New York, which last was solemnly consecrated 5 October, 1910.

Cardinal McCloskey has often been compared with his predecessor by those who knew them both. Father Hewitt wrote: "During his [Archbishop Hughes'] time of warfare, he wielded the battle-axe of Cœur de Lion, while his successor [Cardinal McCloskey], whose characteristics were in marked contrast to his own, was more like Saladin, whose light weapon cut the lace veil with sure and graceful stroke." Cardinal Gibbons said: "These two prelates had each his predominant traits of character. The one [McCloskey] recalls the Prince of the Apostles, blending authority with paternal kindness; the other reminding us of the Apostle of the Gentiles, wielding the two-edged sword of the spirit, the tongue and the pen." Each prelate was a man of Providence, raised up by God for his time. Stormy were the days when Archbishop Hughes took the helm, and he was equal to the emergency. Peaceful the times of Cardinal McCloskey, no great crises calling for striking evidences of power. He gave himself unreservedly to the work his hands found ready to do; to conserve and build up, to increase the work of him who went before him. He was a ripe scholar, more erudite than prominent. If his proficiency in sacred science was not generally accorded the prominence it might well have commanded, we must attribute it to his modesty and humility, of which we find so many unmistakable signs in his letters. In fact he never lost an opportunity of denying himself what natural ambition might honestly take. As a young priest in Rome he declined the degree of Doctor of Divinity; he strove with all his might to avoid promotion to the Metropolitan See of New York, and no one was more surprised than himself when the news flashed across the ocean of his elevation to the cardinalate. He delighted to conceal the gifts which, if allowed to display themselves, would have secured the applause of all men. His written and impromptu sermons and discourses showed his cultured mind and strong natural gifts to the best advantage. The dignity and grace of manner, the quiet but persuasive style of oratory that carries conviction to every hearer were particularly his. "But all these endowments were as nothing compared to the beauty of his soul which was the seat of all those virtues that render a man acceptable before God and dear to his fellow-men. If we had to mention only one trait of character, we should select what perhaps was the most conspicuous, certainly the most edifying—the admirable blending in him of dignity which repelled none with a sweetness which attracted all, a rare blessing—

'Non bene conveniunt nec in una sede morantur
Majestas et amor. . .'"

In the soul of Cardinal McCloskey, where Christian virtue had solid roots, they co-existed in a wonderful manner. In him were coupled the majesty of a prince, which inspired no fear, but exacted the reverence of all, with the simplicity and amiableness of a child. Well may we say of him that he was "Beloved of God and men."

McCloskey, *MS.—Diary and Itinerary of Journey to Rome* (1835) in *Cathedral Archives of New York;* Clarke, *Lives of Deceased Prelates* (New York, 1888); Farley, *History of St. Patrick's Cathedral* (New York, 1908); Shea, *History of the Catholic Church in the United States* (New York, 1892); *Historical Records and Studies, United States Catholic Historical Society,* I, Pt. I; II, Pt. I; II, Pt. II; *Catholic World,* XLII (New York, Dec., 1885); *MS. Letters* in *Archives of Propaganda* (Rome); *Ave Maria,* XXI, 867; *Catholic Quarterly Review,* Vol. X (1885), 745; *The Month,* XXXVI, III Series, 304.

John M. Farley.

McCloskey, William George, Bishop of Louisville, Kentucky, b. at Brooklyn, N. Y., 10 Nov., 1823; d. 17 September, 1909. He was the youngest of five brothers. Two of his older brothers also became priests: John, for years president of Mount St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg, Md.; and George, pastor of the Church of the Nativity, New York. William George was sent to Mount St. Mary's in 1835. In May, 1850, he was ordained subdeacon at that seminary by Archbishop Eccleston of Baltimore, and 6 Oct., 1852, was ordained priest by Bishop Hughes in St. Patrick's Cathedral, New York. He said his first Mass in the basement of the Church of the Nativity, of which his brother George was then pastor, and remained there ten months as assistant. Then, from a desire to live in the seminary cloister, he returned with the consent of his superiors to Mount St. Mary's, where he taught moral theology, Scripture, and Latin for about six years. He was appointed, 1 Dec., 1859, the first rector of the American College at Rome, being the unanimous choice of the American bishops. He reached Rome March, 1860. Georgetown University had shortly before conferred on him the degree of Doctor of

Divinity. He was rector until his promotion to the See of Louisville in May, 1868, being consecrated bishop in the chapel of the college on 24 May of that year by Cardinal de Reisach, Archbishop of Munich, Bavaria, assisted by Monsignor Xavier de Mérode, minister of Pius IX, and by Monsignor Viteleschi, Archbishop of Osimo and Cingoli. Dr. McCloskey's administration of the American College saw the crisis in the history of its affairs, an echo of the crisis in American political life. He was rector during our Civil War. In spite of all his efforts and diplomatic skill the spirit of faction affected the college, Southern Catholics being as loyal to the South as the Northerners were to the North. Moreover, some of the bishops could at the time send neither students nor support, and the very existence of the institution was threatened. But Dr. McCloskey stood loyally to his post, and cheerfully bore adversity.

He arrived in Louisville as its bishop towards the end of summer, 1868. The following facts attest the energy of his character and the zeal of his administration. He found sixty-four churches and left in his diocese at his death one hundred and sixty-five. He was zealous to provide chapels for the small settlements of his jurisdiction. From eighty, the number of his priests grew to be two hundred. He introduced many religious orders into the diocese, the Passionists, the Benedictines, the Fathers of the Resurrection, the Sisters of Mercy, the Little Sisters of the Poor, the Franciscan Sisters, and the Brothers of Mary. The growth of the parochial schools was chiefly the product of his zeal. The number of children attending them increased from 2000, in 1868, to 12,000, in 1909. In 1869 he established the diocesan seminary known as Preston Park Seminary. He was present at the Vatican Council in 1870. He also attended the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore in 1866, and the Third, in 1884, strongly advocating in the former the cause of the American College at Rome. He had a splendid physique and was a man of talent and cultured taste. He had a strong will, and held tenaciously to any view or plan of action that he had once entered on. Of strong Christian faith, of exemplary priestly life, he was especially charitable to the very poor and to the unfortunate classes of society. He will never be forgotten by the unfortunate magdalens of the House of the Good Shepherd at Louisville. Every Sunday, unless stormy weather prevented, he visited, instructed and consoled them, listening to each one's tale of woe and showing to this fallen class that charity of which Christ set the Divine example. He wrote a life of St. Mary Magdalen (Louisville, 1900). His love for the poor, whom he visited in their homes even in his old age, and to whom he gave whatever money he owned, so that he died a poor man, illuminated the city in which he wielded the crosier with force and mercy for almost half a century. He was beloved by all who knew him.

This sketch of his life is founded on letters of his sister, Mary McCloskey, and of his chancellor, Rev. Dr. Schuhmann; *The Record*, the diocesan organ of Louisville, files; Brann, *History of the American College at Rome* (New York, 1910).

Henry A. Brann.

MacDonald, Alexander. See Victoria, Diocese of.

McDonald, James Charles. See Charlottetown, Diocese of.

MacDonald, John, Laird of Glenaladale and Glenfinnan, philanthropist, colonizer, soldier, b. in Glenaladale, Scotland, about 1742; d. at Tracadie, Prince Edward Island, Canada, 1811; he was the son of Alexander and Margaret (MacDonnell of Scotus). He entered the Scots College, Ratisbon, Bavaria, in 1756, and there completed his education. Returning to Scotland, his high personal character and distinguished mentality were quickly recognized. The MacDonalds of Glenaladale are the senior cadet branch of the MacDonalds of Clanranald, and Captain MacDonald was chosen "Tanister" or second in command to, and representative of, his chief. It was an evil time for Jacobite Scotland, especially for Catholic Jacobite Scotland. The Catholic Jacobite was cruelly persecuted, and Alexander MacDonald of Boisdale, South Uist, a former Catholic, outdid others in severity by compelling his tenants either to renounce their faith or lose their land and homes. They chose to emigrate to America, but, being utterly destitute, found this impossible. Hearing of their pitiable condition, Captain MacDonald went to investigate. What he saw moved him to an act of heroic abnegation. It is said: "As a nursery for the priesthood, no old Highland house can rival that of Glenaladale, from the time Laird Angus became a priest in 1676, to Archbishop Angus, Metropolitan of Scotland, in 1892". Captain MacDonald proved himself a worthy son of his house, when he decided to mortgage his estates to his cousin in order to aid his distressed compatriots. With the money thus obtained he purchased (1771) a tract of land in Prince Edward Island. The following year the South Uist tenants with other Catholics from the mainland of Scotland embarked for Canada. Glenaladale, who had from the first resolved to exile himself with them, came a year later. In the Revolutionary War he and General Small raised the 84th (Royal Highland Emigrant) Regiment. Captain MacDonald and his men fought so well for the king that he was offered the governorship of Prince Edward Island, but the Test Act being still in force, he could not, as a Catholic, comply with the statutory conditions. From this time until his death he was actively engaged in the service of the new colonists, both in regard to their temporal and spiritual affairs. His kindness and generosity knew no bounds and, extending to those of other faiths, did much to create a feeling, rare enough in those days, of mutual toleration and esteem. He himself never became wealthy, and his Scotch estates eventually passed to the cousin to whom they had been mortgaged. His people, however, increased richly in numbers and in fortune. He gave his tenants nine hundred and ninety-nine year leases at a trifling rental, and from this came much of their prosperity.

Captain MacDonald married, first, Miss Gordon of Baldornie, aunt of Admiral Sir James Gordon; second, Marjory MacDonald of Ghernish (Morar). Many of his descendants embraced the religious life, notably his two grandsons, John Alaistir MacDonald and Allan McDonell, both of the Society of Jesus.

MacDonald, *Sketches of Highlanders* (St. John, N. B., 1843); MacMillan, *Early History of the Catholic Church in Prince Edward Island* (Quebec, 1905); MacDonald, *A Knight of the Eighteenth Century* in *The Messenger* (January, 1902); MacDonell, *Sketches, Glengarry in Canada* (Montreal, 1893), note, 130; MacKenzie, *History of the MacDonalds and Lords of the Isles* (Inverness, 1881); *Records, Scots Colleges at Douai, Rome, Madrid, Valladolid, and Ratisbon* (Aberdeen, 1906).

Anna Sprague MacDonald.

Macdonell, Alexander, first Bishop of Kingston, Ontario, Canada, b. 17 July, 1760, at Inchlaggan in Glengarry, Scotland; d. 14 January, 1840, at Dumfries, Scotland. His early education was received at Bourblach on Loch Morar. He attended the Scots Colleges at Paris, and Valladolid, Spain, and was ordained priest at the latter place 16 February, 1787. Returning to his native land he exercised the ministry for five years in the Braes of Lochaber. In 1792 his people were evicted from their homes, and their lands were converted into sheepwalks. Despite the bitter feelings against Catholics, lately intensified by the Gordon Riots, and disregarding the fact that, being a Catholic priest he was *ipso facto* an outlaw, undaunted, he led his clansmen to the city of Glasgow, where he secured employment for them, acting as their devoted pastor and faithful guardian, a sharer in their fortunes,

as indeed he continued to be for fifty years. Within two years after the Highlanders' arrival in Glasgow, the Revolution on the Continent ruined the export trade of Glasgow and deprived them of their livelihood. The only avenue open to the unemployed was service in the militia, but even this was closed to the Glengarry men, who, being Catholics, could not declare themselves Protestants, as required for enlistment.

The genius for organization possessed by Father Macdonell, which was destined to make a great name for him on two continents, and render valuable service to Church and State, quickly showed itself. He boldly offered to organize his clansmen into a Catholic regiment. The pressing need of strengthening the forces made the offer acceptable, and in 1794 the "Glengarry Fencible Regiment" was raised, and Father Macdonell, though it was contrary to the existing law, was appointed chaplain, thus becoming the first Catholic chaplain in the British Army since the Reformation. The regiment was despatched to the Isle of Guernsey in 1795, then threatened by the French, and on the breaking out of the Rebellion, they were sent to Ireland in 1798. Bernard Kelly in the "Fate of Glengarry", writing of their sojourn in the latter country says: "They everywhere won golden opinions by their humane behaviour towards the vanquished, which was in striking contrast with the floggings, burnings, and hangings which formed the daily occupation of the rest of the military. Father Macdonell, who accompanied the regiment in all their enterprises, was instrumental in fostering this spirit of conciliation, and his efforts contributed not a little to the extinction of the Rebellion. The Catholic chapels in many places had been turned into stables by the yeomanry, and these he caused to be restored to their proper use. He often said Mass himself in these humble places of devotion, and invited the inhabitants to leave their hiding places and resume once more their wonted occupations, assuring them of the king's protection, if they behaved quietly and peaceably. Such timely exhortations had an almost magical effect, though the terror-stricken population could scarcely believe their eyes when they beheld a regiment of Roman Catholics, speaking their language, and among them a *soggarth*, a priest, assuring them of immunity from a government immemorially associated with every species of wrong and oppression." An American bishop, lately deceased, has given this testimony to the chaplain's services and to the Irish people's gratitude: "The memory of Father Macdonell is as green in those regions as the fields they cultivate. That holy, chivalrous priest saved the lives of many innocent Irishmen and restored the chapels to their original purpose." At the close of the Rebellion Father Macdonell was called to London in the interest of the regiment, and was at the same time commissioned by the Bishops of Ireland to make known to the British government their sentiments in regard to the proposed legislative union of Great Britain and Ireland. The Fencibles were disbanded in Glasgow in 1802.

The next two years found Father Macdonell in negotiation with the government for the immigration of his people to Canada. Powerful forces were arrayed against him, both at home and in the government, but he eventually triumphed, and brought out in 1803 and 1804 large numbers of Catholic Highlanders to Glengarry in Upper Canada, where many of his faith and race were already exiled on account of persecution in their native land. Father Macdonell arrived at York, now Toronto, 1 November, 1804, and proceeded to settle the people on the lands granted by the British government. The whole of the present Dominion was then the vast Diocese of Quebec. Father Macdonell with authority of vicar-general was assigned to the mission of St. Raphael's in Glengarry, "the Cradle of the Church in Ontario", which he made his headquarters for twenty-five years, though his home was everywhere in the province. On his arrival he found three priests in the province, the Rev. Roderick Macdonell (Leek) at St. Andrew's and St. Regis, the Rev. Francis Fitzimmons in Glengarry, and the Rev. Father Richard at Sandwich.

The Rev. Roderick Macdonell died in 1806 and Father Fitzimmons removed shortly afterwards to New Brunswick; this left Father Macdonell in charge of the whole province for the next ten years without any assistance, Father Richard being unable to speak English. He was obliged to travel over the country from the province line of Lower Canada to Lake Superior, carrying the requisites for Mass, and the administration of the sacraments, sometimes on horseback, sometimes in Indian birch canoes, and sometimes on foot, living among the savages with such fare as they afforded, crossing the great lakes and rivers, and even descending the rapids of the St. Lawrence in their dangerous craft. Equal hardships and privation he endured among the new settlers. Thus he spent those years in travelling about, offering the Holy Sacrifice in rude huts, teaching the children, administering the sacraments and preaching to the widely separated settlers throughout the great province, now Ontario. During the War of 1812 his powerful influence was successfully used in rousing the martial spirit of his countrymen, and indeed of the other inhabitants, in defence of their adopted land. With the reorganized "Glengarry Fencibles" he was present in several engagements against the American forces. His civil and military services were recognized by the British Government in 1816 by an addition to his own government allowance, and by an annual grant of £100 each, to three clergymen and four school-masters.

In 1817 Upper Canada was set apart from the See of Quebec as a vicariate Apostolic, and two years later Father Macdonell was appointed vicar Apostolic, his consecration as Bishop of Rhosina taking place in the Ursuline chapel, Quebec, on 31 December, 1820. A significant incident was the gift to Bishop Macdonell of a magnificent episcopal ring by King George IV. Six years later, 14 February, 1826, the vicariate was raised to a bishopric by Leo XII, and Bishop Macdonell then became the first Bishop of Upper Canada with his see at Kingston. Advancing age caused him to apply for a co-adjutor. Father Weld of Lulworth Castle, England, was appointed and consecrated Bishop of Amycla, and co-adjutor of Upper Canada, 1 August, 1826, but his health becoming impaired he never assumed office. Bishop Macdonell's thorough knowledge of the country and its people and his great administrative ability made his counsel desirable to the government, and on 12 October, 1831, he was called to the Legislative Council, and thereafter was accorded the title "Honourable". In a letter to a friend he writes of his appointment as follows: "The only consideration that would induce me to think of accepting such a situation, would be the hope of being able to promote the interests of our holy religion more effectually, and carrying my measures through the Provincial Legislature with more facility and expedition than I could otherwise do."

Five voyages to Europe, an average travel of two thousand miles per year through Ontario, the personal selection of church sites, in nearly all the places now marked by cities and towns in the province of Ontario, untiring and successful efforts to obtain a fair share of government grants in money and land for church and school purposes (the first grant of public money for a Catholic school in Ontario was obtained for St. Andrew's, Stormont County, in 1832), are all evidences of an unusually active life. His zeal for the formation of a native priesthood is abundantly shown in the establishment of the Seminary of Iona at St. Raphael's, in 1826, and of Regiopolis College at Kingston, in 1838, not to speak of the many priests educated

at his own expense. There is a statement left among his papers showing that he expended £13,000 of his private funds for the furthering of religion and education.

His voluminous letters reveal the master mind of the organizer and ruler, and the singleness of purpose of the great churchman. His life was a striking example of the truth that in the Catholic Church piety and patriotism go hand in hand. In the year 1840 he died in his native Scotland, whither he had gone with the hope of interesting Irish and Scotch bishops in a scheme of emigration. In 1861 his remains were brought to Kingston by Bishop Horan and were interred beneath the cathedral. Bishop Macdonell in 1804 found three priests and three churches in Upper Canada. By his energy and perseverance he induced a considerable immigration to the province, and left at his death forty-eight churches attended by thirty priests. The memory that survives him is that of a great missionary, prelate, and patriot—the Apostle of Ontario.

Letters of Bishop Macdonell; MACDONELL, *Reminiscences of the Hon. and Rt. Rev. Alexander Macdonell;* KELLY, *The Fate of Glengarry;* MORGAN, *Biographies of Celebrated Canadians;* HOPKINS, *Progress of Canada.*

D. R. MACDONALD.

MacDonell, WILLIAM A. See ALEXANDRIA, DIOCESE OF.

McDonnell, CHARLES EDWARD. See BROOKLYN, DIOCESE OF.

McDonnell, EDMUND. See O'DONNELL, EDMUND.

Mace.—(1) A short, richly ornamented staff, often made of silver, the upper part furnished with a knob or other head-piece and decorated with a coat of arms, usually borne before eminent ecclesiastical corporations, magistrates, and academic bodies as a mark and symbol of jurisdiction.

(2) More properly, the club-shaped beaten silver stick (*mazza*) carried by papal *mazzieri* (mace-bearers), Swiss Guards (vergers), in papal chapels, at the consecration of bishops, and by the *cursores apostolici* (papal messengers). When in use the mace is carried on the right shoulder, with its head upwards. Formerly cardinals had mace-bearers. *Mazzieri,* once called *servientes armorum,* or halberdiers, were the body-guard of the pope, and *mazze* (*clavæ, virgæ*) date back at least to the twelfth century (*virgarii* in chapter xl of the Ordo of Cencius).

Die Katholische Kirche, I (Berlin, 1899), 317.

JOSEPH BRAUN.

Macedo, FRANCISCO, known as A S. AUGUSTINO, O.F.M., theologian, b. at Coimbra, Portugal, 1596; he entered the Jesuit Order in 1610, which however he left in 1638 in order to join the Discalced Franciscans. These also he left in 1648, for the Observants. In Portugal he sided with the House of Braganza. Summoned to Rome by Alexander VII he taught theology at the College of the Propaganda, and afterwards church history at the Sapienza, and as consultor to the Inquisition. At Venice in 1667, during the week beginning 26 Sept., he held a public disputation, against all comers, on nearly every branch of human knowledge, especially the Bible, theology, patrology, history, law, literature, and poetry. He named this disputation, in his quaint and extravagant style, "Leonis Marci rugitus litterarii" (the literary roaring of the Lion of St. Mark); this obtained for him the freedom of the city of Venice and the professorship of moral philosophy at the University of Padua. He died there 1 May, 1681.

Rather restless, but a man of enormous erudition, he wrote a number of books, of which over 100 appeared in print, and about thirty are still unprinted. The following may be mentioned: "Collationes doctrinæ S. Thomæ et Scoti" (Padua, 1671, 1673, 1680), 3 vols. in folio; "Scholæ theologicæ positivæ ad . . . confutationem hæreticorum" (Rome, 1664) copied in part in Roccaberti, "Bibliotheca Maxima Pontificia", XII (Rome, 1696) 221–48; "De clavibus Petri" (Rome, 1660) partially reprinted in Roccaberti, XII, 113–37; "Controversiæ selectæ contra hæreticos" (Rome, 1663). "Assertor romanus adversus calumnias heterodoxorum Anglorum præsertim et Scotorum in academiis Oxoniensi, Cantabrigiensi et Aberdoniensi" (Rome, 1667); "Tessera romana auctoritatis pontificiæ adversus buccinam Thomæ Angli" (London, 1654), also in Roccaberti, XII, 164–220. He also took an active part in the Jansenist controversy, being at first inclined to Jansenism; but afterwards he defended St. Augustine's teaching with regard to Grace in the most decided manner. "Scrutinium divi Augustini" (London, 1644; Paris, 1648; Münster, 1649); "Cortina divi Augustini" (Paris, 1648 etc.); "Mens divi Augustini illustrata" (London, 1655); "Mens divinitus inspirata SS. papæ Innocentii X." (Louvain, 1655); "Commentationes duæ ecclesiastico-polemicæ" (Verona, 1674), concerning Vincent of Lérins and Hilarius of Arles, against whom H. Norisius wrote his "Adventoria" in P. L., XLVII, 538 sq. "Medulla historiæ ecclesiasticæ" (Padua, 1671); "Azymus Eucharisticus", Ingolstadt (Venice, ——), 1673, against Cardinal Giovanni Bona, and at once placed on the Index (21 June, 1673), "until it is corrected", which was done in the new edition (Verona, 1673). Mabillon also wrote against this. "Schema S. congregationis s. officii" (Padua, 1676).

SBARALEA, *Supplem. ad Script. Ord. Min.* (Rome, 1806), 260–3; 2nd ed. (Rome, 1908), I, 276–9; JOH. DE S. ANTONIO, *Bibl. univ. francisc.,* I (Madrid, 1732), 362; NICERON, *Mém. pour servir à l'hist. des hommes illust.,* XXI, 317, 333; HURTER, *Nomenclator;* SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibl. de la c. de J.,* V, 244 sq.

MICHAEL BIHL.

Macedo, JOSÉ AGOSTINHO DE (1761–1831), Portuguese controversialist, preacher, and poet, was born at Beja and educated by the Oratorians. Entering the Augustinian Order, he made his profession in 1778, but lived in perpetual strife with his superiors and finally abandoned the monastic life and habit. In 1792 he was unfrocked, but appealed against the sentence and obtained a papal Brief which secularized him and conserved his ecclesiastical status. He now laid the foundations of a vast though superficial learning, while, as a means of livelihood, he devoted himself to writing and preaching. He founded, or contributed to, a large number of newspapers and in these, and in political pamphlets, defended the absolute monarchy and the Church against liberalism in politics and religion, though he changed his views more than once in accordance with his interests or sympathies. His fiery zeal was equalled by a brilliancy of invective and mordant satire which gained him bitter foes and warm admirers. From 1824 to 1829 he served as diocesan censor and his critical analyses of the books submitted to him reveal his versatility, though this, and his fecundity, are best seen by the catalogue of his writings which occupies thirty pages in Vol. 4 of the "Diccionario Bibliographico" of Innocencio da Silva. As early as 1802 he became one of the royal preachers and his sonorous voice and discourses seasoned by political allusions made him the most popular pulpit orator of the day. He introduced didactic poetry into Portugal, writing rhetorical poems devoid of inspiration, and sought to rival Camoëns by a lifeless epic "Oriente".

In that decadent period Macedo was able to enthrone himself as dictator of letters, but this involved him in numerous literary duels with rival bards whom he chastised in "Os Burros", the most libellous poem in the language. His political and erotic odes reach a high level, but he gave the best proof of his rare intel-

lectual powers in the philosophical treatise "A demonstration of the existence of God", while his tract "On the state of Portugal" (1808) shows a sound perception which is lacking in his later prose work. A man of immense vanity, irregular life, and atrabilious temper, he yet had an affable manner and kindly heart and contributed generously to charities. These qualities and his rare talents earned him a great position and much esteem so that, when he passed away, part of the population mourned his death as a national loss.

DA SILVA, *Memorias para a vida de José Agostinho de Macedo* (Lisbon, 1899); BRAGA, *Obras Ineditas de José Agostinho de Macedo*, 2 vols. (Lisbon, 1900–1).

EDGAR PRESTAGE.

Macedonia. See PAUL, SAINT, APOSTLE; ROMAN EMPIRE; SALONIKI; TURKISH EMPIRE.

Macedonians. See PNEUMATOMACHI.

Macerata and Tolentino, UNITED SEES OF, in the Marches, Central Italy. Macerata is a provincial capital, situated on a hill, between the Chienti and the Potenza rivers, from which there is a beautiful view of the sea. Its name is derived from *maceries* (ruins), because the town was built on the ruins of Helvia Recina, a city founded by Septimus Severus, and destroyed by Alaric in 408, after which its inhabitants established the towns of Macerata and Recanati. The former is mentioned apropos of the Gothic wars and of Desiderius, King of the Lombards, after which time it fell into decadence. Nicholas IV restored it and, in 1290, established there a university renewed by Paul III in 1540; this pope made Macerata the residence of the governors of the Marches, and thenceforth it was one of the towns most faithful to the papacy. Gregory XI gave the city to Rudolfo Varani di Camerino, a papal general; the people, however, drove him away, wishing to be governed directly by the Holy See. In the fifteenth century, the families of Malatesta of Rimini and Sforza of Milan struggled for the possession of Macerata, from which the latter were definitely expelled in 1441. Later, the town became part of the Duchy of Urbino. In 1797 it was pillaged by the French. It has a fine cathedral, in which there is a mosaic of St. Michael by Calandra and a Madonna by Pinturicchio. There are, also, the beautiful churches of Santa Maria della Pace (1323) and of the Madonna delle Vergini (1550), the latter designed by Galasso da Carpi. The university has only the two faculties of law and medicine.

The episcopal see was created in 1320, after the suppression of that of Recanati, which was re-established in 1516, independently of Macerata, to which last Sixtus V, in 1586, united the Diocese of Tolentino (a very ancient city in the province of Macerata), destroyed by the barbarians. Tolentino had bishops in the fifth century, and the martyrdom of St. Catervus, the apostle of the city, is referred to the time of Trajan. Besides its fine cathedral, this town contains the beautiful church of St. Nicholas of Tolentino, which belongs to the Augustinians, and in which is the tomb of its patron saint (1310). Tolentino is famous as the place where was signed the treaty between Napoleon and Pius VI, which gave Bologna, Ferrara, and Romagna to the Cisalpine Republic. In 1815 was fought between Macerata and Tolentino the battle in which the Austrians defeated Murat and which cost the latter the throne of Naples.

Among the distinguished men of Macerata are G. B. Crescimbeni, a poet of the thirteenth century, and Mario Crescimbeni, a man of letters of the seventeenth century and one of the founders of the Roman Arcadia; Father Matteo Ricci, S.J., astronomer, and missionary to China; the architect Floriani, who constructed the fortifications of Malta. The united sees are suffragan of Fermo and contain 25 parishes, with 46,200 inhabitants; within their territory are 4 religious houses of men, and 9 of women; they have 4 educational institutes for male students, and 4 for girls, and a monthly theological publication.

CAPPELLETTI, *Chiese d'Italia*, III (Venice, 1857); FAGLIETTI, *Conferenze sulla storia antica maceratese* (Macerata, 1884); *Conferenze sulla storia medioevale maceratese* (Macerata, 1885).

U. BENIGNI.

McEvay, FERGUS PATRICK. See TORONTO, ARCHDIOCESE OF.

McFarland, FRANCIS PATRICK, third Bishop of Hartford (q. v.), b. at Franklin, Pa., 16 April, 1819; d. at Hartford, Conn., 2 October, 1874. His parents, John McFarland and Mary McKeever, emigrated from Armagh. From early childhood Francis had a predilection for the priestly state. Diligent and talented, he was employed as teacher in the village school, but soon entered Mount St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg, Md., where he graduated with high honours and was retained as teacher. The following year, 1845, he was ordained, 18 May, at New York by Archbishop Hughes, who immediately detailed the young priest to a professor's chair at St. John's College, Fordham. Father McFarland, however, longed for the direct ministry of souls and from his college made frequent missionary journeys among the scattered Catholics. After a year at Fordham he was appointed pastor of Watertown, N. Y., where his zeal was felt for many miles around. On March, 1851, he was transferred by his new ordinary, Bishop McCloskey of Albany, to St. John's Church, Utica. For seven years the whole city was edified by his "saintly labours", and the news of his apostolic achievements reached as far as Rome. He was appointed Vicar-Apostolic of Florida, 9 March, 1857. He declined the honour only to be elected Bishop of Hartford. He was consecrated at Providence, 14 March, 1858, and resided in that city until the division of his diocese in 1872 (see PROVIDENCE, DIOCESE OF). Failing health prompted him, while attending the Vatican Council, to resign his see. His confrères of the American episcopate would not hear of such a step. They had learned to regard him as the embodiment of the virtues of a bishop and one of the brightest ornaments of their order. By dividing the diocese it was hoped that his burden would be sufficiently lightened. He left Providence for Hartford 28 Feb., 1872. After reorganizing his diocese he immediately set about the erection of a cathedral, and to his enlightened initiative is owing the splendid edifice of which the Catholics of Connecticut are so justly proud. Bishop McFarland displayed rare wisdom in the administration of his see. His zeal and self-sacrifice carried him everywhere, preaching, catechizing, lecturing, moving among priests and people as a saint and scholar. He was a man of fine intellect and commanding presence. Austere and thoughtful, he always preserved a quiet dignity and the humility of the true servant of Christ. He collected a valuable theological library which he bequeathed to his diocese. His death at the early age of fifty-five was mourned as a calamity. His name is still a household word among the Catholics of Connecticut.

History of the Catholic Church in New England (Boston, 1899); *The Connecticut Catholic Year Book* (Hartford, Conn.); *The Catholic Transcript* (Hartford, Conn.), files.

T. S. DUGGAN.

MacFarlane, ANGUS. See DUNKELD, DIOCESE OF.

McFaul, JAMES A. See TRENTON, DIOCESE OF.

McGavick, ALEXANDER J. See CHICAGO, ARCHDIOCESE OF.

McGee, THOMAS D'ARCY, editor, politician, and poet, b. at Carlingford, Co. Louth, Ireland, 13 April, 1825; assassinated at Ottawa, Canada, 7 April, 1868. He was a precocious youth and emigrating to the United States at seventeen a speech he made soon after at Providence, Rhode Island, on the Repeal of

the Union between England and Ireland, brought him an offer of employment on the Boston "Pilot". His editorial and other contributions to this paper and public addresses attracted the attention of O'Connell who called them "the inspired utterances of a young exiled Irish boy in America". After this McGee returned to Dublin to take a place on the editorial staff of "The Freeman's Journal", but his advocacy of the advanced ideas of the Young Ireland Party caused him to leave that paper for a position on Charles Gavan Duffy's "Nation", in which many of his poems and patriotic essays were printed. In the subsequent revolutionary episodes of 1848 he figured as one of the most active leaders, being the secretary of the Irish Confederation, and was arrested and imprisoned for a short time because of an unwise speech. When the government began to suppress the movement and to arrest its leaders McGee escaped to the United States disguised as a priest. In New York he started a paper called "The Nation", but soon got into trouble with Bishop Hughes over his violent revolutionary ideas and diatribes against the priesthood in their relation to Irish politics. Changing the name of the paper to "The American Celt" he moved to Boston, thence to Buffalo and again back to New York.

In 1857 he settled in Montreal where he published another paper, "The New Era", and entering actively into local politics was elected to the Canadian Parliament, in which his ability as a speaker put him at once in the front rank. He changed the whole tenor of his political views and, as he advanced in official prominence, advocated British supremacy as loyally as he had formerly promoted the revolutionary doctrines of his youth. The Confederation of the British colonies of North America as the Dominion of Canada was due largely to his initiative. In the change of his political ideas he constantly embittered and attacked the revolutionary organizations of his fellow countrymen, and so made himself very obnoxious to them. It was this that led to his assassination by an overwrought fanatic. His literary activity in his earlier years brought forth many poems full of patriotic vigour, tenderness and melody, and a number of works, notably: "Irish Writers of the Seventeenth Century" (1846); "History of the Irish Settlers in North America" (1854); "History of the Attempt to establish the Protestant Reformation in Ireland" (1853); "Catholic History of North America" (1854); "History of Ireland" (1862).

SADLIER, *T. D. McGee's Poems with Introduction and Biographical Sketch* (New York, 1869); McCARTHY, *History of Our Own Times*, I (New York, 1887); FITZGERALD, *Ireland and Her People*, II (Chicago, 1910), s. v.; DUFFY, *Young Ireland* (London, 1880); IDEM, *Four Years of Irish History* (London, 1883).

THOMAS F. MEEHAN.

MacGeoghegan, JAMES, b. at Uisneach, Westmeath, Ireland, 1702; d. at Paris, 1763. He came of a family long settled in Westmeath and long holding a high position among the Leinster chiefs, and was related to that MacGeoghegan who so heroically defended the Castle of Dunboy against Carew, and also to Connell MacGeoghegan, who translated the Annals of Clonmacnoise. Early in the eighteenth century the penal laws were enacted and enforced against the Irish Catholics, and education, except in Protestant schools and colleges, was rigorously proscribed. Young MacGeoghegan, therefore, went abroad, and received his education at the Irish (then the Lombard) College in Paris, and in due course was ordained priest. Then for five years he filled the position of vicar in the parish of Poissy, in the Diocese of Chartres, "attending in choir, hearing confessions and administering sacraments in a laudable and edifying manner". In 1734 he was elected one of the provisors of the Lombard College, and subsequently was attached to the church of St-Merri in Paris. He was also for some time chaplain to the Irish troops in the service of France; and during these years he wrote a "History of Ireland". It was written in French and published at Paris in 1758. It was dedicated by the author to the Irish Brigade, and he is responsible for the interesting statement that for the fifty years following the Treaty of Limerick (1691) no less than 450,000 Irish soldiers died in the service of France. MacGeoghegan's "History" is the fruit of much labour and research, though, on account of his residence abroad, he was necessarily shut out from access to the manuscript materials of history in Ireland, and had to rely chiefly on Lynch and Colgan. Mitchel's "History of Ireland" professes to be merely a continuation of MacGeoghegan, though Mitchel is throughout much more of a partisan than MacGeoghegan.

MacGEOGHEGAN, *History of Ireland*, tr. O'KELLY (Dublin, 1831); O'CURRY, *MSS. Materials of Irish History* (Dublin, 1861); BOYLE, *The Irish College of Paris* (London, 1901).

E. A. D'ALTON.

McGolrick, JAMES. See DULUTH, DIOCESE OF.

Machabees, THE (Gr. Οἱ Μακκαβαῖοι; Lat. Machabæi; most probably from Aramaic מקבא, *maqqābā'*= "hammer"), a priestly family which under the leadership of Mathathias initiated the revolt against the tyranny of Antiochus IV Epiphanes, King of Syria, and after securing Jewish independence ruled the commonwealth till overthrown by Herod the Great. The name Machabee was originally the surname of Judas, the third son of Mathathias, but was later extended to all the descendants of Mathathias, and even to all who took part in the rebellion. It is also given to the martyrs mentioned in II Mach., vi, 18–vii. Of the various explanations of the word the one given above is the most probable. Machabee would accordingly mean "hammerer" or "hammer-like", and would have been given to Judas because of his valour in combating the enemies of Israel. The family patronymic of the Machabees was Hasmoneans or Asmoneans, from Hashmon, Gr. Ἀσαμωναῖος, an ancestor of Mathathias. This designation, which is always used by the old Jewish writers, is now commonly applied to the princes of the dynasty founded by Simon, the last of the sons of Mathathias.

Events leading to the Revolt of Mathathias.—The rising under Mathathias was caused by the attempt of Antiochus IV to force Greek paganism on his Jewish subjects. This was the climax of a movement to hellenize the Jews, begun with the king's approval by a party among the Jewish aristocracy, who were in favour of breaking down the wall of separation between Jew and Gentile and of adopting Greek customs. The leader of this party was Jesus, or Josue, better known by his Greek name Jason, the unworthy brother of the worthy high-priest Onias III. By promising the king a large sum of money, and by offering to become the promoter among the Jews of his policy of hellenizing the non-Greek population of his domains, he obtained the deposition of his brother and his own appointment to the high-priesthood (174 B. C.). As soon as he was installed he began the work of hellenizing and carried it on with considerable success. A gymnasium was built below the Acra (citadel), in close proximity to the temple, where the youths of Jerusalem were taught Greek sports. Even priests became addicted to the games and neglected the altar for the gymnasium. Many, ashamed of what a true Jew gloried in, had the marks of circumcision removed to avoid being recognized as Jews in the baths or the gymnasium. Jason himself went so far as to send money for the games celebrated at Tyre in honour of Hercules (I Mach., i, 11–16; II Mach., iv, 7–20). After three years Jason was forced to yield the pontificate to Menelaus, his agent with the king in money matters, who secured the office by outbidding his employer. To satisfy his obligations to the king, this man, who was a Jew only in name, appropriated sacred vessels, and when the former high-priest Onias pro-

tested against the sacrilege he procured his assassination. The following year Jason, emboldened by a rumor of the death of Antiochus, who was then warring against Egypt, attacked Jerusalem and forced Menelaus to take refuge in the Acra. On hearing of the occurrence Antiochus marched against the city, massacred many of the inhabitants, and carried off what sacred vessels were left (I Mach., i, 17–29; II Mach., iv, 23–v, 23).

In 168 B. C. Antiochus undertook a second campaign against Egypt, but was stopped in his victorious progress by an ultimatum of the Roman Senate. He vented his rage on the Jews, and began a war of extermination against their religion. Apollonius was sent with orders to hellenize Jerusalem by extirpating the native population and by peopling the city with strangers. The unsuspecting inhabitants were attacked on the Sabbath, when they would offer no defence; the men were slaughtered, the women and children sold into slavery. The city itself was laid waste and its walls demolished. An order was next issued abolishing Jewish worship and forbidding the observance of Jewish rites under pain of death. A heathen altar was built on the altar of holocausts, where sacrifices were offered to Olympic Jupiter, and the temple was profaned by pagan orgies. Altars were also set up throughout the country at which the Jews were to sacrifice to the king's divinities. Though many conformed to these orders, the majority remained faithful and a number of them laid down their lives rather than violate the law of their fathers. The Second Book of Machabees narrates at length the heroic death of an old man, named Eleazar, and of seven brothers with their mother. (I Mach., i, 30–67; II Mach., v, 24–vii, 41.)

The persecution proved a blessing in disguise; it exasperated even the moderate Hellenists, and prepared a rebellion which freed the country from the corrupting influences of the extreme Hellenist party. The standard of revolt was raised by Mathathias, as priest of the order of Joarib (cf. I Par., xxiv, 7), who to avoid the persecution had fled from Jerusalem to Modin (now El Mediyeh), near Lydda, with his five sons John, Simon, Judas, Eleazar and Jonathan. When solicited by a royal officer to sacrifice to the gods, with promises of rich rewards and of the king's favour, he firmly refused, and when a Jew approached the altar to sacrifice, he slew him together with the king's officer, and destroyed the altar. He and his sons then fled to the mountains, where they were followed by many of those who remained attached to their religion. Among these were the Ḥasîdîm, or Assideans, a society formed to oppose the encroaching Hellenism by a scrupulous observance of traditional customs. Mathathias and his followers now overran the country destroying heathen altars, circumcising children, driving off aliens and apostate Jews, and gathering in new recruits. He died, however, within a year (166 B. C.). At his death he exhorted his sons to carry on the fight for their religion, and appointed Judas military commander with Simon as adviser. He was buried at Modin amid great lamentations (I Mach., ii).

Judas Machabeus (*166–161* B. C.).—Judas fully justified his father's choice. In a first encounter he defeated and killed Apollonius, and shortly after routed Seron at Bethoron (I Mach., iii, 1–26). Lysias, the regent during Antiochus's absence in the East, then sent a large army under the three generals Ptolemee, Nicanor and Gorgias. Judas's little army unexpectedly fell on the main body of the enemy at Emmaus (later Nicopolis, now Amwâs) in the absence of Gorgias, and put it to rout before the latter could come to its aid; whereupon Gorgias took to flight (I Mach., iii, 27–iv, 25; II Mach., viii). The next year Lysias himself took the field with a still larger force; but he, too, was defeated at Bethsura (not Bethoron as in the Vulgate). Judas now occupied Jerusalem, though the Acra still remained in the hands of the Syrians. The temple was cleansed and rededicated on the day on which three years before it had been profaned (I Mach., iv, 26–61; II Mach., x, 1–8). During the breathing time left to him by the Syrians Judas undertook several expeditions into neighbouring territory, either to punish acts of aggression or to bring into Judea Jews exposed to danger among hostile populations (I Mach., v; II Mach., x, 14–38; xii, 3–40). After the death of Antiochus Epiphanes (164 B. C.) Lysias led two more expeditions into Judea. The first ended with another defeat at Bethsura, and with the granting of freedom of worship to the Jews (II Mach., xi). In the second, in which Lysias was accompanied by his ward, Antiochus V Eupator, Judas suffered a reverse at Bethzacharam (where Eleazar died a glorious death), and Lysias laid siege to Jerusalem. Just then troubles concerning the regency required his presence at home; he therefore concluded peace on condition that the city be surrendered (I Mach., vi, 21–63; II Mach., xiii). As the object for which the rebellion was begun, had been obtained, the Assideans seceded from Judas when Demetrius I, who in the meanwhile had dethroned Antiochus V, installed Alcimus, "a priest of the seed of Aaron", as high-priest (I Mach., vii, 1–19). Judas, however, seeing that the danger to religion would remain as long as the Hellenists were in power, would not lay down his arms till the country was freed of these men. Nicanor was sent to the aid of Alcimus, but was twice defeated and lost his life in the second encounter (I Mach., vii, 20–49; II Mach., xiv, 11–xv, 37). Judas now sent a deputation to Rome to solicit Roman interference; but before the senate's warning reached Demetrius, Judas with only 800 men risked a battle at Laisa (or Elasa) with a vastly superior force under Baccides, and fell overwhelmed by numbers (I Mach., viii–ix, 20). Thus perished a man worthy of Israel's most heroic days. He was buried beside his father at Modin (161 B. C.).

Jonathan (*161–143* B. C.).—The handful of men who still remained faithful to Judas's policy chose Jonathan as their leader. John was soon after killed by Arabs near Madaba, and Jonathan with his little army escaped the hands of Bacchides only by swimming the Jordan. Their cause seemed hopeless. Gradually, however, the number of adherents increased and the Hellenists were again obliged to call for help. Bacchides returned and besieged the rebels in Bethbessen; but disgusted at his ill success he returned to Syria (I Mach., ix, 23–72). During the next four years Jonathan was practically the master of the country. Then began a series of contests for the Syrian crown, which Jonathan turned to such good account that by shrewd diplomacy he obtained more than his brother had been able to win by his generalship and his victories. Both Demetrius I and his opponent Alexander Balas, sought to win him to their side. Jonathan took the part of Alexander, who appointed him high-priest and bestowed on him the insignia of a prince. Three years later, in reward for his services, Alexander conferred on him both the civil and military authority over Judea (I Mach., ix, 73–x, 66). In the conflict between Alexander and Demetrius II Jonathan again supported Alexander, and in return received the gift of the city of Accaron with its territory (I Mach., x, 67–89). After the fall of Alexander, Demetrius summoned Jonathan to Ptolemais to answer for his attack on the Acra; but instead of punishing him Demetrius confirmed him in all his dignities, and even granted him three districts of Samaria. Jonathan having lent efficient aid in quelling an insurrection at Antioch, Demetrius promised to withdraw the Syrian garrison from the Acra and other fortified places in Judea. As he failed to keep his word, Jonathan went over to the party of Antiochus VI, the son of Alexander Balas, whose claims Tryphon was press-

ing. Jonathan was confirmed in all his possessions and dignities, and Simon appointed commander of the seaboard. While giving valuable aid to Antiochus the two brothers took occasion to strengthen their own position. Tryphon fearing that Jonathan might interfere with his ambitious plans, treacherously invited him to Ptolemais and kept him a prisoner (I Mach., xi, 19–xii, 48).

Simon (*143–135* B. C.).—Simon was chosen to take the place of his captive brother, and by his vigilance frustrated Tryphon's attempt to invade Judea. Tryphon in revenge killed Jonathan with his two sons whom Simon had sent as hostages on Tryphon's promise to liberate Jonathan (I Mach., xiii, 1–23). Simon obtained from Demetrius II exemption from taxation and thereby established the independence of Judea. To secure communication with the port of Joppe, which he had occupied immediately upon his appointment, he seized Gazara (the ancient Gazer or Gezer) and settled it with Jews. He also finally drove the Syrian garrison out of the Acra. In recognition of his services the people decreed that the high-priesthood and the supreme command, civil and military, should be hereditary in his family. After five years of peace and prosperity under his wise rule Judea was threatened by Antiochus VII Sidetes, but his general Cendebeus was defeated at Modin by Judas and John, Simon's sons. A few months later Simon was murdered with two of his sons by his ambitious son-in-law Ptolemy (D. V. Ptolemee), and was buried at Modin with his parents and brothers, over whose tombs he had erected a magnificent monument (I Mach., xiii, 25–xvi, 17). After him the race quickly degenerated.

THE HASMONEANS.—*John Hyrcanus* (*135–105* B. C.). —Simon's third son John, surnamed Hyrcanus, who escaped the assassin's knife through timely warning, was recognized as high-priest and chief of the nation. In the first year of his rule Antiochus Sidetes besieged Jerusalem, and John was forced to capitulate though under rather favourable conditions. Renewed civil strife in Syria enabled John to enlarge his possessions by the conquest of Samaria, Idumea, and some territory beyond the Jordan. By forcing the Idumeans to accept circumcision he unwittingly opened the way for Herod's accession to the throne. In his reign we first meet with the two parties of the Pharisees and Sadducees. Towards the end of his life John allied himself with the latter.

Aristobulus I (*105–104* B. C.).—John left the civil power to his wife and the high-priesthood to his oldest son Aristobulus or Judas. But Aristobulus seized the reins of government and imprisoned his mother with three of his brothers. The fourth brother, Antigonus, he ordered to be killed, in a fit of jealousy instigated by a court cabal. He was the first to assume the title King of the Jews. His surname Φιλέλλην shows his Hellenistic proclivities.

Alexander Jannæus (*104–78* B. C.).—Aristobulus was succeeded by the oldest of his imprisoned brothers, Alexander Jannæus (Jonathan). Though generally unfortunate in his wars, he managed to acquire new territory, including the coast towns except Ascalon. His reign was marred by a bloody feud with the Pharisees.

The Last Machabees (*78–37* B. C.).—Alexander bequeathed the government to his wife Alexandra Salome, and the high-priesthood to his son Hyrcanus II. She ruled in accordance with the wishes of the Pharisees. At her death (69 B. C.) civil war broke out between Hyrcanus II and his brother Aristobulus II. This brought on Roman interference and loss of independence (63 B. C.). Hyrcanus, whom the Romans recognized as ethnarch, was ruler only in name. Aristobulus was poisoned in Rome by the adherents of Pompey, and his son Alexander was beheaded at Antioch by order of Pompey himself (49 B. C.). Antigonus, the son of Aristobulus, was made king by the Parthians; but the next year he was defeated by Herod with the aid of the Romans, and beheaded at Antioch (37 B. C.). With him ended the rule of the Machabees. Herod successively murdered (a) Aristobulus III, the grandson of both Aristobulus II and Hyrcanus II through the marriage of Alexander, the son of the former, with Alexandra, the daughter of the latter (35 B. C.); (b) Hyrcanus II (30 B. C.) and his daughter Alexandra (28 B. C.); (c) Mariamne, the sister of Aristobulus III (29 B. C.); and lastly his own two sons by Mariamne, Alexander and Aristobulus (7 B. C.). In this manner the line of the Machabees became extinct.

JOSEPHUS, *Antiq.*, XII, v–XV, vii; XVI, iv, x, xi; SCHÜRER, *Hist. of the Jewish People*, I (New York, 1891), i, 186 sq.; GRÄTZ, *Hist. of the Jews*, I (Philadelphia, 1891), 435 sq.; II, i sq.; STANLEY, *Lectures on the Hist. of the Jewish Church*, III (London, 1876); DE SAULCY, *Hist. des Machabées* (Paris, 1880); DERENBOURG, *Hist. de la Palestine* (Paris, 1867); WELLHAUSEN, *Israelitische und Jüdische Geschichte* (Berlin, 1894); CURTISS, *The Name Machabees* (Leipzig, 1876).

F. BECHTEL.

Machabees, THE BOOKS OF.—The title of four books, of which the first and second only are regarded by the Church as canonical; the third and fourth, as Protestants consider all four, are apocryphal. The first two have been so named because they treat of the history of the rebellion of the Machabees, the fourth because it speaks of the Machabee martyrs. The third, which has no connexion whatever with the Machabee period, no doubt owes its name to the fact that like the others it treats of a persecution of the Jews. For the canonicity of I and II Mach. see CANON OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

THE FIRST BOOK OF MACHABEES (Μακκαβαίων Α; Liber Primus Machabæorum).—*Contents.*—The First Book of the Machabees is a history of the struggle of the Jewish people for religious and political liberty under the leadership of the Machabee family, with Judas Machabeus as the central figure. After a brief introduction (i, 1–9) explaining how the Jews came to pass from the Persian domination to that of the Seleucids, it relates the causes of the rising under Mathathias and the details of the revolt up to his death (i, 10–ii); the glorious deeds and heroic death of Judas Machabeus (iii–ix, 22); the story of the successful leadership of Jonathan (ix, 23–xii), and of the wise administration of Simon (xiii–xvi, 17). It concludes (xvi, 18–24) with a brief mention of the difficulties attending the accession of John Hyrcanus and with a short summary of his reign (see MACHABEES, THE). The book thus covers the period between the years 175 and 135 B. C.

Character.—The narrative both in style and manner is modelled on the earlier historical books of the Old Testament. The style is usually simple, yet at times becomes eloquent and even poetic, as, for instance, in Mathathias's lament over the woes of the people and the profanation of the Temple (ii, 7–13), or in the eulogy of Judas Machabeus (iii, 1–9), or again in the description of the peace and prosperity of the people after the long years of war and suffering (xiv, 4–15). The tone is calm and objective, the author as a rule abstaining from any direct comment on the facts he is narrating. The more important events are carefully dated according to the Seleucid era, which began with the autumn of 312 B. C. It should be noted, however, that the author begins the year with spring (the month Nisan), whereas the author of II Mach. begins it with autumn (the month Tishri). By reason of this difference some of the events are dated a year later in the second than in the first book. (Cf. Patrizzi, "De Consensu Utriusque Libri Mach.", 27 sq.; Schürer, "Hist. of the Jewish People", I, i, 36 sq.)

Original Language.—The text from which all translations have been derived is the Greek of the Septuagint. But there is little doubt that the Septuagint is itself a translation of a Hebrew or Aramaic original, with the probabilities in favour of Hebrew. Not only

is the structure of the sentences decidedly Hebrew (or Aramaic), but many words and expressions occur which are literal renderings of Hebrew idioms (e. g., i, 4, 15, 16, 44; ii, 19, 42, 48; v, 37, 40; etc.). These peculiarities can scarcely be explained by assuming that the writer was little versed in Greek, for a number of instances show that he was acquainted with the niceties of the language. Besides, there are inexact expressions and obscurities which can be explained only in the supposition of an imperfect translation or a misreading of a Hebrew original (e. g., i, 16, 28; iv, 19, 24; xi, 28; xiv, 5). The internal evidence is confirmed by the testimony of St. Jerome and of Origen. The former writes that he saw the book in Hebrew: "Machabæorum primum librum Hebraicum reperi" (Prol. Galeat.). As there is no ground for assuming that St. Jerome refers to a translation, and as he is not likely to have applied the term Hebrew to an Aramaic text, his testimony tells strongly in favour of a Hebrew as against an Aramaic original. Origen states (Eusebius, "Hist. Eccl.", vi, 25) that the title of the book was Sarbeth Sarbane el (Σαρβὴθ Σαρβανὲ ἔλ), or more correctly Sarbeth Sabanaiel (Σ. Σαβαναιέλ). Though the meaning of this title is uncertain (a number of different explanations have been proposed, especially of the first reading), it is plainly either Hebrew or Aramaic. The fragment of a Hebrew text published by Chwolson in 1896, and later again by Schweitzer, has little claim to be considered as part of the original.

Author and Date of Composition.—No data can be found either in the book itself or in later writers which would give us a clue as to the person of the author. Names have indeed been mentioned, but on groundless conjecture. That he was a native of Palestine is evident from the language in which he wrote, and from the thorough knowledge of the geography of Palestine which he possessed. Although he rarely expresses his own sentiments, the spirit pervading his work is proof that he was deeply religious, zealous for the Law, and thoroughly in sympathy with the Machabean movement and its leaders. However, strange to say, he studiously avoids the use of the words "God" and "Lord" (that is in the better Greek text; in the ordinary text "God" is found once, and "Lord" three times; in the Vulgate both occur repeatedly); but this is probably due to reverence for the Divine names, Jahweh and Adonai, since he often uses the equivalents "heaven", "Thou", or "He". There is absolutely no ground for the opinion, maintained by some modern scholars, that he was a Sadducee. He does not, it is true, mention the unworthy high-priests, Jason and Menelaus; but as he mentions the no less unworthy Alcimus, and that in the severest terms, it cannot be said that he wishes to spare the priestly class.

The last verses show that the book cannot have been written till some time after the beginning of the reign of John Hyrcanus (135–105 B. C.), for they mention his accession and some of the acts of his administration. The latest possible date is generally admitted to be prior to 63 B. C., the year of the occupation of Jerusalem by Pompey; but there is some difference in fixing the approximately exact date. Whether it can be placed as early as the reign of Hyrcanus depends on the meaning of the concluding verse, "Behold these [the Acts of Hyrcanus] are written in the book of the days of his priesthood, from the time (ἀφ οὗ, "ex quo") that he was made high priest after his father". Many understand it to indicate that Hyrcanus was then still alive, and this seems to be the more natural meaning. Others, however, take it to imply that Hyrcanus was already dead. In this latter supposition the composition of the work must have followed close upon the death of that ruler. For not only does the vivid character of the narrative suggest an early period after the events, but the absence of even the slightest allusion to events later than the death of Hyrcanus, and, in particular, to the conduct of his two successors which aroused popular hatred against the Machabees, makes a much later date improbable. The date would, therefore, in any case, be within the last years of the second century B. C.

Historicity.—In the eighteenth century the two brothers E. F. and G. Wernsdorf made an attempt to discredit I Mach., but with little success. Modern scholars of all schools, even the most extreme, admit that the book is a historical document of the highest value. "With regard to the historical value of I Mach.", says Cornill (Einl., 3rd ed., 265), "there is but one voice; in it we possess a source of the very first order, an absolutely reliable account of one of the most important epochs in the history of the Jewish people." The accuracy of a few minor details concerning foreign nations has, however, been denied. The author is mistaken, it is said, when he states that Alexander the Great divided his empire among his generals (i, 7), or when he speaks of the Spartans as akin to the Jews (xii, 6, 7, 21); he is inexact in several particulars regarding the Romans (viii, 1 sq.); he exaggerates the numbers of elephants at the battle of Magnesia (viii, 6), and some other numbers (e. g., v, 34; vi, 30, 37; xi, 45, 48). But the author cannot be charged with whatever inaccuracies or exaggerations may be contained in viii, 1–16. He there merely sets down the reports, inexact and exaggerated, no doubt, in some particulars, which had reached Judas Machabeus. The same is true with regard to the statement concerning the kinship of the Spartans with the Jews. The author merely reproduces the letter of Jonathan to the Spartans, and that written to the high-priest Onias I by Arius.

When a writer simply reports the words of others, an error can be laid to his charge only when he reproduces their statements inaccurately. The assertion that Alexander divided his empire among his generals (to be understood in the light of vv. 9 and 10, where it is said that they "made *themselves* kings . . . and put crowns on themselves after his death"), cannot be shown to be erroneous. Quintus Curtius, who is the authority for the contrary view, acknowledges that there were writers who believed that Alexander made a division of the provinces by his will. As the author of I Mach. is a careful historian and wrote about a century and a half before Q. Curtius, he would deserve more credit than the latter, even if he were not supported by other writers. As to the exaggeration of numbers in some instances, in so far as they are not errors of copyists, it should be remembered that ancient authors, both sacred and profane, frequently do not give absolute figures, but estimated or popularly current numbers. Exact numbers cannot be reasonably expected in an account of a popular insurrection, like that of Antioch (xi, 45, 48), because they could not be ascertained. Now the same was often the case with regard to the strength of the enemy's forces and of the number of the enemy slain in battle. A modifying clause, such as "it is reported", must be supplied in these cases.

Sources.—That the author used written sources to a certain extent is witnessed by the documents which he cites (viii, 23–32; x, 3–6, 18–20, 25–45; xi, 30–37; xii, 6–23; etc.). But there is little doubt that he also derived most of the other matter from written records of the events, oral tradition being insufficient to account for the many and minute details. There is every reason to believe that such records existed for the Acts of Jonathan and Simon as well as for those of Judas (ix, 22), and of John Hyrcanus (xvi, 23–24). For the last part he may also have relied on the reminiscenses of older contemporaries, or even drawn upon his own.

Greek Text and Ancient Versions.—The Greek translation was probably made soon after the book was written. The text is found in three uncial codices,

namely the Sinaiticus, the Alexandrinus, and the Venetus, and in sixteen cursive MSS. The *textus receptus* is that of the Sixtine edition, derived from the Codex Venetus and some cursives. The best editions are those of Fritzsche ("Libri Apocryphi V. T.", Leipzig, 1871, 203 sq.) and of Swete ("O. T. in Greek", Cambridge, 1905, III, 594 sq.), both based on the Cod. Alexandrinus. The old Latin version in the Vulgate is that of the Itala, probably unretouched by St. Jerome. Part of a still older version, or rather recension (chap. i–xiii), was published by Sabatier (Biblior. Sacror. Latinæ Versiones Antiquæ, II, 1017 sq.), the complete text of which was recently discovered in a MSS. at Madrid. Two Syriac versions are extant: that of the Peshitto, which follows the Greek text of the Lucian recension, and another published by Ceriani ("Translatio Syra photolithographice edita", Milan, 1876, 592–615), which reproduces the ordinary Greek text.

THE SECOND BOOK OF MACHABEES (Μακκαβαίων Β; Liber Secundus Machabæorum). — *Contents.* — The Second Book of Machabees is not, as the name might suggest, a continuation of the First, but covers part of the same ground. The book proper (ii, 20–xv, 40) is preceded by two letters of the Jews of Jerusalem to their Egyptian coreligionists (i, 1–ii, 19). The first (i, 1–10a), dated in the year 188 of the Seleucid era (i. e. 124 B. C.), beyond expressions of goodwill and an allusion to a former letter, contains nothing but an invitation to the Jews of Egypt to celebrate the feast of the Dedication of the Temple (instituted to commemorate its rededication, I Mach., iv, 59; II Mach., x, 8). The second (i, 10b–ii, 19), which is undated, is from the "senate" (γερουσία) and Judas (Machabeus) to Aristobulus, the preceptor or counsellor of Ptolemy (D. V. Ptolemee) (Philometor), and to the Jews in Egypt. It informs the Egyptian Jews of the death of Antiochus (Epiphanes) while attempting to rob the temple of Nanea, and invites them to join their Palestinian brethren in celebrating the feasts of the Dedication and of the Recovery of the Sacred Fire. The story of the recovery of the sacred fire is then told, and in connexion with it the story of the hiding by the Prophet Jeremias of the tabernacle, the ark and the altar of incense. After an offer to send copies of the books which Judas had collected after the example of Nehemias, it repeats the invitation to celebrate the two feasts, and concludes with the hope that the dispersed of Israel might soon be gathered together in the Holy Land.

The book itself begins with an elaborate preface (ii, 20–33) in which the author after mentioning that his work is an epitome of the larger history in five books of Jason of Cyrene states his motive in writing the book, and comments on the respective duties of the historian and of the epitomizer. The first part of the book (iii–iv, 6) relates the attempt of Heliodorus, prime minister of Seleucus IV (187–175 B. C.), to rob the treasures of the Temple at the instigation of a certain Simon, and the troubles caused by this latter individual to Onias III. The rest of the book is the history of the Machabean rebellion down to the death of Nicanor (161 B. C.), and therefore corresponds to I Mach., i, 11–vii, 50. Section iv, 7–x, 9, deals with the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes (I Mach., i, 11–vi, 16), while section x, 10–xv, 37, records the events of the reigns of Antiochus Eupator and Demetrius I (I Mach., vi, 17–vii, 50). II Mach. thus covers a period of only fifteen years, from 176 to 161 B. C. But while the field is narrower, the narrative is much more copious in details than I Mach., and furnishes many particulars, for instance, names of persons, which are not found in the first book.

Object and Character.—On comparing the two Books of Machabees it is plainly seen that the author of the Second does not, like the author of the First, write history merely to acquaint his readers with the stirring events of the period with which he is dealing. He writes history with a view to instruction and edification. His first object is to exalt the Temple of Jerusalem as the centre of Jewish worship. This appears from the pains he takes to extol on every occasion its dignity and sanctity. It is "the great temple" (ii, 20), "the most renowned" and "the most holy in all the world" (ii, 23; v, 15), "the great and holy temple" (xiv, 31); even heathen princes esteemed it worthy of honour and glorified it with great gifts (iii, 2–3; v, 16; xiii, 23); the concern of the Jews in time of danger was more for the holiness of the Temple than for their wives and children (xv, 18); God protects it by miraculous interpositions (iii, xiv, 31 sq.), and punishes those guilty of sacrilege against it (iii, 24 sq.; ix, 16; xiii, 6–8; xiv, 31 sq.; xv, 32); if He has allowed it to be profaned, it was because of the sins of the Jews (v, 17–20). It is, no doubt, with this design that the two letters, which otherwise have no connexion with the book, were prefixed to it. The author apparently intended his work specially for the Jews of the Dispersion, and more particularly for those of Egypt, where a schismatical temple had been erected at Leontopolis about 160 B. C. The second object of the author is to exhort the Jews to faithfulness to the Law, by impressing upon them that God is still mindful of His covenant, and that He does not abandon them unless they first abandon Him; the tribulations they endure are a punishment for their unfaithfulness, and will cease when they repent (iv, 17; v, 17, 19; vi, 13, 15, 16; vii, 32, 33, 37, 38; viii, 5, 36; xiv, 15; xv, 23, 24). To the difference of object corresponds a difference in tone and method. The author is not satisfied with merely relating facts, but freely comments on persons and acts, distributing praise or blame as they may deserve when judged from the standpoint of a true Israelite. Supernatural intervention in favour of the Jews is emphasized. The style is rhetorical, the dates are comparatively few. As has been remarked, the chronology of II Mach. slightly differs from that of I Mach.

Author and Date.—II Mach. is, as has been said, an epitome of a larger work by a certain Jason of Cyrene. Nothing further is known of this Jason except that, judging from his exact geographical knowledge, he must have lived for some time in Palestine. The author of the epitome is unknown. From the prominence which he gives to the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, it has been inferred that he was a Pharisee. Some have even maintained that his book was a Pharisaical partisan writing. This last, at any rate, is a baseless assertion. II Mach. does not speak more severely of Alcimus than I Mach., and the fact that it mentions the high-priests, Jason and Menelaus, by name no more proves it to be a Pharisaic partisan writing, than the omission of their names in I Mach. proves that to be a Sadducee production. Jason must have finished his work shortly after the death of Nicanor, and before disaster overtook Judas Machabeus, as he not only omits to allude to that hero's death, but makes the statement, which would be palpably false if he had written later, that after the death of Nicanor Jerusalem always remained in the possession of the Jews (xv, 38). The epitome cannot have been written earlier than the date of the first letter, that is 124 B. C.

As to the exact date there is great divergence. In the very probable supposition that the first letter was sent with a copy of the book, the latter would be of about the same date. It cannot in any case be very much later, since the demand for an abridged form of Jason's history, to which the author alludes in the preface (ii, 25–26), must have arisen within a reasonably short time after the publication of that work. The second letter must have been written soon after the death of Antiochus, before the exact circumstances concerning it had become known in Jerusalem, therefore about 163 B. C. That the Antiochus there mentioned is Antiochus IV and not Antiochus III, as many Catholic

commentators maintain, is clear from the fact that his death is related in connexion with the celebration of the Feast of the Dedication, and that he is represented as an enemy of the Jews, which is not true of Antiochus III.

Original Language.—The two letters which were addressed to the Jews of Egypt, who knew little or no Hebrew or Aramaic, were in all probability written in Greek. That the book itself was composed in the same language, is evident from the style, as St. Jerome already remarked (Prol. Gal.). Hebraisms are fewer than would be expected considering the subject, whereas Greek idioms and Greek constructions are very numerous. Jason's Hellenistic origin, and the absence in the epitome of all signs that would mark it as a translation, are sufficient to show that he also wrote in Greek.

Historicity.—The Second Book of Machabees is much less thought of as a historical document by non-Catholic scholars than the First, though Niese has recently come out strongly in its defence. The objections brought against the two letters need not, however, concern us, except in so far as they affect their authenticity, of which hereafter. These letters are on the same footing as the other documents cited in I and II Mach.; the author is therefore not responsible for the truth of their contents. We may, then, admit that the story of the sacred fire, as well as that of the hiding of the tabernacle, etc., is a pure legend, and that the account of the death of Antiochus as given in the second letter is historically false; the author's credit as a historian will not in the least be diminished thereby. Some recent Catholic scholars have thought that errors could also be admitted in the book itself without casting any discredit on the epitomizer, inasmuch as the latter declines to assume responsibility for the exact truth of all its contents. But though this view may find some support in the Vulgate (ii, 29), it is hardly countenanced by the Greek text. Besides, there is no need to have recourse to a theory which, while absolving the author from formal error, would admit real inaccuracies in the book, and so lessen its historical value. The difficulties urged against it are not such as to defy satisfactory explanation. Some are based on a false interpretation of the text, as when, for instance, it is credited with the statement that Demetrius landed in Syria with a mighty host and a fleet (xiv, 1), and is thus placed in opposition to I Mach., vii, 1, where he is said to have landed with a few men. Others are due to subjective impressions, as when the supernatural apparitions are called into question. The exaggeration of numbers has been dealt with in connexion with I Mach.

The following are the main objections with some real foundation: (1) The campaign of Lysias, which I Mach., iv, 26–34, places in the last year of Antiochus Epiphanes, is transferred in II Mach., xi, to the reign of Antiochus Eupator; (2) The Jewish raids on neighbouring tribes and the expeditions into Galilee and Galaad, represented in I Mach., v, as carried on in rapid succession after the rededication of the temple, are separated in II Mach. and placed in a different historical setting (viii, 30; x, 15–38; xii, 10–45); (3) The account given in II Mach., ix, differs from that of I Mach., vi, regarding the death of Antiochus Epiphanes, who is falsely declared to have written a letter to the Jews; (4) The picture of the martyrdoms in vi, 18–vii, is highly coloured, and it is improbable that Antiochus was present at them.

To these objections it may be briefly answered: (1) The campaign spoken of in II Mach., xi, is not the same as that related in I Mach., iv; (2) The events mentioned in viii, 30 and x, 15 sq. are not narrated in I Mach., v. Before the expedition into Galaad (xii, 10 sq.) can be said to be out of its proper historical setting, it would have to be proved that I Mach. invariably adheres to chronological order, and that the events grouped together in chap. v took place in rapid succession; (3) The two accounts of the death of Antiochus Epiphanes differ, it is true, but they fit very well into one another. Considering the character of Antiochus and the condition he was in at the time, it is not at all improbable that he wrote a letter to the Jews; (4) There is no reason to doubt that in spite of the rhetorical form the story of the martyrdoms is substantially correct. As the place where they occurred is unknown, it is hard to see on what ground the presence of Antiochus is denied It should be noted, moreover, that the book betrays accurate knowledge in a multitude of small details, and that it is often supported by Josephus, who was unacquainted with it. Even its detractors admit that the earlier portion is of the greatest value, and that in all that relates to Syria its knowledge is extensive and minute. Hence it is not likely that it would be guilty of the gross errors imputed to it.

Authenticity of the Two Letters.—Although these letters have a clear bearing on the purpose of the book, they have been declared to be palpable forgeries. Nothing, however, justifies such an opinion. The glaring contradiction in the first letter, which represents the climax of affliction as having been experienced under Demetrius II, has no existence. The letter does not compare the sufferings under Demetrius with those of the past, but speaks of the whole period of affliction including the time of Demetrius. The legend of the sacred fire etc., proves nothing against the genuineness of the second letter, unless it be shown that no such legend existed at the time. The false account of the death of Antiochus Epiphanes is rather a proof in favour of the authenticity of the letter. Such an account would be quite natural if the letter was written soon after the first news, exaggerated and distorted as first news often is, had reached Jerusalem. There remains only the so-called blunder of attributing the building of the Temple to Nehemias. The very improbability of such a gross blunder on the part of an educated Jew (the supposed forger) should have made the critics pause. Nehemias put the last touches to the Temple (II Esdr., ii, 8; Josephus, "Antiq.", XI, v, 6) which justifies the use of *ὠκοδομήσας*. Codex 125 (Mosquensis) reads *ὠκονομήσας* "having ordered the service of the temple and altar"; this would remove all difficulty (cf. II Esdr., x, 32 sq.; xiii sqq.).

Greek Text and Versions.—The Greek text is usually found in the same MSS. as I Mach.; it is wanting, however, in the Cod. Sinaiticus. The Latin version in the Vulgate is that of the Itala. An older version was published by Peyron and again by Ceriani from the Codex Ambrosianus. A third Latin text is found in the Madrid MSS. which contains an old version of I Mach. The Syriac version is often a paraphrase rather than a translation.

THE THIRD AND FOURTH BOOKS OF MACHABEES.—III Mach. is the story of a persecution of the Jews in Egypt under Ptolemy IV Philopator (222–205 B. C.), and therefore has no right to its title. Though the work contains much that is historical, the story is a fiction. IV Mach. is a Jewish-Stoic philosophical treatise on the supremacy of pious reason, that is religious principles, over the passions. The martyrdom of Eleazar and of the seven brothers (II Mach., vi, 18–vii) is introduced to illustrate the author's thesis. Neither book has any claim to canonicity, though the first for a while received favourable consideration in some Churches.

GIGOT, *Spec. Introd.*, I (New York, 1901), 365 sq.; CORNELY, *Introd.*, II (Paris, 1897), i, 440 sq.; KNABENBAUER, *Comm. in Lib. Mach.* (Paris, 1907); PATRIZZI, *De Consensu Utriusq. Lib. Mach.* (Rome, 1856); FRÖLICH, *De Fontibus Historiæ Syriæ in Lib. Mach.* (Vienna, 1746); KHELL, *Auctoritas Utriusq. Lib. Mach.* (Vienna, 1749); HERKENNE, *Die Briefe zu Beginn des Zweiten Makkabäerbuches* (Freiburg, 1904); GILLET, *Les Machabées* (Paris, 1880); BEURLIER in *Vig. Dict. de la Bible*, IV, 488 sq.; LESÊTRE, *Introd.*, II (Paris, 1890); VIGOUROUX, *Man. Bibl.*, II (Paris, 1899), 217 sq.; IDEM, *La Bible et la Critique*

Ration., 5th ed., IV, 638 sq.; SCHÜRER, *Hist. of the Jewish People* (New York, 1891), II, iii, 6 sq.; 211 sq.; 244 sq.; FAIRWEATHER in HASTINGS, *Dict. of the Bible*, III, 187 sq.; NIESE, *Kritik der beiden Makkabäerbücher* (Berlin, 1900); GRIMM, *Kurzgefasstes Exeg. Handbuch zu den Apokryphen*, Fasc. 3 and 4 (Leipzig, 1853, 1857); KEIL, *Comm. über die Bücher der Makkabäer* (Leipzig, 1875); KAUTZSCH (AND KAMPHAUSEN), *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des A. T.* (Tübingen, 1900).

F. BECHTEL.

MacHale, JOHN, b. 6 March, 1791, at Tubbernavine, Co. Mayo, Ireland; d. at Tuam, 4 November, 1881. He was so feeble at his birth that he was baptized at home by Father Conroy, who, six years later, was unjustly hanged during the Irish Rebellion. Though Irish was always spoken by the peasants at that time, the MacHale children were all taught English. When he was old enough John ran barefoot with his brothers to the hedge-school, then the sole means of instruction for Catholic peasant children, who on fine days conned their lessons in a dry ditch under a hedge, and in wet weather were gathered into a rough barn. John was an eager pupil, and listened attentively to lives of saints, legends, national songs, and historical tales, related by his elders, as well as to the accounts of the French Revolution given by an eyewitness, his uncle, Father MacHale, who had just escaped from France. Three important events happened during John's sixth year: the Irish Rebellion of 1798; the landing at Killala of French troops, whom the boy, hidden in a stacked sheaf of flax, watched marching through a mountain pass to Castlebar; and a few months later the brutal execution of Father Conroy on a false charge of high treason. These occurrences made an indelible impression upon the child's singularly acute mind. After school hours he betook himself to the study of Irish history, under the guidance of an excellent old scholar in the neighbourhood. Being destined for the priesthood the boy was sent to a school at Castlebar to learn Latin, Greek, and English grammar. In his sixteenth year the Bishop of Killala gave him a bursarship in the ecclesiastical college at Maynooth.

The emigrant French priests who then taught at Maynooth, appreciated the linguistic aptitude of the young man and taught him not only French, but also Latin, Greek, Italian, German, Hebrew, and the English classics. After seven years of hard work, having acquired a profound knowledge of theology, he was appointed in 1814 lecturer in that science, although only a sub-deacon. Before the end of the year, however, at the age of twenty-four, he was ordained a priest by Dr. Murray, Archbishop of Dublin. Father MacHale continued his lectures at Maynooth until 1820, when he was nominated professor of theology. He was much esteemed by his students, whom he strove to render as zealous, earnest, and sincere as himself, and he never failed to give them very practical advice about their duties and studies.

Dr. MacHale was then above medium height, of rather an athletic figure. Dignified and reserved in demeanour, his simple unassuming manners and attractive conversation procured him many admirers, including the Duke of Leinster, who often invited him to Carton, where he had frequent opportunities of meeting men capable of appreciating his intellect and character. About this period he commenced a series of letters signed "Hierophilus", vigorously attacking the Irish Established Church. They attracted the notice of Daniel O'Connell and led to a very sincere friendship between these two Irish patriots. In 1825, Leo XII appointed him Bishop of Maronia, *in partibus*, and coadjutor to Dr. Waldron, Bishop of Killala. After his consecration in Maynooth College chapel, the new prelate, who was warmly received by Dr. Waldron and his people, devoted himself to his sacred duties. He preached Irish and English sermons, and superintended the missions given in the diocese for the Jubilee of 1825. The next year Dr. MacHale joined Bishop Doyle ("J. K. L.") in denouncing the proselytising Kildare Street Society of Dublin to which the Government unjustifiably gave countenance. He also attended the annual meeting of the Irish bishops, and gave evidence at Maynooth College before the Parliamentary Commissioners then inquiring into the condition of education in Ireland.

About this time he also revised a theological manual "On the Evidences and Doctrines of the Catholic Church", afterwards translated into German. With his friend and ally, Daniel O'Connell, MacHale took a prominent part in the important question of Catholic Emancipation, impeaching in unmeasured terms the severities of the penal code, which branded Catholics with the stamp of inferiority. During 1826 his zeal was omnipresent; "he spoke to the people in secret and in public, by night and by day, on the highways and in places of public resort, calling up the memories of the past, denouncing the wrongs of the present, and promising imperishable rewards to those who should die in their struggle for the faith. He called on the Government to remember how the Union was carried by Mr. Pitt on the distinct assurance and implied promise that Catholic Emancipation, which had been denied by the Irish Parliament, should be granted by the Parliament of the Empire" (Burke, "The History of the Catholic Archbishops of Tuam").

In two letters written to the prime minister, Earl Grey, he described the distress occasioned by starvation and fever in Connaught, the ruin of the linen trade, the vestry tax for the benefit of Protestant churches, the tithes to the Protestant clergy, which Catholics were obliged to pay as well as their Protestant countrymen, the exorbitant rents exacted by absentee landlords, and the crying abuse of forcing the peasantry to buy seed-corn and seed-potatoes from landlords and agents at usurious charges. No attention was vouchsafed to these letters. Dr. MacHale accompanied to London a deputation of Mayo gentlemen, who received only meaningless assurances from Earl Grey. After witnessing the coronation of William IV at Westminster Abbey, the bishop, requiring change of air on account of ill-health, went on to Rome, but not before he had addressed to the premier another letter informing him that the scarcity in Ireland "was a famine in the midst of plenty, the oats being exported to pay rents, tithes, etc., and that the English people were actually sending back in charity what had grown originally on Irish soil *plus* freightage and insurance". It may be observed that Dr. MacHale never blamed the English people, whose generosity he ever acknowledged. On the other hand he severely condemned the Government for its incapacity, its indifference to the wrongs of Ireland, that aroused in the Irish peasantry a sullen hatred unknown to their more simple-minded forefathers. During an absence of sixteen months he wrote excellent descriptive letters of all he saw on the Continent. They were eagerly read in "The Freeman's Journal", while the sermons he preached in Rome were so admired that they were translated into Italian. Amid the varied interests of the Eternal City he was ever mindful of Ireland's woes and forwarded thence another protest to Earl Grey against tithes, cess, and proselytism, this last grievance being then rampant, particularly in Western Connaught. On his return he became an opponent of the proposed system of National Schools, fearing that the bill as originally framed, was an insidious attempt to weaken the faith of Irish children.

Dr. Kelly, Archbishop of Tuam, died in 1834, and the clergy selected Dr. MacHale as one of three candidates, to the annoyance of the Government who despatched agents to induce the pope not to nominate the Bishop of Maronia to the vacant see. Gregory XVI dryly remarked "that ever since the Relief Bill had passed, the English Government never failed to interfere about every appointment as it fell vacant"

(Greville, "Memoirs", pt. II). Disregarding their request, the pope appointed Dr. MacHale Archbishop of Tuam. He was the first prelate since the Reformation, who had received his entire education in Ireland. The corrupt practices of general parliamentary elections and the Tithe war caused frequent rioting and bloodshed, and were the subjects of no little denunciation by the new archbishop, until matters were tardily settled by the passing of a Tithes Bill in 1838. In spite of the labours of his diocese, which he always zealously fulfilled, Archbishop MacHale now began in the newspapers a series of open letters to the Government, whereby he frequently harassed the ministers into activity in Irish affairs. During the Autumn of 1835, he visited the Island of Achill, a stronghold of the Bible Readers. In order to offset their proselytism, he sent thither more priests and Franciscan monks of the Third Order. Although Dr. MacHale had strong views as to the proper relief of the poor and the education of youth, he condemned the Poor Law, and the system of National Schools and Queen's Colleges as devised by the Government. He founded his own schools, entrusting those for boys to the Christian Brothers and Franciscan monks, while Sisters of Mercy and Presentation Nuns taught the girls. But the want of funds naturally restricted the number of these schools which had to be supplemented by the National Board at a later period, when the necessary amendments had been added to the Bill.

The Repeal of the Union, advocated by Daniel O'Connell, enlisted his ardent sympathy and he assisted the Liberator in many ways, and remitted subscriptions from his priests for this purpose. We are told by his biographer O'Reilly, that like his friend, the prelate "was for a thorough and universal organisation of Irishmen in a movement for obtaining by legal and peaceful agitation the restoration of Ireland's legislative independence". The Charitable Bequests Bill, formerly productive of numerous lawsuits owing to its animus against donations to religious orders, was vehemently opposed by the archbishop. In this he differed considerably from some other Irish prelates, who thought that each bishop should exercise his own judgment as to his acceptance of a commissionership on the Board, or as regarded the partial application of the Act. The latter has since then been so amended, that in its present form it is quite favourable to Catholic charities and the Catholic poor. In his zeal for the cause of the Catholic religion and of Ireland, so long down-trodden, Dr. MacHale frequently incurred from his opponents the charge of intemperate language, something not altogether undeserved. He did not possess that suavity of manner which is so invaluable to leaders of men and public opinion, and so he alarmed or offended others. In his anxiety to reform abuses and to secure the welfare of Ireland, by an uncompromising and impetuous zeal, he made many bitter and unrelenting enemies. This was particularly true of British ministers and their supporters, by whom he was dubbed "a firebrand", and "a dangerous demagogue". Cardinal Barnabò, Prefect of Propaganda, who had serious disagreements with Dr. MacHale, declared he was a twice-dyed Irishman, a good man ever insisting on getting his own way. This excessive inflexibility, not sufficiently tempered by prudence, explains his more or less stormy career.

During the calamitous famine of 1846–47, nothing could exceed his energy and activity on behalf of the afflicted people. He vainly warned the Government as to the awful state of Ireland, reproached them for their dilatoriness in coming to the rescue, and held up the uselessness of relief works expended on high roads instead of on quays and piers to develop the sea fisheries. From England as well as other parts of the world, cargoes of food were sent to the starving Irish. Bread and soup were distributed from the archbishop's own kitchen, and he drove about regularly to relieve hungry children and people too weak and infirm to seek for food in Tuam. The enormous donations sent to him were punctiliously acknowledged, accounted for, and promptly disbursed by his clergy among the victims of fever and famine. The death of Daniel O'Connell (1847) was a deep sorrow to Dr. MacHale. He was also much grieved at the dissensions of the Repealers, and the violent tactics of the Young Ireland Party, who would not listen to his wise and patriotic advice. In 1848, he visited Rome and by his representations to Pius IX inflicted a deadly blow upon the Queen's Colleges. He also succeeded in preventing diplomatic intercourse between the British Government and Rome. The Synod of Thurles, held in 1850, emphasized the different views entertained by the hierarchy respecting the education question. On that occasion Dr. MacHale strongly protested against giving any countenance to a mixed system of education already condemned by the pope. During the recrudescence of "No Popery" in 1851, on the occasion of the re-establishment of the English Catholic hierarchy, and the passing of an intolerant Ecclesiastical Titles Bill that inflicted penalties upon any Roman Catholic prelate who assumed the title of his see, Dr. MacHale boldly signed his letters to Government on this subject "John, Archbishop of Tuam". This act of defiance so startled the Cabinet that it was considered more prudent not to attempt a prosecution and to allow the Bill to remain a dead letter.

As to the Catholic University, though Dr. MacHale had been foremost in advocating the project, he disagreed completely with Dr. Cullen, Archbishop of Dublin (afterward Cardinal), concerning its management and control, and the appointment of Dr. Newman as rector. The want of concord among the Irish bishops on this question, and the honest but totally wrong opinions of Dr. MacHale, handicapped the new university. The archbishop approved of Tenant Right and also of the Irish Tenant League. He wrote to O'Connell's son that it "was the assertion of the primitive right of man to enjoy in security and peace the fruit of his industry and labour". At a conference held in Dublin, men of all creeds supported his views on "fixity of tenure, free sale, and fair rent". Though it is impossible to relate all the events of a life which the "Freeman's Journal" described as the history of Ireland for the greater part of the nineteenth century, enough has been written to show how by pen, word, and deed, "the Lion of Juda" endeavoured to benefit his country. Toward the end of his life he withdrew very much from active politics, though he was happy enough to live to see the dawn of more prosperous days for Ireland.

Notwithstanding his very advanced years, Dr. MacHale attended the Vatican Council in 1869. With several distinguished prelates of various nationalities, he thought that the favourable moment had not arrived for an immediate definition of the dogma of papal infallibility; consequently, he spoke and voted in the council against its promulgation. Once the dogma had been defined, Dr. MacHale instantly submitted his judgment to the Holy See, and in his own cathedral he declared the dogma of infallibility "to be true Catholic doctrine, which he believed as he believed the Apostles' Creed", a public profession that further raised John of Tuam in the estimation of all who admired his great genius and virtue. In 1877, to the disappointment of the archbishop who desired that his nephew should be his co-adjutor, Dr. McEvilly, Bishop of Galway, was elected by the clergy of the archdiocese, and was commanded by Leo XIII after some delay, to assume his post. Although the aged prelate had opposed this election as far as possible, he submitted to the papal order, without protest or resentment. In private life Dr. MacHale never wasted time, for he was always employed in study, business and prayer. He was noted for his charity to the poor,

his strict fulfilment of every sacred duty, and the affectionate consideration and hospitality ever displayed towards his clergy. His intense respect for sacerdotal dignity rendered him slow to reprimand, though he was inflexible in matters of faith and principle. Every Sunday he preached a sermon in Irish at the cathedral, and during his diocesan visitations he always addressed the poor people in their native tongue. On journeys he usually conversed in Irish with his attendant chaplain, and never addressed in any other tongue the poor people of Tuam or the beggars who greeted him whenever he went out. He always encouraged the preservation of the Irish language, and compiled in it a catechism and a prayer-book. Moreover, he made translations into Irish of portions of the Holy Scriptures as well as the magnificent Latin hymns, "Dies Iræ" and "Stabat Mater". He translated into Irish Moore's "Melodies" and Homer's "Iliad". In the preface to his translation of the first book of the "Iliad" he wrote that "there is no European tongue better adapted than ours (Irish) to a full or perfect version of Homer". These Irish works of Dr. MacHale excited the sincere admiration of all Celtic scholars who were able to appreciate the beauty of his classical Gaelic. He celebrated the golden jubilee of his episcopacy in 1875. The venerable old man lived for six more years, maintaining his usual mode of life as far as his strength permitted and making the visitations of his diocese. He preached his last Irish sermon after his Sunday Mass, April, 1881 He died after a short illness, and is buried in Tuam Cathedral.

NICOLÒ MACHIAVELLI
XV-century terra-cotta, Florence

O'REILLY, *Life of John MacHale, Archbishop of Tuam*, 2 vols. (New York); MOORE in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, s. v.; BURKE, *Lives of the Catholic Archbishops of Tuam;* CUSACK, *The Liberator, his Life and Times* (Dublin, —); JUSTIN H. M'CARTHY, *Ireland since the Union; A roll of honour of Irish prelates and priests of the last century;* preface by JOHN HEALY. See also ASHLEY, *Life of Palmerston*, 2 vols.; *Memoirs of Charles Greville* (London, 1875); DUFFY, *League of North and South;* PARKER, *Life of Sir Robert Peel.*

M. T. KELLY.

Machiavelli, NICOLÒ, historian and statesman, b. at Florence, 3 May, 1469; d. there, 22 June, 1527. His family is said to have been descended from the old marquesses of Tuscany, and to have given Florence thirteen gonfaloniers of justice. His father, Bernardo, was a lawyer, and acted as treasurer of the Marches, but was far from wealthy. Of Nicolò's studies we only know that he was a pupil of Marcello Virgilio. In 1498 he was elected secretary of the Lower Chancery of the Signory, and in later years he held the same post under the Ten. Thus it chanced that for fourteen years he had charge of the home and foreign correspondence of the republic, the registration of trials, the keeping of the minutes of the councils, and the drafting of agreements with other states. Moreover he was sent in various capacities to one or other locality within the State of Tuscany, and on twenty-three occasions he acted as legate on important embassies to foreign princes, e. g. to Catherine Sforza (1499), to France (1500, 1510, 1511), to the emperor (1507, 1509), to Rome (1503, 1506), to Cæsar Borgia (1502), to Gian Paolo Baglione at Perugia, to the Petrucci at Siena, and to Piombino. On these embassies he gave evidence of wonderful keenness of observation and insight into the hidden thoughts of the men he was dealing with, rather than of any great diplomatic skill. After the defeat of France in Italy (1512) the Medici once more obtained control of Florence; the secretary was dismissed and exiled for one year from the city. On the discovery of the Capponi and Boscoli plot against Cardinal Giovanni de' Medici, Machiavelli was accused as an accomplice, and tortured, but he was set free when the cardinal became Pope Leo X. Thereupon he retired to some property he had at Strada near San Casciano, where he gave himself up to the study of the classics, especially Livy, and to the writing of his political and literary histories. Both Leo X and Clement VII sought his advice in political matters, and he was often employed on particular missions affecting matters of state, as, for instance, when he was sent to Francesco Guiccardini, the papal leader in the Romagna and general of the army of the League, concerning the fortification of Florence. He made vain efforts to secure a public post under the Medici, being ready even to sacrifice his political opinions for the purpose. He returned home after the sack of Rome (12 May, 1527) when the power of the Medici had been once more overthrown, but his old political party turned against him as one who fawned on tyrants. He died soon afterwards.

Machiavelli's writings consist of the following works:—*Historical:*—"Storie Fiorentine", which goes from the fall of the Empire to 1492, dedicated to Clement VII, at whose request it had been written. "Descrizione del modo tenuto dal duca Valentino nello ammazzare Vitellozzo Vitelli, etc."; "Vita di Castruccio Castracane"; "Discorsi sopra la prima deca di Tito Livio"; "Descrizione della peste di Firenze dell' anno 1527"; to this group belong also his letters from his embassies as well as his minor writings concerning the affairs of Pisa, Lucca, France, Germany. *Political:*—"Il Principe", "Discorso sopra il Riformare lo Stato di Firenze"; "Dell'arte della guerra", and other military works. *Literary:*—"Dialogo sulle lingue"; five comedies: "Mandragola"; "Clizia"; a comedy in prose; "The Andria" of Terence, a translation; a comedy in verse; "I Decennali" (a metrical history of the years 1495–1504); "Dell' Asino d'oro", writings on moral subjects; "La serenata"; "Canti Carnascialeschi"; a novel, "Belfagor", etc.

Machiavelli's character as a man and a writer has been widely discussed, and on both heads his merits and demerits have been exaggerated, but in such a way that his demerits have preponderated to the detriment of his memory. Machiavellism has become synonymous with treachery, intrigue, subterfuge, and tyranny. It has been even said that "Old Nick", the popular name of the Devil among Anglo-Saxon races, derives its origin from that of Nicolò Machiavelli. This dubious fame he has won by his book the "Prin-

cipe", and the theories therein exploited were further elaborated in his "Discorsi sopra Livio". To understand the "Principe" right it must be borne in mind that the work is not a treatise on foreign politics. It aims solely at examining how a kingdom may be best built up and established; nor is it a mere abstract discussion, but it is carried on in the light of an ideal long held by Machiavelli, that a United Italy was possible, and in the last chapter of the work he exhorts the Medici of Florence (Giuliano and Lorenzo) to its realization. His aim was to point out the best way for bringing it about; he did not deal with abstract principles and arguments, but collected examples from classical antiquity and from recent events, especially from the career of Cæsar Borgia. So that the "Principe" is a political tract with a definite aim and intended for a particular locality. To gain the end in view results are to be the only criteria of the methods employed, and even the teachings of the moral law must give way to secure the end in view. Good faith, clemency, and moderation are not cast overboard, but he teaches that the interests of the state are above all individual virtues. These virtues may be useful, and when they are a prince ought to exercise them, but more often in dealing with an opponent they are a hindrance, not in themselves, but by reason of the crookedness of others.

MONUMENT OF MACHIAVELLI
Church of Santa Croce, Florence

Whosoever would prevail against the treachery, crime, and cruelty of others, must himself be beforehand in misleading and deceiving his opponent and even in getting rid of him, as Cæsar Borgia had done. While on the other hand Gian Paolo Baglione made a mistake, by omitting to imprison or put to death Julius II, in 1506, on the occasion of his unprotected entry to Perugia (Discorsi sopra Livio, I, xxvii). Again, a prince must keep clear of crime not only when it is hurtful to his interests but when it is useless. He should try to win the love of his subjects, by simulating virtue if he does not possess it; he ought to encourage trade so that his people, busied in getting rich, may have no time for politics; he ought to show concern for religion, because it is a potent means for keeping his people submissive and obedient. Such is the general teaching of the "Principe", which has been often refuted. As a theory Machiavellism may perhaps be called an innovation; but as a practice it is as old as political society. It was a most immoral work, in that it cuts politics adrift from all morality, and it was rightly put on the Index in 1559. It is worth noting that the "Principe" with its glorification of absolutism is totally opposed to its author's ideas of democracy, which led to his ruin. To explain the difficulty it is not necessary to claim that the book is a satire, nor that it is evidence of how easily the writer could change his political views provided he could stand well with the Medici. Much as Machiavelli loved liberty and Florence he dreamed of a "larger Italy" of the Italians. As a practical man he saw that his dream could be realized only through a prince of character and energy who would walk in the steps of Cæsar Borgia, and he conceded that the individual good must give way to the general well-being.

As a historian Machiavelli is an excellent source when he deals with what happened under his eyes at the various embassies; but it should be remembered that he gives everything a more or less unconscious twist to bring it into conformity with his generalizations. This is more marked even in his accounts of what he had heard or read, and serves to explain the discrepancies in the letters he wrote during his embassies to Cæsar Borgia, the "Descrizione", etc., the ideal picture he drew of affairs in Germany, and his life of Castruccio Castracane, which is rather an historical romance modelled on the character of Agathocles in Plutarch. He knew nothing of historical criticism, yet he showed how events in history move in obedience to certain general laws; and this is his great merit as an historian. His natural bent was politics, but in his dealings with military matters he showed such skill as would amaze us even if we did not know he had never been a soldier. He recognized that to be strong a state must have its standing army, and he upholds this not only in the "Principe" and the "Discorsi" but in his various military writings. The broad and stable laws of military tactics he lays down in masterly fashion; yet it is curious to note that he lays no great stress on firearms.

His style is always clear and crisp and his reasoning close and orderly. What poetry he has left gives no proof of poetic talent; rather, the comedies are clever and successful as compositions and only too often bear undisguised traces of the moral laxity of the author (this is shown also in his letters to his friends) and of the age in which he lived. His "Mandragola" and "Clizia" are nothing more or less than *pochades* and lose no opportunity of scoring against religion. Machiavelli did not disguise his dislike for Christianity which by exalting humility, meekness, and patience had, he said, weakened the social and patriotic instincts of mankind. Hence, he mocked at Savonarola though he was the saviour of democracy, and he had a special dislike for the Holy See as a temporal power, as he saw in it the greatest obstacle to Italian unity; to use his own expression, it was too weak to control the whole peninsula, but too strong to allow of any other state bringing about unity. This explains why he has no words of praise for Julius II and his Italian policy. It was merely as an opportunist that he courted the favour of Leo X and Clement VII. On the other hand, when death came his way he remembered that he was a Christian and he died a Christian death, though his life, habits, and ideals had been pagan, and himself a typical representative of the Italian Renaissance.

Opere di Macchiavelli, ed. PASSERINI FANFANI E MILANESI (6 vols., Florence, 1873–77); *The Works of Nicholas Machiavel, Faithfully Englished* (London, 1695); *Lettere famigliari*, ed. ALVISI (Florence, 1883); NITTI, *Macchiavelli nella vita e nelle opere* (Naples, 1876); VILLARI, *Machiavelli and his Times* (tr. London, 1892); RANKE, *Zur Kritik neuerer Geschichtsschreiber* (1824); MACAULAY, *Critical and Historical Essays* (Edinburgh, 1827); MOHL, *Die Macchiavelli Litteratur* in *Geschichte und Literatur der Staatswissenschaften*, III (Erlangen, 1855–8); PASTOR, *History of the Popes*, tr. ANTROBUS, V, VI (St. Louis, 1902), passim; DYER, *Machiavelli and the Modern State* (Boston, 1905); VAUGHAN, *Nicolò Machiavelli* in *Dublin Review* (April, 1909); MORLEY, *Miscellanies* (London, 1907). Works against Machiavelli were written by: CARDINAL POLE; CATARINO; the Calvinist GENTILLET, *Discours d'Estat. . . . contre Nicol. Machiavel* (1576); OSORIUS, *De nobilitate christiana* (Rome, 1592); POSSEVINO, *Judicium de quatuor scriptoribus* (Rome, 1592); FREDERICK II OF PRUSSIA, whose *Anti-Machiavel* was edited by VOLTAIRE (Amsterdam, 1741). Machiavelli was defended by SCIOPPIUS, COURING, CHRISTINUS, BOLLMANN. N. H. THOMSON has translated into English *The Prince* (Oxford, 1897) and *Machiavelli's Discourses* (London, 1883).

U. BENIGNI.

Machpelah, the burial-place in the vicinity of ancient Hebron which Abraham bought from Ephron the Hethite for the interment of Sara (Gen., xxiii, 9, 17). Sara was buried there in a cave (xxiii, 19), as

was later Abraham himself (xxv, 9). The words of the dying Jacob inform us that Rebecca and Lia were also buried in this cave (xlix, 31), and, lastly, Jacob found there his last resting place (l, 13). According to the Hebrew text, which always uses the word *Machpelah* with the article, *the Machpelah* is the place in which the field with the cave is to be found. Thus we read "the cave in the field of the Machpelah" in Gen., xxiii, 17, 19; xlix, 30; l, 13, "the cave of the Machpelah" is twice mentioned (xxiii, 9; xxv, 9). But in the Greek text the word is rendered "the double cave"—by derivation from the root *kafal*, "to double". This meaning is admitted into the Targum, into the Syrian translation and into the Vulgate.

In the later books of the Old Testament Machpelah is not mentioned. Josephus, however, knows the tomb of Abraham and his descendants in the district then known as Hebron (Antiq., I, xiv, 1; xxii, 1; xxi, 3). According to this historian (op. cit., II, viii, 2), the brothers of Joseph were also interred in their ancestral burial-place—a hypothesis for which there is no foundation in Holy Writ. A Rabbinic tradition of not much later date on the strength of a misinterpretation of Jos., xiv, 15 (Hebron-Kiriath Arba—"City of Four") would place the graves of four Patriarchs at Hebron, and, relying on the same passage, declares Adam to be the fourth Patriarch. St. Jerome accepted this interpretation (see "Onomasticon des Eusebius", ed. Klostermann, Leipzig, 1904, p. 7), and introduced it into the Vulgate. According to Rabbinic legends, Esau also was buried in the neighbourhood. Since the sixth century the grave of Joseph has been pointed out at Hebron (Itinerar. Antonini), in spite of Jos., xxiv, 32, while the Mohammedans even to-day regard an Arabian building joined to the north-west of the Haram as Joseph's tomb. The tomb mentioned by Josephus is undoubtedly the Haram situated in the south-east quarter of Hebron (El-Khalil). The shrine facing north-west and south-east forms a spacious rectangle 197 feet long by 111 feet wide, and rises to a height of about 40 feet. The mighty blocks of limestone as hard as marble, dressed and closely fitted ("beautiful, artistically carved marble", Josephus, "Bell. Jud.", IV, ix, 7), have acquired with age almost the tint of bronze. The monotony of the long lines is relieved by rectangular pilasters, sixteen on each side and eight at the top and bottom. Of the builder tradition is silent; Josephus is ignorant of his identity. Its resemblance in style to the Haram at Jerusalem has led many to refer it to the Herodian period, e. g., Conder, Benzinger. Robinson, Warren, and Heidet regard the building as pre-Herodian.

Since Josephus tradition has no doubt preserved the site correctly. Eusebius merely mentions the burial-place ("Onomasticon", ed. Klostermann, s. v. "Arbo", p. 6); the Pilgrim of Bordeaux (333) speaks explicitly of a rectangular building of magnificent stone ("Itinera Hieros.", ed. Geyer, "Corpus Script. Eccl. Lat.", XXXIX, Vienna, 1898, p. 25). In his version of the "Onomasticon", St. Jerome unfortunately does not express himself clearly; it is doubtful whether the church, which he declares to have been recently built (*a nostris ibidem jam exstructa*), is to be sought in the mausoleum or at Haram Ramet el Khalil, half an hour's journey north of Hebron. The "Itinerarium" of St. Antoninus (c. 570) mentions a basilica with four halls (perhaps four porches about the walls) at the graves of the Patriarchs, possessing an open court, and equally venerated by Christians and Jews ("It. Hieros.", ed. Geyer, 178 sq.). About 700, Adamnan informs us, on the authority of Arculf, that the burial-place of the Patriarchs is surrounded by a rectangular wall, and that over the graves stand monuments, but there is no mention of a basilica ("De Locis Sanct.", II, x, Geyer, 261 sq.). The following centuries (Mukkadasi, Saewulf, Daniel—985, 1102, 1106) throw no new light on the question. In 1119 a Christian church was undoubtedly to be found there, either the old Byzantine or the Crusader's church, which, to judge from the style, apparently dates from the middle of the twelfth century. Remains from early times are still perceptible, but they do not enable one to form any judgment concerning the old basilica; what still remained of it at the period of the Crusades is uncertain. According to a rather improbable statement of Benjamin of Tudela, a Jewish synagogue stood in the Haram before the re-establishment of Christian domination. After the downfall of the Frankish kingdom, the Latin church was converted into the present mosque. This is built in the southern section of the Haram in such a position as to utilize three of the boundary walls. The interior is seventy feet long and ninety-three feet wide; four pillars divide it into three aisles of almost the same breadth, but of unequal length. The entrance to the Haram is effected by means of two flights of steps, a specimen of Arabian art of the fourteenth century.

According to a late and unreliable Mohammedan tradition, the tombs of the Patriarchs lie under six monuments: to Isaac and Rebecca are assigned those within the mosque itself; to Abraham and Sara the next two, in front of the north wall of the mosque in two chapels of the narthex; those of Jacob and Lia are the last two at the north end of the Haram. Concerning the subterranean chambers we possess only inexact information. The Jewish accounts (Benjamin of Tudela, 1160–73; Rabbi Petacchia, 1175–80; David Reubeni, 1525) are neither clear nor uniform. An extensive investigation was undertaken by the Latin monks of Kiriath Arba (D. V. Cariath-Arbe-Hebron) in 1119, but was never completed. After several days of laborious work, they disclosed a whole system of subterranean chambers, in which it was believed that at last the much-sought-for "double cave" with the remains of the three Patriarchs had been discovered. In 1859, by means of an entrance in the porch of the mosque between the sarcophagi of Abraham and Sara, the Italian Pierotti succeeded in descending some steps of a stairway hewn in the rock. According to Pierotti's observations, the cavity extends the whole length of the Haram. Owing to the intolerance of the Mohammedans, all subsequent attempts of English and German investigators (1862, 1869, 1882) have led to no satisfactory results. Concerning the plan of and connexion between the underground chambers no judgment can be formed without fresh investigation.

ROBINSON, *Biblical Researches in Palestine*, II (Boston, 1841), 75 sqq.; *Memoirs on the Survey of Western Palestine*, III (London, 1883), 333 sqq.; *Palestine Exploration Fund, Quarterly Statement* (1882), 197 sqq. (1897), 53 sqq.; LE STRANGE, *Palestine under the Moslems* (London, 1890), 309 sqq.; *Acta SS.*, IV, Oct., 688 sqq.; RIANT, *Archives de l'Orient latin*, II (Genoa, 1884), 411 sqq.; PIEROTTI, *Macpéla ou tombeaux des patriarches* (Lausanne, 1869); HEIDET in VIGOUROUX, *Dict. de la Bible*, s. v. *Macpélah*.

A. MERK.

Machutus, SAINT (MACLOVIUS; MALO), b. about the year 520 probably in Wales and baptized by St. Brendan. Machutus became his favourite disciple and was one of those specially selected by that holy man for his oft-described voyage. No doubt he may have remained some years in Llancarrven Abbey, when St. Brendan stayed there, and it was from there that St. Brendan and his disciple, St. Machutus, with numerous companions set forth for the discovery of the "Island of the Blest". He then put to sea on a second voyage and visited the Island of September, in the seaward front of St. Malo, known as Cizembra, where he tarried for some time. It was on the occasion of his second voyage that he evangelized the Orkney Islands and the northern isles of Scotland. At Aleth opposite St. Malo he placed himself under a venerable hermit named Aaron, on whose death in 543 (or 544), St. Machutus succeeded to the spiritual rule of the district subsequently known as St. Malo, and

was consecrated first Bishop of Aleth. It is remarkable that St. Brendan also laboured at Aleth, and had a hermit's cell there on a precipitous rock in the sea, whither he often retired. In old age the disorder of the island compelled St. Machutus to leave, but the people soon begged the saint to come back. On his return matters were put right, and the saint, feeling that his end was at hand, determined to spend his last days in solitary penance. Accordingly he proceeded to Archambiac, a village in the Diocese of Santes, where he passed the remainder of his life in prayer and mortification. His obit is chronicled on 15 Nov., in the year 618, 620, or 622.

O'HANLON, *Lives of the Irish Saints* (Dublin, s. d.); O'DONOGHUE, *St. Brendan the Voyager* (Dublin, 1895); MORAN, *Irish Saints in Great Britain* (Callan, 1903).

W. H. GRATTAN-FLOOD.

Mackenzie, VICARIATE APOSTOLIC OF.—This vicariate which was detached from the Athabaska-Mackenzie Vicariate in 1901 and intrusted to Mgr Gabriel Breynat, Titular Bishop of Adramytus, consecrated 6 April, 1902, is bounded on the west by the Rocky Mountains, on the south by 60° latitude, on the east by the water-shed and is unlimited on the north towards the pole. It comprised the Yukon, which was not erected into a prefecture Apostolic until 1908. Through this immense territory, which has an area of over half a million square miles, are scattered six nomad tribes: the Montagnais, the Slave, the Flat-dog-side, the Hare Indian, the Loucheux, and the Eskimo, making a total population of 6000 souls. Leaving out the Eskimo tribe which is still pagan and nearly four hundred Protestant red-skins, all the other tribes embraced the Catholic Faith which was introduced by the Oblates, who began mission work here in 1858. The difficulties of Christianizing this land of perpetual snow and long winters, when the thermometer sometimes falls to 68° below zero, are readily understood when one knows that the only means of travel are dogs trained to harness and that the heavens are the only roof. Means of communication are so poor that from September to July there is but one mail delivery in Lower Mackenzie and provisions are brought by steamboat but once a year. Hence the difficulties of travel, the absolute lack of local resources, the severity of the climate contribute to make this vicariate the poorest in the whole world, living on charity, more especially on pecuniary help sent from France by the Propagation of Faith. Owing to this assistance the vicar Apostolic with his twenty Oblate fathers and twenty-one brothers can maintain twelve missions where the Indians gather every year. In 1867 the Montreal Gray Nuns came and shared the hardships of the missionaries, establishing an orphanage at the Providence Mission, where they are now teaching seventy-six children under their care. In 1903 they opened another orphanage at the St. Joseph Mission, Fort Resolution, the vicar Apostolic's residence, where forty-five children are being instructed. There are twenty-one nuns working in the mission.

PIOLET, *Les missions catholiques*, VI (Paris, 1903), 51–130; TACHÉ, *Vingt années de missions dans le Nord-Ouest de l'Amérique* (Montreal, 1866); IDEM, *Esquisse sur le nord-ouest de l'Amérique* (Montreal, 1869), tr. CAMERON (1870); *Annales des missions de la congrégation des Oblats de Marie-Immaculée* (1862–1910); *Catholic Directory* (Milwaukee, 1910).

C. H. A. GIROUX.

McLoughlin, JOHN, physician and pioneer, b. in the parish of La Rivière du Loup, Canada, 19 Oct., 1784; d. at Oregon City, 3 Sept., 1857. He is the great hero of Oregon's pioneer period. His paternal grandfather was born in the parish of Desertegney, Ireland. He emigrated to Canada and married there, and his son John was the father of Dr. John McLoughlin. The maiden name of the mother of the latter was Angelique Fraser, born in the parish of Beaumont, Canada. Her father was Malcolm Fraser, a Scotch Highlander, who went to Canada in 1759 with the army of Wolfe. Dr. McLoughlin's father died while his son was a lad. He was brought up in the home of his maternal grandfather, and educated in Canada and Scotland. He became a physician while quite young, but did not practise long. He became a partner of the North-West Company. When that company coalesced with the Hudson Bay Company in 1821, he was in charge of Fort William on Lake Superior, which was then the chief depot and factory of the North-West Company. In 1824 Dr. McLoughlin was sent to Fort George[Astoria]near the mouth of the Columbia River. He soon moved the head-quarters of the company to Fort Vancouver, on the northern side of the Columbia River. There he ruled for twenty-two years as the absolute but kindly autocrat of what is known as the Oregon Country. He had no military force, but by his own personality and the aid of his officers and employés, he established order and maintained peace so that persons unaccompanied by escort could travel over the country without danger from formerly hostile Indians. There were no Indian wars in the Oregon Country until after he resigned from the Hudson Bay Company. The Methodist, Presbyterian, and Catholic missionaries he aided and protected, although at that time he was an Anglican. In 1842 he joined the Catholic Church, and became a devoted Catholic, being created a Knight of St. Gregory in 1846. In 1843 the first of the Oregon home-building immigrants arrived in Oregon. Dr. McLoughlin fed and clothed them and cared for the sick, he supplied them with seed and farming implements, and loaned them domestic animals. He gave similar assistance to the immigrants of 1844 and 1845. As he furnished most of this aid on credit, and did not discourage the settlement of Oregon by citizens of the United States, he was forced to resign by the Hudson Bay Company in 1846. For the rest of his life he resided at Oregon City. Prior to 1840 he had taken up a land claim, but there was no legal way to acquire ownership of land in Oregon before the Oregon land law of 27 Sept., 1850. This land claim was at Oregon City, which he founded and named, and where there is a fine water power. He developed this power, and erected flour and saw mills which he personally operated. It was asserted that as he was a British subject, he was not entitled to take up a land claim. But this was merely a pretext, for until 1846, when the treaty between the United States and Great Britain settled the ownership of the Oregon Country, a convention between the two countries existed, providing for the joint occupancy of the Oregon Country by Americans and British, both having equal rights. Some of the Methodist missionaries and their followers—all of whom had been befriended by Dr. McLoughlin—started this action against him. It was continued until in the donation land law a section was inserted which deprived him of his land claim, and gave it to the territory of Oregon for the establishment and endowment of a university. It was restored to his heirs by the legislature of Oregon five years after his death. The effect of this law was that Dr. McLoughlin lost nearly all of the large fortune which he had accumulated. He died a broken-hearted man, the victim of mendacity, and ingratitude. He was buried in the churchyard of St. John's Catholic church in Oregon City, where his body has lain ever since. By common consent he has become known as the Father of Oregon.

FREDERICK V. HOLMAN.

MacMahon, MARIE-EDMÉ-PATRICE-MAURICE DE, Duc de Magenta, Marshal of France, President of the French Republic; b. at Sully, Saône-et-Loire, 13 July, 1808; d. at Montcresson, Loiret, 16 October, 1893. His ancestors were Irish, and had been settled in France since the time of James II, having applied for naturalization in 1749. MacMahon took part in the expedition to Algiers in 1830 as aide-de-camp to Gen-

eral Achard. His military career in Algeria lasted twenty years (1834 to 1854), and he there gained exceptional distinction in the assault on Constantine. In the Crimean War he led the attack on The Malakoff (8 Sept., 1855); in the Italian War he effected the decisive movement of the victory of Magenta (4 June, 1859), and was created a marshal and Duc de Magenta on the field of battle. On 1 September, 1864, he was appointed Governor-General of Algeria, and in that position became involved in a controversy with Archbishop (afterwards Cardinal) Lavigerie which attracted much attention at the time. Mgr Lavigerie, then Archbishop of Algiers, having just founded the Société des Missionnaires d'Algers, had collected more than a thousand Arab children in his orphanages, to save them from typhus fever and starvation. MacMahon protested publicly against a letter dated 6 April, 1868, in which the archbishop, announcing his intention of founding a nursery of Arab Christians, concluded with the declaration: "France must either let the Gospel be given to this people or drive them into the desert, away from the civilized world." In a letter dated 26 April, 1868, MacMahon accused Lavigerie of wishing to push the Arabs back into the desert. Lavigerie explained that his meaning had been misunderstood, and refused the coadjutorship of Lyons, which the emperor, to satisfy MacMahon, offered him. The incident was closed by a letter from Marshal Niel, the minister of war (28 May, 1868).

At the beginning of the Franco-German War MacMahon's advance guard was beaten at Wissembourg (4 August, 1870), and his own corps was outnumbered at Reischoffen (6 August, 1870); he commanded the retreat on Châlons, and then, obeying the orders of Palikas, the minister of war, led the army to Sedan, where he was wounded, and where Napoleon III was obliged to capitulate (1 September). On 28 May, 1871, MacMahon completed the victory of the Versailles Army over the Paris Commune, and effected the entry of the regular troops into Paris. His splendid military career won general admiration. "A perfect military officer" (*officier de guerre complet*), Saint-Arnaud called him; and Thiers, the "chevalier sans peur et sans reproche" (the fearless, blameless knight). Upon the fall of Thiers in the session of 24 May, 1873, the National Assembly elected MacMahon president by a majority of 390 to 2, the Left abstaining from voting. In his message of 26 May he promised to be "energetically and resolutely Conservative" (*énergiquement et résolûment conservateur*), and to be "the sentinel on guard over the integrity of the sovereign power of the Assembly". These expressions define the spirit in which he exercised his office as president. Being determined to devote himself loyally to "the integrity of the sovereign power of the Assembly", he refused to associate himself with any projects looking to the restoration of the Comte de Chambord and the White Flag.

The Assembly having (9 November, 1873) fixed his term of office at seven years, he declared in a speech delivered 4 February, 1874, that he would know how to make the legally established order of things respected for seven years. Preferring to remain above party, he rather assisted at than took part in the proceedings which, in January and February, 1875, led up to the passage of the fundamental laws finally establishing the Republic as the legal government of France. And yet MacMahon writes in his still unpublished memoirs: "By family tradition, and by the sentiments towards the royal house which were instilled in me by my early education, I could not be anything but a Legitimist." He felt some repugnance, too, in forming, in 1876, the Dufaure and the Jules Simon cabinets, in which the Republican element was represented. When the episcopal charges of the Bishops of Poitiers, Nîmes, and Nevers, recommending the case of the captive Pope Pius IX to the sympathy of the French Government, were met by a resolution in the Chamber, proposed by the Left, that the Government be requested "to repress Ultramontane manifestations" (4 May, 1877), MacMahon, twelve days later, asked Jules Simon to resign, summoned to power a Conservative ministry under the Duc de Broglie, persuaded the Senate to dissolve the Chamber, and travelled through the country to assure the success of the Conservatives in the elections, protesting at the same time that he did not wish to overturn the Republic. However, the elections of 14 October resulted in a majority of 120 for the Left; the de Broglie ministry resigned 19 November, and the president formed a Left cabinet under Dufaure. He retained his office until 1878, so as to allow the Exposition Universelle to take place in political peace, and then, the senatorial elections of 5 January, 1879, having brought another victory to the Left, MacMahon found a pretext to resign (30 January, 1879), and Jules Grévy succeeded him.

This soldier was not made for politics. "I have remained a soldier", he says in his memoirs, "and I can conscientiously say that I have not only served one government after another loyally, but, when they fell, have regretted all of them with the single exception of my own." In his voluntary retirement he carried with him the esteem of all parties: Jules Simon, who did not love him, and whom he did not love, afterwards called him "a great captain, a great citizen, and a righteous man" (un grand capitaine, un grand citoyen et un homme de bien). His presidency may be summed up in two words: on the one hand, he allowed the Republic to establish itself; on the other hand, so far as his lawful prerogatives permitted, he retarded the political advance of parties hostile to the Church, convinced that the triumph of Radicalism would be to the detriment of France. The last fourteen years of his life were passed in retirement, quite removed from political interests. In 1893 he was buried, with national honours, in the crypt of the Invalides.

LAFORGE, *Histoire complète de MacMahon* (3 vols., Paris, 1898); CHEROT, *Figures de Soldats* (Lille, 1900); LEBRUN, *Souvenirs des Guerres de Crimée et d'Italie* (Paris, 1890); BANNARD, *Le cardinal Lavigerie*, I (Paris, 1896), 234–264; DAUDET, *Souvenirs de la présidence de MacMahon* (Paris, 1880); HANOTAUX, *Histoire de la France contemporaine*, II, III, IV (Paris, 1904–1908); DE MARCÈRE, *L'assemblée Nationale de 1871*, II (Paris, 1907); IDEM, *Le seize Mai et la fin du Septennat* (Paris, 1900); IDEM, *Hist. de la République de 1876 à 1879* (2 vols., Paris, 1908 and 1910).

GEORGES GOYAU.

McMahon, MARTIN THOMAS, soldier, jurist; b. at Laprairie, Canada, 21 March, 1838; d. in New York, 21 April, 1906. His parents took him to the United States when he was three weeks old and eventually settled in New York. He attended St. John's College, Fordham, where he was graduated in 1855. To study law he went to Buffalo, thence as a special agent on the post-office to the Pacific coast and was admitted to the bar at Sacramento, Cal., in 1861. When the Civil War broke out he raised the first company of cavalry of the Pacific coast, but resigned its captaincy when he found it would not go to the front and went east to Washington where he was appointed an aide-de-camp to General McClellan. He served with the Army of the Potomac all through the war, and at its close had attained the rank of brevet Major-General of Volunteers. For bravery at the battle of White Oak Swamp he received the medal of honour from Congress. In 1866 he resigned from the army and was appointed corporation counsel of New York City (1866–67) and then was sent as Minister to Paraguay (1868–69). On his return he practised law until 1881, he was made Receiver of Taxes, U. S. Marshal, State Assemblyman and Senator. In 1896 he was elected Judge of the Court of General Sessions which office he held at this death.

His brothers, John Eugene, and James Power, were also lawyers and soldiers and both held the command

as colonels of the 164th New York Volunteers during the Civil War. John was born in Waterford, Ireland, in 1834, was educated at St. John's College, Fordham, and died at Buffalo, New York, in 1863, from injuries received in the army; James was born in Waterford, 1836, and was killed while leading his regiment at the battle of Cold Harbor, Va.

Messenger (New York, March, 1906); *Catholic News* (New York, April, 1906), files; HEITMAN, *Hist. Register and Dictionary, U. S. Army* (Washington, 1903); *Nat. Cyclopedia, Am. Biog.*, s. v.

THOMAS F. MEEHAN.

McMaster, JAMES ALPHONSUS, editor, convert, b. at Duanesburg, New York, U. S. A., 1 April, 1820; d. in Brooklyn, New York, 29 December, 1886. His father, a prominent Presbyterian minister, sent his son to Union College, but he left before graduating and became a private tutor. It was the era of Tractarianism and Brook Farm, and McMaster became a Catholic in 1845. Believing he had a vocation for the priesthood, he was accepted as a novice in the Redemptorist Congregation and sent by his superiors to Belgium. Here he quickly found that the life of a religious was not suitable for him, and returning to the United States he adopted the profession of journalism.

JAMES A. McMASTER

His vigorous and prolific pen secured him an opening in several papers and periodicals and his contributions were also printed in "The New York Freeman's Journal", then owned by Bishop John Hughes. In 1848 he thought of starting a semi-monthly magazine and then a semi-weekly independent Catholic paper, but abandoned both ideas, and, with money loaned him by George V. Hecker, bought "The Freeman's Journal" in June, 1848, from Bishop Hughes. He at once assumed its editorial management, which he retained up to the time of his death. Letters he wrote then to Orestes A. Brownson clearly show that even at this early date he was dominated by the aversion to episcopal supervision and a determination to propound his own views which was such a characteristic feature of his later years.

Sound on fundamental issues and principles, faultfinding was one of his weaknesses. He spared no one, high or low, who differed from him, and his invective was as bitter as an unlimited vocabulary could make it. He quarrelled almost immediately with Bishop Hughes on the Irish question and with Brownson on his philosophy. In politics he was a States Rights Democrat and Anti-Abolitionist and took a very active and influential part in the great national controversies that raged before the Civil War. After the conflict began, his editorial assaults on President Lincoln and his administration resulted in his being arrested, in 1861, and confined for eleven months in Fort Lafayette as a disloyal citizen. "The Freeman's Journal" was suppressed by the Government and did not resume publication until 19 April, 1862. In national politics he then adopted a milder tone, but for the rest the old style remained. In European politics Louis Veuillot and his "Univers" were the constant models of "The Freeman's Journal". There is record of his saying of the pope on the outlook in European politics in a letter to Brownson 12 June, 1848: "He may yet in good earnest be imprisoned, but it will not take a whit from his moral power—it will add to it"; but after the events of 1870, in season and out there was no stronger or more valiant champion of the rights of the Holy See. In behalf of Catholic education he was equally strenuous and uncompromising, and waged a long warfare against the attendance of Catholic children at the public schools.

With the advent of modern newspaper methods and the decline of the old-fashioned "personal journalism", a new generation with new ideals tired of McMaster's literary violence, and his once wide-spread prestige and influence waned. The whims and idiosyncrasies of the old man, who grew more and more difficult to manage as the end of his curious and stormy career drew to a close, still cramped and hampered the paper, and when he died it had little influence and scant circulation. Of his three children one daughter became a Carmelite and another a Sister of the Holy Child.

Freeman's Journal (New York), files; *Catholic News* (New York, April 11, 1908); *Catholic Home Almanac* (New York, 1888); BROWNSON, *Middle Life* (Detroit, 1899); ID., *Latter Life* (Detroit, 1900); *Cyc. Am. Biog.*, s. v.

THOMAS F. MEEHAN.

McNeil, NEIL. See ST. GEORGE'S, DIOCESE OF.

MacNeven, WILLIAM JAMES, distinguished Irish-American physician and medical educator, b. at Ballynahowna, near Aughrim, Co. Galway, Ireland, 21 March, 1763; d. at New York, 12 July, 1841. His ancestors were driven by Cromwell from the North of Ireland where they held large possessions to the wilds of Connaught. William James MacNeven was the eldest of four sons. At the age of twelve he was sent by his uncle Baron MacNeven, to receive his education abroad, for the penal laws rendered education impossible for Catholics in Ireland. This Baron MacNeven was William O'Kelly MacNeven, an Irish exile physician, who for his medical skill in her service had been created an Austrian noble by the Empress Maria Theresa. Young MacNeven made his collegiate studies at Prague. His medical studies were made at Vienna where he was a favourite pupil of the distinguished professor Pestel and took his degree in 1784. The same year he returned to Dublin to practise. A brilliant career opened before him in medicine, but he became involved in the revolutionary disturbances of the time with such men as Lord Edward Fitzgerald, Thomas Addis Emmet, and his brother Robert. He was arrested in March, 1798, and confined in Kilmainham Jail, and afterwards in Fort George, Scotland, until 1802, when he was liberated and exiled. In 1803, he was in Paris seeking an interview with Bonaparte in order to obtain French troops for Ireland. Disappointed in his mission, Dr. MacNeven came to America, landing at New York on 4 July, 1805.



In 1807, Dr. MacNeven delivered a course of lectures on clinical medicine in the recently established College of Physicians and Surgeons. Here in 1808, he received the appointment of professor of midwifery. In 1810, at the reorganization of the school, he became the professor of chemistry, and in 1816 was appointed in addition to the chair of materia medica. In 1826 with six of his colleagues, he resigned his professorship because of a misunderstanding with the New York Board of Regents, and accepted the chair of materia medica in Rutgers Medical College, a branch of the New Jersey institution of that name, established in New York as a rival to the College of Physicians and Surgeons. The school at once became popular because of its faculty, but after four years was closed by legislative enactment on account of interstate difficulties. The attempt to create a school independent of the regents resulted in a reorganization of the University of the State of New York. Dr. MacNeven's best known contribution to science is his "Exposition of the Atomic Theory" (New York, 1820), which was reprinted in the French "Annales de Chimie". In 1821 he published with emendations an edition of Brande's "Chemistry" (New York, 1829). Some of his purely literary works, his "Rambles through Switzerland" (Dublin, 1803), his "Pieces of Irish History" (New York, 1807), and his numerous political tracts attracted wide attention. He was co-editor for many years of the "New York Medical and Philosophical Journal".

FRANCIS, *Life of MacNeven* in GROSS, *Lives of Eminent American Physicians* (Philadelphia, 1861); GILMAN in *New York Medical Gazette* (1841), 65; BYRNE, *Memoirs of Miles Byrne* (Paris, 1863); MADDEN, *Lives of the United Irishmen*, series ii, vol. II (London, 1842–46); FITZPATRICK, *Secret Service under Pitt* (London, 1892–93).

JAMES J. WALSH.

Mâcon, ANCIENT DIOCESE OF (MATISCONENSIS), in Burgundy (q. v.). The city of Mâcon, formerly the capital of the Mâconnais, now of the Department of Saône-et-Loire, became a *civitas* in the fifth century, when it was separated from the Æduan territory. Christianity appears to have been introduced from Lyons into this city at an early period, and Hugh, Archbishop of Lyons, in the eleventh century, called Mâcon "the eldest daughter of the Church of Lyons". The bishopric, however, came into existence somewhat later than might have been expected: in the latter part of the fifth century it was still a Bishop of Lyons who brought succour to the famine-stricken people of Mâcon. At the end of that same century Clovis's occupation of the city both foreshadowed the gradual establishment of Frankish supremacy and brought with it the utter rout of Arianism. Duchesne thinks that the Bishopric of Mâcon, suffragan of Lyons, may have originated in an understanding between the Merovingian princes after the suppression of the Burgundian state. The separate existence of Mâcon as a diocese ended at the French Revolution, and the title of Mâcon is now borne by the Bishop of Autun.

The first bishop historically known is St. Placidus (538–55). The authentic list of his successors, as reconstructed by Duchesne, comprises several bishops venerated as saints: St. Florentinus (c. 561); St. Cælodonius, who assisted at the Council of Lyons in 570; St. Eusebius, who assisted at two councils, in 581 and 585. Tradition adds to this list the names of Sts. Salvinius, Nicetius (Nizier), and Justus, as bishops of Mâcon in the course of the sixth century. Among other bishops of later date may be mentioned St. Gerard (886–926), who died in a hermitage at Brou near Bourg-en-Bresse, and Cardinal Philibert Hugonet (1473–84). For many centuries the bishops seem to have been the only rulers of Mâcon; the city had no counts until after 850. From 926 the countship became hereditary. The Mâconnais was sold to St. Louis in 1239 by Alice of Vienne, granddaughter of the last count, and her husband, Jean de Braine. In 1435 Charles VII of France, by the Treaty of Arras, ceded it to Philip, Duke of Burgundy, but in 1477 it reverted to France, upon the death of Charles the Bold. Emperor Charles V definitively recognized the Mâconnais as French at the Treaty of Cambrai (1529).

The wars of religion filled Mâcon with blood; it was captured on 5 May, 1562, by the Protestant d'Entragues, on 18 August, 1562, by the Catholic Tavannes, on 29 Sept., 1567, it again fell into the hands of the Protestants, and on 4 Dec., 1567, was recovered by the Catholics. But the Protestants of Mâcon were saved from the Massacre of St. Bartholomew, probably by the passive resistance with which the bailiff, Philibert de Laguiche, met the orders of Charles IX. Odet de Coligny, Cardinal de Châtillon, who eventually became a Protestant and went to London to marry under the name of Comte de Beauvais, was from 1554 to 1560 prior, and after 1560 provost, of St-Pierre de Mâcon. The Abbey of Cluny, situated within the territory of this diocese, was exempted from its jurisdiction in the eleventh century, in spite of the opposition of Bishop Drogon. There is still preserved in the archives of the city a copy of the cartulary of the cathedral church of St-Vincent, rebuilt in the thirteenth century, but destroyed in 1793.

Of the six councils held at Mâcon (579, 581—or 582—585, 624, 906, 1286), the second and third, convoked by command of King Gontran, are worthy of special mention. The first, in 581 or 582, which assembled six metropolitans and fifteen bishops, enacted penalties against luxury among the clergy, against clerics who summoned other clerics before lay tribunals, and against religious who married; it also regulated the relations of Christians with Jews. The second, in 585, at which 43 bishops and the representatives of 20 other bishops assisted, tried the bishops accused of having taken part in the revolt of Gondebaud, fixed the penalties for violating the Sunday rest, insisted on the obligation of paying tithes, established the right of the bishop to interfere in the courts when widows and orphans were concerned, determined the relative precedence of clerics and laymen, and decreed that every three years a national synod should be convoked by the Bishop of Lyons and the king.

Gallia Christiana (*Nova*), IV (1728), 1038–1110; *Instrumenta*, 263–90; DUCHESNE, *Fastes Episcopaux*, II (Paris), 195–198; DE LA ROCHETTE, *Histoire des évêques de Mâcon* (2 vols, Mâcon, 1866–67); CHAVOT, *Le Mâconnais, géographie historique* (Paris, 1884); RAGUT AND CHAVOT, *Cartulaire de Saint-Vincent de Mâcon, connu sous le nom de livre enchaîné* (Mâcon, 1864); JEANDET, *Mâcon au XVIe siècle* (Mâcon, 1892); RAMEAU, *La Révolution dans l'ancien diocèse de Mâcon* (Mâcon, 1900); CHAUMONT, *Recherches historiques sur la persécution religieuse dans le département de Saône et Loire pendant la Révolution* (4 vols., Mâcon, 1903); VIREY, *L'Architecture romane dans l'ancien diocèse de Mâcon* (Paris, 1892); CHEVALIER, *Topobibl.*, 1799–1800.

GEORGES GOYAU.

McQuaid, BERNARD JOHN, first Bishop of Rochester, U. S. A.; b. in New York City, 15 December, 1823; d. at Rochester, 18 January, 1909. His father, Bernard McQuaid, from Tyrone, Ireland, settled in Powel's Hook (now Jersey City), New Jersey. It was in the McQuaid home that Mass was first said in Powel's Hook, by Father John Conron, on the first Sunday in Advent, November, 1829. After his college course at Chambly, Quebec, young McQuaid entered St. John's Seminary, at Fordham, and was ordained in old St. Patrick's Cathedral, New York, 16 January, 1848. Most of the State of New Jersey was at that time included in the Diocese of New York, so Father McQuaid was sent as assistant to the pastor at Madison. When the Diocese of Newark was created in 1853, Bishop Bayley made Father McQuaid rector of his cathedral church, and later, in 1866, his vicar-general. With the bishop he founded Seton Hall College, and, without giving up his parochial charge or his diocesan office, was its president for ten years. He helped to establish the Madison, New Jersey, foundation of the Seton Sisters of Charity. When the Civil War broke

out he was the first clergyman at Newark to espouse publicly the cause of the Union; he also volunteered as a chaplain and accompanied the New Jersey Brigade to the seat of war, during which service he was captured by the Confederates. On the creation of the Diocese of Rochester in 1868, Father McQuaid was appointed its first bishop and was consecrated in St. Patrick's Cathedral, New York, 12 July, 1868. He was installed in Rochester, on July 16. A man of strong character and untiring as a worker, he especially devoted himself to the cause of Catholic education. In Rochester within ten years he completely organized a splendid parochial school system, taught by nuns, and affiliated it with the State university. Two years after he took charge of the diocese he opened St. Andrew's Preparatory Seminary, the promising students of which he sent to the Roman and other famous European seminaries. Meantime he was constantly extending the parishes throughout the diocese; founding new works of charity, or strengthening those already established; securing freedom of worship and their constitutional rights for the inmates of the state institutions, of which there are four in the diocese. The crowning event of his career was the opening, in 1893, of St. Bernard's Seminary, which he lived to see expanded to an institution patronized by students from twenty-six other dioceses, regarded by the whole country as a model of its kind. Bishop McQuaid attended the Vatican Council in 1870. In 1905 he asked for a coadjutor, and Bishop Thomas F. Hickey was consecrated, 24 May, 1905. (See ROCHESTER, DIOCESE OF.)



BERNARD J. MCQUAID

The Republic (Boston, 23 January, 1909); *Catholic Sun* (Syracuse, 22 January, 1909); *Catholic News* (New York, 23 January, 1909); FLYNN, *Catholic Church in New Jersey* (Morristown, 1904); REUSS, *Biog. Cyclo. Cath. Hierarchy of U. S.* (Milwaukee, 1879); *Catholic Directory* (1849–1909).

THOMAS F. MEEHAN.

Macri (or MACRAS?), a titular see in Mauretania Sitifiensis. This town figures only in the "Notitia Africæ" and the "Itinerarium Antonini". It flourished for a long period, and Arabian authors often mention it in eulogistic terms. It was situated on the Oued-Magra which still bears its name, near the Djebel Magra, in the plain of Bou Megueur, south-west of Setif (Algeria). In 411 Macri had a Donatist bishop, Maximus, who attended the Carthage Conference. In 479 Huneric banished a great many Catholics from this town and from many other regions of the desert. In 484 Emeritus, Bishop of Macri, was one of the members present at the Carthage Assembly; like the others, he was banished by Huneric.

TOULOTTE, *Géographie de l'Afrique chrétienne: Mauretanie* (Montreuil-sur-mer, 1894), p. 212.

S. PÉTRIDÈS.

Macrina, the name of two saints, grandmother and granddaughter. They belonged to the family of the great Cappadocian Fathers, Sts. Basil and Gregory of Nyssa.

ST. MACRINA THE ELDER.—Our knowledge of the life of the elder Macrina is derived mainly from the testimony of the above-mentioned Fathers of the Church, her grandchildren (Basil, Ep. cciv, 7; ccxxiii, 3; Gregory of Nyssa, "Vita Macrinæ Junioris"), and the panegyric of the third great Cappadocian, St. Gregory of Nazianzus, on St. Basil (Gregory Naz., Oratio xliii). She was the mother of the elder Basil, the father of Basil, Gregory, and other children whose names are known to us, including Macrina the Younger. Her home was at Neocæsarea in Pontus. In her childhood she was acquainted with St. Gregory Thaumaturgus, first bishop of her native town. As this venerable doctor, who had won Neocæsarea almost completely for Christianity, died between 270 and 275, St. Macrina must have been born before 270. During the Diocletian persecution she fled from her native town with her husband, of whose name we are ignorant, and had to endure many privations. She was thus a confessor of the Faith during the last violent storm that burst over the early Church. On the intellectual and religious training of St. Basil and his elder brothers and sisters, she exercised a great influence, implanting in their minds those seeds of piety and that ardent desire for Christian perfection which were later to attain so glorious a growth. As St. Basil was probably born in 331, St. Macrina must have died early in the fourth decade of the fourth century. Her feast is celebrated on 14 January.

ST. MACRINA THE YOUNGER, b. about 330; d. 379. She was the eldest child of Basil and the Elder Emmelia, the granddaughter of St. Macrina the Elder, and the sister of the Cappadocian Fathers, Sts. Basil and Gregory of Nyssa. The last-mentioned has left us a biography of his sister in the form of a panegyric ("Vita Macrinæ Junioris" in P. G., XLVI, 960 sq.). She received an excellent intellectual training, though one based more on the study of Holy Writ than on that of profane literature. When she was but twelve years old, her father had already arranged a marriage for her with a young advocate of excellent family. Soon afterwards, however, her affianced husband died suddenly, and Macrina resolved to devote herself to a life of perpetual virginity and the pursuit of Christian perfection. She exercised great influence over the religious training of her younger brothers, especially St. Peter, afterwards Bishop of Sebaste, and through her St. Gregory received the greatest intellectual stimulation. On the death of their father, Basil took her, with their mother, to a family estate on the River Iris, in Pontus. Here, with their servants and other companions, they led a life of retirement, consecrating themselves to God. Strict asceticism, zealous meditation on the truths of Christianity, and prayer were the chief concerns of this community. Not only the brothers of St. Macrina, but also St. Gregory of Nazianzus and Eustathius of Sebaste were associated with this pious circle and were there stimulated to make still further advances towards Christian perfection. After the death of her mother Emmelia, Macrina became the head of this community, in which the fruit of the earnest Christian life matured so gloriously. On his return from a synod at Antioch, towards the end of 379, Gregory of Nyssa visited his deeply venerated sister, and found her grievously ill. In pious discourse, the brother and sister spoke of the life beyond and of the meeting in heaven. Soon afterwards Macrina passed blissfully to her reward. Gregory composed a "Dialogue on the Soul and Resurrection" (*περὶ ψυχῆς καὶ ἀναστάσεως*), treating of his pious discourse with his dying sister. In this, Macrina appears as teacher, and treats of the soul, death, the resurrection, and the restoration of all things. Hence the title of the work, *τὰ Μακρίνια* (P. G., XLVI, 12 sq.). Her feast is celebrated 19 July.

Acta SS., Jan., I, 952 sq.; July, IV, 589 sq.; ALLARD, *St-Basile* (Paris, 1899); BOUVY, *Sainte Macrine* in *Revue Augustinienne* (July, 1902), 265–88.

J. P. KIRSCH.

MacSherry, HUGH. See GOOD HOPE, EASTERN VICARIATE OF THE CAPE OF.

McSherry, JAMES, author; b. at Liberty Town, Frederick County, Maryland, 29 July, 1819; d. at Frederick City, Maryland, 13 July, 1869, was the son of James McSherry and Anne Ridgely Sappington, and grandson of Patrick McSherry, who came from Ireland in 1745 to Lancaster County, Pa., and removed later to Maryland. He graduated from Mount St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg, Md., in 1838, studied law, and was admitted to the bar in 1840. He began the practice of his profession in Gettysburg, Pa., but returned to Maryland in 1841, marrying Eliza Spurrier on 30 September of that year. Of his five children the oldest, James, became chief justice of Maryland. He continued in the practice of law at Frederick until his death. Mr. McSherry was always of a literary turn, his writings showing a strong Catholic spirit, and is best known for his "History of Maryland" (Baltimore, 1849). He was a frequent contributor to the "United States Catholic Magazine", and also wrote "Père Jean, or the Jesuit Missionary" (1849) and "Willitoff, or the Days of James the First: a Tale" (1851), republished in German (Frankfort, 1858).

LAMB, *Biog. Dict. of the U. S.*, V, 312; SCHARF, *History of Western Maryland*, I (Philadelphia, 1882), 412–13.

J. P. W. MCNEAL.

McSherry, JAMES, jurist, son of the above, b. at Frederick, Maryland, 30 December, 1842; died there 23 October, 1907. He received a collegiate education to the year before graduation at Mount St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg, Maryland, but was compelled to leave there in 1861 on account of his outspoken Southern sympathies, being arrested and confined for a time at Fort McHenry, Baltimore. He studied law in his father's office and was admitted to the bar on 8 February, 1864. On 26 February, 1866, he married Miss Clara Louise McAleer, by whom he had six children. In 1887 he was appointed chief judge of the circuit court for Frederick and Montgomery Counties and, as such, a member of the court of appeals of the State, and was elected for the full term on 8 November, 1887, without opposition. Judge McSherry was appointed chief justice of the court of appeals on 25 January, 1896, which position he filled with distinction until his death. The degree of Doctor of Laws was conferred upon Judge McSherry by Mount St. Mary's College in 1904 and by the University of Maryland in 1907.

The Sun (Baltimore, 24 October, 1907); *Nat. Cyc. of Amer. Biography*, s. v.

J. P. W. MCNEAL.

McSherry, RICHARD, physician; b. at Martinsburg, Va. (now W. Va.), 21 November, 1817; d. Baltimore, Md., 7 October, 1885, son of Dr. Richard McSherry. He was educated at Georgetown College and at the University of Maryland, and received the degree of M. D. at the University of Pennsylvania in 1841. Being appointed assistant surgeon on the medical corps of the U. S. Army on 21 August, 1838, he served under General Taylor in the Seminole War and resigned his commission on 30 April, 1840. He married in 1842 a daughter of Robert Wilson of Baltimore. From 1843 to 1856 he served as assistant surgeon in the U. S. Navy, and after that practised medicine in Baltimore until 1883. He was the first president of the Baltimore Academy of Medicine, of which he was also one of the founders. Dr. McSherry contributed to medical journals, and was also the author of "El Puchero, or a Mixed Dish from Mexico" (1850); "Essays" (1869), and "Health and How to Promote It" (1883).

LAMB, *Biog. Dict. of U. S.*, V, 312.

J. P. W. MCNEAL.

Mactaris, a titular see of the Byzantine Empire. This town is not spoken of by any ancient geographers; the "Notitia Africæ" mentions it among the towns of the Byzantine Empire. It is now the village of Mactar, headquarters of the civil administration between Kairouan and the Kef, in Tunisia, situated 950 metres above the sea-level, in a well-watered region. Punic civilization long flourished here, as is attested by several interesting inscriptions. It was counted a Roman town until the year 170 at least, having become a colony during the last years of Marcus Aurelius, under the name of Ælia Aurelia Mactaris, as we see from other Latin inscriptions. In the vicinity of Mactaris a number of enormous dolmens may be seen. The remains of the Roman city are very important; among them are two triumphal arches, an amphitheatre, public baths, a temple, an aqueduct, tombs, etc. The ruins of a basilica have furnished several Christian epitaphs, among others those of two bishops. There has also been found an altar covering the remains of two martyrs, one of whom was named Felix. Six bishops are known, from 255 to the sixth century, among them Victor, a contemporary of Cassiodorus, who tells us that this Victor revised the books of Cassian.

TOULOTTE, *Géographie de l'Afrique chrétienne, Byzacène et Tripolitaine* (Montreuil-sur-Mer, 1894), 127–133.

S. PÉTRIDÈS.

Madagascar.—On the second day of March, 1500, a fleet of thirteen ships, commanded by Pedro Alvarez Cabral, sailed from Lisbon to explore the Indian Ocean. On 10 August, one vessel of this fleet, commanded by Diego Dias, having been parted from the rest by stress of weather, came in sight of a point of land on the east coast of a large island. To this island the name of St. Lawrence was given, the day of its discovery being the feast of that martyr; it is now the island of Madagascar, situated to the south-east of Africa, between 11° 57′ 30″ and 25° 38′ 55″ S. latitude, and between 43° 10′ and 50° 25′ East long. Many small islands of less importance are adjacent to it in the Indian Ocean and the Mozambique Channel, the principal being St. Mary, Mayotte, and Nossi-Bé.

The island of Madagascar is, on the whole, very thinly populated, the population averaging little more than thirteen to the square mile; but this population is unequally distributed, dense in the central regions and sparse in other parts. The principal ethnological divisions are the Hova, the Betsileo, the Sakalava, the Betsimisaraka, the Sihamaka, the Antaimoro, the Antanosy. Since the French conquest of the island these various peoples, or tribes, have been distributed in provinces, circuits, and districts, all under the administration of a governor-general who resides at the capital, Tananarivo. Divers opinions have been put forward by the learned as to the origin of the peoples of Madagascar. M. Alfred Grandidier, who is an acknowledged authority in such matters, thinks, and the greater number of anthropologists think with him, that this population is of the black Indonesian race, and is therefore one of the chief groups of the Malayo-Polynesian countries. Malagasy (the native language) seems to be related to the Malayo-Polynesian languages, is, like them, agglutinative, and has a grammar apparently based on general principles analogous to theirs. It is very rich on the material and physical side, and poor in the expression of abstract ideas.

The religion of the Malagasies appears to be fundamentally a kind of mixed Monotheism, under the form of a Fetishism which finds expression in numerous superstitious practices of which these people are very tenacious. Even those who have received Christian instruction and baptism retain a tendency to be guided, in the various circumstances of their lives, rather by these superstitious prescriptions than by the dictates of reason and faith. They admit the existence of the soul, but without, apparently, forming any very exact notion of it; in their conception, it is not so much a spirit made in the image of the Creator as a double of the man, only more subtile than the visible corporeal man. The Malagasy is naturally prone to lying, cupidity, and sexual immorality,

which is for him so far from being a detestable vice that parents are the first to introduce their children to debauchery. This immorality and the lack of stability and fidelity in marriage are the great obstacles to the development of the family and of the Christian religion in Madagascar.

The first priests to bring the Gospel of Jesus Christ to Madagascar after the discovery of the island, came with the Portuguese. Old documents mention religious who, about the year 1540, accompanied a colony of emigrants to the south-eastern part of the island, where they were all massacred together during the celebration of a feast. Then again, about 1585, Frey João de S. Thomé, a Dominican, appears to have been

View of Tananarivo, Madagascar

poisoned on the coast of the island. In the seventeenth century two Jesuits came from Goa with Ramaka, the young son of the King of Anosy. This youth had been taken away, in 1615, by a Portuguese ship, to Goa, where the viceroy had entrusted him to the care of the Jesuits; he had been instructed and baptized. Ramaka's father permitted these two Jesuits to preach Christianity in his dominions. But soon, when they were beginning to wield some power for good, the king, instigated by his *ombiasy* (sorcerers) forbade his subjects to either give or sell anything whatsoever to the fathers. One of the two died, but the other succeeded in returning to India. Some years after this, the Lazarists, sent by St. Vincent de Paul, essayed to conquer Madagascar for the Faith. The Société de l'Orient had then recently taken possession, in the name of France, of a tract of territory on the south-eastern litoral, and had named its principal establishment Fort-Dauphin. The first superior of this Lazarist mission was M. Nacquart; he left France with the Sieur de Flacourt, who represented the Société de l'Orient, and one of his associates, M. Gondrée. Arriving at Fort-Dauphin in December, 1648, M. Nacquart devoted himself most zealously, amid difficulties of every kind, to the evangelization of the natives, until he was carried off by a fever, 29 May, 1650. M. Gondrée had died the year before. During these fourteen months of apostolate seventy-seven persons had received baptism. It was not until four years later that MM. Mounier and Bourdaise came to continue the missionary work which had been initiated at such cost; but they, too, succumbed to the severity of their task. A reinforcement of three missionaries sent to their assistance never reached them; one died at sea, the other two on the island of St. Mary, where they had landed. Nevertheless, St. Vincent de Paul was not discouraged.

In 1663, M. Alméras, the successor of St. Vincent de Paul in the government of the Congregation of St. Lazare, obtained the appointment of M. Etienne as prefect Apostolic and sent him to Fort-Dauphin with two of his brethren and some workmen. On Christmas Day M. Etienne baptized fifteen little children and four adults. But it was not long before he, too, fell a victim to his zeal. On 7 March, 1665, four new missionaries set out, and on 7 January, 1667, they were followed by five priests and four lay brothers, with two Recollét fathers. But in 1671, the Compagnie des Indes, which had succeeded to the Société de l'Orient, having resolved to quit Madagascar, M. Jolly, M. Alméras' successor, recalled his missionaries. Only two out of thirty-seven who had been sent to the island, were able to return to France, in June, 1676; all the rest had died in harness. From the forced abandonment of the Madagascar mission in 1674 until the middle of the nineteenth century, there were only a few isolated attempts, at long intervals, to resume the evangelization of the great African Island: we may mention those of M. Noinville de Gléfier, of the Missions Etrangères of Paris, and of the Lazarists Monet and Durocher. The last-named even sent some natives to the Propaganda Seminary at Rome with the view of training them for the apostolate in their own country.

In 1832 MM. de Solages and Dalmond laid the first foundations of the new Madagascar Mission. But by this time some English Methodists, supported by the Government of their country, had already succeeded in establishing themselves in the centre of the island. The Rev. Mr. Jones had obtained authorization from the Court of Imerina to open a school at Tananarivo, the capital. Other English Protestant missionaries followed him, and by 1830 they had thirty-two schools in Imerina, with four thousand pupils. When, moreover, it was learned at Tananarivo that the new prefect Apostolic, M. de Solages, a Catholic priest, was on his way to the capital, everything was done to arrest his progress, and he died of misery and grief at Andovoranto. M. Dalmond took up the work begun by M. de Solages. After preaching the Gospel in the small islands off the coast until about 1843, he returned to France in order to recruit a large missionary force. The aid which he so much needed he obtained from Father Roothan, the general of the Jesuits, who authorized him to take six fathers or brothers from the Lyons province. Two priests from the Holy Ghost Seminary went with them. After a fruitless attempt at Saint-Augustin, the Jesuit fathers set themselves to evangelize the adjacent islands of St. Mary, Nossi-Bé, and Mayotte. Assisted by the Sisters of St. Joseph of Cluny, they also made earnest efforts towards the instruction and education of the Malagasy boys and girls in the island of Réunion (or Bourbon). They did not, however, by any means lose sight of the great island, and again endeavoured to establish themselves on its littoral, but were once more compelled to abandon their brave enterprise.

It was only in 1855 that Père Finaz, disguised, and under an assumed name, was able to penetrate as far as the capital. "At last", he exclaimed in the joy of his heart, "I am at Tananarivo, of which I take possession in the name of Catholicism." Waiting for the time when he should be able to freely announce the Gospel to the Hova, he used all his efforts to prolong his stay at the capital without arousing suspicion,

making himself useful and agreeable to the queen and the great personages of the realm. He sent up a balloon before the awe-stricken populace assembled in the holy place of Mahamasina; he contrived theatrical performances on a stage constructed and set by himself; he made them a telegraphic apparatus, a miniature railroad, and other things wonderful in their eyes. Meanwhile, Fathers Jouen and Weber, under assumed names, joined Father Finaz at Tananarivo, coming as assistants to a surgeon, Dr. Milhet-Fontarabie, who had been summoned from Réunion by the Queen of Madagascar, Ranavalona I, to perform a rhinoplastic operation on one of her favourites. But this state of affairs was not to last long; Ranavalona soon grew suspicious and ordered the expulsion of the few Europeans who resided at Tananarivo. The fathers, however, had managed, during their brief stay at the capital, to conciliate the favour of the heir presumptive, Ranavalona's son. And so it was that, in 1861, when this same prince, on the death of his mother, succeeded to the throne as Radama II, Fathers Jouen and Weber could return to Tananarivo, bringing with them a small contingent of Jesuit fathers and Sisters of St. Joseph of Cluny, and without being obliged, this time, to dissemble their object in coming.

Radama II gave full authorization for the teaching of the Catholic religion in his dominions; and this much having been conceded to the French Catholic missionaries, similar concessions had to be made to the English Protestants of the London Missionary Society. What with the large subventions furnished by this organization to its emissaries, and the clever manœuvres of some of them—particularly of Mr. Ellis—after the tragic death of Radama II, the English missionaries acquired considerable influence with the new queen, Rasoherina, and her chief adviser, Rainilaiarivony, to the detriment of the Catholic missionaries. The latter, moreover, were few in number—six fathers and five lay brothers at Tananarivo, with two small schools for boys and one, under the Sisters of St. Joseph of Cluny, for girls; and at Tamatave, three fathers, one lay brother, and two sisters. Nevertheless, in spite of all difficulties, the number of neophytes increased, and, especially after the arrival of the Christian Brothers in 1866, the schools took on fresh vigour. Already four parishes were in operation within the capital city, and the missionaries thought of extending their efforts outside. Father Finaz opened the missionary station at Antanetibe on 12 September, 1868; by the end of 1869, thirty-eight groups of neophytes had been formed, twenty-two chapels built, and twenty-five schools opened. Betsileo was occupied in 1871, then Ampositra and Vakinankaratra. A propaganda periodical, "Resaka", was founded. A leper-house was built to receive about one hundred patients. The sisters gave care and remedies to the large numbers who daily applied at their dispensary. A fine large cathedral of cut stone was erected in the centre of Tananarivo. When the war between France and the Hova broke out in 1883, the Catholic mission numbered 44 priests, 19 lay brothers, 8 Brothers of the Christian Schools, 20 Sisters of St. Joseph of Cluny (besides 3 native postulants and 3 novices), 346 native male, and 181 native female, teachers, 20,000 pupils, a laity amounting to 80,000, 152 churches and 120 chapels completed, and 11 churches and 43 chapels in course of construction. In the year ending July, 1882, there were 1161 baptisms of adults, 1882 infant baptisms, 55,406 confessions, 580 first communions, 45,466 ordinary communions, 860 confirmations, and 190 marriages. Sir Gore Jones, a British admiral, whose testimony cannot be suspected of favourable bias, declared in 1883, in a report to his Government after a visit to the island made by its orders, that the Catholic missionaries, "working silently in Madagascar", were planting in that land "a tree far superior to all others".

Cathedral of the Immaculate Conception, Tananarivo, Madagascar

On 17 May, 1883, Admiral Pierre took possession of Majunga in the name of France, and on 11 June of Tamatave. A formal order of the queen expelled all the Catholic missionaries and all French citizens. "Do not resist the queen's word", was the answer of the more responsible among the native Catholics when the fathers consulted them as to the course to be pursued. "To do so would be to compromise our future and, perhaps, to bring upon us more serious misfortunes. If you submit now, you will the more easily return later on." They left the centre of the island—at the same time leaving the native Catholics to their own resources—and went down to the coast. For two years, more or less, while hostilities lasted, the Malagasy Catholics, left without priests, were able to maintain their religion—thanks to the devotion and energy of Victoire Rasoamanarivo, a lady related to the prime minister, of the native Brother Raphael of the Congregation of the Christian Schools, and of some members of the Catholic Union. This organization, consisting of young Malagasies, shows a truly wonderful zeal in their efforts to make up for the absence of the fathers. Both in the city parishes and at the country stations, they made themselves ubiquitous, instructing and encouraging the neophytes. At Tananarivo they sang the choral parts of high Mass every Sunday, just as if the priest had been at the altar; and the native Government, compelled to admire their fidelity, permitted this exercise of devotion. On the first Sunday after the departure of the fathers, when the Catholics attempting to enter the cathedral were warned away, Rasoamanarivo said to the guards at the door: "If you must have blood, begin by shedding mine; but fear shall not keep us from assembling for prayer." After that she entered, followed by all the faithful. The Franco-Hova struggle came to an end, and the missionaries returned to resume their work. Madagascar, until then a prefecture Apostolic, was made a vicariate under its former prefect, who became a titular bishop, Mgr J. B. Cazet. Under his wise and firm administration the mission continued to progress. After a visit to the island, in 1892, the Rev. Kenelm Vaughan, an English priest, was most favourably impressed by the mission work he saw.

In 1894 there was a new rupture between the French

Republic and the Court of Tananarivo. The French missionaries once more had to abandon their work, which then included one college, 9 normal schools, 443 schools and mission stations, 83 churches, 287 chapels, 2 leper-houses, an observatory, a printing press, and various workshops. The staff of the mission comprised: one bishop (the vicar Apostolic), 72 priests, 4 scholastics (one of them a Malagasy), 17 lay brothers, 16 Brothers of the Christian Schools, 29 Sisters of St. Joseph of Cluny, 819 native teachers of both sexes. There were 26,839 pupils and 136,175 converts, of whom 41,133 had been baptized. During the military operations a great many of the Catholic missionaries served as chaplains in the expeditionary corps, and several paid for their devotedness with their lives. After the conquest came the insurrection of the Tahavalo, in which Father Berthieu sacrificed his life for his Christians, whom he would not forsake: he was barbarously slaughtered by the insurgents. But his blood was the seed of progress for the mission: in 1897 it counted something like thrice as many adherents and pupils in its schools as it had before the war. As to the question whether all these new converts to the Faith were sincerely convinced, it must be said that the number of defections tends to show the existence of political or other human motives. Many converts went over to Catholicism as they would have gone over to Protestantism had England conquered the island, or as some went over to Methodism when the prime minister and the queen, by their adherence to it, made that a sort of state religion.

CATHOLIC FAMILY OF TANANARIVO, MADAGASCAR

In any case Mgr Cazet was no longer able to sustain the burden of his vast and heavy responsibility for the whole island. At his petition, two new vicariates Apostolic were created. That of Southern Madagascar, extending from the twenty-second parallel of south latitude to the southern extremity of the island, was entrusted to the Lazarists, who, under Mgr Crouzet, resumed the work of their brethren after an interruption of 200 years. That of Northern Madagascar, extending from the northern extremity to the eighteenth parallel, was given to the fathers of the Congregation of the Holy Ghost, under Mgr Corbet. Mgr Cazet kept the territory between 18° and 22° S. latitude, forming the Vicariate of Central Madagascar. In view of the development of his more densely populated vicariate and, consequently, of its needs, Mgr Cazet asked and obtained the help of the Missionary Fathers of Our Lady of La Salette and the Sisters of Providence of Corenc, to whom he committed the Vakinankavatra district, while Betsileo was confided to the Jesuits of the Champagne province. Mgr Henry de Saune was appointed his coadjutor.

In the meantime the Protestants also have multiplied. To the missionaries and material resources of the London Missionary Society have, for some time past, been added those of the Friends' Foreign Mission Association and the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, the Norwegian Mission, the Norwegian Lutheran Mission of America (United Church); also those of the Free Church and, lastly, of the Société des Missions Evangéliques of Paris. At present (1906) these different societies number about 115 representatives, men and women, in Madagascar, while the working staff of the three Catholic vicariates exceeds 300. Nevertheless about nine-tenths of the inhabitants of Madagascar remain pagans. Progress is slow owing to the perplexity arising from a variety of Christian sects. To any pagan the spectacle of Christian preachers attributing contradictory doctrines to the same Master must prove confusing.

FLACOURT, *Histoire de la grand' île de Madagascar* (Paris, 1658); *Mémoires de la Congrégation de la Mission*, IX (Paris, 1867); DE LA VASSIÈRE, *Histoire de Madagascar* (Paris, 1884); ABINAL AND DE LA VASSIÈRE, *Vingt ans à Madagascar* (Paris, 1884); ROUVIER, *Loin du pays, V (Madagascar)* (Paris, 1902); *Les Missions Catholiques* in *Revue Hebdomadaire illustrée des Missions* (Lyons); *Annales de la propagation de la foi* (Lyons and Paris); *Journal officiel de Madagascar*, a government weekly publication at Tananarivo; *Annuaire de Madagascar* (an annual publication of the Tananarivo government); *Resaka* and *Iraka*, publications in Malagasy by the Catholic Mission at Tananarivo; GRANDIDIER, *La bibliographie de Madagascar, 1500–1905* (Paris, 1906, 2 vols.).

PAUL CAMBOUÉ.

Madaurus, or MADAURA, a titular see of Numidia. It was an old Numidian town which, having once belonged to the Kingdom of Syphax, was annexed to that of Massinissa at the close of the second Punic War. It became a Roman colony about the end of the first century and was famous for its schools. It was the native town of Apuleius, author of "The Golden Ass", and of the grammarians Nonius and Maximus. St. Augustine studied there; through a letter which he addressed later to the inhabitants we learn that many were still pagans. Madaurus, however, had many martyrs known by their epitaphs; several are named in the Roman martyrology on 4 July. Three bishops are known: Antigonus, who attended the council of Carthage, 349; Placentius, the council of 407 and the Conference of 411; Pudentius, sent into exile by Huneric with the other bishops who had been present at the Conference of 484. The ruins of Madaurus are seen near Mdaouroch, department of Constantine (Algeria); a fine Roman mausoleum, vast baths, a Byzantine fortress, a Christian basilica are noteworthy and have furnished several Christian inscriptions.

SMITH, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Geogr.* s. v.; TOULOTTE, *Géographie de l'Afrique chrétienne: Numidie* (Rennes, 1894), 201–206.

S. PÉTRIDÈS.

Maderna, CARLO (1556–1629), known principally by his extension of St. Peter's, at the command of the pope, from the form of a Greek to that of a Latin cross. Regard for ecclesiastical tradition and other causes made the long nave preferable, notwithstanding that the effect of the cupola was thus much diminished. Maderna began his task in the year 1605, forty years after the death of Michelangelo. By bringing the columns nearer together, he sought to lessen the un-

favourable effect produced, but in so doing obstructed the former unbroken vista in the side aisles. However, notwithstanding the extension, the great basilica has not lost its sublime grandeur.

The new façade was widened. It is an ornamental structure independent of the building itself, and its impressive size does not harmonize with the character of the decorations. The length measures 112 metres (367 ft. 4 in.) and the height 44 metres (144 ft. 4 in.). Eight gigantic columns, 27 metres (88 ft. 6½ in.) in height, stand in two divisions, on both sides of which are pillars and imbedded pillars. Above these extends an entablature with balustrades, and an arch surmounts the portals. Upon this entablature stand statues of Christ and the Apostles, 5 to 7 metres (16 to 22 ft.) high. Massive corner-pieces were intended for bell-towers, the lack of which at the present day weakens the effect of the façade. In the arrangement of the foreground and background, and in the different effects of intercolumniation, much freedom is used, not without many happy shadow effects. Between the building, which was itself lengthened by 50 metres (164 ft.), and the façade, there is a vestibule 71 metres (nearly 233 ft.) wide, 13 metres (42 ft. 6 in.) deep, and 20 metres (65 ft. 6 in.) high, leading into the five entrances. The interior of this vestibule is the finest work of the master, and it has even been rated one of the most beautiful architectural works of Rome, on account of the lordly proportions, the symmetrical arrangement, and the simple colouring, the relief on the ceiling being painted in white and dark yellow.

The two fountains in the open space (*piazza*) before St. Peter's are also much admired. The façade of St. Susanna and that of the Incurabili, as lesser works, were better suited to the genius of Maderna. He also provided Sta. Francesca Romana with a façade in the Baroque style. In all these works, the want of harmony between the façade and the main body of the church was an inheritance from the Renaissance. But it was partially through the influence of Fontana, his uncle, that Maderna was even then dominated by the freedom of the Baroque style, which, in its later development, broke loose from all restraint. The serious dignity of the façade of the Gesù is not interfered with by its charming rhythm, varying shadow effects and rich decoration; and there is no lack of harmony of the whole, or of symmetry. The interior of Sant' Andrea della Valle, majestic and rich in tone, gives us even now a true idea of the artistic taste of Maderna. He built a part of the Palazzo Mattei (the court, with lofty loggias) and, with Bernini, the Palazzo Barberini (the central building, with three orders of columns and an open arcade). He co-operated, besides, in many works at Rome, for example, the Quirinal Gardens. At Ferrara, he designed the fortifications.

Quatremère De Quincy, *Hist. des plus célèbres architectes* II (Paris); Burckhardt, *Cicerone;* Kuhn, *Allgemeine Kunst-Geschichte* (New York, Cincinnati, Chicago, 1900–09).

G. Gietmann.

Maderno, Stefano (1576–1636), a sculptor of the Roman School and of the era just preceding Bernini, his contemporary. He is believed to be of Lombard origin from the neighbourhood of Como; probably he was related to Carlo Maderna, the architect and sculptor, who was also born near Como, at Bissone. Stefano's works are found frequently in churches upon which Carlo was engaged. Stefano began by copying the antique and made several highly esteemed models in bronze. His fame rests, however, upon the statue of St. Cecilia over her tomb in the church of St. Cecilia in Trastevere, Rome. He never surpassed, or even equalled this, which he executed in his twenty-third year. The body of the martyr, discovered by Pope Paschal I (fourth century) in the Catacomb of St. Callistus and brought by him to the church which had been her dwelling, was viewed anew unchanged in 1599. Before closing the tomb again, Clement VIII summoned Maderno, the most skilful artist of his day to make an exact reproduction of the figure. His statue represents a delicate, rather small body, lying face downward, with the knees drawn together, the arms extended along the side and crossing at the wrists, the head enveloped in a veil. A gold fillet marks the wound in the back of the partly-severed neck. The form is so natural and lifelike, so full of modesty and grace, that one scarcely needs the sculptor's testimony graven on the base: "Behold the body of the most holy virgin Cecilia whom I myself saw lying incorrupt in her tomb. I have in this marble expressed for thee the same saint in the very same posture of body". If it were art alone, it would be consummate art, but Cicognara bears witness that in the perfect simplicity of this work, more unstudied and flexuous than his other productions, the youthful sculptor must have been guided solely by the nature of the object before him, and followed it with unswerving docility.

Stefano is supposed to have assisted in the construction of the Pauline Chapel of Sta Maria Maggiore, where two of his reliefs are to be found: one in marble representing a battle, the other, the story of the snow-fall in August, the origin of the basilica. Also attributed to Stefano, but quite without importance, are: the figure of St. Peter for the façade of the Quirinal Palace: a statue of St. Charles Borromeo in the church of S. Lorenzo in Damaso, decorative figures of children in the Sixtine Chapel of Sta. Maria Maggiore, angels of the Madonna di Loreto and Sta Maria sopra Minerva and the allegories of Peace and Justice at Sta Maria della Pace. Count Gaspare Rivaldi, for whom Maderno executed various commissions, having sought to reward him by procuring for him a lucrative position at the excise offices of the Gabelle di Ripetta, the sculptor's time became unfortunately engrossed by his new duties to the exclusion of his art. He died in Rome in 1636.

Cicognara, *Storia della Scultura* (Venice, 1818); Hare, *Walks in Rome* (New York, 1890); *Grande Encyclopédie* (Paris, 1886), s. v.

M. L. Handley.

Madianites (in A. V. Midianites), an Arabian tribe: Heb. מדינים Sept. Μαδιηναῖοι and Μαδιανεῖται, Lat. Madianitæ). Comparison of Gen., xxxvi, 35, with xxxvii, 28, 36 proves that the Biblical authors employ indifferently the simple form Madian (Heb. מדין Sept. Μαδιάν, Lat. Madian) instead of the tribal plural. The collective *Madian* appears in Judges, vi-viii, and seems to have been subsequently preferred (cf. Is., ix, 3; x, 26; Ps. lxxxiii, 10). In I Kings, xi, 18, and Hab., iii, 7, for example, if *Madian* denotes a country, it is by transposition of the name of the people, which was not the primitive usage. By a specious, but inconclusive, argument, P. Haupt ("Midian und Sinai" in "Zeitschrift der Deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft", lxiii, 1909, p. 506) has even recently sought to prove that *Madian* was an abstract term denoting a religious association such as the Greeks called an Amphictyony (ἀμφικτυονία). The term *Madianites* must, in that case, have been used somewhat as we say *Mussulmans*.

The Madianites were introduced into history in the texts of Gen., xxv, 1–4 and I Chron., i, 32 sq. which assign as their ancestor an eponym called Madian, the son of Abraham by Qetourah (D.V. Cetura), which signifies "incense" or conveys the idea of incense and aromatics (cf. Deut., xxxiii, 10). Of the five other sons which Abraham had by Cetura the only other one who can now be identified is Shûâh (D.V. Sue). For a long time Delitzsch had suggested a connexion between this name and that of Suhu, a country, mentioned in the Assyrian documents ("Wo lag das Paradies", Leipzig, 1881, 297 sq.), which is the desert region between the Euphrates and Syria (see Ed. Meyer "Die Israeliter und ihre Nachbarstämme",

Halle, 1906, 314.—*Dadan*, too, may probably be considered as a geographical name in the region of Teimā). The continuation of the genealogy settles its character and permits a better identification of the Madianites: Madian must have had five sons, 'Ĕpha, 'Ĕphér, Ḥănōk, Ăbîdâ', and 'Ĕldâh. The last two are used as proper names in the Sabeo-Minean inscriptions, but are otherwise unknown. The first three, which occur in later Israelitish genealogies (see Num., xxvi, 5; I Chron., ii, 47; iv, 17), have been rightly compared with local and ethnological designations in southern Arabia (see the more important citations from Arabian authors collected in Dillmann, "Die Genesis erklärt", 6th ed., Leipzig, 1892, 308 sq.). For 'Ĕpha in particular there is the valuable witness of the Assyrian texts. The annals of Tiglath-Pileser (D.V. Theglathphalasar); (d. 727 B. C.) mention among the tribes of Teimā and Saba a tribe called Hayapa which is philologically the equivalent of the Hebrew עיפה (cf. Schrader, "Die Keilenschriften und das A. T.", 3rd ed., Berlin, 1903, 58).—It may be inferred from these indications that the genealogy of Madian is a literary process by which the Bible connects with the history of the Hebrew people the Arabian tribes of the regions which we now call Nejd and Jáûf. *Madianites* is, then, to be regarded as the generic name of an immense tribe divided into several clans of which we know at least some of the names.

This notion established, there will be scarcely any difficulty in tracing through sacred history the rôle played by the Madianites, without having recourse, as has too often been done, to alleged contradictions in the sources. Some of these—e. g., Gen., xxxvii, 28, 36 (cf. Is., lx, 6)—represent them as merchants engaged chiefly in the transportation of aromatics by their camel caravans. Others—e. g., Ex., ii, 15 sq.; iii, 1—depict them as shepherds, but somewhat sedentary. In one place (v. g., Ex., xviii, 7–12, and Judges, i, 16; see the commentaries of Moore, Lagrange, etc., for the exact reading) the Madianites in general, or the special clan of the Qenites (D.V. Cinites), appear as the friends and allies of Israel; in another (v. g., Judges, vi–viii, and Num., xxv, xxxii) they are irreconcilable enemies; Hab., iii, 7, manifestly localizes them in southern Arabia, by parallel with כושן which designates a country of eastern Kûsh, most certainly distinct from Ethiopian Nubia. (This distinction, first established by Glaser, then by Winckler and Hommel, has been discussed by Lagrange in "Les inscriptions du sud de l'Arabie et l'exégèse biblique" in "Revue Biblique", 1902, 269 sqq. Ed. Meyer, who denies the distinction, in "Die Israeliten", 315 sqq., does not bring forward any solid argument against it.) Num., xxii, 4, and especially Gen., xxxvi, 35, place them beyond contradiction in almost immediate relation with Moab, so that Winckler ("Geschichte Israels in Einzeldarstellungen", I, Leipzig, 1895, 47 sqq.) assigns to them as habitat, according to the most ancient tradition, the country later occupied by the Moabites.

It is evidently a matter for Biblical criticism to examine the particular point of view of the various accounts in which the Madianites occur, and to explain, for instance, why *Madianites* and *Ishmaelites* are employed in apparent equivalence in Gen., xxxvii, 25, 28, and Judges, viii, 24, 26. For the rest, much light is shed on the history of this ancient and powerful tribe by analogies with what we know concerning the great Arabian tribes, their constitution, their division, their habitat, their relations with the neighbouring tribes or sedentary peoples. As we find them in the Pentateuch the Madianites were an important tribe in which were gathered the chief clans inhabiting Southern Arabia. The area wherein these nomads moved with their flocks stretched towards the west, probably to the frontiers of Egypt, and towards the north, without well-defined limits to the plateaux east of the Dead Sea and towards Haurân. (Compare the modern tribe—much less important, it is true—of the Ḥaweiṭâte.) It was with them that Moses sought refuge when he was fleeing from Egypt (Ex., ii, 15), as did the Egyptian officer in the well-known account of Sinouhit. His welcome to the tribe and the alliance which subsequently resulted therefrom, when Moses and his people were marching towards Sinai, are like common occurrences in the history of modern tribes. But the Madianites were not all, nor exclusively, shepherds. Masters of the eastern desert, if not also of the fertile countries of southern Arabia, they at least monopolized the traffic between Arabia and the Aramean countries, on the north, or Egypt, on the west. Their commercial caravans brought them into contact with the regions of culture, and thus, as always happens with nomads, the spectacle of the prosperity of more settled peoples aroused their covetousness and tempted them to make raids. When Israel was forming its political and religious organizations at Mount Sinai, it was in peaceful contact with one of the Madianite clans, the Cinites. (One considerable school in recent times has even undertaken to prove that the religion of Israel, and especially the worship of Jahve, was borrowed from the Cinites. Lagrange has shown, in "Revue Biblique", 1903, 382 sqq., that this assumption is without foundation.) It has even been established that a portion of this clan united its fortunes with those of Israel and followed it to Chanaan (cf. Num., xxiv, 21 sq.; Judges, i, 16; iv, 11, 17; v, 24; I Sam., xv, 6 sq.). However, other Madianite clans scattered through the eastern desert were at the same time covetously watching the confines of the Aramean country. They were called upon by the Moabites to oppose the passage of Israel (Num., xxii, sqq.). As to these "Mountains of the east", (*Hârerē Qĕdĕm*) of Num., xxiii, 7, whence was brought the Madianite diviner Balaam, cf. "the east country" of Gen., xxv, 7, to which Abraham relegated the offspring of his concubine Cetura; cf. also the modern linguistic usage of the Arabs, to whom "the East" (*Sherq*) indicates the entire desert region where the Bedouin tribes wander, between Syria and Mesopotamia, to the north, and between the Gulf of Akabah and the Persian Gulf to the south.

Nothing is to be concluded from this momentary alliance between the Moabites and a portion of the Madianites, either with regard to a very definite habitat of the great tribe on the confines of Moab, or with regard to a contradiction with other Biblical accounts. In the time of Gedeon, perhaps two centuries after the events in Moab, the eastern Madianites penetrated the fertile regions where Israel was for a long time settled. This was much more in the nature of a foray than of a conquest of the soil. But the Madianite chieftains had exasperated Gedeon by slaying his brothers. The vengeance taken was in conformity with the law of the times, which is to this day the Arabian law. Gedeon, as conqueror, exterminated the tribe after having slain its leaders (Judges, viii). From this time the tribe disappeared almost entirely from the history of Israel and seems never to have regained much of its importance. The installation of the eastern Israelitish tribes forced these Madianites back into the desert; the surviving clans fell back towards the south, to Arabia, which had been their cradle, and where some portions of the tribe had never ceased to dwell. This was their centre in the time of Isaias (lx, 6), probably also in the time of Habacuc (iii, 7; about 600 B. C.); here, at any rate, all the Assyrian documents of Theglathphalasar (745–27) and Sargon (722–05) make mention of one of their clans. However, the conflict between the South-Arabian tribes increased, and new waves of population, flowing northwards to the regions of culture, were to absorb the remains of the ancient decayed tribe. According to the testimony of Greek geographers and, later, of Arabian authors, the Madianites

would seem to have taken up their permanent abode on the borders of the Gulf of Akabah, since there existed there a town called Μοδιάνα (Ptolemy, "Geogr." VI, vii, 2; but according to Flavius, Josephus, and Eusebius, Μαδιανή), whose ruins have been described by the explorer Rüppel and, more recently, by Sir R. Burton ("The Gold Mines of Midian" and "The Land of Midian revisited", London, 1878 and 1879), now known as Mûghâir Shuaib, not far from the abandoned harbour of Maqna, on the eastern shore of the Gulf of Akabah. If, as there is every reason to believe, it was the Madianites whom Procopius had in mind under the somewhat distorted name of Μααδηνοί (Persian War, I, xix; ed. Niebuhr, Bonn, 1833, p. 100), the tribe still existed exactly in the region mentioned under the reign of Justinian. But this document shows us in a manner the death-throes of the tribe which was then dependent on the Himyarites and doubtless was soon rendered wholly extinct by absorption in the Islamite hordes.

WINCKLER and BURTON in works cited above in the body of this article. Also BONACCORSI in VIGOUROUX, *Dict. de la Bible*, s. v.; CHAPMAN in HASTINGS, *Dict. of the Bible*, s.v. *Midian, Midianites*.

HUGUES VINCENT.

Madras (MADRASPATAM), ARCHDIOCESE OF (MADRASPATANA), in India. Its area is about 40,350 square miles, and the Catholic population about 50,000 out of a total of over seven millions. The diocese is under the care of secular clergy (European and native) and the missionaries of St. Joseph, Mill Hill. There are in the archdiocese 47 churches and 135 chapels in charge of 59 priests (of whom 39 are Europeans, 18 natives and 2 Eurasians), assisted by the Brothers of St. Patrick and of St. Francis of Assisi, Nuns of the Orders of the Presentation and the Good Shepherd, the Sisters of Jesus, Mary, and Joseph, and the Native Sisterhoods of St. Anne, of St. Francis of Assisi, of St. Fancis Xavier, numbering in all 262.

TELUGU PUPILS OF ST. ANNE'S SCHOOL
Phiranghipuram, Diocese of Madras

From the year 1606 the districts covered by the present Diocese of Madras belonged to the Padroado See of San Thomé. In 1642, however, a Capuchin mission was started at Madras and erected into a prefecture Apostolic under Propaganda. This mission was kept up by the same order until the substitution of a vicariate Apostolic in 1832. The frequent vacancies of the See of San Thomé and other reasons led the Holy See in 1832 to erect a new vicariate Apostolic in place of the old prefecture Apostolic, and, by the brief "Multa Præclare" of 1838, to withdraw entirely the jurisdiction of San Thomé as well as the other Padroado suffragan sees, transferring this portion of it to the new Vicar Apostolic of Madras, the other portions being assigned to the Vicars Apostolic of Madura, of Bengal, and of the Coromandel Coast (Pondicherry), etc. The Vicariate of Madras was at first very extensive, but was reduced by the erection of new vicariates—those of Vizagapatam in 1849 and Hyderabad in 1851. On the establishment of the hierarchy in 1886, Madras was made into an archdiocese, with Vizagapatam and Hyderabad as suffragan dioceses, and the following year a third suffragan see was added at Nagpur by a subdivision of the territory of Vizagapatam. Subsequently the Doab of Raichur was ceded to Hyderabad, and thus the present boundaries were arrived at. Within the confines of the archdiocese there are five exempted churches in Madras belonging to the jurisdiction of San Thomé, and on the other hand Adyar in the Mylapore confines is under the jurisdiction of Madras.

The list of Capuchin prefects Apostolic from 1642 to 1832 is not accessible. Vicars Apostolic: John Bede Polding, O.S.B., nominated in 1832, but declined; Pedro D'Alcantara, O. Carm. Disc., Vic. Ap. of Bombay, appointed *ad interim* 1834–35; Daniel O'Connell, O.S.A., 1835–40; Patrick Joseph Carew, 1840–42; John Fennelly, 1842–68; Stephen Fennelly, 1868–80; Joseph Colgan, 1882, became archbishop in 1886, still living; present coadjutor-bishop, John Aelen, since 1892. The Mill Hill Fathers, who first entered the diocese in 1882, have St. Mary's European High School, Madras, founded 1906, with 130 European pupils; St. Gabriel's High School, Madras, founded 1839, with 200 native pupils; St. Joseph's European School, Bellary, with 65 boarders and 20 day-scholars; Native Higher Secondary School, Bellary, with 100 Telugu pupils. The Brothers of St. Patrick, established 1875, have St. Patrick's Orphanage, Adyar, with 90 orphans, also European Boarding School with 60 pupils. The Tertiary Brothers of St. Francis of Assisi, founded 1889, established at Bellary, 1899, have a school with 52 boarders and primary school with 117 boys.

The Presentation Nuns, established 1842, have the Presentation Convent College, Madras, with 200 boarders and 225 day scholars, besides a branch school at Royapuram, with 104 pupils; at Vepery, a convent school with 40 boarders and 91 day scholars, an orphanage with 22 inmates, and St. Joseph's High School (founded 1884) with 20 pupils. The Good Shepherd Nuns, established in 1875 at Bellary: noviciate of the order, and also of Native Sisters of St. Francis Xavier; St. Philomena's High School for Europeans, with boarders and day-scholars (total 135); military orphanage; St. Joseph's Orphanage for European Girls, with 65 inmates; St. Xavier's Orphanage, for native children, with 28 inmates; Magdalene asylum and widows' home opened in 1896, with 19 inmates. Sisters of Jesus, Mary and Joseph, established in 1904: dispensaries at Guntur and Vetapalem, and schools with about 140 pupils; novitiate with 6 novices. Native Sisters of St. Anne, established at Kilacheri in 1863 (Telugu caste nuns): school with 63 pupils; school at Royapuram, founded 1885, with 148 pupils; school at N. George Town, founded 1900, with 150 pupils. Native Sisters of St. Francis Xavier: day-school at Phiranghipuram, with 120 pupils, and primary school, with 180 boys; teachers' training-school, orphanage and widows' home; school at Rentachintla, with 180 pupils, and at Patibandla, with 100 pupils; lower secondary school at Bellary, with 65 pupils; orphanage, with 20 inmates. Native Sisters of St. Francis of Assisi, founded 1884: four schools at Vepery, with 250 pupils; orphanage, with 18 inmates, and foundling asylum.

Leaving aside the larger high schools, convent schools, and European and native orphanages, there are in the archdiocese 3 English schools for boys, 2 for girls, and 4 mixed; 16 Tamil schools for boys, 6 for girls, and 5 mixed; 38 Telugu schools for boys, 6 for girls, and 15 mixed. The Tamil Catholic population is strong in Madras and neighbourhood, where there are many churches, while in the outlying parts there are three Telugu mission groups in the Guntur, Bellary and Chingleput districts. As regards indications of missionary progress, the estimated Catholic population in 1888 was 43,587, as compared with 49,290 in 1908. The finest building in Madras is the old cathedral, Armenian Street, built in 1775; but several fine churches have been erected in the districts.

Local publications include the Madras "Catholic Watchman", a weekly paper started in 1887; the "Madras Catholic Directory", published annually since 1851, and covering the whole of India, Burma, Ceylon, and Malacca, with an appendix on Siam and China; the "Nalla Ayan", a Tamil monthly.

Madras Catholic Directory for 1909 and previous years, especially the year 1867, which contains a special historical account of the Capuchin Mission; *Bombay Examiner*, 11 May, 1907, on Bellary district. A history of the Telugu Missions is in preparation by FATHER KROOT. ERNEST R. HULL.

Madrid-Alcalá, DIOCESE OF (MATRITENSIS-ALACHENSIS, OR-COMPLUTENSIS: Complutum being the name given by the Romans to the town called in later years Alcalá by the Moors). Madrid is the name of a province and town in Spain.

PROVINCE.—Madrid is one of the five provinces into which New Castile is divided: area 3084 square miles; pop. (in 1900), 775,036. It lies in the basin of the Tagus; other rivers of the province being the Jarama, the Henares, the Logaza and the Manzanares, all tributaries of the Tagus. The soil is clayey and sandy, and on the whole treeless, except along the mountain slopes of the Guadarrama. The quarries of the Guadarrama contain granite, lime, iron, copper, and lead. The chief manufactures are cloth, paper, porcelain, bricks, and glass. In the neighbourhood of Madrid gardening is carried on extensively, and wine and oil are a source of wealth throughout the province. Commerce is mainly carried on with the town of Madrid, and of late years an improved railway system is developing the economical condition of country places. The great plain of Madrid lies in the heart of the province, an immense desert flanked by the Guadarrama mountains, and resembling the wide campagna in which Rome stands.

TOWN.—The early history of Madrid is largely conjectural. Roman tablets and remains have been discovered in the neighbourhood, but nothing definite is known until the Moors took possession of the surrounding country and established a fortress called Majrît. Tradition relates that there were Christians in the town and that during the Moorish occupation they concealed an image of the Blessed Virgin, known as Our Lady of the Almudena, in a tower of the city walls, where it was found in after years. The Moors were driven out by Don Ramiro II of Leon in 939, the Moorish Alcázar became a royal palace, and the mosque a Christian church. The new cathedral, begun in 1885, and still unfinished, stands on the site of the mosque. Under the kings of Castile, Madrid attained no great prominence. In the fourteenth century the Cortes met there twice; John II and Henry IV resided occasionally in the royal palace, and Charles V visited it in 1524. In 1525 Francis I of France was imprisoned in Madrid, and in 1526 he signed the Treaty of Madrid by which he abandoned his rights over Italy. On regaining freedom, however, he refused to be bound by its terms. There were two other Treaties of Madrid, that of 1617 between Spain and Venice, and that of 1800 between Spain and Portugal. Philip II by decree dated 1561 declared the town of Madrid to be the *unica corte*, thereby establishing it as capital of all Spain, over the older and more historic towns of Valladolid, Seville, Toledo, etc., capitals of the kingdoms into which Spain had been divided.

From this time dates the expansion of Madrid; Philip II built the Escorial palace and monastery in the vicinity; Philip III, the Plaza Mayor; Philip IV, the Buen Retiro; Charles III, the Prado Museum and the Alcalá Gateway. In 1789 Madrid had 18 parishes, 39 colleges, 15 gates, and 140,000 inhabitants. In 1808 it raised the standard of independence against the French invaders and the monument of the Dos de Mayo (2 May) commemorates the heroism of the Madrileños when the French assaulted the Puerta del Sol. The Duke of Wellington restored the town to Spain in 1812. In 1878 the walls were taken down and the urban boundaries enlarged and its population in 1900 was 539,835. After the abdication of King Amadeo (1873), of the House of Savoy, who accepted the crown on the assassination of General Prim, the town was for a time in a state of anarchy owing to the rival political passions of Carlists, Republicans, and Socialists. Eventually a republic was instituted which lasted till 1875 when the House of Bourbon returned to Madrid in the person of Alfonso XII, father of the present sovereign Alfonso XIII.

Madrid is built on the Manzanares (a narrow river crossed by imposing bridges, the principal of which are Puente de Toledo and Puente de Segovia), on low irregular sandhills in the centre of a bleak plateau 2150 feet above sea-level to the south of, but unprotected by, the Sierra Guadarrama. The temperature ranges from 18° to 105° F.; the climate while not unhealthy is treacherous; the winter cold is intense and the summer heat pitiless. The dust of the sandhills is a source of discomfort to the inhabitants, and baffles all the efforts of the municipality to overcome it. Modern improvements are to be seen everywhere. The streets are a network of electric cars; the telephone system is excellent; transportation facilities are provided for by the railways which give direct communication with Paris, Lisbon, etc.; water is supplied from the Logasa, by an aqueduct 47 miles long conveying 40,000,000 gallons of water daily to Madrid: this aqueduct was erected at a cost of $11,000,000. The working classes are well organized to defend their interests; the masons' and bricklayers' union has 15,000 members. Socialistic ideals find some favour among the working men, and May Day demonstrations are sometimes troublesome. Public peace is looked after by gendarmes and civil guards. The State maintains a savings bank, and the pawnbroking of the town is in Government hands. There are 3 foundling institutions, 6 orphanges, 20 hospitals, including the Princess Hospital, Hospital of St. John of God, military hospital, and a lunatic asylum. The birthràte is 37.5 per 1000; the mortality 37.4. The principal manufactures are tobacco (the tobacco monopoly employs over 4000 women and girls), metal ware, leather, gloves, and fans. It is a town of small traders, a frugal, industrious community reflecting the political ideals of the country. Barcelona, while commercially more important, has strong affinities with France; Burgos, Salamanca, and Cordova live in their past greatness, but Madrid is a thriving stately town, well fitted to be the capital of modern Spain.

The arms of the town are a tree in leaf with a bear climbing the trunk, and the escutcheon is surmounted by a crown. Madrid has never been officially granted the title *ciudad* or city.

Monuments.—Old Madrid ended on one side at the Puerta del Sol, now the centre of the town, whence the chief thoroughfares radiate: the Calle de Alcalá, the Calle del Arenal, the Calle Mayor, and the Carrera de San Jeronimo, or Fifth Avenue of Madrid. The Buen Retiro and Parque de Madrid are recreation grounds. In the Plaza Mayor is a bronze equestrian statue of

Philip III, the work of Juan de Bologna. The Ministry of State dates from Philip IV and the town hall with its fine staircase is a seventeenth-century structure. The Palacio del Congreso, where the deputies meet, is a Corinthian building dating from 1850. The Plaza de Oriente, the largest square in Madrid, has a handsome fountain adorned with bronze lions. This square dates from the reign of Joseph Bonaparte(1808). The Royal Exchange and Bank of Spain are modern but imposing buildings. The Royal Palace, a large rectangular building designed by Sacchetti, overlooks the Manzanares and commands a view of the whole town. Before the twelfth century a moorish Alcázar stood there and a palace was built on the site by Henry IV from designs by Herrera. This structure was destroyed by fire in 1738, and the present building was then erected at a cost of $15,000,000. It is built of granite and faces the south. The main staircase is of black and white marble; the throne room has paintings by Tiefolo; there is a hall by Gasparini; and the royal chapel has paintings by Mengs and contains the font at which St. Dominic was baptized. Another royal palace is La Granja (4000 feet above sea-level), the grange or farm, a summer residence in view of the Guadarrama mountains. It was built in 1746 by Philip V and is known officially as San Ildefonso. Its park and fountains are famous. El Pardo, a royal shooting box, 6 miles from Madrid has Gobelin tapestries after designs by Teniers and Goya. Aranjuez, 30 miles from Madrid, is another royal palace, famous for its gardens (Garden of the Primavera) and for its paintings by Mengs, Maella, and Lopez. (See also Escorial.)

Church of San Jerónimo, Madrid

In the neighbourhood of the Royal Palace, Madrid, is the upper house of the Cortes, the House of Senators. The Senate consists of 80 members who are senators in their own right, 100 members nominated by the crown, and 180 members elected by state corporations, including ecclesiastical bodies, for 10 years, one half renewable every 5 years. The House of Deputies is nominally composed of one deputy to every 50,000 inhabitants; he must be over 25 years of age, and is elected for a term of 5 years. In all there are 406 deputies. Neither senators nor deputies are paid for their services to the nation. Suffrage is the right of every male adult who has arrived at the age of 25 years (Law of 26 June, 1890), and who has resided within a municipality for at least 2 years. The king's civil list is $1,900,000; and the queen has a state allowance of $90,000 annually.

Adjoining the Royal Palace is the Royal Armoury where the student can view if not the evolution at least the highest expression of the armourer's craft. It contains the masterpieces of the Colmans of Augsburg and the Negrolis of Milan. Historically, perhaps less valuable than that of the Tower of London, in magnificence the Madrid collection is rivalled only by that of the Imperial Armoury at Vienna. The National Museum known as Museo del Prado from designs by Villanueva, dates from the reign of Charles III, and was completed under Ferdinand VII. It is a handsome building, badly lighted, and contains masterpieces of nearly all the schools of painting and sculpture of Europe. The early Spanish School is represented by Gallegos; Pedro Berruguete, Morales, El Greco, and Ribera (predecessor of Velasquez and Murillo) are also represented. Velasquez, a native of Seville, went to Madrid in 1623 where he died in 1660, and his masterpieces are to be seen in a *sala* of the Prado: "Las Meniñas", "The Forge of Vulcan", "Los Barrachos", "Las Lanzas". The Prado contains Murillo's "Holy Family", "The penitent Magdalen", "The Adoration of the Shepherds", etc. Among Italian painters there are works by Fra Angelico, Mantegna, Raffaele, Del Sarto, Corregio, Tintoretto, Veronese, Titian. There are examples of Van Eyck, a Van der Weyden, a Memlinc, a Holbein, and about 60 paintings by Rubens, who visited Madrid in 1628. The collection of paintings in The Prado rivals even that of The Louvre, and artists from every country are to be seen studying or copying its masterpieces. Its treasures include twoscore Murillos, nine canvases from the brush of El Greco, much of the work of Ribera (a decidedly modern painter, though he lived between 1588–1656), and a whole *sala* devoted to Velasquez. There too is to be seen the work of Antonio Moro, founder of the Spanish School of portraiture, whose painting of Mary Tudor of England, wife of Philip II of Spain, is of peculiar interest. Among other glories of The Prado are Rubens and Goya. This assemblage of canvases of all the great masters of painting makes The Prado collection one of the most famous and valuable in the world. The Museo de Arte Moderna has many pictures by contemporary artists, and much statuary. The Real Academia de Bellas Artes, built in 1752, has also a valuable picture gallery. There are moreover Academies of History (1738), Science (1847), and Medicine (1732), and a Naval Museum (1856).

The first public library in Madrid was the San Isidro, founded by the Jesuits, and containing 60,000 volumes. The National Library was built in 1712; it has many editions of "Don Quixote", a Visigothic work of the tenth century and the "Siete Partidas" of Alfonso the Wise. The library of the Royal Academy of History has many valuable books and MSS.

Francisco de Quevedo Villegas, poet and prose writer, was born in Madrid in 1580, and studied at Alcalá. His works have been collected in 3 vols. in "Biblioteca de Autores Españoles". His "Visions" were translated into English in 1688 and republished in 1715. Calderon lived in the Calle Mayor, or Calle de Almudena, and Lope de Vega was born there (1562). There is a monument to Calderon by Figuéras in the Plaza de Santa Ana. The first part of Cervantes' masterpiece, "Don Quixote", was published in Madrid in 1605. He died in 1616 and there is a monument to him in the Plaza de las Cortes. The first newspaper was the "Gaceta de Madrid" printed in 1661: at first it appeared annually, but in 1667 every Saturday; later it was issued twice a week

and in 1808 it was made a daily. The "Diario" was started in 1758, and its title afterwards became "Diario oficial de Avisos de Madrid". In 1825 it became the government newspaper. "Imparcial" began in 1806; and "El Imparcial", "La Correspondencia", and "El Día" were published in 1867. "La Epoca" dates from 1848; and "El Universo" is newer in the field. Among the reviews published in Madrid are "Lectura", "Ateneo", "España Moderna", "Nuestra Tiempo", and "Razon y Fe."

The Plaza de Toros or bull ring dates from 1874. It seats about 15,000 persons, and cost 3,000,000 reales. It is in the Moorish style of architecture, with a very imposing arch. Madrid remains the Mecca of the *toreros*, and the *corrida* is one of the chief institutions of the national capital.

The national Church of Spain is the Catholic Church. A restricted liberty of worship is allowed to Protestants of whom there are about 3000 in the whole kingdom: statistics for Madrid are lacking. The first Protestant Bishop of Madrid was appointed in 1895. There is a Protestant cemetery, and schools are conducted by Protestants of various denominations in the town. A project of law for extending greater liberty to non-Catholic forms of religion is at present (1910) in contemplation. The total non-Catholic population of the country was 30,000 in 1900, of whom 4000 were Jews, 3000 Protestants, the remainder being Rationalists etc. The chief religious restrictions complained of are the forbidding of the ringing of service bells and the prohibition of non-Catholic houses of worship with doors abutting on to the streets of the town. A letter from Mr. William Collier, U. S. minister at Madrid to the Secretary of State, Washington, 17 February, 1906, contains the following passage: "The study of the statutes [of Spain] which I have made and the advice of counsel lead me to the opinion that non-Catholics who are Spanish subjects may by complying with the provisions of the law, form legal associations vested with a legal personality, subject of course in their ceremonies and religious observances to the restrictions of the constitutional provisions." The province of Madrid is mainly a region of small agriculturists, large towns are few, and the peasant does not love to be taxed for educational purposes. That education is making rapid progress in Spain is proved by statistics. In 1860, about 75 per cent. of the people could neither read nor write; in 1880 the number stood at 68 per cent.; in 1900 the illiterates had been reduced to 30 per cent. In other words the young generation is growing up well educated. The public schools of the country are in the hands of lay teachers appointed after competitive examination, while the teaching orders of the Church conduct private schools and *institutos* or high schools in which about one-fifth of the children of the country are educated.

Churches.—San Pedro in the Calle de Segovia, is a building in Moorish architecture and dates from the fourteenth century. It is the oldest church in Madrid. San Jerónimo el Real, a handsome Gothic building, dates from 1503 and has been much restored. In this church the heir-apparent takes the Constitutional oath, and in the convent close by, Charles of England stayed when he visited Madrid, in 1623, on the occasion of the contemplated "Spanish Match". San Francisco el Grande, the finest church in Madrid is modelled on the Pantheon at Rome, and was built in 1784. Cervantes, Lope de Vega, and Velasquez are buried there. San Isidro, the church of the patron saint of Madrid, an ornate building, dates from 1626–51, and has paintings by Rizi and Morales. It serves as pro-cathedral to the diocese. The Ermita de San Antonio de la Florida has a frescoed dome by Goya. Santa Barbara dates from the reign of Ferdinand VI (1746–59), who lies buried in the transept. The Church of the Atocha contains the tombs of Palafox, hero of the war against Napoleon, and of Prim, leader of the insurgents in 1868, who was shot in 1870.

Ecclesiastical History.—The Diocese of Madrid which includes the civil province of Madrid; area 3084 sq. miles; is suffragan of Toledo, and while its foundation dates from the Concordat of 1851, it was not canonically erected until the issuing of the Bull of 7 March, 1885, which united Alcalá and Madrid. The first bishop, Mgr Narciso Martinez Izquierdo, took possession of the see, 2 August, 1885; and the Cathedral chapter, erected 24 November, 1885, consists of 20 canons and 8 beneficed ecclesiastics. The total population of the Diocese in 1900 was 775,034 souls, divided into 240 parishes (of which 21 are in the town of Madrid), containing 776 churches or chapels and the diocesan clergy numbers 664. The principal towns within the Diocese of Alcalá with their populations in 1904, are as follows:—Alcalá (10,300), Colmenar de Oreja (3694), Colmenar Viejo (4758), Chinchon (4200), Escorial (4570), Getafe (3820), Leganes (5412), Morata (4000), Navalcarnero (3788), Pinto (2396), San Martin de Valdeiglesias (3290), San Sebastian de los Reyes (1477), Tetuan (2825), Torrejon (3081), Valdemoro (2726), Vallecas (5625).

In the town of Madrid there are 67 houses of religious women (including 18 homes or institutes for orphans or old and infirm people under the care of the Sisters of St. Vincent of Paul), and 14 monasteries for men, Dominicans (Orator del Olivar; Nuestra Señora de la Rosario), Augustinians (San Roque and Espíritu Santo), Jesuits (San Miguel), Trinitarians (San Ignacio) Redemptorists (San Justo), and Servites (SanNicolás). Besides the Hospital of San Rafael in Madrid, the Brothers of St. John of God have hospitals at Pinto and Ciempozuelos; the Capuchins have a house at El Pardo; the Jesuits a college at Chamartin; the Piarist Fathers a college at Alcalá and another at Getafe, where the Trappists also have a farm; the Augustinians have a college and monastery at Escorial and the Fathers of the Mission a house at Valdemoro. There are Carmelite nuns at Loeches, Boadilla and Alcalá; Dominican nuns at Loeches and Alcalá; Capuchin nuns at Pinto; Franciscan nuns at Valdemoro, Carabanchel Bajo, Cubas, Chinchon, Ciempuzuelos, Griñon and Alcalá; Augustinian nuns at Colemar de Oreja and at Alcalá, where the Sisters of St. Vincent of Paul maintain a hospital. The total number of convents, hospices, and hospitals in the hands of religious is 145.

The present bishop, Mgr Salvador y Barrera was born at Marchena in the Diocese of Seville, 1 October, 1851; appointed Bishop of Tarazona, 16 December, 1901; transferred to Madrid, 14 December, 1905, where he succeeded Mgr Guisasola y Mendez. The holydays of the Diocese are Christmas, Epiphany, Purification, Ash Wednesday, Annunciation, Holy Thursday, Good Friday, Ascension, Corpus Christi, All Saints, and Immaculate Conception.

Alcalá on the Henares, 21 miles from Madrid, at a height of 2000 feet above sea level is a town of historic importance and one of the first bishoprics founded in Spain. Cervantes was born there, and baptized in the Church of Santa Maria in 1547, and the unhappy Catherine of Aragon, wife of Henry VIII of England, was a native of the place. The name by which it was known to the Romans was Complutum, but under the Moors it became a fortified town and was known as Alcalá, the stronghold or castle. In the Middle Ages it was famous for its university founded by Cardinal Ximenez, which stood on the site of the modern Colegio de San Ildefonso. The bishop's residence is now used for preserving historical archives. It was designed by Berruguete, and has a famous staircase. The university chapel dedicated to Saints Just and Pastor has a monument to Cardinal Ximenez by Fancelli, an Italian sculptor. The surroundings of

ISABELLA THE CATHOLIC

ERECTED BY MADRID MUNICIPALITY (1885)

the town are austere and bleak, but it is protected by hills on the north side. The University buildings are in ruins, and the town which at one time had a population of 60,000, numbered in 1900 about 10,000 inhabitants. At Alcalá was printed under Cardinal Ximenez' care the polyglot Bible known as the Complutensian Bible, the first of the many similar Bibles produced during the revival of Biblical studies that took place in the sixteenth century.

UNIVERSITY OF MADRID.—A school was founded in Madrid in 1590, known as the College of Doña Maria of Aragon, which may in a sense be considered as the foundation of the modern University of Madrid, but Madrid had no university previous to 1836. A university had been established at Alcalá in 1508 by Cardinal Ximenez, which in 1518, owing to disputes between the students and the townsfolk it was resolved to remove to Madrid. The plan fell through, though it was again discussed in 1623. In 1822 the Alcalá University staff did actually open their lectures in Madrid, but 1823 found them once more at Alcalá. It was not until 1836 that the final transference of the Alcalá University to the Calle de San Bernardo, Madrid, was accomplished (see ALCALÁ, UNIVERSITY OF). At the time of its transference the university included a theological faculty, but this was suppressed in 1868. In 1906 there were 5300 students (550 philosophy; 900 science; 1600 law; 1500 medicine, and 102 professors). The rector is Señor Rafael Conde y Luque. The library contains 204,000 volumes and 5500 MSS. Its endowment in 1906 amounted to $180,000. Affiliated to it is the College of San Isidro founded in 1770.

SHAW, *Spain of to-day* (New York, 1909); SEYMOUR, *Saunterings in Spain* (London, 1906); HUTTON, *Cities of Spain* (London, 1908); CALVERT, *Madrid* (London, 1909); *Annuaire Pontifical* (1910); *Gerarchia* (1910); *Statesman's Year Book* (1910); ANGULO in *Dicc. di Ciencias Eccles.*, s. v.; *Anuario Eclesiástico de España*, 1909.

J. C. GREY.

Madruzzi, CHRISTOPHER, of a noble family of Trent, b. 5 July, 1512; d. at Tivoli, Italy, 5 July, 1578. He studied at Padua and Bologna, received in 1529 from his older brother a canonicate at Trent and the parish of Tirol near Meran, was in 1536 a canon of Salzburg, in 1537 of Brixen, and in 1539 became Prince-Bishop of Trent. Being only a subdeacon at the time, he was promoted to the deaconship, priesthood, and episcopate in 1542. In January, 1543, he was appointed administrator of the See of Brixen, and shortly afterwards, during the same year 1543, he was raised to the dignity of a cardinal by Paul III (1534–49). Having resigned his bishopric at Trent in 1567, he spent the latter years of his life in Italy, and became Cardinal-Bishop successively of Sabina, Palestrina, and Porto. A few years after his death his remains were entombed in the family chapel, in the church of St. Onofrio, Rome. Madruzzi was a man of great intellectual gifts, well versed in secular and ecclesiastical affairs. Charles V (1519–56) and his brother, King Ferdinand I, afterwards emperor (1556–64), esteemed him very highly and employed him in many important and delicate missions. In the controversies between Catholics and Protestants, at the time of the incipient Reformation, he always proved himself a ready champion of the Church. He took an active part in the imperial Diet of Ratisbon (1541) as representative of the emperor, and upheld strenuously the Catholic teaching against the heresy of Luther.

As cardinal, Bishop of Trent, and temporal ruler of that principality he naturally played a prominent part in the Council of Trent. Among other things he insisted that the reform of the Church should be taken up in earnest, a matter much desired by Charles V, and by which it was hoped to win the Protestants back to the Church. It was largely due to his efforts, that this subject was discussed and enactments of that character were passed in each session together with decisions on doctrinal matters. He was also intent upon promoting a truly religious and Christian life among both the people and the ecclesiastics under his jurisdiction. For the first he recommended chiefly yearly confession and communion; and for the second an edifying, chaste, and temperate conduct, and an exact fulfilment of all the obligations connected with their high office. He was himself cultured and learned, and patronized with great munificence the liberal arts and learning. One stain attaches to his memory, the accumulation of several benefices in his hands. Mention was made of the smaller ecclesiastical holdings; in addition to his two sees he received in 1546, by the favour of Charles V, a yearly allowance of 2000 ducats from the Spanish Archbishopric of Compostela. He may be somewhat excused in view of the usage of the time, and of the financial burdens imposed on him during the sessions of the Council of Trent; moreover, in 1567, he gave up one of his two sees.

PALLAVICINI, *Hist. Conc. Trident.* lib. V–VIII; BONELLI, *Mon. Eccl. Trident.*, III (Trent, 1765).

F. J. SCHAEFER.

Madura, DIOCESE OF. See TRICHINOPOLI, DIOCESE OF.

Madura Mission.—As shown in the "Atlas Geographicus S.J.", the ancient Jesuit missions in India under the Portuguese were divided into two provinces —that of Goa comprising the west coast down to Calicut exclusive, and the interior districts of the Deccan and Mysore, while the Malabar province occupied the south of the peninsula, that is the Malabar coast on the west, and the Coromandel coast on the east as far north as the River Vellar, including Cochin, Travancore, Madura, Tanjore, San Thomé, and other contiguous districts. The term "Madura Mission" refers to that Jesuit missionary movement which had its starting point at Madura and extended thence over the eastern half of the peninsula. At the outset it may be remarked that the districts comprised under the Madura Mission were totally removed from Portuguese political or state influence, so that even the prestige of the Portuguese name can hardly be regarded as having reached there, to say nothing of the machinery of the State. The fact is a standing refutation of the unhistorical charge that the spread of the Gospel in India was due to political influence and the use of coercion, for in no part of the country did the efforts of the missionaries meet with greater success than in Madura.

The Madura Mission owes its origin to Robert de Nobili, who commenced at Madura, in 1606, that peculiar method of propagating the faith which has made his name famous. "This policy consisted in conforming to the ways of life in vogue among the Brahmins, in order to remove their prejudices against him; to exhibit himself as noble, as learned, as ascetical as they; by this means to excite their interest and esteem, and to draw them into ready intercourse with himself; then by degrees to progress from indifferent subjects to religious matters, beginning with those points which were common, and gradually passing to those which were distinctively Christian; showing how Christianity offered to Hindus a purified and perfect religion, without requiring the abandonment of native social usages or the loss of racial rank and nobility." ("East and West", Dec., 1904.) (See MALABAR RITES.) Shortly afterwards Father Antony de Vico, and Father Manoel Martins began imitating his mode of life and working on the same lines with considerable success Father Vico died in 1638 and was succeeded by Fr. Sebastian de Maya, who in 1640 was imprisoned at Madura in company with de Nobili, while Father Martins remained at Trichinopoli. In 1640 a new departure was made by Father Balthasar da Costa who began working specially for the lower castes. The success was such that in 1644 the total number of converts in the Ma-

dura, Trichinopoli, Tanjore, and Satiamangalam districts rose to 3500, that is to say 1000 of the higher castes, and 2500 pariahs. At that time there were five priests working on the mission. Subsequent progress was still more gratifying, for in 1680 the number of converts altogether was reckoned at no less than 80,000. The number of workers, however, did not increase in proportion; they generally amounted to seven, eight, or ten, and only as late as 1746 reached to fourteen. Among these the most successful were Father Balthasar da Costa and Manoel Martins already mentioned, Andrew Freyre, Bl. John de Britto, Francis Laynes, Venance Bouchet, Peter Martin, and Father Beschi. The last named, who worked from 1711 to 1740, found himself in conflict with the Lutheran pioneers of Protestant missionary enterprise who started work at Tranquebar in 1706, and against whom he wrote several controversial works.

The expulsion of the Jesuit Order from Portuguese territory in the year 1759 put an immediate check on the supply of missionaries, but the fathers already in the mission, being outside the Portuguese dominions, were able to continue their work though with diminishing numbers. The entire suppression of the Order in 1773, however, brought the Jesuit regime to an end. Three years later (1776) a new mission of the Karnatic was established by the Holy See, under the Paris Seminary for Foreign Missions, which, taking Pondicherry as its centre, gradually extended its labours inwards as far as Mysore, and to the old Madura Mission. Under the Foreign Mission Society the remaining Jesuit Fathers continued to work till they gradually died out. Not much in the way of missionary work was done by the Goan clergy, who took the place of the Jesuits in certain stations, and the results previously gained were in prospect of being almost totally lost. In the year 1836 the Karnatic mission was erected into the Vicariate Apostolic of the Coromandel Coast; and as the Foreign Mission Society could not for want of men come to the rescue of Madura, they willingly accepted the appointment of the Jesuits in the same year—the Society having been restored in 1814. In 1846 the Madura Mission was in turn made into a vicariate Apostolic with Mgr Alexis Canoz as its first vicar Apostolic; but the portion north of the Cauvery was retained by Pondicherry. In 1886, on the establishment of the hierarchy, the Madura Vicariate was made the Diocese of Trichinopoly. In 1893 Tanjore was taken away and given to the *Padroado* Diocese of Mylapore. In the same year the Trichinopoly Diocese was finally made suffragan to Bombay (see TRICHINOPOLI, DIOCESE OF).

BERTRAND, *La Mission du Maduré*, 4 vols. (1847–54); IDEM, *Lettres des nouvelles missions du Maduré*, 4 vols. (1839–47); IDEM, *Lettres édifiantes et curieuses de la nouvelle Mission du Maduré*, 2 vols. (1865); SAINT CYR, *Les nouveaux Jésuites dans l'Inde* (1865); WHITEHEAD, *India: a Sketch of the Madura Mission* (London, s. d.); GUCHEN, *Cinquante ans au Maduré*, 2 vols. (1889); LAUNAY, *Histoire des Missions de l'Inde*, 5 vols. (1898); COUBÉ, *Au pays des Castes* (1888); STRICKLAND, *The Jesuits in India* (Dublin, 1852); IDEM, *The Goa Schism* (Dublin, 1853); STRICKLAND AND MARSHALL, *Catholic Missions in S. India* (London, 1865); SUAN, *Monseigneur Cañoz* (1891); DE BUSSIÈRE, *Histoire du Schisme Portuguais dans l'Inde* (1856).

ERNEST R. HULL.

Maedoc (MOEDHOG, MOGUE, AEDDAN FOEDDOG, AIDUS, HUGH), SAINT, first Bishop of Ferns, in Wexford, b. about 558, on an island in Brackley Lough, County Cavan; d. 31 January, 626. He was the son of Sedna, a chieftain of Connaught, and of his wife, Eithne. Even in his early years the fame of his sanctity was widespread and, when many came to the young man and desired to become his disciples, he fled from Ireland to Wales. Here he became the pupil of St. David and is named as one of his three most faithful disciples. Many miracles are recorded of St. Maedoc, both in his childhood and during his sojourn in Wales. After many years he returned to Ireland accompanied by a band of disciples, and settled at Brentrocht in Leinster. He founded several monasteries in that district, the greatest being Ferns, which was built on land given to him by Brandubh, King of Leinster. Here a synod was held, at which he was elected and consecrated bishop, about 598. St. Maedoc of Ferns must not be confounded either with St. Madoc (or Maidoc), the son of Gildas (28 Feb.), who also lived in the sixth century and was the founder of Llanfadog in Wales; or with St. Modoc the Culdee, who lived in the third or fourth century.

Acta SS., Jan., II, 1111–20; BOASE in *Dict. Christ. Biog.*, s. v.; KILMADOCK, *St. Mogue's or St. Ninian's Island* in *Notes and Queries*, 8th series, IV, 421; *Lives of the Cambro-British Saints*, ed. REES (Llandovery, 1853), 232–50; MCGOVERN, *St. Mogue's or St. Ninian's Island* in *Notes and Queries*, 8th series, V, 151–2; STANTON, *Menology of England and Wales* (London, 1887), 42; *Vitæ Sanctorum Hiberniæ*, ed. PLUMMER (Oxford, 1910), I, lxxv-lxxviii; II, 141–63, 295–311.

LESLIE A. ST. L. TOKE.

Maelruan (MAOLRUAIN, MELRUAN, MOLRUAN), SAINT, founder and first Abbot of Tamlacht (Tallacht), in the County of Dublin, Ireland. Nothing seems to be known of St. Maelruan before the foundation of Tamlacht, which took place in the year 769. The church, which was dedicated to St. Michael, was built on land given by Donnchadh, King of Leinster. It was to this monastery that St. Aengus, the Culdee, came, during the abbacy of Maelruan and, concealing his name, served for some time at mere manual work. His identity, however, was revealed through assistance that he gave to a backward scholar. St. Maelruan sought him at once and, gently reproaching him, gave him an honoured place in the community. The two saints are joint authors of the "Rule of the Célidhé Dé" (see CULDEES), of which a copy is preserved in the library of the Royal Irish Academy. "It contains", says O'Curry, "a minute series of rules for the regulation of the lives of the Célidhé Dé, their prayers, their preachings, their conversations, their confessions, their communions, their ablutions, their fastings, their abstinences, their relaxations, their sleep, their celebrations of the Mass, and so forth". St. Maelruan is called a "Bishop and soldier of Christ" in the "Annals of Ulster", where his death is recorded under the year 791. In the "Annals of the Four Masters", however, wherein also he is styled "Bishop", his death is assigned, probably incorrectly, to the year 787. His feast is on 7 July.

COLGAN, *Acta Sanctorum veteris et maioris Scotiæ* (Louvain, 1645–7); GAMMACK in *Dict. Christ. Biog.*, s. v.; HEALY, *Insula Sanctorum et Doctorum, or Ireland's ancient Schools and Scholars* (Dublin, 1890), 407–9; LANIGAN, *Ecclesiastical History of Ireland*, III (Dublin, 1822), 232; O'CURRY, *Lectures on the manuscript materials of ancient Irish History* (Dublin, 1861), 364, 375.

LESLIE A. ST. L. TOKE.

Maelrubha (MA-RUI, MOLROY, ERREW, SUMMARRUFF, also SAGART-RUADH), SAINT, abbot and martyr, founder of Abercrossan, b. 642; d. 21 April, 722. He was descended from Niall, King of Ireland, on the side of his father, Elganach. His mother, Subtan, was a niece of St. Comgall the Great, of Bangor. St. Maelrubha was born in the County of Derry and was educated at Bangor. When he was in his thirtieth year he sailed from Ireland for Scotland, with a following of monks. For two years he travelled about, chiefly in Argyll, and founded about half-a-dozen churches, then settled at Abercrossan (Applecross), in the west of Ross. Here he built his chief church and monastery in the midst of the Pictish folk, and thence he set out on missionary journeys, westward to the islands of Skye and Lewis, eastward to Forres and Keith, and northward to Loch Shinn, Durness, and Farr. It was on this last journey that he was martyred by Danish vikings, probably at Teampull, about nine miles up Strath-Naver from Farr, where he had built a cell. He was buried close to the River Naver, not far from his cell, and his grave is still marked by "a rough cross-marked stone". The tradition, in the "Aberdeen Breviary", that he was killed at Urquhart and

buried at Abercrossan is probably a mistake arising from a confusion of Gaelic place-names. This error had been copied by several later hagiologists, as has also the same writers' confusion of St. Maelrubha with St. Rufus of Capua. Maelrubha was, after St. Columba, perhaps the most popular saint of the north-west of Scotland. At least twenty-one churches are dedicated to him, and Dean Reeves enumerates about forty forms of his name. His death occurred on 21 April, and his feast has always been kept in Ireland on this day; but in Scotland (probably owing to the confusion with St. Rufus) it was kept on 27 August. On 5 July, 1898, Pope Leo XIII restored his feast for the Church in Scotland, to be kept on 27 August.

Annals of . . . the Four Masters, ed. O'Donovan (Dublin, 1856), ad ann. 671, 722; *Annals of Ulster*, ed. Hennessy (Dublin, 1887), ad ann. 670, 672, 721; Barrett, *Early Scottish Saints* in *Dublin Review*, XV (1899), 348–72; Barrett, *Calendar of Scottish Saints* (Fort Augustus, 1904), 64–7; *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina*, ed. Bollandists (Brussels, 1900),771; Campbell, *St. Maolrubha* in *Scottish Historical Review*, VI (1909), 442–3; Forbes, *Kalendars of Scottish Saints* (Edinburgh, 1872), 382–4; Gammack in *Dict. Christ. Biog.*, s. v.; Mitchell, *On various superstitions in the North-west Highlands and Islands* in *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland*, IV, 251; Pinius, *De sancto Maelrubio monacho et martyre* in *Acta SS.*, Aug., VI, 131–2; Reeves, *Saint Maelrubha, his history and churches* in *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland*, III, 258–96; Scot, *St. Maolrubha* in *Scottish His orical Review*, VI (1909), 260–80.

Leslie A. St. L. Toke.

Maerlant, Jacob van, the greatest Flemish poet of the Middle Ages, b. about 1235; d. after 1291. Of his life little is known. His name he seems to have derived from Maerlant on the island of Voorne, where he lived for some time employed as a sexton, whence his surname "de Coster". Later he resided at Damme, near Bruges, where, according to tradition, he held the position of town-clerk. Maerlant's earliest works were chivalrous romances, such as were in vogue at that time in courtly circles, and were adapted from French or Latin sources. Such are "Alexanders Geesten" (written c. 1257), from the Latin of Gauthier de Chastillon; "Historie van den Grale" and "Merlijns Boeck" from the French of Robert de Borron; the "Roman van Torec", from a lost French original; and the "Historie van Troyen" (ab. 1264), from the French of Benôit de Sainte More. But this kind of literature was little to his taste, which inclined to the didactic and useful. So he turned his back on the lying romances, as he called these works in his "Rijmbijbel", and devoted his talent to poems of a didactic and moralizing character. Among the most noteworthy of these poems are "Heimlicheit der Heimlicheden", a treatise on politics, adapted from the pseudo-Aristotelean "Secreta Secretorum"; "Der Naturen Bloeme", a versified natural history based on the "De natura rerum" of Thomas of Cantimpré, and the famous "Rijmbijbel", a rhymed Biblical history, translated from the "Scholastica" of Petrus Comestor, with a continuation "Die Wrake van Jherusalem", adapted from the history of Josephus. He also translated a "Life of St. Francis" (Leven van St. Franciscus) from the Latin of Bonaventure. Maerlant's most extensive work is the "Spiegel Historiael", a rhymed chronicle of the world, translated from the "Speculum historiale" of Vincent of Beauvais. It is dedicated to Count Floris V and was begun in 1283, but was left unfinished at the poet's death. Continuations were given by Philip Utenbroeke and Lodewijc van Velthem, a Brabant priest.

Maerlant is also the author of a number of strophic poems, which date from different periods of his life. Of these the best known is the "Wapene Martijn" (Alas! Martin) so called from the opening words. It is a dialogue on the course of events held between the poet himself and a character named Martin. Altogether there are three parts, of which the above-mentioned is the first. The other two parts are known as "Dander Martijn" (the second Martin) and "Derden Martijn" (third Martin). Other poems of this kind are "Van ons Heren wonden", a translation of the hymn "Salve mea! o patrona"; "Die Clausule van der Bible", an allegorical poem in praise of the Blessed Virgin; the "Disputacie van onser Vrouwen ende van den helighen Cruce", which bewails the sad situation of the Holy Land. Maerlant's last poem "Van den Lande van Oversee" was written after the fall of Acre (1291) and is a stirring summons to a crusade against the infidels, with bitter complaints about abuses in the Church. The "Geesten" were edited by Franck (Gröningen, 1882); the "Heimlicheit, etc.", by Clarisse (Dordrecht, 1838) and by Kausler (1844); "Der Naturen Bloeme" by Verwijs (Gröningen, 1878); the "Rijmbijbel" by David (Brussels, 1858–69); the Life of St. Francis by J. Tideman (Leyden, 1848); the "Spiegel Historiael" by de Vries and Verwijs (Leyden, 1857–63). Complete editions of the strophic poems were given by E. Verwijs (Gröningen, 1880) and by J. Franck and J. Verdam (Gröningen, 1898).

Serrure, *Jacob van Maerlant en zijne werken* (2nd ed., Ghent, 1867); te Winkel, *Maerlants werken beschouwd als Spiegel van de 13. eeuw* (2nd ed., Ghent, 1892); Jonckbloet, *Geschichte der Niederländischen Literatur*, German tr. by Berg, I (Leipzig, 1870), 215–253; te Winkel, *Geschichte der niederländischen Literatur* in Paul, *Grundriss der germanischen Philologie*, II (2nd ed., Strasburg, 1902), pp. 437–40.

Arthur F. J. Remy.

Maes, Camillus Paul. See Covington, Diocese of.

Maestro di Camera del Papa.—In former times there were four so-called palace prelates (*prelati palatini*): (1) the Major Domo; (2) the Maestro di Camera; (3) the Auditor to the pope; and (4) the Master of the Sacred Palace. As the position of auditor had been allowed to remain vacant during the later years of Leo XIII's pontificate, it was abolished as being superfluous at the beginning of Pius X's reign. And when the major domo, Mgr. Cagiano de Azevedo, was raised to the cardinalate on 11 Nov., 1905, the then maestro di camera, Mgr. Gaetano Bisleti, was promoted to the office of major domo; in the "Gerarchia Cattolica" for 1906 the office of maestro di camera is vacant, and a footnote says: "The duties of maestro di camera are temporarily transferred to His Excellency the Monsignor Major Domo". This state of affairs still continues, so that there are now only three palace prelacies and (as one official discharges the duties attached to two of these) only two palatine prelates. All three prelates have the right of residence in the Apostolic palace.

The maestro di camera is the real chief chamberlain. His authority extends over all matters concerning the daily personal service of His Holiness. He is the immediate superior of all the chamberlains, both clerical and lay; he has charge of the service of the Anticamera as regards the four acting clerical privy chamberlains; he informs the orderly officer of the Noble, Swiss, and Palace Guards respectively, of the hours of duty for the next day; he summons the privy and honorary lay chamberlains to their period of weekly service, and dismisses them at the end of it. All petitions for audiences are lodged with him, whether they are presented to him immediately, or whether they are presented to him (in diplomatic language) *mediately*, by the Secretary of State. He issues the summonses to audiences, and regulates all occasional, unusual, or unofficial ceremonies, such as the reception of pilgrimages and the like. Being in daily personal touch with the pope, he receives his orders concerning the Anticamera of the next day, and makes arrangements accordingly. As supernumerary Prothonotary Apostolic he is always at the head of this college of prelates, irrespective of the date of his appointment. At papal audiences and on other occasions when the pope sits upon his throne without pontifical vestments, the major domo stands on the right, the maestro di camera on

the left, both on the second step of the throne. The extent of this prelate's jurisdiction is limited exclusively to the reception rooms of the pope, from the first anticamera to the private apartments. He has also some ancient privileges, which may be read of in Humphrey, "Urbs et Orbis".

See old works on the Roman Curia; also *Gerarchia Cattolica;* Humphrey, *Urbs et Orbis* (London, 1899), 124–34; *Die Katholische Kirche unserer Zeit*, I (Berlin, 1899), 278.

Paul Maria Baumgarten.

Maffei, Bernardino, poet, orator, and antiquarian, b. at Bergamo, 27 Jan., 1514; d. at Rome, 1 Aug., 1549. He studied jurisprudence at Padua, and during the frequent absence of Dandino acted as secretary to Cardinal Alessandro Farnese, and later to Paul III. On 12 March, 1547, he was made Bishop of Massa Maritima, then Archbishop of Chieti, and on 8 April, 1549, raised to the purple. He was on intimate terms with St. Ignatius Loyola and was highly esteemed by Julius III. His commentary on the "Letters of Cicero" is one of the best. He also wrote: "De inscriptionibus et imaginibus veterum numismatum".

Pfülf in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.; Ciaconius, *Vitæ et Res gestæ P. P.*, III, 737; *Röm. Quartalschrift* (1907), 50; Hurter, *Nomenclator;* Pastor, *Papstgeschichte*, V, passim.

Francis Mershman.

Maffei, Francesco, Italian painter, b. at Vicenza; d. at Padua, 1660. His influence upon the art of his own and later times has not been sufficient to attach much interest to the details of his life. His celebrity is due to the large number of generally pleasing pictures by him, still to be seen in the churches of his native Vicenza and many towns of Lombardy. He was a pupil of Peranda, but modelled his work upon that of Veronese, which shows itself in a certain opulence of colouring. Unfortunately his work has been very ill preserved, whether as the result of hurried execution, or of faulty methods in the mixing of his pigments. This is particularly apparent in his "Paradise" in the church of San Francesco at Padua. His "St. Anne" at San Michele, Vicenza, is probably one of the best expressions of his poetical fancy and colour-sense. He was among those painters of his period who gave an impetus to the still young art of engraving by copying his own work in that medium.

E. Macpherson.

Maffei, Raffaelo, humanist, historian, and theologian, b. 17 February, 1451; d. 25 January, 1522. He was a native of Volterra, Italy, and therefore is called Raphael Volaterranus. From earliest youth he devoted himself to the study of letters, and in 1466 was called to Rome, with his brothers, by their father, Gherardo Maffei, whom Pius II had appointed professor of law at the University of Rome, and had taken later for his secretary, which position he held also under Paul II and Sixtus IV. At Rome, Raffaelo held himself aloof from the court, devoting his time to the practice of piety and to the study of philosophy, of theology, and of the Greek language, the latter under George of Trebizond. In 1477, he went to Hungary with Cardinal Louis of Aragon, on the latter's mission to Matthias Corvinus. Upon his return, Raffaelo was persuaded by the Blessed Gaspare da Firenze not to become a Minor Observant, as Raffaelo intended to do; whereupon he married, and established his residence at Volterra. The remainder of his life was spent in study, in the practice of piety and of penance, and in the exercise of works of charity; in his own house, he established an *accademia*, in which he gave lectures on philosophy and on theology, while he founded the Clarisse monastery of Volterra. He died in the odour of sanctity; and, contrary to his desire, his brother erected to his memory a splendid monument, the work of Fra Angelo da Montorsoli.

Among the works of Maffei are "Commentariorum rerum urbanarum libri XXXVIII" (Rome, 1506; Paris, 1516), an encyclopedia of all subjects known at that time, prepared with great care, but not always with the best judgment. It consists of three parts; in the first, "Geography", he writes extensively of the Spaniards and of the Portuguese; the second part, "Anthropology", is devoted, more especially, to the contemporaneous history of that time; the third part is devoted to "Philology". Maffei's lives of Sixtus IV, Innocent VIII, Alexander VI, and Pius III, which appear as an appendix to the Platina, and which were also published separately (Venice, 1518), are taken from the "Commentarii"; in them, Maffei blames unsparingly the disordered life of the Roman court. At Volterra, he wrote a compendium of philosophy and of theology, "De institutione christiana" and "De prima philosophia" (Rome, 1518) in which he rather follows Scotus. He translated, from the Greek into Latin, the "Odyssey" of Homer, the "Œconomics" of Xenophon, the "Gothic War" of Procopius, "Sermones et tractatus S. Basilii", some sermons of St. John of Damascus and of St. Andrew of Crete; he also wrote the "Vita B. Jacobi de Certaldo". On the other hand, he was in epistolary communication with popes, cardinals, and other learned men. The manuscript of the work which he called "Peristromata" remained incomplete; it went to the Biblioteca Barberiniana.

The elder brother of Maffei, Antonio, was involved in the conspiracy of the Pazzi. Another brother, Mario, was a man of great culture. He was nuncio to France and, later, prefect of the building of St. Peter's (1507), regent of the penitentiaries, and Bishop, first, of Aquino (1516) and then of Cavaillon; he died on 23 June, 1537.

Falconcini, *Vita del nobil uomo e gran servo di Dio, Raffaello Maffei* (Rome, 1722); *Giornale della Letteratura Ital.*, XXIX, 449 sq. (under *Mario Maffei*).

U. Benigni.

Magaud, Antoine-Dominique, French painter, b. at Marseilles 1817; d. there, 1899. He studied in Paris under Léon Cogniet. The most important of his works are at Marseilles, where he presided over the Ecole des Beaux Arts so successfully that he was entitled to be called its second founder. Magaud's talent was universal; his portraits, and especially that of himself, are remarkable; then he took up landscape painting, and has left us among others "A view taken from St. Martha's" near Marseilles; his genre paintings include a famous "Bashi-Bazouk calling up Spirits". But it is principally in his decorative compositions that his real greatness is shown. In Marseilles he decorated the Café de France, the Chamber of Commerce, the Library, the Grand-Hôtel, the Prefecture. His masterpiece in work of this kind is the historical gallery of the Marseilles Religious Association. This gallery comprises fifteen canvases, four metres by two, and a ceiling nine metres. The subject to be treated was a pictorial glorification of the benefits of Christian civilization. The main theme is

set forth on the ceiling in a vast symbolical composition representing Religion as the inspiration of Learning, Science and Art. On the side walls of the gallery the following subjects appear: Philosophy, personified by St. Justin endeavouring to prove to the Jew, Tryphon, the superiority of Christianity; Theology is represented by St. Thomas Aquinas on a visit to St. Bonaventure; Languages and Literature by the Palatine School of Charlemagne and Alcuin; Justice by St. Louis seated under the oak of Vincennes; Eloquence by St. Bernard preaching the second crusade at Vézelay; Poetry by Dante in rapt contemplation of the heavens. Then comes Christopher Columbus landing at San Salvador and thanking God for having given him the grace "of carrying His name and His holy religion beyond the confines of the known stars"; next, Michelangelo, submitting plans for St. Peter's Basilica to Pope Paul III; Palestrina on his knees before Pius IV, pleading the cause of sacred music; Father Cataldino evangelizing the Indians during the conquest of Paraguay; Condé thanking God for the victory of Rocroi; Mgr de Belzunce ministering to the plague-stricken; Volta in his laboratory at Como among his alembics and his retorts giving thanks to the God of Science; finally Bossuet teaching history to the Dauphin.

This ensemble of paintings is assuredly one of the most beautiful works of Christian Art during the nineteenth century. Without going to Marseilles we can form some idea of it by turning over the leaves of the album in which Sirouy has skilfully reproduced the various subjects of this vast epopee. Magaud has shown in many other less important paintings, that he could treat artistic subjects with the mind of an enlightened Christian. For instance, "The Probatica Pool"; "The Slaughter of the Innocents"; "The Christians in the prisons, aided by their brethren"; "The Holy Family" in St. Lazarus's Church, Marseilles; eight decorative compositions for the chapel of the "Carmelins" founded in 1621 by the officers of the Confraternity of the Scapular; "Jeremias reproaching the Jews with their ill-deeds".

SERVIAN, *Magaud, l'artiste, le chef d'école, l'homme*, 36 etchings apart from the text (Paris, 1908); SIROUY, *Album de la Galerie historique du Cercle religieux de Marseille* (Paris, s. d.).

GASTON SORTAIS.

Magdala (Hebr. *Migdal* = tower, fortress; Aramaic *Magdala;* Greek Μαγδάλα).—It is perhaps the *Migdal-El* mentioned in the Old Testament (Jos., xix, 38) belonging to the tribe of Nephtali. St. Jerome in his version of Eusebius's "Chronicle" supposes the place to be in the neighbourhood of Dor (Tanturah) on the sea-coast; Kiepert, on the contrary, identifies it with 'Athlit (*Castellum Peregrinorum*). The territory of Nephtali, however, never extended so far to the west. According to Matt., xv, 39, after the second multiplication of loaves, Jesus went with His Apostles into the country of Magedan, the name given in various forms (by many of the best authorities, ℵ, B, D, Old Lat., Old Syr., Vulg.). Very many earlier authorities, however, give Magdala instead of Magedan (15 Greek uncials, the Minusculi, 1 Old Lat., Armen., Boh., Æth., Syr., Hex.). The parallel passage in Mark, viii, 10, reads in most recensions Dalmanutha (only D, Syr. Sin. Old Lat. with one exception, Goth., and some Minusculi agree with the name in Matthew). A solution is rendered difficult by the fact that the situation is unknown, and the direction cannot be inferred from the Gospel. The most plausible suggestion is that of van Kasteren who thinks Dalmanutha is the modern El-Delhamiye, about four miles south of the southern end of the lake near the Jordan, north of the influx of the Yarmuk. He also thinks that Magedan is represented by Ma'ad, still more to the south (the change of *ghimel* to *ayin* offers no difficulty). In sound the transition from Magdala to Magadan is not impossible in palæography; it is indeed easily intelligible.

The existence of a Galilean Magdala, the birthplace or home of St. Mary *Magdalen* (i. e. of Magdala), is indicated by Luke, viii, 2; Mark, xvi, 9; Matt., xxvii, 56, 61; xxviii, 1, and in the parallel passages, John xx, 1, 18. The Talmud distinguishes between two Magdalas only. One was in the east, on the Yarmuk near Gadara (in the Middle Ages Jadar, now Mukes), thus acquiring the name of *Magdala Gadar;* as a much frequented watering place it was called *Magdala Çeba 'ayya* (now El-Hammi, about two hours' journey from the southern end of the lake to the east, near a railway station, Haifa-Dera'a). According to various passages in the Talmud, there was another Magdala near Tiberias, at a distance from it of about three and three-quarter miles. Only one mile being given in the Palestinian Talmud, several different places have been identified with it; wrongly, however, for according to the parallel passages in the Babylonian Talmud and the context of the passage, the reading must be condemned as an error. This Magdala, perhaps to distinguish it from the place similarly named east of the Jordan, is called *Magdala Nunayya*, "Magdala of the Fishes", by which its situation near the lake and plentiful fisheries appear to be indicated. According to the Talmud, Magdala was a wealthy town, and was destroyed by the Romans because of the moral depravity of its inhabitants. Josephus gives an account (Bell. jud., III, x) of the taking of a town in Galilee, which was situated on the lake near Tiberias and which had received its Greek name, Taricheæ (the Hebrew name is not given), from its prosperous fisheries. Pliny places the town to the south of the lake, and it has been searched for there. But a due regard for the various references in Josephus, who was often in the town and was present at its capture, leaves no doubt that Taricheæ lay to the north of Tiberias and thirty stadia from it (about three and three-quarter miles). The identity of Taricheæ with Magdala Nunayya is thus as good as established.

After the destruction of the Temple, Magdala Nunayya became the seat of one of the twenty-four priestly divisions, and several doctors of law sprang from the town. Christian tradition sought there the home of Mary Magdalen. If we are to believe the Melchite patriarch, Euthychius of Alexandria, the brother of St Basil, Peter of Sebaste, knew of a church at Magdala in the second half of the fourth century, which was dedicated to the memory of Mary Magdalen. About the middle of the sixth century, the pilgrim Theodosius reckoned Magdala's distance from Tiberias in the south and Heptapegon (now 'Ain Tabgha) in the north at two miles. At all events the reckoning as to the relative distance between the two places is approximately right. At the end of the eighth century St. Willibald went as a pilgrim from Tiberias past Magdala to Capharnaum. In the tenth century the church and house of Mary Magdalen were shown. The Russian abbot Daniel (1106) and the Franciscan Quaresimus (1616) give the place the name of Magdalia. The small, poverty-stricken village, El-Mejdel, has kept the name and situation to this day. It lies about midway between Tabaryya and 'Ain Tabgha, at the south end of the little fruitful plain of Genesareth, and rests on the declivities of the mountain which projects over the lake. Towards the west the connexion with the inner country of Galilee is effected through Wadi Hamam, past Qarn Hattin. In the caverns of Wadi Haman, about half an hour to the west of Magdala, the Galilean robber bands during the time of the first Herod used to find a safe refuge. Later the caves were occupied by hermits, until finally a stronghold was established there by the Arabs. Mejdel, with its few dirty huts and single palm tree, is all that is left of luxurious Magdala. No ruins of any importance have yet been uncovered.

Besides the usual dictionaries of the Bible, consult OEHLER, *Die Ortschaften u. Grenzen Galiläas nach Josephus* in *Zeitschr. d.*

deutschen Palästinavereins, XXVIII (1905), 11–20; KLEIN, *Beiträge zur Geogr. u. Gesch. Galiläas* (Leipzig, 1909), 76–84; VAN KASTEREN in *Revue bibl.*, VI (1897), 93–9.

A. MERK.

Magdalens, the members of certain religious communities of penitent women who desired to reform their lives. As time went on, however, others of blameless reputation were also admitted, until many communities were composed entirely of the latter, who still retained the name of Magdalens, or White Ladies from the colour of their garb. It is not known at what period the first house was established, the date of foundation of the Metz convent, usually given as 1005, being still in dispute. Rudolph of Worms is the traditional founder of the Magdalens in Germany (Mon. Germ. Script., XVII, 234), where they were in existence early in the thirteenth century, as attested by Bulls of Gregory IX and Innocent IV (1243–54), granting them important privileges. Hélyot quotes letters addressed by Otto, Cardinal of the Title of St. Nicholas in Carcere Tulliano, Apostolic Legate in Germany, granting indulgences to those contributing to the support of the German Magdalens. Among the earliest foundations in Germany were those at Naumburg-on-the-Queis (1217), and Speyer (1226). Gregory IX, in a letter to Rudolph, prescribed for the penitents the Rule of St. Augustine, which was adopted by most of the Magdalens, though many of the German houses later affiliated themselves to the Franciscan or Dominican Orders. Institutions of Magdalens still exist, e. g. at Lauban (founded 1320) and Studenz, for the care of the sick and old. Few of the German convents survived the Reformation.

Houses of the Magdalens were soon founded in France, Belgium, Italy, Spain, and Portugal. The first foundation in France was made at Marseilles about 1272 by Bertrand, a saintly man who associated with himself in his work of rescuing fallen women other zealous men, later constituted a religious congregation by decree of Nicholas III, under the Rule of St. Augustine. In 1492 the eloquence of the Franciscan Père Jean Tisserand influenced a number of women to turn from evil ways and embrace a life of penitence. Five years later Jean-Simon, Bishop of Paris, prescribed for them the Rule of St. Augustine and drew up special statutes for their direction. From the beginning of the seventeenth century these Magdalens of Rue St-Denis were all women of stainless lives. Among other prominent communities of Magdalens were those at Naples (1324), Paris (1592), Rome, where Leo X established one in 1520, Seville (1550), Rouen, and Bordeaux.

The Madelonnettes, members of another Order of St. Mary Magdalen, were founded in 1618 by the Capuchin Père Athanase Molé, who, assisted by zealous laymen, gathered a number of women who desired to reform their lives. Two years later some of these were admitted to religious vows by St. Francis de Sales, and were placed successively under Religious of the Visitation, Ursulines, and Sisters Hospitallers of the Mercy of Jesus, and from 1720 under Religious of Our Lady of Charity. The constitutions, drawn up in 1637, were approved by the Archbishop of Paris in 1640, and the house was erected by Urban VIII into a monastery. Two branch foundations were made at Rouen and Bordeaux. The order comprised three congregations, (1) the Magdalens proper, who had been deemed worthy of being admitted to solemn vows, (2) the Sisters of Saint Martha, who, for some reason, could not undertake the obligation of solemn vows, and were bound by simple vows only, and (3) the Sisters of St. Lazarus, public sinners confined against their will. Each congregation had a separate building and observed a different rule of life. Sisters of St. Martha were admitted to the ranks of the Magdalens after two years novitiate. This order is no longer in existence.

HÉLYOT, *Dict. des ordres rel.* (Paris, 1859); FEHR in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.; WADDING, *Annal. Min.*

FLORENCE RUDGE MCGAHAN.

Magdeburg, capital of the Prussian Province of Saxony, situated on the Elbe; pop. 241,000; it is noted for its industries, particularly the production of sugar, its trade, and its commerce. From 968 until 1552 it was the seat of an archbishopric.

HISTORY.—The town was one of the oldest emporia of the German trade for the Wends who dwelt on the right bank of the Elbe. In 805 it is first mentioned in history. In 806 Charlemagne built a fortress on the eastern bank of the river opposite Magdeburg. The oldest church is also credited to this epoch. Magdeburg first played an important part in the history of Germany during the reign of Otto the Great (936–73). His consort Editha had a particular love for the town and often lived there. The emperor also continually returned to it. On 21 September, 937, Otto founded a Benedictine monastery at Magdeburg, which was dedicated to Sts. Peter, Maurice, and the Holy Innocents. The first abbots and monks came from St. Maximin's at Trier. Later on Otto conceived the plan of establishing an archbishopric at Magdeburg, thus making it a missionary centre for the Wends on the eastern bank of the Elbe. He succeeded in carrying out his idea after various changes and difficulties. The glory of the archbishopric increased rapidly, the town also became more important. The so-called Magdeburg Rights were also adopted by many towns in eastern and north-eastern Germany in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries (in Pomerania, Schleswig, and Prussia). The local tribunal of Magdeburg was the superior court for these towns. Magdeburg was also a member of the Hanseatic league of towns, and as such was first mentioned in 1295. The town had an active maritime commerce on the west (towards Flanders), with the countries of the Baltic Sea, and maintained traffic and communication with the interior (for example Brunswick).

The Reformation found speedy adherents in Magdeburg where Luther had been a schoolboy. The new doctrine was introduced 17 July, 1524, and the town became a stronghold of Protestantism, being known among Protestants as "The Lord God's Chancellery". In 1526 it joined the Alliance of Torgau, and in 1531 the Smalkaldic League, and was repeatedly outlawed by the emperor. Because it would not accept the "Interim" (1548), it was, by the emperor's commands, besieged (1550–51) by the Margrave Maurice of Saxony; it defended itself bravely and retained its religious liberty when peace was declared. Here Flacius Illyricus and his companions wrote their bitterest pamphlets and the great work on church history, "The Magdeburg Centuries", in which they tried to prove that the Catholic Church had become the kingdom of Anti-Christ. The town met with a terrible fate during the Thirty Years' War.

The Elector Christian Wilhelm of Brandenburg, who had been administrator of the archbishopric since 1598, exercised a policy which was hostile to the emperor, and on this account he was deposed by the cathedral chapter in 1628, the latter having remained strictly neutral. He now hoped to regain possession of the country, by means of an alliance with Gustavus Adolphus, and succeeded in forming the alliance 1 August, 1630, with the help of the Evangelical clergy and part of the citizens. Gustavus Adolphus sent his equerry, Colonel Diedrich von Falkenburg, to defend the town against the emperor's army. On 15 December, Tilly, commander-in-chief of the imperial army, ordered Field Marshal Pappenheim to advance upon the town. Tilly himself followed in March. The help which was expected from Sweden, however, was not forthcoming; Falkenburg had 2400 soldiers, and Tilly 24,000. In spite of this the town did not surrender. It was besieged on the morning of 20

March, 1631. Falkenburg was killed. The bloodshed and pillage were frightful; and the misery was only increased by the fire which broke out from some fifty or sixty houses, and which continued to spread on account of the strong north-east wind which was blowing, so that in twelve hours the whole town was in ashes with the exception of the cathedral, the convent of the Blessed Virgin, the parish churches where the fire had been extinguished, and some two hundred small houses. Most of the inhabitants (about 30,000) were smothered in the cellars and granaries where they had taken refuge.

Much has been written about the question as to who was responsible for the fire. There was formerly a Protestant tradition that Tilly was responsible for the destruction of the town. It is true that Pappenheim for tactical reasons caused two houses to be set on fire, and it is possible that the soldiers ignited more, in carrying out the order. But for Pappenheim and his soldiers to have deliberately planned to reduce the town to ashes, as has been suggested, would have been downright folly, for it robbed the imperialists of all the profits of the siege. As opposed to this, Karl Wittich's theory gained many adherents; he held that Falkenburg and his faction set fire to the town to prevent its falling into the hands of the Papists. Von Zwiedineck Sudenhorst is also of this opinion in Ullstein's "Weltgeschichte Pflug", edited by von Harttung (1500–1650, 481 sqq.). This is not absolutely authentic. Recently the opinion has been emphasized that unfortunate circumstances, such as the springing up of the north-east wind, contributed towards it. After 1680 the town belonged to Prussian Brandenburg. In 1806, General v. Kleist in a cowardly manner surrendered the fortress to the French, and it belonged to Westphalia until 1814. Since that time it has belonged to Prussia.

The Cathedral, Magdeburg
North Side

The Archbishopric.—After the wars of the years 940 and 954, when the Slavs, as far as the Oder, had been brought into subjection to German rule, Otto the Great, in 955, set to work to establish an archbishopric in Magdeburg, for the newly acquired territory. He wished to transfer the capital of the diocese from Halberstadt to Magdeburg, and make it an archdiocese. But this was strenuously opposed by the Archbishop of Mainz who was the metropolitan of Halberstadt. When, in 962, John XII sanctioned the establishment of an archbishopric, Otto seemed to have abandoned his plan of a transfer. The estates belonging to the convents mentioned above (founded in 937) were converted into a mensa for the new archbishopric, and the monks transferred to the Berge Convent. The archiepiscopal church made St. Maurice its patron, and in addition received new donations and grants from Otto. The following bishoprics were made suffragans: Havelberg, Brandenburg, Merseburg, Zeitz, and Meissen. Then, on 20 April, 967, the archbishopric was solemnly established at the Synod of Ravenna in the presence of the pope and the emperor. The first archbishop was Adelbert, a former monk of St. Maximin's at Trier, afterwards missionary bishop to the Russians, and Abbot of Weissenburg in Alsace. He was elected in the autumn of 968, received the pallium at Rome, and at the end of the year was solemnly enthroned in Magdeburg.

The Diocese of Magdeburg itself was small; it comprised the Slavonic districts of Serimunt, Nudizi, Neletici, Nizizi, and half of Northern Thuringia, which Halberstadt resigned. Posen was added to the suffragan bishoprics later on (from 970 until the twelfth century, when it fell to Gnesen), also Lebus, and, for a time, Kammin. The cathedral school especially gained in importance under Adelbert's efficient administration. The *scholasticus* Othrich was considered the most learned man of his times. Many eminent men were educated at Magdeburg. Othrich was chosen archbishop after Adelbert's death (981). Gisiler of Merseburg by bribery and fraud obtained possession of the See of Magdeburg, and also succeeded temporarily in grasping the Bishopric of Merseburg (until 1004). Among successors worthy of mention are: the zealous Gero (1012–23); Werner, (1063–78), who was killed in battle with Henry IV (see Investitures, Conflict of); St. Norbert, prominent in the twelfth century (1126–34), the founder of the Premonstratensian order; Wichman (1152–92) was more important as a sovereign and prince of the Holy Roman Empire than as a bishop; Albrecht II (1205–32) quarrelled with the Emperor Otto II (1198–1215), because he had pronounced the pope's ban against the latter and this unfortunate war greatly damaged the archbishopric. In 1208 he began to build the present cathedral, which was only consecrated in 1263, and never entirely finished; Günther I (1277–79) hardly escaped a serious war with the Margrave Otto of Brandenburg, who was incensed because his brother Erich had not been elected archbishop. And the Brandenburgers actually succeeded in forcing Günther and Bernhard (1279–1281) to resign and in making Erich archbishop (1283–1295). Cardinal Albrecht of Brandenburg (1513–45), on account of his insecure position, as well as being crippled by a perpetual lack of funds, gave some occasion for the spread of Lutheranism in his diocese, although himself opposing the Reformation. It is not true that he became a Lutheran and wished to retain his see as a secular principality, and just as untrue that in the Kalbe Parliament in 1541 he consented to the introduction of the Reformation in order to have his debts paid. His successors were the zealous Catholics John Albert of Brandenburg (1545–1550), who however could accomplish very little, and Frederick IV of Brandenburg, who died in 1552.

Administrators who were secular princes now took the place of the archbishop, and they, as well as the majority of the cathedral chapter and the inhabitants of the diocese, had become Evangelical. They belonged to the House of Brandenburg. Christian Wilhelm (see above) was taken prisoner in 1631, and went over to the Catholic Church in Vienna. At the time of the Peace of Prague, this country fell to the share of Prince August of Saxony, and after his death (1680) it was publicly assigned by the Peace of Westphalia to Brandenburg-Prussia (1648), to which it has since belonged, with the exception of the interval of French

rule (1807–1814). At the time of the secularization (1803) there remained only the convent of St. Agnes in the Neustadt Magdeburg, Marienstuhl near Egeln and Mariendorf, and the monastery at Althaldensleben. Catholic parishes took their places. Before the reign of Frederick the Great (1740) no Catholics were admitted to Magdeburg. In modern times the League of St. Boniface has established mission parishes in the suburbs of Magdeburg as well as in other places.

MULVERSTEDT, *Regesta archiepiscopatus Magdeburgensis*, I–IV (Magdeburg, 1876–1899); UHLIRZ, *Geschichte des Erzbistums Magdeburg unter den Kaisern aus dem Sächsischen Hause* (Magdeburg, 1887); RATHMANN, *Geschichte der Stadt Magdeburg*, I-IV (ibid., 1885–1886); HOFFMANN, *Chronik von Magdeburg*, I, II (2nd ed., ibid., 1885–86): WOLTER, *Geschichte der Stadt Magdeburg* (ibid., 3rd ed., 1901); HAUCK, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, III, IV (Leipzig, 1903–06); *Urkundenbuch der Stadt Magdeburg*, ed. von HERTEL (Halle, 1892–96); TEITGE, *Die Frage nach dem Urheber der Zerstörung Magdeburgs* (Halle, 1904).

KLEMENS LÖFFLER.

Magdeburg, CENTURIATORS OF. See CENTURIATORS OF MAGDEBURG.

Mageddo, Chanaanite city, called in Hebrew, Megiddo; in Sept., *Μαγεδδώ(ν)*; in Assyrian, Magiddu, Magaddu; in the Amarna tablets, Magidda and Makida; and in Egyptian, Maketi, Makitu, and Makedo.

Derivation.—Gesenius (Thes., p. 265) derives from root GDD which is in Hithpahel—"collect in crowd" (Jer., v, 7), and from which *gedud*—"troop", is derived. Hence Megiddo—*locus turmarum*. Others derive from *gdd*—"cut", and compare with *κεκοπτομενος* of Sept. at Zach., xii, 11. This suggests a survival of the name in the Náhr-ul-Múqáttá', the ancient Cison (cf. Smith, "Historical Geography of Holy Land", p. 387).

History.—Mageddo, situated on the torrent Qina, on the east of the Plain of Esdraelon opposite Jezrahel, commanded the central of the three passes that join the plain with the seaboard. This pass, which offered the best and shortest route from Egypt and the south to Northern Syria, Phœnicia, and Mesopotamia, was that commonly followed by the Assyrians, Egyptians, Philistines, Greeks, and Romans, and in modern times Napoleon's passage slightly to the north was feasible only because no Mageddo threatened his rear. The same route served for caravans from the days of the "Mohar, the Egyptian traveller" under Rameses II ("Records of the Past", II, 107 sq.; Max Müller, "Asien und Europa", 195 sq.) and of St. Paula, A. D. 382 ("Life" by St. Jerome, IV).

As the key to so important a pass, Mageddo must have been fortified long before the invasion of Thotmes I, about 1600 B. C. Thotmes III after a vigorous forced march, defeated the Syrian princes rallied there under the prince of Cades, and on the following day stormed the place, which he declared to be "worth a thousand cities". Traces of his assault are still visible on the ruins of the citadel (Müller, "Asien", 275; "Records", I, II, pp. 35–47). On the arrival of the Israelites Mageddo had a king of its own; they slew him, but the town proving impregnable was later subjected to tribute (Jos., xii, 21; xvii, 12, Judges, i, 27–28). Though situated in the territory of Issachar it was assigned to Manasses. The position chosen by Sisara for battle with Barac shows that Mageddo was friendly to him (Jud., v, 19). Solomon, who rebuilt the walls (III Kings, ix, 15; Jos., "Ant.", VIII, vi, 1), assigned this with other cities to Bana, the fifth of his governors (III Kings, iv, 12). In the fifth year of Roboam Mageddo was captured by Sesac (Shoshenq, I–XXII Dyn.), as seen from lists at Karnak (Maspero, "Histoire", II, 774; Winckler, "Geschichte Israels", I, 160, but cf. "Encyc. Bibl.", s. vv. "Egypt" and "Shishak"). Following IV Kings, ix, 27, Ochozias died at Mageddo (but contrast II Par., xxii, 9). Finally early in the seventh century Josias tried to bar near Mageddo the advance of the Pharao Nechao towards Mesopotamia and "was slain when he had seen him" (IV Kings, xxiii, 29–30; II Par., xxxv, 22; Jos., "Ant.", X, v, i; Max Müller, "Mittheil. d. Vorderas. Gesell.", III, 1898, p. 54; but against cf. Zimmern and Winckler, "Die Keilin. und A. T.", 105, who follow Herodotus, II, clix). The mourning for this calamity became proverbial (Zach., xii, 11). The warlike reputation of Mageddo is perhaps confirmed by Apoc., xvi, 16.

Identification.—Mageddo is identical with Tell-el Mútesellím at the extremity of a projecting ridge of Carmel, commanding the pass seawards, four miles west of Thanach (for connection of Mageddo and Thanach cf. Jos., xi, 21; xvii, 11; Jud., i, 27; v, 19; III Kings, iv, 12; I Par., vii, 29). The ruins of citadel, gates, and walls, may date from 2500–2000 B. C. and are of extraordinary strength. At the foot of the Tell was the Roman fortress of Legio (sixth legion), now Lejjûn. St. Jerome implicitly identifies Legio with Mageddo, for he calls Esdraelon now Campus Legionis (P. L., XXIII, "De Situ et Nom.", s. v. "Arbela", "Gabathon", etc.), now Campus Mageddon (P. L., "In Zac.", xii). Yá'qût (tenth–eleventh cent.) expressly identifies them [Kítâb Mú'jám íl-Búldân, Wüstenfeld (Leipzig, 1860), 351]. Lastly the stream at el-Lejjûn is still called "the source (Râs) of Cison" and perhaps is the "Waters of Mageddo" (Pal. Ex. Fund Memoirs, XI, 29; Jud., V, 19; Pseudo-Jerome in P. L., XXIII, 1327).

For strategic position:—SMITH, *Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, XIX (New York, 1908); NAPOLEON, *Mémoires dictées par lui-même: Guerre de l'Orient* (Paris, 1847); SCHUMACHER in *Mittheilungen und Nachrichten des Deut. Paläst. Vereins* (1903), 4–10.

Identification:—ROBINSON, *Biblical Researches*, II (Boston, 1841), 329; MOORE, *Judges* (Edinburgh, 1901), 45, 47. BREASTED, *Proceedings of Society of Bib. Archeology* (1900, 95–98); *Palestine Explor. Fund Quarterly* (1880), 223 and *pas.*; BUHL, *Geographie des Alten Palästina* (Freiburg in Br., '99); *Socin. Zeitsch. des Deut. Paläst. Vereins*, IV, 150–151; SCHLATTER, *Zur Topographie und Geschichte Palästinas*, 295–299.

For site near Jordan:—CONDER, *Tent Work in Palestine*, 66–68, 232. (6th ed., London); BIRCH, *Palest. Explor. Fund Quarterly* (1881), 232 etc.; LE STRANGE, *Palestine under the Moslems* (London, 1890), 492.

Elsewhere:—RÄUMER, *Palästina*, 446–448 (4th ed.): Maps of Mari Sanuto in *Zeitschr. des D. Paläst. Vereins* (1891, 1895, 1898).

For excavations at Tell el-Mútesellím:—SCHUMACHER, *Tell el-Mútesellím*, I (Leipzig, 1908).

J. A. HARTIGAN.

Magellan, FERDINAND (Portuguese *Fernão Magalhães*), the first circumnavigator of the world; b. about 1480 at Saborosa in Villa Real, Province of Traz os Montes, Portugal; d. during his voyage of discovery on the Island of Mactan in the Philippines, 27 April, 1521. He was the son of Pedro Ruy de Magalhães, mayor of the town, and of Alda de Mezquita. He was brought up at the Court of Portugal and learned astronomy and the nautical sciences under good teachers, among whom may have been Martin Behaim. These studies filled him at an early age with enthusiasm for the great voyages of discovery which were being made at that period. In 1505 he took part in the expedition of Francisco d'Almeida, which was equipped to establish the Portuguese viceroyalty in India, and in 1511 he performed important services in the Portuguese conquest of Malacca. He returned home in 1512 and took part in the Portuguese expedition to Marocco, where he was severely wounded. On account of a personal disagreement with the commander-in-chief, he left the army without permission. This and an unfavourable report that had been made upon him by Almeida led to his disgrace with the king. Condemned to inactivity and checked in his desire for personal distinction, he once more devoted himself to studies and projects to which he was mainly stimulated by the reports of the recently discovered Moluccas sent by his friend Serrão. Serrão so greatly exaggerated the distance of the Moluccas to the east of Malacca that the islands appeared to lie

within the half of the world granted by the pope to Spain. Magellan therefore resolved to seek the Moluccas by sailing to the west around South America. As he could not hope to arouse interest for the carrying out of his plans in Portugal, and was himself, moreover, misjudged and ignored, he renounced his nationality and offered his services to Spain. He received much aid from Diego Barbosa, warden of the castle of Seville, whose daughter he married, and from the influential Juan de Aranda, agent of the Indian office, who at once desired to claim the Moluccas for Spain. King Charles I of Spain (afterwards the Emperor Charles V) gave his consent as early as 22 March, 1518, being largely influenced to do this by the advice of Cardinal Juan Rodriguez de Fonseca. The king made an agreement with Magellan which settled the different shares of ownership in the new discoveries, and the rewards to be granted the discoverer, and appointed him commander of the fleet. This fleet consisted of five vessels granted by the government; two of 130 tons each, two of 90 tons each, and one of 60 tons. They were provisioned for 234 persons for two years. Magellan commanded the chief ship, the Trinidad; Juan de Cartagena, the San Antonio; Gaspar de Quesada, the Concepcion; Luis de Mendoza, the Victoria; Juan Serrano, the Santiago. The expedition also included Duarte Barbosa, Barbosa's nephew, the cosmographer Andrés de San Martín, and the Italian Antonio Pigafetta of Vicenza, to whom the account of the voyage is due.

Magellan took the oath of allegiance in the church of Santa María de la Victoria de Triana in Seville, and received the imperial standard. He also gave a large sum of money to the monks of the monastery in order that they might pray for the success of the expedition. The fleet sailed 20 September, 1519, from San Lucar de Barameda. They steered by way of the Cape Verde Islands to Cape St. Augustine in Brazil, then along the coast to the Bay of Rio Janeiro (13 December), thence to the mouth of the Plata (10 January, 1520). In both these bodies of water a vain search was made for a passage to the western ocean. On 31 March Magellan decided to spend the winter below 49° 15′ south latitude, and remained nearly five months in the harbour of San Julian. While in winter quarters here a mutiny broke out, so that Magellan was forced to execute Quesada and Mendoza, and to put Cartagena ashore.

The voyage was resumed on 24 August, and on 21 October the fleet reached Cape Virgenes and, with it, the entrance to the long-sought straits. Those straits, which are 373 miles long, now bear the name of the daring discoverer, though he himself called them Canal de Todos los Santos (All Saints' Channel). The San Antonio with the pilot Gomez on board secretly deserted and returned to Spain, while Magellan went on with the other ships. He entered the straits on 21 November and at the end of three weeks reached the open sea on the other side. As he found a very favourable wind, he gave the name of *Mar Pacifico* to the vast ocean upon which he now sailed for more than three months, suffering great privation during that time from lack of provisions. Keeping steadily to a northwesterly course, he reached the equator 13 February, 1521, and the Ladrones 6 March.

On 16 March Magellan discovered the Archipelago of San Lazaro, afterwards called the Philippines. He thought to stay here for a time, safe from the Portuguese, and rest his men and repair his ships, so as to arrive in good condition at the now not distant Moluccas. He was received in a friendly manner by the chief of the island of Cebú, who, after eight days, was baptized along with several hundred other natives. Magellan wished to subdue the neighbouring Island of Mactan and was killed there, 27 April, by the poisoned arrows of the natives. After both Duarte Barbosa and Serrano had also lost their lives on the island of Cebú, the ships Trinidad and Victoria set sail under the guidance of Carvalho and Gonzalo Vaz d'Espinosa and reached the Moluccas 8 November, 1521. Only the Victoria, with Sebastian del Cano as captain, and a crew of eighteen men, reached Spain (8 September, 1522). The ship brought back 533 hundredweight of cloves, which amply repaid the expenses of the voyage.

Magellan himself did not reach his goal, the Spice Islands; yet he had accomplished the most difficult part of his task. He had been the first to undertake the circumnavigation of the world, had carried out his project almost completely, and had thus achieved the most difficult nautical feat of all the centuries. The voyage proved most fruitful for science. It gave the first positive proof of the earth's rotundity and the first true idea of the distribution of land and water.

Amoretti, *Primo viaggio intorno al globo terracqueo* (Milan, 1800) (a publication of the original MSS. of Pigafetta's account, preserved in the Ambrosian Library, Milan, the Bibl. Nationale, Paris, and T. Fitzroy-Fenwick's—formerly Sir T. Philipps's—library, Cheltenham); Pigafetta, tr. and ed. Robertson, *Magellan's Voyage around the World, Original and Complete Text of the Oldest and Best MS.* (the Ambrosian MS. of Milan of the early sixteenth century. Italian text with page for page of English and notes) (Cleveland, Ohio, 1905); Nunhez de Carvalho in *Noticias para la historia e geographia das nações ultramarinas* (6 vols., Lisbon, 1831), gives an extract from the diary of another member of the expedition, Mestro Bautista; Bürck, *Magellan oder die erste Reise um die Erde* (Leipzig, 1844); Barras Arama, *Vida y viajes de Magellanes* (Santiago, 1864); Stanley, *The First Voyage Round the World* (London, 1874); Wieser, *Magalhãesstrasse u. Austral-Continent* (Innsbruck, 1881); Guillemard, *Life of Ferdinand Magellan* (London, 1890); Butterworth, *The Story of Magellan and the Discovery of the Philippines* (New York, 1899); Kölliker, *Die erste Umsegelung der Erde durch Fernando de Magellanes und Juan Sebastian del Cano, 1519–1522* (Munich, 1908).

Otto Hartig.

Magi (plural of Lat. *magus;* Gr. μάγοι), the "wise men from the East" who came to adore Jesus in Bethlehem (Matt., ii). Rationalists regard the Gospel account as fiction; Catholics insist that it is a narrative of fact, supporting their interpretation with the evidence of all MSS. and versions, and patristic citations. All this evidence rationalists pronounce irrelevant; they class the story of the Magi with the so-called "legends of the childhood of Jesus", later apocryphal additions to the Gospels. Admitting only internal evidence, they say, this evidence does not stand the test of criticism. (1) John and Mark are silent.—This is because they begin their Gospels with the public life of Jesus. That John knew the story of the Magi may be gathered from the fact that Irenæus (Adv. Haer., III, ix, 2) is witness to it; for Irenæus gives us the Johannine tradition. (2) Luke is silent.—Naturally, as the fact is told well enough by the other synoptics. Luke tells the Annunciation, details of the Nativity, the Circumcision, and the Presentation of Christ in the Temple, facts of the childhood of Jesus which the silence of the other three Evangelists does not render legendary. (3) Luke contradicts Matthew and returns the Child Jesus to Nazareth immediately after the Presentation (Luke, ii, 39). This return to Nazareth may have been either before the Magi came to Bethlehem or after the exile in Egypt. No contradiction is involved. The subject will be treated in this article under the two divisions: I. Who the Magi

were; II. The Time and Circumstances of their Visit.

I. Who the Magi were. A. *Non-Biblical Evidence.*—We may form a conjecture by non-Biblical evidence of a probable meaning to the word μάγοι. Herodotus (I, ci) is our authority for supposing that the Magi were the sacred caste of the Medes. They provided priests for Persia, and, regardless of dynastic vicissitudes, ever kept up their dominating religious influence. To the head of this caste, Nergal Sharezar, Jeremias gives the title *Rab-Mag*, "Chief Magus" (Jer., xxxix, 3, 13, in Hebrew original—Sept. and Vulg. translations are erroneous here). After the downfall of Assyrian and Babylonian power, the religion of the Magi held sway in Persia. Cyrus completely conquered the sacred caste; his son Cambyses severely repressed it. The Magians revolted and set up Gaumâta, their chief, as King of Persia under the name of Smerdis. He was, however, murdered (521 B. C.), and Darius became king. This downfall of the Magi was celebrated by a national Persian holiday called μαγοφόνια (Her., III, lxiii, lxxiii, lxxix). Still the religious influence of this priestly caste continued throughout the rule of the Achæmenian dynasty in Persia (Ctesias, "Persica", X–XV); and it is not unlikely that at the time of the birth of Christ it was still flourishing under the Parthian dominion. Strabo (XI, ix, 3) says that the Magian priests formed one of the two councils of the Parthian Empire.

B. *Biblical Evidence.*—The word μάγοι often has the meaning of "magician", in both Old and New Testaments (see Acts, viii, 9; xiii, 6, 8; also the Septuagint of Dan., i, 20; ii, 2, 10, 27; iv, 4; v, 7, 11, 15). St. Justin (Tryph., lxxviii), Origen (Cels., I, lx), St. Augustine (Serm. xx, De epiphania) and St. Jerome (In Isa., xix, 1) find the same meaning in the second chapter of Matthew, though this is not the common interpretation.

C. Patristic Evidence.—No Father of the Church holds the Magi to have been kings. Tertullian ("Adv. Marcion.", III, xiii) says that they were wellnigh kings (*fere reges*), and so agrees with what we have concluded from non-Biblical evidence. The Church, indeed, in her liturgy, applies to the Magi the words: "The kings of Tharsis and the islands shall offer presents; the kings of the Arabians and of Saba shall bring gifts: and all the kings of the earth shall adore him" (Ps. lxxi, 10). But this use of the text in reference to them no more proves that they were kings than it traces their journey from Tharsis, Arabia, and Saba. As sometimes happens, a liturgical accommodation of a text has in time come to be looked upon by some as an authentic interpretation thereof. Neither were they magicians: the good meaning of μάγοι, though found nowhere else in the Bible, is demanded by the context of the second chapter of St. Matthew. These Magians can have been none other than members of the priestly caste already referred to. The religion of the Magi was fundamentally that of Zoroaster and forbade sorcery; their astrology and skill in interpreting dreams were occasions of their finding Christ. (See Avesta, The, Theological Aspects of.)

The Gospel narrative omits to mention the number of the Magi, and there is no certain tradition in this matter. Some Fathers speak of three Magi; they are very likely influenced by the number of gifts. In the Orient tradition favours twelve. Early Christian art is no consistent witness: a painting in the cemetery of Sts. Peter and Marcellinus shows two; one in the Lateran Museum, three; one in the cemetery of Domitilla, four; a vase in the Kircher Museum, eight (Marucchi, "Eléments d'archéologie chrétienne", Paris, 1899, I, 197). The names of the Magi are as uncertain as is their number. Among the Latins, from the seventh century, we find slight variants of the names, Gaspar, Melchior, and Balthasar; the Martyrology mentions St. Gaspar, on the first, St. Melchior, on the sixth, and St. Balthasar, on the eleventh of January (Acta SS., I, 8, 323, 664). The Syrians have Larvandad, Hormisdas, Gushnasaph, etc.; the Armenians, Kagba, Badadilma, etc. (cf. Acta Sanctorum, May, I, 1780). Passing over the purely legendary notion that they represented the three families which are descended from Noe, it appears they all came from "the east" (Matt., ii, 1, 2, 9). East of Palestine, only ancient Media, Persia, Assyria, and Babylonia had a Magian priesthood at the time of the birth of Christ. From some such part of the Parthian Empire the Magi came. They probably crossed the Syrian Desert, lying between the Euphrates and Syria, reached either Haleb (Aleppo) or Tudmor (Palmyra), and journeyed on to Damascus and southward, by what is now the great Mecca route (*darb el-haj*, "the pilgrim's way"), keeping the Sea of Galilee and the Jordan to their west till they crossed the ford near Jericho. We have no tradition of the precise land meant by "the east". It is Babylon, according to St. Maximus (Homil. xviii in Epiphan.) and Theodotus of Ancyra (Homil. de Nativitate, I, x); Persia, according to Clement of Alexandria (Strom., I, xv) and St. Cyril of Alexandria (In Is., xlix, 12); Arabia, according to St. Justin (Cont. Tryphon., lxxvii), Tertullian (Adv. Jud., ix), and St. Epiphanius (Expos. fidei, viii).

II. Time and Circumstances of their Visit.—The visit of the Magi took place after the Presentation of the Child in the Temple (Luke, ii, 38). No sooner were the Magi departed than the angel bade Joseph take the Child and its Mother into Egypt (Matt., ii, 13). Once Herod was wroth at the failure of the Magi to return, it was out of all question that the presentation should take place. Now a new difficulty occurs: after the presentation, the Holy Family returned into Galilee (Luke, ii, 39). Some think that this return was not immediate. Luke omits the incidents of the Magi, flight into Egypt, massacre of the Innocents, and return from Egypt, and takes up the story with the return of the Holy Family into Galilee. We prefer to interpret Luke's words as indicating a return to Galilee immediately after the presentation. The stay at Nazareth was very brief. Thereafter the Holy Family probably returned to abide in Bethlehem. Then the Magi came. It was "in the days of king Herod" (Matt., ii, 1), i. e. before the year 4 B. C. (A. U. C. 750), the probable date of Herod's death at Jericho. For we know that Archelaus, Herod's son, succeeded as ethnarch to a part of his father's realm, and was deposed either in his ninth (Josephus, Bel. Jud., II, vii, 3) or tenth (Josephus, Antiq., XVII, xviii, 2) year of office during the consulship of Lepidus and Arruntius (Dion Cassius, lv, 27), i. e., A. D. 6. Moreover, the Magi came while King Herod was in Jerusalem (vv. 3, 7), not in Jericho, i. e., either the beginning of 4 B. C. or the end of 5 B. C. Lastly, it was probably a year, or a little more than a year, after the birth of Christ. Herod had found out from the Magi the time of the star's appearance. Taking this for the time of the Child's birth, he slew the male children of two years old and under in Bethlehem and its borders (v. 16). Some of the Fathers conclude from this ruthless slaughter that the Magi reached Jerusalem two years after the Nativity (St. Epiphanius, "Haer.", LI, 9; Juvencus, "Hist. Evang.", I, 259). Their conclusion has some degree of probability; yet the slaying of children two years old may possibly have been due to some other reason—for instance, a fear on Herod's part that the Magi had deceived him in the matter of the time of the star's appearance or that the Magi had been deceived as to the conjunction of that appearance with the birth of the Child. Art and archæology favour our view. Only one early monument represents the Child in the crib while the Magi adore; in others Jesus rests upon Mary's knees and is at times fairly well grown (see Cornely, "Introd. Special. in N. T.", p. 203).

Typogravure Goupil of Paris (France). *Alinari, photo.*

THE ADORATION OF THE SHEPHERDS

GHIRLANDAJO, ACCADEMIA, FLORENCE

From Persia, whence the Magi are supposed to have come, to Jerusalem was a journey of between 1000 and 1200 miles. Such a distance may have taken any time between three and twelve months by camel. Besides the time of travel, there were probably many weeks of preparation. The Magi could scarcely have reached Jerusalem till a year or more had elapsed from the time of the appearance of the star. St. Augustine (De Consensu Evang., II, v, 17) thought the date of the Epiphany, the sixth of January, proved that the Magi reached Bethlehem thirteen days after the Nativity, i. e., after the twenty-fifth of December. His argument from liturgical dates was incorrect. Neither liturgical date is certainly the historical date. (For

Adoration of the Kings
Gentile da Fabriano, Academy Gallery, Florence

an explanation of the chronological difficulties, see Chronology, Biblical, *Date of the Nativity of Jesus Christ.*) In the fourth century the Churches of the Orient celebrated the sixth of January as the feast of Christ's Birth, the Adoration by the Magi, and Christ's Baptism, whereas, in the Occident, the Birth of Christ was celebrated on the twenty-fifth of December. This latter date of the Nativity was introduced into the Church of Antioch during St. Chrysostom's time (P. G., XLIX, 351), and still later into the Churches of Jerusalem and Alexandria.

That the Magi thought a star led them on, is clear from the words (*εἴδομεν γὰρ αὐτοῦ τὸν ἀστέρα*) which Matthew uses in ii, 2. Was it really a star? Rationalists and rationalistic Protestants, in their efforts to escape the supernatural, have elaborated a number of hypotheses: (1) The word *ἀστήρ* may mean a comet; the star of the Magi was a comet. But we have no record of any such comet. (2) The star may have been a conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn (7 B. C.), or of Jupiter and Venus (6 B. C.). (3) The Magi may have seen a *stella nova*, a star which suddenly increases in magnitude and brilliancy and then fades away.— These theories all fail to explain how "the star which they had seen in the east, went before them, until it came and stood over where the child was" (Matt., ii, 9). The position of a fixed star in the heavens varies at most one degree each day. No fixed star could have so moved before the Magi as to lead them to Bethlehem; neither fixed star nor comet could have disappeared, and reappeared, and stood still. Only a miraculous phenomenon could have been the Star of Bethlehem. It was like the miraculous pillar of fire which stood in the camp by night during Israel's Exodus (Ex., xiii, 21), or to the "brightness of God" which shone round about the shepherds (Luke, ii, 9), or to "the light from heaven" which shone round about the stricken Saul (Acts, ix, 3).

The philosophy of the Magi, erroneous though it was, led them to the journey by which they were to find Christ. Magian astrology postulated a heavenly counterpart to complement man's earthly self and make up the complete human personality. His "double" (the *fravashi* of the Parsi) developed together with every good man until death united the two. The sudden appearance of a new and brilliant star suggested to the Magi the birth of an important person. They came to adore him—i. e., to acknowledge the Divinity of this newborn King (vv 2, 8, 11). Some of the Fathers (St. Irenæus, "Adv. Hær.", III, ix, 2; Origen, "in Num.", homil. xiii, 7) think the Magi saw in "his star" a fulfilment of the prophesy of Balaam: "A star shall rise out of Jacob and a sceptre shall spring up from Israel" (Num., xxiv, 17). But from the parallelism of the prophesy, the "star" of Balaam is a great prince, not a heavenly body; it is

not likely that, in virtue of this Messianic prophesy, the Magi would look forward to a very special star of the firmament as a sign of the Messias. It is likely, however, that the Magi were familiar with the great Messianic prophesies. Many Jews did not return from exile with Nehemias. When Christ was born, there was undoubtedly a Hebrew population in Babylon, and probably one in Persia. At any rate, the Hebrew tradition survived in Persia. Moreover, Virgil, Horace, Tacitus (Hist., V, xiii), and Suetonius (Vespas., iv) bear witness that, at the time of the birth of Christ, there was throughout the Roman Empire a general unrest and expectation of a Golden Age and a great deliverer. We may readily admit that the Magi were led by such hebraistic and gentile influences to look forward to a Messias who should soon come. But there must have been some special Divine revelation whereby they knew that "his star" meant the birth of a king, that this new-born king was very God, and that they should be led by "his star" to the place of the God-King's birth (St. Leo, Serm. xxxiv, "In Epiphan." IV, 3).

The advent of the Magi caused a great stir in Jerusalem; everybody, even King Herod, heard their quest (v. 3). Herod and his priests should have been gladdened at the news; they were saddened. It is a striking fact that the priests showed the Magi the way, but would not go that way themselves. The Magi now followed the star some six miles southward to Bethlehem, "and entering into the house [εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν], they found the child" (v. 11). There is no reason to suppose, with some of the Fathers (St. Aug., Serm. cc, "In Epiphan.", I, 2), that the Child was still in the stable. The Magi adored (προσεκύνησαν) the Child as God, and offered Him gold, frankincense, and myrrh. The giving of gifts was in keeping with Oriental custom. The purpose of the gold is clear; the Child was poor. We do not know the purpose of the other gifts. The Magi probably meant no symbolism. The Fathers have found manifold and multiform symbolic meanings in the three gifts; it is not clear that any of these meanings are inspired (cf. Knabenbauer, "in Matth.", 1892).

We are certain that the Magi were told in sleep not to return to Herod and that "they went back another way into their country" (v. 12). This other way may have been a way to the Jordan such as to avoid Jerusalem and Jericho; or a roundabout way south through Beersheba, then east to the great highway (now the Mecca route) in the land of Moab and beyond the Dead Sea. It is said that after their return home, the Magi were baptized by St. Thomas and wrought much for the spread of the Faith in Christ. The story is traceable to an Arian writer of not earlier than the sixth century, whose work is printed, as "Opus imperfectum in Matthæum" among the writings of St. Chrysostom (P.G., LVI, 644). This author admits that he is drawing upon the apocryphal Book of Seth, and writes much about the Magi that is clearly legendary. The cathedral of Cologne contains what are claimed to be the remains of the Magi; these, it is said, were discovered in Persia, brought to Constantinople by St. Helena, transferred to Milan in the fifth century and to Cologne in 1163 (Acta SS., I, 323).

Standard *Commentaries on St Matthew*; LAGRANGE, *La religion des Perses* in *Rev. Bibl.*, 1904; CURCI, *Lezioni sopra i quattro evangeli* (Florence, 1874), FOUARD, *La vie de* N. S.-J.-C., I, 88 (Paris —), DE BROGLIE, *Cours d'histoire des cultes non-chrét.* (Paris, 1881); BEZOLD, *Die Schatzhole* (Leipzig, 1883).

WALTER DRUM.

Magic. See OCCULT ARTS.

Magin Catalá, b. at Montblanch, Catalonia, Spain, 29 or 30 January, 1761; d. at Santa Clara, California, 22 Nov., 1830. He received the habit of St. Francis at Barcelona on 4 April, 1777, and was ordained priest probably in 1785. After obtaining permission to devote himself to the missions in America, he sailed from Cadiz in October, 1786, and joined the famous missionary college of San Fernando in the City of Mexico.

In 1793 he acted as chaplain on a Spanish ship which plied between Mexico and Nootka Sound (Vancouver). In the following year he was sent to the Indian mission of Santa Clara, California, where in company with Father José Viader he laboured most zealously until his death. All through his missionary life Father Catalá suffered intensely from inflammatory rheumatism, so that in his last years he could neither walk nor stand unassisted. He nevertheless visited the sick, and preached in Indian and Spanish while seated in a chair at the altar-rail. Despite his infirmities he observed the rule strictly, used the discipline and penitential girdle, tasted nothing till noon, and then and in the evening would eat only a gruel of corn and milk. He never used meat, fish, eggs, or wine. The venerable missionary was famed far and wide for his miracles and prophecies, as well as for his virtues. In 1884 Archbishop J. S. Alemany of San Francisco instituted the process of his beatification. This, in 1908–9, was followed by the process *de non cultu publico*.

ENGELHARDT, *The Holy Man of Santa Clara* (San Francisco, 1909); *Santa Clara Mission Records.*

ZEPHYRIN ENGELHARDT.

Magisterium of the Church. See CHURCH; INFALLIBILITY; POPE.

Magistris, SIMONE DE, b. in 1728; d. 6 October, 1802; a priest of the Oratorio di S. Filippo Neri, at Rome, whom Pius VI created titular Bishop of Cyrene and provost of the Congregation for the correction of the liturgical books of Oriental Rites. He was very well versed in Oriental languages, and often received from Clement XIV and Pius VI commissions of research on points of ecclesiastical antiquity. He was more especially devoted to the study of the Sacred Scriptures, and among his publications on that subject are (1) "Daniel secundum Septuaginta ex tetraplis Origenis nunc primum editus" (Rome, 1772), from the sole codex in the Chigi library, accompanied by five dissertations (one of them on the chronology of Daniel), by the commentary of St. Hippolytus, by a comparison between the version of the Septuagint and that of Theodotion, a few pieces from the Book of Esther, in Chaldean, a fragment of Papias on the canon of the Sacred Scripture, etc. (2) "Acta Martyrum ad Ostia Tiberina" (Rome, 1795). (3) "S. Dionysii Alexandrini episcopi . . . opera" (Rome, 1796), with a learned introduction on the life and writings of the saint. (4) "Gli atti di cinque martiri della Corea", with a notice on the origin of the Faith in that country (Rome, 1801), etc.

U. BENIGNI.

Magliabechi, ANTONIO, Italian scholar and librarian, b. 29 Oct., 1633, at Florence; d. there, 4 July, 1714. He was the son of Marco Magliabechi, burgher, and Ginevra Baldorietta. He was apprenticed to a goldsmith, and worked in this capacity till his fortieth year. His real inclination was, however, from the beginning towards study, and he was in the habit of buying books out of his small resources and reading them at night. Michele Ermini, librarian to Cardinal de' Medici, recognizing his ability, taught him Latin, Greek, and Hebrew. Magliabechi had an astonishing memory, and thus acquired an unusually large knowledge. In 1673 he became librarian to Grand Duke Cosimo III of Tuscany, thus attaining the ambition of his life.

He became the central figure of literary life in Florence, and scholars of every nation sought his acquaintance and corresponded with him. He was always ready to give a friendly answer to questions on scholarship, and was thus the unacknowledged collab-

orator on many works and publications. Strangers, visiting Florence, stared at him as something miraculous. He not only knew all the volumes in the library, as well as every other possible work, but could also tell the page and paragraph in which any passage occurred. In private life Magliabechi was an eccentric old bachelor, negligent, dirty, slovenly, always reeking with tobacco, engaged in study at all hours, even at his meals, a Diogenes in his requirements. Every room in his house, and even the corridors and stairs, were crowded with books. He died at the monastery of Sta. Maria Novella. He left his books (30,000 volumes) to the Grand Duke to be used as a public library; his fortune went to the poor. The *Magliabechiana* was combined with the grand-ducal private library (*Palatina*) by King Victor Emmanuel in 1861, the two forming the *Biblioteca Nazionale.*

Salvini, *Delle lodi di Antonio Magliabechi* (Florence, 1715); *Clarorum Belgarum, Germanorum, Venetorum ad A. Magliabechium nonnullosque alios epistolæ*, I–V (Florence, 1745–6), ed. Targioni-Tozzetti; *Catologus codicum sæculo* XV. *impressorum, qui in bibliotheca Magliabechiana Florentiæ adservantur*, I–III (Florence, 1793–5); Jöcher, *Allg. Gelehrtenlex.*, III (Leipzig, 1751), 38–9; Valery, *Correspondance inédite de Mabillon et de Montfaucon avec l'Italie*, I–III (Paris, 1847); *Nouv. Biogr. Générale*, s. v.; Beck in *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*, XV (Leipzig, 1898), 97–101; *Lettres de Ménage à Magliabechi* (Paris, 1891), with introduction by Felissier; Axon, *Antonio Magliabechi* in *The Library Association Record*, V (London, 1903), 59–76.

Klemens Löffler.

Magna Carta, the charter of liberties granted by King John of England in 1215 and confirmed with modifications by Henry III in 1216, 1217, and 1225.

The Magna Carta has long been considered by the English-speaking peoples as the earliest of the great constitutional documents which give the history of England so unique a character; it has even been spoken of by some great authorities as the "foundation of our liberties". That the charter enjoyed an exaggerated reputation in the days of Coke and of Blackstone, no one will now deny, and a more accurate knowledge of the meaning of its different provisions has shown that a number of them used to be interpreted quite erroneously. When allowance, however, has been made for the mistakes due to several centuries of indiscriminating admiration, the charter remains an astonishingly complete record of the limitations placed on the Crown at the beginning of the thirteenth century, and an impressive illustration of what is perhaps a national capacity for putting resistance to arbitrary government on a legal basis.

The memories of feudal excess during the reign of Stephen were strong enough and universal enough to give Henry II twenty years of internal peace for the establishment of his masterful administration, and, even when the barons tried to "wrest the club from Hercules" in 1173–4, they trusted largely to the odium which the king had incurred from the murder of St. Thomas. The revolt failed and the Angevin system was stronger than ever, so strong indeed that it was able to maintain its existence, and even to develop its operations, during the absence of Richard I. The heavy taxation of his reign and the constant encroachments of royal justice roused a feeling among the barons which showed itself in a demand for their "rights" put forward at John's accession. It is indeed obvious that, quite apart from acts of individual injustice, the royal administration was attacking in every direction the traditional rights of the barons, and not theirs only. St. Thomas had saved the independence of the Church, and it now remained for the other sections of the community to assert themselves.

Historians have probably been over-tender to the Angevins, for to them feudalism is the enemy; and the increase of the royal power, to be checked later on by a parliamentary system, is the clear line of constitutional development; but, however satisfactory we may think the ultimate result, there was the immediate danger of a rule which was arbitrary and might be tyrannical. The king had acquired a power which he might abuse, and the acts of the reign of John are sufficiently on record to show how much a bad king could do before he became intolerable. Those who drew up the Great Charter never pretended to be formulating a syllabus of fundamental principles, nor was it a code any more than it was a declaration of rights. It was a rehearsal of traditional principles and practices which had been violated by John, and the universality of its scope is the measure of the king's misgovernment.

During the early part of John's reign the loss of the greater part of his French possessions discredited him, and led to constant demands for money. Scutage, which had originally been an alternative for military service occasionally permitted, became practically a new annual tax, while fines were exacted from individuals on many pretexts and by arbitrary means. Any sign of resistance was followed by a demand for a son as a hostage, an intensely irritating practice which continued throughout the reign. The quarrel with Innocent III and the interdict (1206–13) followed hard on the foreign collapse, and during that period John's hand lay so heavily on churchmen that the lay barons had a temporary respite from taxation, though not from ill-government. When peace was finally made with the pope, the king seems to have thought that the Church would now support him against the mutinous barons of the North; but he counted without the new archbishop. Langton showed from the first that he intended to enforce the clause in John's submission to the pope which promised a general reform of abuses, and his support provided the cause with the statesmanlike leadership it had hitherto lacked.

The discontented barons met at St. Albans and St. Paul's in 1213, and Langton produced the Charter of Henry I to act as a model for their demands. Civil war was deferred by John's absence abroad, but the defeat of Bouvines sent him back still more discredited, and war practically broke out early in 1215. Special charters granted to the Church and to London failed to divide his enemies, and John had to meet the "Army of God and Holy Church" on the field of Runnymede between Staines and Windsor. He gave way on nearly every point, and peace was concluded probably on 19 June. The charter which was then sealed was really a treaty of peace, though in form it was a grant of liberties.

The clauses, or chapters, of the Magna Carta are not arranged on any logical plan, and a number of systems of classification have been suggested, but, without attempting to summarize a document so complex, it may be sufficient here to point out the general character of the liberties which it guaranteed. In the opening clause the "freedom" of the Church was secured, and that vague phrase was defined at least in one direction by a special mention of canonical election to bishoprics. Of the remaining sixty clauses the largest class is that dealing directly with the abuses from which the baronage had suffered, fixing the amount of reliefs, protecting heirs and widows from

the Crown and from Jewish creditors, preserving the feudal courts from the invasions of royal justice, and securing the rights of baronial founders over monasteries. The clauses enforcing legal reforms were of more general interest, for Henry II's "possessory assizes" were popular among all classes, and all suffered from arbitrary amercements and from insufficiently controlled officials. These assizes were to be held four times a year, and amercements were to be assessed by the oath of honest men of the neighbourhood. John had allowed the royal officials a very great and very unpopular latitude, and many clauses of the charter were directed to the control of the sheriffs, constables of royal castles, and especially of the numerous forest officials. The commercial classes

Ruin of the Abbey Church of Bury St. Edmunds
The tablets commemorate the meeting of the barons, 20 November, 1214, when Cardinal Langton, standing at the high altar, read out the proposed Charter of Liberties, which in the form of Magna Carta was signed by King John in 1215

were not altogether neglected. London and the other boroughs were to have their ancient liberties, and an effort was made to secure uniformity of weights and measures. The clause, however, which protected foreign merchants, was more to the advantage of the consumer than to that of the English competitor.

There is little in the charter which can be called a statement of constitutional principle; two articles have, however, been treated, not without reason, as such by succeeding generations. Chapter xii, which declares that no extraordinary scutage or aid shall be imposed except by common counsel of the kingdom, may be taken as an assertion of the principle "no taxation without consent". How the counsel of the kingdom was to be taken is explained in chapter xiv which describes the composition of the Great Council. Chapter xxxix prescribes that "no freeman shall be arrested or detained in prison or deprived of his freehold . . . or in any way molested . . . unless by the lawful judgment of his peers and by the law of the land". The chief object of this clause was to prevent execution before trial, and so far it is certainly the assertion of a far-reaching constitutional principle, but the last two phrases have been the subject of much wild interpretation. "Judgment by his peers" was taken to mean "trial by jury", and "the law of the land" to mean "by due process of law"; as a matter of fact, both taken together expressed the preference of the barons for the older traditional and feudal forms of trial rather than for judgment by the court of royal nominees instituted by Henry II and abused by John. The principle asserted by this clause was, therefore, of great constitutional importance, and had a long future before it, but the actual remedy proposed was reactionary. The final chapter was in a sense the most important of all for the moment, for it was an effort to secure the execution of the charter by establishing a baronial committee of twenty-five with the admitted right to make war on the king, should they consider that he had violated any of the liberties he had guaranteed.

Two chief criticisms have been brought against the Magna Carta, that of being behind the times, reactionary, and that of being concerned almost entirely with the "selfish" interests of the baronage. Reactionary the charter certainly was; in many respects it was a protest against the system established by Henry II, and, even when it adopted some of the results of his reign such as the possessory assizes and the distinction between greater and lesser barons, it neglected the latest constitutional developments. It said nothing on taxation of personalty or of the spiritualities of the clergy; it gave no hint of the introduction of the principle of representation into the Great Council: yet the early stages of all these financial and constitutional measures can be found in the reign of John.

Bishop Stubbs expressed in a pregnant phrase this characteristic of the charter when he called it "the translation into the language of the thirteenth century of the ideas of the eleventh, through the forms of the twelfth". It is a reproach, however, which it bears in good company, for all the constitutional documents of English history are in a sense reactionary; they are in the main statements of principles or rights acquired in the past but recently violated. The charge of "baronial selfishness" is a more serious matter, for one of the merits claimed for the charter, even by its more sober admirers, is that of being a *national* document. It must be admitted that many of the clauses are directed solely to the grievances of the barons; that some of the measures enforced, such as the revival of the baronial courts, would be injurious to the national interests; that, even when the rights of freemen were protected, little security if any was given to the numerous villein class. Nor are these criticisms disallowed by chapter lx, which declares in general terms that liberties granted by the king to his men shall in turn be granted by them to their vassals. Such a statement is so general that it need not mean much. It is more important to notice that all the numerous clauses directed to the controlling of the royal officials would benefit directly or indirectly all classes, that after all what the country had been suffering from was royal and not baronial tyranny, and that it was the barons and the clergy who had been, for the most part, the immediate victims. Finally the word "selfish" must be used cautiously of an age when, by universal consent, each class had its own *liberties*, and might quite legitimately contend for them.

Though in form a free grant of liberties, the charter had really been won from John at the sword's point. It could not in any sense be looked upon as an act of legislation. He had accepted the terms demanded by the barons, but he would do so only so long as he was compelled to. He had already taken measures to acquire both juridical and physical weapons against

SIGNING OF THE MAGNA CARTA

PAINTING BY ERNEST NORMAND, ROYAL EXCHANGE, LONDON

his enemies by appealing to his suzerain, the pope, and sending abroad for mercenary troops. By a Bull dated 24 August at Anagni, Innocent III revoked the charter and later on excommunicated the rebellious barons. The motives of Innocent's action are not far to seek. To begin with, he was probably misled as to the facts, and trusted too much to the king's account of what had happened. He was naturally inclined to protect the interests of a professed crusader and a vassal, and he took up the position that the barons could not be judges in their own cause but should have referred the matter to him, the king's suzerain, for arbitration. But, more than this, he maintained quite correctly that the king had made the concessions under compulsion, and that the barons were in open rebellion against the Crown. It is indeed manifest that the charter could not have been a final settlement; it was accepted as such by neither extreme party, and, even before the gathering at Runnymede had separated, the archbishop and the moderates had grown suspicious of the executive committee of twenty-five. War broke out almost at once, the revolted barons brought over the French king's son, and, during the sixteen troubled months that intervened between the signing of the charter and the end of the reign, John had on the whole the advantage.

Shortly after the accession of the young Henry III, the charter was reissued by the regent, William Marshall. This Charter of 1216 differed in a good many respects from that accepted by John at Runnymede. To begin with, the clauses dealing with the royal forests were formed into a separate charter, the Charter of the Forests; the other clauses were considerably modified, points were more accurately defined, matters of a temporary nature, including naturally the old executive clause, were left out, but the chief change was to restore to the Crown a number of powers which had been abandoned during the previous year. Amongst these the most important was the right of taxation, chapters xii and xiv being omitted. On the other hand, there is this all-important difference that the new charter was a genuine grant by the Crown. It may be called a piece of honest legislation; and to this charter the papal legate gave the fullest consent. A few further changes were introduced in 1217, and for a third time the Magna Carta was reissued in 1225. The form it then received was final, and the *charters* which the Crown was so repeatedly asked to confirm for many years to come, meant the Charter of Liberties of 1225 and the Forest Charter.

In time the *Charters* became almost symbolical; the precise meaning of many of the clauses was forgotten, and much more was read into some of them than their authors had ever intended to imply. They came to represent, like the "Laws of Good King Edward" in an earlier age, the ancient liberties of Englishmen, and, when in Stuart days men looked behind the Tudor absolutism to a time of greater independence, lawyers like Sir E. Coke continued the process of idealization which had been begun even in the thirteenth century. This symbolical use of the Great Charter has played a great part in English constitutional history, but it would have been impossible, had not the original document in its original sense been a thorough, an intelligent, and, in the main, a moderate expression of the determination of Englishmen to be ruled by law and tradition and not by arbitrary will. The most convenient text of the Great Charter is that printed in Bémont's "Chartes des Libertés anglaises" (Paris, 1892), but it will also be found in Stubbs's "Select Charters" and similar compilations. W. S. McKechnie ("Magna Carta", Glasgow, 1905) has published a very thorough commentary, clause by clause, together with an historical introduction and a discussion of the criticisms brought against the Charter. His book also contains a bibliography.

The ordinary histories of the period naturally contain much on the subject, especially STUBBS, *Constitutional History* (Oxford, 1883); IDEM, *Introductions to the Rolls Series;* NORGATE, *John Lackland* (London, 1905), and DAVIS, *Norman and Angevin England*. See also PETIT-DUTAILLIS, notes to the French translation of STUBBS, *Constitutional History*. These notes have been translated and published separately as *Studies Supplementary to Stubbs Constitutional History*, I, in *Manchester University Historical Series* (1908).

F. F. URQUHART.

Magnesia, a titular see in Lydia, suffragan of Ephesus, lying about 40 miles north-east of Smyrna and supposed to have been founded by the Magneti of Thessaly in the fifth century B. C. Lucius Scipio defeated Antiochus, King of Syria, there in 190 B. C. It was ruined by an earthquake in the reign of Tiberius, but recovered and prospered. It is now known as Manisa, a flourishing town of 35,000 inhabitants in the sanjak of Sarakhan, containing twenty mosques, and a Greek and an Armenian church. The following bishops are known: Eusebius, at Ephesus (431); Alexander, at Chalcedon (553); Stephen at Constantinople (680); Basil at Nicæa (787); Athanasius at Constantinople (869); Luke at the synod held there in 879.

There was another see in Asia called Magnesia ad Mæandrum, which was situated on the Meander in Ionia. Said to have been built by Leucippus, it was the site of the celebrated temple of Diana Leucophryne, erected by Hermogenes, which was granted the privilege of asylum by Scipio, on account of the fidelity of the inhabitants. Eight of its bishops are known: Damasus (second century); Eusebius at Philoppolis (343); Macarius, contemporary of St. Chrysostom; Daphnus at Ephesus (431); Leontius at the Robber-Council (449); Patritius at the synod in Trullo (692); Basil at Nicæa (787); Theophilus at Constantinople (879); Basil and Eusebius may be those referred to in speaking of the Lydian Magnesia.

LE QUIEN, *Oriens Christianus*, I, 697, 736.

A. A. MACERLEAN.

Magnien, ALPHONSE, educator of the clergy, b. at Bleymard, in the Diocese of Mende, France, 9 June, 1837; d. 21 December, 1902. As a student of classics at Chirac, and of philosophy and theology at Orléans (1857–1862), he was distinguished for sound and brilliant talents and a noble, attractive character. He had become affiliated to the Diocese of Orléans in response to Mgr Dupanloup's appeal for clerical recruits. In the seminary he developed a Sulpician vocation; but the bishop postponed the fulfilment of his desire, employing him for two years after his ordination in 1862 as professor in the preparatory seminary of La Chapelle St-Mesmin. He then became successively, under the direction of his Sulpician superiors, professor of sciences at Nantes (1864–65), and professor of theology and Holy Scripture at Rodez (1866–69). At length, in the fall of 1869, Father Magnien began the work at Baltimore which made him so well known to the priests of America. He soon revealed himself at St. Mary's as a born teacher, first in his course of philosophy and, later, of Holy Scripture and dogma. He seemed instinctively to grasp the vital part of a question and rested content only when he had found the truth.

After the death of Dr. Dubreul, superior of the seminary, in 1878, Father Magnien was appointed to the succession. As superior of St. Mary's Seminary during a quarter of a century, Father Magnien exercised the widest influence on the formation of the American clergy. He was richly endowed for his predestined work. He was a naturally upright, frank, manly character; and above all he was a true priest, devoted to the Church and supremely interested in the spread of religion. He spoke to the seminarians out of the abundance of a priestly heart and from a full knowledge of priestly life. Nowhere was he so much at home as on the rostrum. To speak almost daily on

spiritual topics without becoming tiresome is a task of rare difficulty; few men, indeed, could stand the test so well as Father Magnien. In the administration of his office there was nothing narrow or harsh. He had a keen knowledge of conditions in this country. He used to say at the close of his life "I have trusted very much and been sometimes deceived; but I know that had I trusted less I would have been still oftener deceived."

This generous and wise sentiment characterizes the man and partially reveals the secret of his influence. Father Magnien was loved and revered. He had strong affections; he had also strong dislikes, but not so uncontrollable as to lead him into an injustice. His personality contributed, in no small degree, to the growth and prosperity of St. Mary's Seminary. Under his administration St. Austin's College was founded at the Catholic University, Washington, for the recruiting of American vocations to St. Sulpice. His abilities as a churchman and a theologian were conspicuously revealed at the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore.

ABBÉ MAGNIEN

Throughout his life, his wise counsel was frequently sought and highly valued by many members of the hierarchy, and he was a father to many of the clergy. He frequently preached retreats to the clergy; during the retreat at St. Louis in 1897, he was seized with an attack of a disease from which he had suffered for years. Some months later he went to Paris for special treatment, where he underwent a very dangerous operation, and returned to his post at Baltimore. His health, however, was never entirely regained and after two or three years began to fail markedly, and in the summer of 1902 he resigned his burden. The good he wrought in the Church in America can never be told. In my love and veneration for his memory, I may be permitted to add that he was to me, for more than a quarter of a century, a most affectionate, devoted, and faithful friend, and a wise and able counsellor.

DONAHUE, Sermon preached on the day of the funeral; LEBAS, *Lettre circulaire à l'occasion de la mort de M. Magnien;* FOLEY, *Very Rev. Alphonse L. Magnien* in *The Catholic World* (New York, March, 1903), pp. 814–822; *Bulletin Trimestriel des Anciens Elèves de S. Sulpice* (1903), pp. 160–169; *Very Rev. A. L. Magnien, A Memorial.*

JAMES CARDINAL GIBBONS.

Magnificat, the title commonly given to the Latin text and vernacular translation of the Canticle (or Song) of Mary. It is the opening word of the Vulgate text (Luke, i, 46–55): "Magnificat anima mea Dominum", etc. (My soul doth magnify the Lord, etc.). In ancient antiphonaries it was often styled *Evangelium Mariæ*, the "Gospel of Mary". In the Roman Breviary it is entitled (Vespers for Sunday) *Canticum B.M.V.* (Canticle of the Blessed Virgin Mary). The "Magnificat", "Benedictus" (Canticle of Zachary—Luke i, 68–79), and "Nunc Dimittis" (Canticle of Simeon—Luke, ii, 29–32) are also styled "evangelical canticles", as they are found in the Gospel (*Evangelium*) of St. Luke.

FORM AND CONTENT.—Commentators divide it into three or four stanzas, of which easily accessible illustrations may be found in McEvilly, "Exposition of the Gospel of St. Luke" (triple division: verses 46–49, 50–53, 54–55); in Maas, "Life of Jesus Christ" (also triple, but slightly different: vv. 46–50, 51–53, 54–55); and in Schaff and Riddle, "Popular Commentary on the New Testament" (division into four stanzas: vv. 46–48, 49–50, 51–52, 53–55). The Magnificat is in many places very similar in thought and phrase to the Canticle of Anna (I Kings, ii, 1–10), and to various psalms (xxxiii, 3–4; xxxiv, 9; cxxxvii, 6; lxx, 19; cxxv, 2–3; cx, 9; xcvii, 1; cxvii, 16; xxxii, 10; cxii, 7; xxxiii, 11; xcvii, 3; cxxxi, 11). Similarities are found with Hab., iii, 18; Mal., iii, 12; Job, v, 11; Is., xli, 8, and xlix, 3; Gen., xvii, 19. Steeped thus in Scriptural thought and phraseology, summing up in its inspired ecstasy the economy of God with His Chosen People, indicating the fulfilment of the olden prophecy and prophesying anew until the end of time, the Magnificat is the crown of the Old Testament singing, the last canticle of the Old and the first of the New Testament. It was uttered (or, not improbably, chanted) by the Blessed Virgin, when she visited her cousin Elizabeth under the circumstances narrated by St. Luke in the first chapter of his Gospel. It is an ecstasy of praise for the inestimable favour bestowed by God on the Virgin, for the mercies shown to Israel, and for the fulfilment of the promises made to Abraham and to the patriarchs. Only four points of exegesis will be noted here. Some commentators distinguish the meaning of "soul" (or "intellect") and "spirit" (or "will") in the first two verses; but, in view of Hebrew usage, probably both words mean the same thing, "the soul with all its faculties". In v. 48, "humility" probably means the "low estate", or "lowliness", rather than the virtue of humility. The second half of v. 48 utters a prophecy which has been fulfilled ever since, and which adds to the overwhelming reasons for rejecting the Elizabethan authorship of the canticle. Finally the first half of v. 55 (As he spoke to our fathers) is probably parenthetical.

MARIAN AUTHORSHIP.—The past decade has witnessed a discussion of the authorship of the Magnificat, based on the fact that three ancient codices (Vercellensis, Veronensis, Rhedigerianus) have: "Et ait Elisabeth: Magnificat anima mea", etc. (And Elizabeth said: My soul doth magnify, etc.); and also on some very slight patristic use of the variant reading. Harnack in "Berliner Sitzungsberichte" (17 May, 1900), 538–56, announced his view of the Elizabethan authorship, contending that the original reading is neither "Mary" nor "Elizabeth", but merely "she" (said). About two years previously, Durand had criticized, in the "Revue Biblique", the argument of Jacobé for a probable ascription to Elizabeth. Dom Morin had called attention ("Revue Biblique", 1897) to the words of Nicetas (Niceta) of Remesiana, in a Vatican MS. of his "De psalmodiæ bono": "Cum Helisabeth Dominum anima nostra magnificat" (With Elizabeth our soul doth magnify the Lord). The works of Nicetas have been edited recently by Burn, and give (De psalmodiæ bono, ix, xi) evidence of Nicetas's view (see note 4, p. 79, ibid.). In the introduction to Burn's volume, Burkitt rejects the reading "Et ait Elisabeth" as wholly untenable in view of the contradictory testimony of Tertullian and of all the Greek and Syriac texts, but contends for the original reading "she" (said) and for the Elizabethan authorship. He is answered by the Anglican Bishop of Salisbury, who supports the probability of an original reading "she", but rejects the ascription to Elizabeth (pp. clv–clviii). The witness of the codices and of the Fathers is practically unanimous for the Vulgate reading: "Et ait Maria"; but, apart from this, the attribution of the Magnificat to Elizabeth would, in St. Luke's context, be highly abnormal. Long before the recent

discussion, Westcott and Hort, in the appendix (52) to their "Introduction to the New Testament in the Original Greek" (New York, 1882), had briefly discussed and rejected the reading "Elisabeth"; and this rejection is summarily confirmed in their revised text of the "N. T. in the Original Greek" (London, 1895), 523.

LITURGICAL USE.—While the canticles taken by the Roman Breviary from the Old Testament are located with the psalms, and are so distributed as to be sung only once a week, the Magnificat shares with the other two "evangelical canticles" the honour of a daily recitation and of a singularly prominent location immediately before the *Oratio*, or Prayer of the daily Office (or, if there be *preces*, immediately before these). The "Magnificat" is assigned to Vespers, the "Benedictus" to Lauds, and the "Nunc Dimittis" to Compline. Six reasons are given by Durandus for the assignment of the Magnificat to Vespers, the first being that the world was saved in its eventide by the assent of Mary to the Divine plan of Redemption. Another reason is found by Colvenarius in the probability that it was towards evening when Our Lady arrived at the house of St. Elizabeth. However this may be, in the Rule (written before 502) of St. Cæsarius of Arles, the earliest extant account of its liturgical use, it is assigned to Lauds, as it is in the Greek Churches of to-day. The ceremonies attending its singing in the choir at solemn Vespers are notably impressive. At the intonation "Magnificat", all who are in the sanctuary arise, and the celebrant (having first removed his birretta "in honour of the canticles") goes with his assistants to the altar, where, with the customary reverences, etc., he blesses the incense and incenses the altar as at the beginning of solemn Mass. In order to permit the elaborate ceremony of incensing, the Magnificat is sung much more slowly than the psalms. A similar ceremony attends the singing of the Benedictus at solemn Lauds, but not of the Nunc Dimittis at Compline.

At the first word of the Magnificat and of the Benedictus (but not of the Nunc Dimittis, save where custom has made it lawful) the Sign of the Cross is made. In some churches the Magnificat is sung at devotions outside of Vespers. Answering a question from Canada, the "Ecclesiastical Review" (XXIII, 74) declares that the rubrics allow such a separation, but forbids the incensing of the altar in such a case. The same review (XXIII, 173) remarks that "the practice of making the Sign of the Cross at the opening of the Magnificat, the Benedictus, and the Nunc Dimittis in the Office is of very ancient usage, and is sanctioned by the very best authority", and refers to the Congregation of Sacred Rites, 20 December, 1861.

GROUP OF THE VISITATION
Bernini, Shrine of Madonna of Pity, Savona

MUSICAL SETTINGS.—Like the canticles and psalms, the Magnificat is preceded and followed by an antiphon varying for the feast or ferial Office, and is sung to the eight modes of plain song. The first verse has, however, no mediation, because of the brevity (the one word *Magnificat*) of the first half. The Canticles of Mary and of Zachary share (even in the Office of the Dead) the peculiar honour of commencing every verse with an *initium* or intonation. This intonation varies for the varying modes; and the Magnificat has a special solemn intonation for the second, seventh, and eighth modes, although in this case the usual festive intonation applies, in the second and eighth modes, to all the verses except the first. The "musical", as distinguished from the "plain song", treating of the canticle has been very varied. Sometimes the chanted verses alternated with harmonized plain song, sometimes with *falso bordone* having original melodies in the same mode as the plain song. But there are innumerable settings which are entirely original, and which run through the whole range of musical expression, from the simplest harmony up to the most elaborate dramatic treatment, with orchestral accompaniment of the text. Almost every great church composer has worked often and zealously on this theme. Palestrina published two settings in each of the eight modes, and left in manuscript almost as many more. Fifty settings by Orlando di Lasso are in the Royal Library at Munich, and tradition credits him with twice as many more. In our own days, César Franck (1822-90) is said to have completed sixty-three out of the hundred he had planned. In addition to such names as Palestrina, di Lasso, Josquin des Prés, Morales, Goudimal, Animuccia, Vittoria, Anerio, Gabrieli, Suriano, who with their contemporaries contributed innumerable settings, the modern Cecilian School has done much work on the Magnificat both as a separate canticle, and as one of the numbers in a "Complete Vespers" of many feasts. In Anglican

services the Magnificat receives a musical treatment not different from that accorded to the other canticles, and therefore quite dissimilar to that for Catholic Vespers, in which the length of time consumed in incensing the altar allows much greater musical elaboration. A glance through the pages of Novello's catalogue of "Services" leads to the estimate of upwards of one thousand settings of the Magnificat for Anglican services by a single publishing house. Altogether, the estimate of Krehbiel that this canticle "has probably been set to music oftener than any hymn in the liturgy" seems well within the truth.

VIVES, *Expositiones SS. Patrum et Doctorum super Canticum "Magnificat"*, etc. (Rome, 1904), a royal 8vo of 827 double-column pages, containing homilies and commentaries on the Magnificat distributed through every day of the year, prefaced by the Latin paraphrase of URBAN VIII, in thirty-two iambic dimeters; COLERIDGE, *The Nine Months (The Life of Our Lord in the Womb)* (London, 1885), 161–234, an extended commentary under the title, *The Canticle of Mary;* NICOLAS, *La Vierge Marie d'après l'Evangile* (Paris, 1880), 243–57, argues that the Magnificat alone "proves the divinity of Christianity and even the existence of God"; DEIDIER, *L'Extase de Marie, ou le Magnificat* (Paris, 1892); M'SWINEY, *Translations of the Psalms and Canticles with Commentary* (St. Louis, 1901), gives bi columnar trans. from the Vulgate and Peshito, with commentary; A LAPIDE, *St. Luke's Gospel*, tr. MOSSMAN (London, 1892), 41–57; MCEVILLY, *Exposition of the Gospel of St. Luke* (New York, 1888), 27–33; BREEN, *A Harmonized Exposition of the Four Gospels*, I (Rochester, New York, 1899), 135–45; ARMINIO in *Ecclesiastical Review*, VIII (321–27), a devotional essay; SHEEHAN, *Canticle of the Magnificat* (Notre Dame, Ind., 1900), a poetic meditation in one hundred six-lined stanzas; BAGSHAWE, *The Psalms and Canticles in English Verse* (St. Louis, 1903), gives (353) a metrical version of the canticle, and in the preface proposes metrical versions for use by Catholics; ALLAN in SHIPLEY, *Carmina Mariana*, 2nd series (London, 1902), 260–63, a poetical commentary on each verse of the Magnificat—this volume gives other poems in English dealing either with the canticles or with the Visitation (17, 321, 490); cf. also *Carmina*, 1st series (London, 1893), 78, 360. For non-Catholic metrical versions in English, see JULIAN, *Dict. of Hymnology*, 2nd ed. (London, 1907), 711 (Magnificat); 801, col. 1 (New Version); 1034, col. 1 (Scottish Translations); 1541, col. 1 (Old Version); MARBACH, *Carmina Scripturarum*, etc. (Strasburg, 1907), 430–33, gives in great detail the antiphons derived from the Magnificat, the feasts to which assigned, etc. For discussion of the Marian authorship and references, see LUKE, GOSPEL OF SAINT, sub-title *Who Spoke the Magnificat?* See also JOHNER, *A New School of Gregorian Chant* (New York, 1906), 60–69, the various intonations of the Magnificat in the eight modes; ROCKSTRO in GROVE, *Dict. of Music and Musicians*, s. v. *Magnificat;* SINGENBERGER, *Guide to Catholic Church Music* (St. Francis, Wis.), gives (148–150) a list of one hundred approved settings; KREHBIEL in *New Music Review* (Feb., 1910), 147; PIRRO, *L'Esthétique de Jean-Sébastien Bach* (Paris, 1907), gives various references (519) to author's views of Bach's Magnificat.

H. T. HENRY.

Magnus (MAGNOALDUS, MAGINALDUS, popularly known as ST. MANG), SAINT, apostle of the Algäu, d. about 750 (655?). The history of St. Magnus is shrouded in obscurity. The only source is an old "Vita S. Magni", which, however, contains so many manifest anachronisms that little reliance can be placed on it. It relates that two Irish missionaries, Columbanus and Gall, spent some time with Willimar, a priest at Arbon. Here Gall fell sick and was put in charge of Magnus and Theodore (Maginald and Theodo), two clerics living with Willimar, while Columbanus proceeded to Italy and founded the monastery of Bobbio. When Gall had been miraculously informed of the death of Columbanus he sent Magnus to pray at his grave in Bobbio. Magnus returned from Bobbio with the staff of Columbanus and thereafter they followed his rule. After the death of Gall, Magnus succeeded him as superior of the cell.

About this time a priest of the Diocese of Augsburg, named Tozzo, came as a pilgrim to the grave of St. Gall and invited Magnus to accompany him to the eastern part of Algäu. Magnus proceeded to Eptaticus (Epfach), where Bishop Wichbert of Augsburg received him and entrusted him with the Christianization of Eastern Algäu. He penetrated into the wilderness, then crossed the River Lech at a place which is still known as St. Mangstritt (footstep of St. Magnus) and built a cell, where afterwards the monastery of Füssen was erected, and where he died.

The "Life" is said to have been written by Theodore, the companion of Magnus, and placed in the grave under the head of St. Magnus. When in 851 Bishop Lanto transferred the relics to the newly erected church of Füssen, this "Life" is said to have been found in a scarcely legible condition, and to have been emendated and rewritten by Ermenrich, a monk of Ellwangen. It was re-edited with worthless additions in 1070 by Othloh of St. Emmeram. A manuscript is preserved at the Monastery of St. Gall (Codex 565). The chief inconsistencies in the "Life" are the following: St. Magnus is made a disciple of St. Gall (d. 627) and at the same time he is treated as a contemporary of Wichbert, the first historically established Bishop of Augsburg (d. about 749). Other manifest impossibilities have induced Mabillon (Acta SS. O.S.B., II, 505 sq.), Rettberg (Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands, II, 147 sq.), Hauck (Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands, 4th ed., I, 339 sq.), and others, to reject the whole "Life" as a forgery of a much later date, while Steichele (Bistum Augsburg, IV, 338 sq.), Baumann (Geschichte des Allgäus, I, 93 sq.), and many others conclude that the first part of the "Life", where Magnus is made a companion of St. Gall, is a later addition, and that the second part was written in 851 when the relics of the saint were transferred. The opinion of Steichele and Baumann is the one generally followed at present. They maintain that a monk of Ellwangen (probably not Ermenrich, as Goldast asserts without any authority) wrote the "Life" in 851, when the body of Magnus was transferred. To attach more weight to the "Life", the story was given out that it had been written by Theodore, the companion of Magnus, and was found with the body of the saint, but in a scarcely legible condition; that therefore a monk of Ellwangen was ordered to rewrite it. (This was a common custom of the early Middle Ages.) The "Life", as it was written by the monk of Ellwangen, is an account of the ninth-century popular tradition. When Bishop-Abbot Solomon III of Constance dedicated a church in honour of St. Magnus at the monastery of St. Gall, he received a relic and the "Life" from the monks of Füssen. The monks of St. Gall had a tradition of another Magnus, who was a companion of St. Gall and lived 100 years before the Apostle of the Algäu. They now wrote a new "Life", in which they blended the tradition of the earlier Magnus with the "Life" which they had received from Füssen. This accounts for the historical discrepancies. His feast is celebrated on 6 Sept.

Acta SS., Sept., II, 700–81; STEICHELE, *Bistum Augsburg*, IV (Augsburg, 1885), 338–369; BAUMANN, *Geschichte des Allgäus*, I (Kempten, 1883), 93–98; SEPP, *Zur Magnuslegende* in *Beilage zur Augsburger Postzeitung*, no. 36 (29 June, 1901), 283–86; BABENSTUBER, *St. Magnus Algoiorum Apostolus* (Tegernsee, 1721); TRAFRATHSHOFER, *Der hl. Magnus, Apostel des Algäues* (Kempten, 1842); MAYER VON KNONAU in *Realencyk. für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, XII (Leipzig, 1903), 75–6.

MICHAEL OTT.

Magnus, OLAUS, Swedish historian and geographer, b. at Skeninge, Sweden, 1490; d. at Rome, 1 Aug., 1558. He belonged to the old and noble family of Store (i. e. great, *magnus*), and pursued his studies from 1510 to 1517 in Germany. He was then, like his brother John Magnus, taken into the higher ecclesiastical service, and made cathedral provost at Strengnas. In 1523 King Gustave I named John Archbishop of Upsala, and sent Olaus to the pope to have the appointment confirmed. After vain efforts to prevent the king from introducing the new doctrines into Sweden, John went to Rome in 1537, and Olaus accompanied him as secretary, having by his fidelity to Catholicism lost his property in the confiscation of church goods. When John died in 1544, Olaus was appointed his successor in Upsala, but never entered into office, spending the rest of his life in Italy, for the most part in Rome. From 1545 to 1549 he attended the Council of Trent, having been commissioned to

that duty by Paul III. He was buried by the side of his brother in St. Peter's.

His works, which mark him as one of the most important geographers of the Renaissance period, were published in Italy. His knowledge of the North, which was so extensive that he was the first to suggest the idea of a north-east passage, enabled him to produce after years of labour a great map of the lands in the North. It appeared at Venice in 1539 with the title, "Carta marina et descriptio septentrionalium terrarum ac mirabilium rerum", and included the area from the south coast of Greenland to the Russian coasts of the Baltic, including Iceland, the northern isles, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, and Finland. In this map we have the first general fairly definite representation of the North, surpassing every attempt contained in the Ptolemaic editions. The work was regarded for a long time as lost, and a single copy, procured in the sixteenth century and preserved in the Royal and National Library, Munich, was only found in 1886 by Oscar Brenner. The Munich University library has a rough copy done by hand. Niccolò Zeno, the younger, in 1558, used the exact data given by the map to publish an account of a northern journey supposed to have been undertaken by his ancestors in 1400. This work created a sensation, and was not until some time later recognized as a fiction. Sebastian Münster, Gastaldi, and Ortelius also turned the map to good account. Olaus Magnus likewise compiled an important work dealing with history, geography, and natural history: "Historia de gentibus septentrionalibus" (Rome, 1555; Antwerp, 1558; Basle, 1567; Frankfort, 1618. Translations: German (Strasburg and Basle, 1567); Italian (Venice, 1565); English (London, 1658); Dutch (Amsterdam, 1665). It is divided into twenty-two books, and deals picturesquely and successively with the manners and customs, the commercial and political life of northern nations, the physical proportions of the land and its minerals and zoology. Olaus also published a life of Catharine, daughter of the Swedish St. Bridget, "Vita Catharinæ", as well as another work, "Vita abbreviata S. Briggitæ". He edited the following works of his brother John: "Historia Gothorum Succorum libris XXIV" (Rome, 1554), and the "Historia Metropolitana, seu Episcoporum et Archiepiscoporum Upsaliensium" (Rome, 1557).

BRENNER, *Die ächte Karte des Olaus Magnus vom Jahre 1539 nach dem Exemplar der Münchener Staatsbibliothek* in *Christiania Videnskabs-Selskas Forhandlinger* (1886), no. 15; SCHUMACHER, *Olaus Magnus u. die ältesten Karten der Nordlande* in *Zeitschr. der Gesellsch. f. Erdkunde zu Berlin*, XXIII (1893), 167–200; METELKA in *Sitzungsber. der k. böhmischen Gesellsch. der Wissenschaften, Philol.-hist. Klasse* (1896), in Bohemian; AHLENIUS, *Olaus Magnus och hans framstellning af Nordens geografi* (Upsala, 1895); NIELSEN, *Kirkeleksikon for Norden* (Aarhus, 1909).

OTTO HARTIG.

Magnus (MAGNI), VALERIANUS, b. at Milan, 1586, presumably of the noble family of de Magni; d. at Salzburg, 29 July, 1661. He received the Capuchin habit at Prague. He was also provincial there, and in 1626 was appointed Apostolic missionary for Germany, Hungary, and Poland. He was greatly respected by Emperors Ferdinand II and III, as well as by King Wladislaw IV of Poland, who employed him on diplomatic missions. Landgrave Ernst of Hesse, who had been converted at Vienna on 6 Jan., 1652, and who knew Father Valerian, summoned Capuchins to St. Goar on the Rhine, and was present at the religious disputation between Valerian and Haberkorn of Giessen at Rheinfels in 1651. The Jesuit Johann Rosenthal having attacked certain assertions of Valerian's at this debate, the latter was drawn into the sharp literary controversy between Capuchins and Jesuits, which extended even to Rome. On the appearance of his pamphlet "Contra imposturas Jesuitarum" in 1659, he was cited to appear at Rome. As he did not obey the summons, he was arrested at Vienna in 1661 at the instance of the nuncio, but was liberated at the urgent request of Emperor Ferdinand III. He was apparently on his way to Rome when in the same year death overtook him at Salzburg. His writings include, in addition to many other polemical and philosophical works: "Judicium de catholicorum et acatholicorum regula credendi" (Prague, 1628), a much attacked work which he defended in his "Judicium de catholicorum regula credendi". "De infallibilitate cath. reg. credendi" (Prague, 1641); "Organum theologicum" (Prague, 1643), i. e. defence of Catholic theology with reasoned arguments; "Methodus convincendi et revocandi hæreticos" (Prague, 1643).

DIONYSIUS GENUENSIS, *Bibliotheca Scriptorum O. Cap.* (Genoa, 1591), 306 sqq.; ed. BERNARDUS DE BONONIA (Venice, 1727), 241 sqq.; *Historisch-politische Blätter*, CXVII, 556 sqq.; REUSCH in *Allg. deutsche Biog.*, XX, 92–4; DE BACKER, *Bibl. écriv. C. de. J.*, III, 339 sqq.; SBARALEA, *Supplem. ad Script. Ord. Min.* (Rome, 1806), 682 sq.; HURTER, *Nomenclator.*

MICHAEL BIHL.

Magog. See GOG AND MAGOG.

Magrath, JOHN MACRORY; b. in Munster, Ireland, in the fifteenth century; date and place of death unknown. Like many of his ancestors, he was chief historian to the O'Briens, princes of Thomond and chiefs of the Dalcassian clans. To the same family belonged the celebrated Miler Magrath, Protestant Archbishop of Cashel. Magrath's fame rests on his one work, "Cathreim Thoirdhealbhaigh". It was written in Irish, but has been translated into English by S. H. O'Grady. It is a history of the wars of Thomond from 1194 to 1318, and for the period covered is of great value. Magrath has necessarily much to say of the Anglo-Normans, especially of the de Clares, and of the efforts made by the Dalcassians to repel their attacks. He has much also to say of the internal strife in Thomond, and he gives full particulars of the attempt of O'Brien and O'Neill in the thirteenth century to make common cause against the invaders. But as neither chief would serve under the other the result was the victory of the Anglo-Normans at the battle of Downpatrick in 1259. We have also an account of the final overthrow of the de Clares at the battle of Dysert O'Dea, in 1318. Magrath's work is not a mere chronicle of events, but an historical composition in which motives and causes are examined, battles are described, and the characters of men are estimated. There is also much about the Dalcassian chiefs, and of the topography of the districts over which they ruled. In these respects the work is valuable, though it often lacks sobriety of statement.

O'CURRY, *MSS. Materials of Ancient Irish History* (Dublin, 1861), O'REILLY, *Irish Writers* (Dublin, 1820).

E. A. D'ALTON.

Maguelonne. See MONTPELLIER, DIOCESE OF.

Maguire, JOHN ALOYSIUS. See GLASGOW, ARCHDIOCESE OF.

Magydus, a titular see of Pamphylia Secunda, suffragan of Perga. It was a small town with no history, on the coast between Attaleia and Perga, occasionally mentioned by ancient geographers, and on numerous coins of the imperial era. Its site was probably Laara in the vilayet of Konia, where there are ruins of a small artificial harbour. The See of Magydus figures in the "Notitiæ episcopatuum" until the twelfth or thirteenth century. Five bishops are known: Aphrodisius, present at the Nicene Council (325); Macedo, at Chalcedon (451); Conon, at Constantinople (553); Platon at Constantinople (680 and 692); Marinus, at Nicæa (787).

SMITH, *Dict. Greek and Roman Geog.*, s. v.; LE QUIEN, *Oriens christ.*, I, 1025.

S. PÉTRIDÈS.

Mahony, CHARLES, VENERABLE, Irish Franciscan martyr; b. after 1639; d. at Ruthin, Denbighshire, 12 August, 1679. The British Museum has a copy of a single sheet entitled "The Last Speeches of Three Priests that were Executed for Religion, Anno Domini 1679", from which the following transcript is made:—

"*An Account of the words spoken by Mr.* Charles Mahony, *an* Irish *Priest of the Holy Order of St.* Francis, *who was Executed in his Habit at* Ruthin *in* North Wales, *August 12, 1679.*

Now God Almighty is pleased I should suffer Martyrdom, his Holy Name be praised, since I dye for my Religion. But you have no Right to put me to death in this Country, though I confessed myself to be a Priest, for you seized me as I was going to my Native Country *Ireland*, being driven at Sea on this Coast, for I never used my Function in *England* before I was taken, however God forgive you, as I do and shall always pray for you, especially for those that were so good to me in my distress, I pray God bless our King, and defend him from his Enemies, and convert him to the Holy Catholick Faith, *Amen.*

His Age was under Forty, He was tryed and Condemned at Denby [i. e. Denbigh] *Confessing himself to be a Priest.*"

Bishop Challoner bases his account of our martyr on the above-mentioned single sheet, but appears to have had access to another authority now lost, for he writes: "He suffered with great constancy, being cut down alive and butchered according to the sentence, as I remember to have read in a manuscript, which I could not since recover." Subsequent writers add nothing to Bishop Challoner's narrative.

CHALLONER, *Memoirs of Missionary Priests*, II, no. 205; GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.*, IV, 392; STANTON, *Menology of England and Wales* (London, 1887); HOPE, *Franciscan Martyrs in England* (London, 1878), 240; OLIVER, *Collections illustrating the History of the Catholic Religion* (London, 1857), 565; THADDEUS, *Franciscans in England* (London and Leamington, 1898), 52, 71, 101.

JOHN B. WAINEWRIGHT.

Mai, ANGELO, Roman cardinal and celebrated philologist, b. at Schilpario, in the Diocese of Bergamo, 7 March, 1782; d. at Albano, 9 September, 1854. At an early age he entered the Society of Jesus (he was a novice in 1779), was sent to the residence in Naples (1804) and was also stationed at Orvieto and Rome. However, on account of his proficiency in palæography he was appointed in 1811 to a position in the Ambrosian Library, Milan. This led to his initial discoveries: Cicero's orations: "Pro Scauro", "Pro Tullio", "Pro Flacco", "In Clodium", and "In Curionem" (1814); the correspondence of Fronto, Marcus Aurelius, and Verus (1815); the speech of Isæus, "De hæreditate Cleonymi" (1815); a fragment of the "Vidularia" of Plautus, and commentaries on Terence (1816); Philo, "De Virtute"; a discourse of Themistius; a fragment of Dionysius of Halicarnassus (1816); a Gothic version of St. Paul; the "Itinerarium Alexandri"; a biography of Alexander by Julius Valerius (1817); and an Armenian version of the "Chronicle" of Eusebius (1818). So many new texts, almost all of which were found in palimpsests, not to mention some editions of already known texts, drew world-wide attention to Mai. In 1819, his superiors decided that he could render greater service in the ranks of the secular clergy; he therefore left the Society and was called by the pope to the Vatican Library. He then worked with increased zest in a richer field. His most brilliant find at this time was the "Republic" of Cicero (1822). To insure the regular publication of his discoveries, he began large series of *Anecdota:* "Scriptorum veterum nova collectio" (10 vols., 1825–38); "Classici auctores" (10 vols., 1825–38); "Spicilegium Romanum" (10 vols., 1839–44); "Nova Patrum bibliotheca" (7 vols., 1852–54), published by Mai himself. The profane authors who profited by Mai's labours are: Diodorus of Sicily; Polybius; Oribasus; Procopius; Cicero (especially the Verrine orations), and the Roman jurisconsults. Important discoveries were made likewise with regard to the works of the Fathers: Saints Augustine, Hilary, Cyprian, Jerome, Ambrose, Athanasius, Cyril, Basil, and Origen, Irenæus, Eusebius of Cæsarea, etc. To these ancient writers must be added the Italian Humanists, the Latin poets of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, Poliziano, Sannazaro, Bembo, Sadoleto, and others, whose works he printed for the first time in the "Spicilegium Romanum". He gave to the world unpublished pages of more than 350 authors. Finally, he did not overlook the Bible. After long delays, inspired by timidity, he was as last authorized to make known one of the most important Greek MS. of the Bible (Vetus et Novum Testamentum ex antiquissimo codice Vaticano, 1858). It has been stated that the gall nut used by Mai to revive the writing of the palimpsests half destroyed them. The truth is that all reagents injure parchment. Soon little will remain of the palimpsest of Plautus in the Ambrosian Library. But the work of Studemund, Mai's successor, will insure its perpetuity. Mai's brilliant discoveries won him the homage and affection of many. He was an intimate friend of Leopardi, the poet of New Italy, a friendship equally honourable to both. Mai was blamed for his great unwillingness to allow the learned to share in the treasures he guarded so jealously. He wished to enjoy them all alone. In 1838, the pope named him cardinal; but he continued his researches, and his publications were interrupted only by his death.

SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibliothèque de la compagnie de Jésus*, V, 323, till 1819; BONNETTY, *Table alphabétique analytique et raisonnée de tous les auteurs sacrés et profanes qui ont été découverts et édités récemment dans les 43 vol. publiés par le cardinal Mai* (Paris, 1850); POLETTO, PRINA, and others, *Nel primo centenario del cardinale Angelo Mai, atti della solenne Accademia tenutasi in suo onore il 7 Marzo 1832* (Bergamo, 1882); POLETTO, *Del cardinale Angelo Mai e de' suoi studi e scoperte* (Siena, 1886); CHATELAIN, *Les palimpsestes latins* in *Annuaire de l'Ecole pratique des hautes études* (1904), 5.

PAUL LEJAY.

Maignan, EMMANUEL, French physicist and theologian; b. at Toulouse, 17 July, 1601; d. at Toulouse, 29 October, 1676. His father was dean of the Chancery of that city and his mother's father was professor of medicine at the University of Toulouse. He studied the humanities at the Jesuit college. At the age of eighteen he joined the Order of Minims. His instructor in philosophy was a follower of Aristotle, but Maignan soon began to dispute and oppose all that seemed to him false in Aristotle's teachings, especially of physics. He preferred Plato to Aristotle. He mastered the mathematics of the day, practically without aid from any one. At the end of a few years his ability was recognized by his superiors and he was given charge of the instruction of novices. In 1636 he was called to Rome by the general of the order to teach mathematics at the convent of the Trinità dei Monti. There he lived for fourteen years, engaged in mathematics and in physical experiments, and publishing his work on gnomonics and perspective. In 1650 he returned to Toulouse and was made provincial. When his three years were up, he was glad to devote himself entirely to his studies. When Louis XIV, having seen his machines and curiosities at Toulouse, invited him to Paris, in 1660, through Cardinal Mazarin, he begged to be allowed to pass his life in the seclusion of the convent. His published works are: "Perspectiva horaria, sive de horologiographia, tum teorica, tum practica" (4 vols., Rome, 1848); "Cursus philosophicus" (1st ed., 4 vols., Toulouse, 1652; 2nd ed. with changes and additions, Lyons, 1673); "Sacra philosophia entis supernaturalis" (Lyons, 1662, 1st vol., and 1672, 2nd vol.); "Dissertatio theologica de usu licito pecuniæ" (Lyons, 1673). This dissertation seemed to authorize usury and was therefore censured by a number of bishops.

SAGUENS, *De Vita, moribus et scriptis R. P. E. Maignani et elogium* (Toulouse, 1697); NICÉRON, *Mémoires ... E. M.*, XXXI (Paris, 1735), 346–353.

WILLIAM FOX.

Mailla (MAILLAC), JOSEPH-ANNA-MARIE DE MOYRIA DE, Jesuit missionary; b. 16 Dec., 1669, at Château

Maillac on the Isère; d. 28 June, 1748, at Peking, China. After finishing his studies he joined the Society of Jesus in 1686, and in 1701 was sent on the mission to China as a member of the order. In June, 1703, he arrived in Morocco and thence set out for Canton, where he acquired a thorough knowledge of the Chinese language and style of writing, and devoted himself particularly to the study of Chinese historical works. When the Emperor Khang-hi entrusted the Jesuit missionaries with the cartographical survey of his empire, the provinces of Ho-nan, Kiang-nan, Tshekiang, and Fo-kien, and the Island of Formosa fell to the lot of Father Mailla along with Fathers Regis and Hinderer. As a mark of his satisfaction, the emperor, when the work had been completed, conferred on Father Mailla the rank of mandarin. When he was fifty years old he began the study of the Manchurian tongue, and made such progress that he was able to translate into French the "Thoung-kian-kang-mou", an extract from the great Chinese annals, which the emperor had had prepared in the Manchurian language. He finished the translation in several volumes in the year 1730, and in 1737 sent it to France, where it lay for thirty years in the library of the college at Lyons, Ferret, who purposed publishing it, having died. On the suppression of the order the college authorities gave the manuscript to the Abbé Grosier on condition that he would see to the publication of the work, which had long been awaited with interest by the learned world. Not long after, the work appeared under the title: "Histoire générale de la Chine, ou Annales de cet Empire; traduit du Tong-kiere-kang-mou par de Mailla, Paris, 1777–1783", in 12 volumes, with maps and plans. In 1785 a thirteenth volume followed. Besides Grosier, the Orientalists Deshauterayes and Colson were mainly responsible for the publication. Mailla's work even to this day provides the most important foundation for any connected presentation of the history of China. Mailla is also the first European scholar to whom we owe a detailed knowledge of the "Shuking", the classic historical work of the Chinese, most of its books being included in his translation. Mailla, also, in order to promote the work of the mission, compiled some edifying books in Chinese; the most important being lives of the saints, and meditations on the Gospels of the Sundays throughout the whole year. In "Lettres édifiantes" there are some interesting letters from him on the persecution of the Christians which took place in China during his time. When he died, in his seventy-ninth year, he was buried at the expense of the Emperor Khiang-lung, many people being present at the obsequies.

Lettres édifiantes, Series XXVIII (Paris, 1758), lix-lxx; *Biographie universelle*, XXVI, 120; RICHTHOFEN, *China* (1877); DE BACKER-SOMMERVOGEL, V (1894), 330–34.

OTTO HARTIG.

Maillard, ANTOINE-SIMON, missionary, b. in France (parentage, place and date of birth unknown); d. 12 August, 1762. He was sent to Acadia by the French Seminary of Foreign Missions in 1735. In 1740 he was appointed vicar-general to the Bishop of Quebec, and resided at Louisbourg until its fall in 1745, after which he retired to the woods and ministered to the dispersed Acadians and Indians of Cape Breton, St. John's (Prince Edward) Island, and the eastern coast of Acadia (Nova Scotia). He was the first to acquire a complete mastery of the extremely difficult language of the Micmacs, for whom he composed a hieroglyphic alphabet, a grammar, a dictionary, a prayer-book, a catechism, and a series of sermons. Although credited with the gift of tongues, he had devoted over eight years to his task. Maillard was the only Catholic priest tolerated by the English in Acadia. When the Indians, to avenge British barbarity towards the Acadians and their missionaries, massacred every English subject that strayed within their reach, the Government appealed to Maillard, whose influence wrought an immediate change. In recognition, he was invited to Halifax, where a church was built for him, and he received a pension of £200, the free exercise of the Catholic Faith being conceded to all his coreligionists, Irish as well as Acadian and Indian. From Halifax he addressed to the scattered groups letters that were read with veneration like the Epistles of St. Paul. At death's hour, after thirty years of laborious ministry, being without any priest to administer the last rites, he was visited by the Anglican parson, Thomas Wood, who offered his ministration. Calmly and gently Maillard refused, saying: "I have served God all my life, and each day I have prepared for death by offering up the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass." Thus vanishes the legend of his request to Wood to read the prayers for the sick from the English ritual. His body alone could the Protestants claim, and they interred it with great demonstrations of honour. He is justly named the Apostle of the Micmacs, by whom he is still held in great veneration, and who, in spite of many trials and temptations, have preserved, with their language, the Faith he taught them.

Soirées Canadiennes (Quebec, 1863); *Canada-Français* (Quebec, 1888); CASGRAIN, *Au pays d'Evangéline* (Paris, 1890); *Les Sulpiciens en Acadie* (Quebec, 1897); O'BRIEN, *Memoirs of Right Rev. Edmund Burke* (Ottawa, 1894); PLESSIS, *Journal des visites pastorales de 1815 et 1816* (Quebec, 1903).

LIONEL LINDSAY.

Maillard, OLIVIER, celebrated preacher, b. at Juignac (?), Brittany, about 1430; d. at Toulouse, 22 July, 1502. He took the Franciscan habit with the Observants, apparently in the province of Aquitaine. He was there the vicar provincial of the Observants when on 2 June, 1487, he was elected Vicar General of the Ultramontane Observants (i. e. those north of the Alps) at the general chapter of the Observants at Toulouse. After his first term of office (1487–90), he was twice re-elected (1493–6 and 1499–1502). Retiring from office at the General Chapter of 15 May, 1502, he went to Toulouse, where he died at the monastery of St. Mary of the Angels. As miracles soon occurred at his grave, the General Chapter of Barcelona in 1508 ordered that his remains should be translated to a chapel built specially for them, where for some time he enjoyed a certain amount of public veneration. He is specially celebrated as a forceful, popular preacher, who preached inspiriting and profitable Lenten sermons in both churches and public places. His manner and style were indeed often rather bluntly plebeian, but by no means so rough as the later classicists have proclaimed them to be. Of a fearless nature, he did not abstain from well-merited attacks upon the abuses of his time, and upon the crimes of those in high places (e. g. the cruelties of Louis XI). He also espoused the cause of Jeanne de Valois, the repudiated wife of the Duke of Orléans. On the other hand, Maillard, who was highly respected by all classes, confirmed Charles VIII in his plan of restoring Roussillon and Cerdagne to Aragon. Innocent VIII asked Maillard in 1488 to use his best endeavours with the French king for abolishing the Pragmatic Sanction: but in this task he was unsuccessful, like many others.

Of his works, nearly all of which are sermons, there is no complete collection; they appeared in detached fashion, many in various editions and in both French and Latin. The most important are: "Sermones de adventu, quadragesimales et dominicales" (3 vols., Paris, 1497–8, 1506, 1522, etc.; Lyons, 1498, etc.); "Sermones de adventu, quadragesimales, dominicales" and "De peccati stipendio et gratiæ præmio" (Paris, 1498——, 1515, etc.; Lyons, 1503), delivered at Paris in 1498; "Quadragesimale", delivered at Bruges in 1501 (Paris, s. d.); printed with the author's notes and the edition of his "Sermon fait l'an 1500 . . . en la ville de Bruges" (2nd ed., Antwerp, s. d.); "Chanson piteuse . . . chantée à Toulouse 1502" (2nd ed., Paris, 1826);

"Histoire de la passion . . . de nostre doulx sauveur" (Paris, 1493); "La conformité et correspondance très dévote des . . . mystères de la messe à la passion . . ." (Paris, 1552), reprinted as a literary monument (Paris, 1828); "L'instruction et consolacion de la vie contemplative" (Paris, s. d.), containing various treatises; "La confession de Frère Olivier Maillard" (Paris, s. d.; Paris, 1500), frequently edited.

SAMOUILLAN, *Etude sur la chaire . . . française au XV^e siècle, Olivier Maillard* (Bordeaux, Toulouse, and Paris, 1891); BORDERIE, *Œuvres françaises d'Oliv. M.: Sermons et poésies* (Nantes, 1877); PIAGET in *Annales du Midi*, V (Toulouse, 1893), 315 sqq.; WADDING, *Annales Ord. Frat. Minorum*, XIV (Rome, 1735), 270; (2nd ed., Rome, 1806), 184; (3rd ed., 1906), 181; SBARALEA, *Supplem. ad Script. O. M.* (Rome, 1806), 571; FERET, *La faculté de théologie de Paris, époque moderne*, II, 213–33; CHEVALIER, *Bio-bibl.* (Paris, 1907), s. v.

MICHAEL BIHL.

Maillard de Tournon, CHARLES-THOMAS. See TOURNON.

Maimbourg, LOUIS, French church historian, b. at Nancy, 10 January, 1610; d. at Paris, 13 August, 1686. In 1626 he entered the Society of Jesus, taught rhetoric and humanities for six years, and subsequently won considerable fame as a preacher. He is now known, however, more particularly as a prolific historical writer, an opponent of Jansenism and Protestantism, and a defender of "the Liberties of the Gallican Church" against the Apostolic See. Owing to his defence of Gallicanism, Pope Innocent XI ordered his expulsion from the Society of Jesus (1681). When he left the order, in 1682, Louis XIV granted him a pension, and until his death he continued his literary pursuits in the Abbey of St. Victor, Paris. His works, remarkable for their elegant diction, are of little value, because somewhat untrustworthy. Among the most important of them are: (1) "Histoire de l'Arianisme" (Paris, 1673); (2) "Histoire de l'hérésie des Iconoclastes" (Paris, 1674); (3) "Histoire des Croisades" (Paris, 1675); (4) "Histoire du schisme des Grecs" (Paris, 1678). The following works by him were placed on the "Index of Forbidden Books": (1) "Histoire de la décadence de l'empire depuis Charlemagne" (Paris, 1676); (2) "Histoire du grand schisme d'Occident" (Paris, 1678); (3) "Histoire du Luthéranisme" (Paris, 1680); (4) "Traité historique de l'établissement et des prérogatives de l'église de Rome et de ses évêques" (Paris, 1685); (5) "Histoire du Pontificat de S. Grégoire le Grand" (Paris, 1686). He is the author of histories of Calvinism, of the League, and of Leo the Great. His collected historical works were published at Paris, 1686.

SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus*, V (Paris, 1894), 343–56; HURTER in *Kirchenlex.* s. v.; CHALMERS, *Biographical Dictionary*, XXI (London, 1815), 143–45.

N. A. WEBER.

Maimonides, MOSES, TEACHING OF.—Moses ben Maimun (Arabic, Abu Amran Musa), Spanish commentator and philosopher, was born of Spanish Jewish parents at Cordova in 1135. After sojourning with his parents in Spain, Palestine, and Northern Africa, he settled down at Old Cairo, Egypt, in 1165. There he received the office of court physician, and at the same time, as head of the Jewish communities in Egypt, devoted himself to the exposition of the Talmud. He died at Cairo, 13 December, 1204, and was buried at Tiberias in Palestine. His writings include: (1) Commentaries: (a) "Kitâb al-Siraj", a commentary on the Mishnah, written in Arabic and translated into Hebrew (first published, 1492), Latin (Oxford, 1654), and German (Leipzig, 1863); (b) "Mishneh Torah", or "Yad ha-Hazakah", written in Hebrew, and many times published (first ed. in Italy, 1480; latest, Vilna, 1900); translated in part into English in 1863 by Bernard and Soloweyczik; (2) Philosophical Works: (a) "Dalalat al-Ha'irîn", translated into Hebrew as "Moreh Nebûkîm" (1204), and into Latin as "Doctor Perplexorum", "Dux Dubitantium". The Arabic original was published, with a French translation entitled "Guide des égarés" by Munk (13 vols., Paris, 1856–66). An English translation of portion of it by Townley appeared as "The Reasons of the Laws of Moses" (London, 1827), and a version of the whole work under the title "The Guide of the Perplexed'" by Friedländer (London, 1889); (b) Minor Philosophical Works: "On the Unity of God", "On Happiness", "On the Terminology of Logic", "On Resurrection" etc.; (3) Medical and Astronomical Works: Several treatises on poisons, on hygiene, a commentary on Hippocrates, on the astronomical principles of the Jewish calendar etc.

Through the "Guide of the Perplexed" and the philosophical introductions to sections of his commentaries on the Mishna, Maimonides exerted a very important influence on the Scholastic philosophers, especially on Albert the Great, St. Thomas, and Duns Scotus. He was himself a Jewish Scholastic. Educated more by reading the works of the Arabian philosophers than by personal contact with Arabian teachers, he acquired through the abundant philosophical literature in the Arabic language an intimate acquaintance with the doctrines of Aristotle, and strove earnestly to reconcile the philosophy of the Stagirite with the teachings of the Bible. The principle which inspired all his philosophical activity was identical with the fundamental tenet of Scholasticism: there can be no contradiction between the truths which God has revealed and the findings of the human mind in science and philosophy. Moreover, by science and philosophy he understood the science and philosophy of Aristotle. In some important points, however, he departed from the teaching of the Aristotelean text, holding, for instance, that the world is not eternal, as Aristotle taught, but was created *ex nihilo*, as is taught explicitly in the Bible. Again, he rejected the Aristotelean doctrine that God's provident care extends only to humanity, and not to the individual. But, while in these important points, Maimonides forestalled the Scholastics and undoubtedly influenced them, he was led by his admiration for the neo-Platonic commentators and by the bent of his own mind, which was essentially Jewish, to maintain many doctrines which the Scholastics could not accept. For instance, he pushed too far the principle of negative predication in regard to God. The Scholastics agreed with him that no predicate is adequate to express the nature of God, but they did not go so far as to say that no term can be applied to God in the affirmative sense. They admitted that while "eternal", "omnipotent", etc., as we apply them to God, are inadequate, at the same time we may say "God is eternal" etc., and need not stop, as Moses did, with the negative "God is not not-eternal", etc.

The most characteristic of all his philosophical doctrines is that of acquired immortality. He distinguishes two kinds of intelligence in man, the one *material* in the sense of being dependent on, and influenced by, the body, and the other *immaterial*, that is, inde-

pendent of the bodily organism. The latter is a direct emanation from the universal active intellect (this is his interpretation of the *νοῦς ποιητικός* of Aristotelean philosophy), and is acquired as the result of the efforts of the soul to attain a knowledge of the absolute, pure intelligence of God. The knowledge of God is, therefore, the knowledge which, so to speak, develops in us the immaterial intelligence, and thus confers on man an immaterial or spiritual nature. This immateriality not only confers on the soul that perfection in which human happiness consists, but also endows the soul with immortality. He who has attained a knowledge of God has reached a condition of existence which renders him immune from all the accidents of fortune, from all the allurements of sin, and even from death itself. Man, therefore, since he has it in his power to attain this salutary knowledge, is in a position not only to work out his own salvation, but also to work out his own immortality. The resemblance between this doctrine and Spinoza's doctrine of immortality is so striking as to warrant the hypothesis that there is a casual dependence of the later on the earlier doctrine. The difference between the two Jewish thinkers is, however, as remarkable as the resemblance. While Spinoza teaches that the way to attain the knowledge which confers immortality is the progress from sense-knowledge through scientific knowledge to philosophical intuition of all things *sub specie æternitatis*, Moses holds that the road to perfection and immortality is the path of duty as described in the Law of God.

Among the theological questions which Moses discussed were the nature of prophecy and the reconciliation of evil with the goodness of God. He agrees with "the philosophers" in teaching that, man's intelligence being one in the series of intelligences emanating from God, the prophet must, by study and meditation, lift himself up to the degree of perfection required in the prophetic state. But here he invokes the authority of "the Law", which teaches that, after that perfection is reached, there is required the free act of God before the man actually becomes the prophet. In his solution of the problem of evil, he follows the neo-Platonists in laying stress on matter as the source of all evil and imperfection.

GUTTMANN, *Verhältniss des Thomas v. Aquin zum Judentum* (Breslau, 1891); BEER, *Leben u. Werken des Maimonides* (Prague, 1850); GEIGER, *Moses ben Maimon* (Breslau, 1850); BARUCH, *Two lectures on Maimonides* (London, 1847); *Jewish Encyclopedia*, s. v. *Moses Ben Maimon;* GUTTMANN, *Die Scholastik in ihrer Bez. zum Judentum* (Breslau, 1902); STÖCKL, *Gesch. der Phil. des Mittelalters*, II (Mainz, 1865), 265 sqq.; TURNER, *History of Philosophy* (Boston, 1903), 316 ff.

WILLIAM TURNER.

Maina Indians (also MAYNA), a group of tribes constituting a distinct linguistic stock, the Mainan, ranging along the north bank of the Marañón. Their earlier habitat is supposed to have been on the upper waters of the Morona and Pastaza, Ecuador. Brinton gives them six tribes, or dialects, viz.: Cahuapana, Chapa, Chayavita, Coronado, Humurano, Maina, Roamaina. Hervas gives them two languages in six dialects, viz.: Maina (Chapo, Coronado, Humurano, Roamaino dialects) and Chayavita (Cahuapano and Paranapuro dialects). The Maina are notable as having been the first tribes of the upper Amazon region to be evangelized, so that they gave their name to the whole mission jurisdiction of the region and to the later province of Mainas, which included the larger part of the present Ecuador and northern Peru, east of the main Cordillera, including the basins of the Huallaga and Ucayali. In this missionary province of Mainas, according to Hervas, there laboured from 1638 to the expulsion in 1767, 157 Jesuit missionaries of Quito, who founded 152 missions, and eight of whom won the palm of martyrdom. The work was begun in 1638 by the Jesuit Fathers Gaspar de Cuxia and Lucas de la Cueva, from Quito, who, beginning their labour at the new town of San Francisco de Borja (now Borja) on the north bank of the Marañón below the junction of the Santiago, established by themselves and their successors from the Quito province, a series of missions extending down the river on both sides. In 1682 Rodríguez enumerates three missions of the Maina proper, in proximity to Borja, and one each of the Chayavita Coronados, Paranapura, and Roamaina, besides others in the surrounding tribes. In 1798 Hervas names San Ignacio, San Juan, Conceptión, Presentación, and presumably San Borja, as missions occupied by Maina tribes. All the missions were then far on the decline, which he ascribes chiefly to the repeated inroads of the Brazilian slave hunters (see MAMELUCO). The mission population is now either extinct or assimilated with the general civilized population, but a few untamed bands still roam the forests.

RODRÍGUEZ, *El Marañón y Amazonas* (Madrid, 1684); HERVAS, *Catálogo de las Lenguas*, I (Madrid, 1800); BRINTON, *The American Race* (New York, 1891); HERNDON, *Exploration of the Valley of the Amazon* (Washington, 1853).

JAMES MOONEY.

Maine.—Maine is commonly known as the Pine Tree State, but is sometimes called the Star in the East.

GEOGRAPHY.—It lies between 43° 6′ and 47° 27′ N. lat., and 66° 56′ and 71° 6′ W. long., bounded on the north by the Provinces of Quebec and New Brunswick; on the east by New Brunswick; on the south-east and south by the Atlantic Ocean; on the west by the State of New Hampshire and the Province of Quebec. It has an area of 33,040 square miles, including some 3000 square miles of water. The coast of Maine has numerous indentations; with a coast-line of 218 miles, when measured direct, it has a sea-coast of 2500 miles. As a result, it has beautiful bays such as Penobscot and Pasamaquoddy; a number of fine harbours, Portland harbour on Casco Bay being one of the best on the Atlantic. The islands off the coast of Maine are very numerous. In Penobscot Bay alone there are some five hundred. The principal rivers of Maine are the Saco, Androscoggin, Kennebec, Penobscot, and St. Croix, which flow south, and the St. John, flowing at first northerly and gradually turning and flowing in a south-easterly direction through New Brunswick into the Bay of Fundy. These rivers and their tributaries, which are in general rapid streams, afford many great and valuable sources of water-power, estimated to represent some 3,000,000 available horse-power. By the Treaty of Washington, also called the Ashburton Treaty, made in 1842 to end the dispute relative to the proper location of the north-eastern frontier, the St. John River was constituted the northern boundary of Maine for a distance of 72 miles, and the St. Croix for a distance of 100 miles or more. Unfortunately, it failed in part at least to accomplish its purpose, for at the present time (1910) a Joint International Commission is endeavouring to harmonize the differences concerning the use of the river which have arisen, and are liable to arise in the future between citizens of Maine on the northern border and British subjects living on the lower St. John.

SEAL OF MAINE

The number of lakes in Maine is about 1580. The largest and most celebrated is Moosehead Lake near the centre of the state, drained by the Kennebec. There are no long mountain ranges in Maine, but there

is a general elevation which extends from the northeast boundary at Mars Hill to the sources of the Magalloway River in the west, and constitutes a divide between the streams flowing south, and those flowing north or east. There are several mountain peaks, the principal being Mount Katahdin (5385 feet), near the geographical centre of the state, Saddleback Mountain (4000 feet), Mount Blue (3900 feet), Mount Abraham (3387 feet), and Green Mountain on Mount Desert Island (1800 feet). The soil of Maine is for the most part hard, dry, and rocky, but along the river valleys, and in low lands originally covered by water, there is considerable fertile land, while in the northern portion of the state, in the valleys of the St. John and its tributary, the Aroostook, the soil is equal in fertility to any in the world.

INDUSTRIES.—The following compilation will convey a fair idea of the leading industries as they stood in 1905.

	No. of Establishments	Capital	Value of products (including custom work and repairing)
Boots and shoes	50	$4,450,939	$12,351,293
Canning and preserving fish	141	2,144,690	5,055,091
Flour and grist-mill products	161	1,422,671	3,932,882
Foundry and machine shop products	99	5,191,274	4,767,025
Leather, tanned, curried and finished	27	1,464,735	2,500,146
Lumber and timber products	752	15,083,395	17,937,683
Lumber, planing mill products, including sash, doors and blinds	84	2,003,304	2,223,956
Marble and stone work	42	2,897,215	2,382,180
Paper and wood-pulp	37	41,273,915	22,951,124
Printing and publishing	206	2,107,149	3,372,331
Shipbuilding, wooden, including boat-building	138	1,221,691	3,038,016
Cotton goods	15	21,642,675	15,405,823
Woollen goods	66	14,990,211	13,969,600
Worsted goods	6	2,562,193	3,609,990
	1824	$118,456,057	$113,497,140
Sixty-eight other industries	1321	25,149,693	30,623,051
Total.....	3145	$143,605,750	$144,120,191

Besides the above specified industries, large amounts are derived from others of which no accurate report can be readily obtained. A large sum is derived each year from the fisheries, apart from what results from the canning industry. The manufacture of lime in the vicinity of Rockland is carried on on a very large scale. The granite quarries at Vinalhaven yield a large return. A very considerable amount is obtained through the mining industries, the numerous mineral springs, located chiefly in Androscoggin County, and numerous lesser industries of which no report is made to the labour commissioner. A very conservative estimate places these at six millions or more.

Agriculture.—Finally, and most important by far as the source from which the livelihood of the vast majority of the population is drawn, come the agricultural products. The County of Aroostook was reported a few years since as ranking second in the Union in the value of its agricultural products, and there has been a great increase in the quantity and value of its products since then. The potato crop of that county in 1908 brought nearly $15,000,000. Taking then the state as a whole, and reckoning potatoes, hay, oats, wheat, buckwheat, barley, rye, corn for canning purposes, apples (of which there were grown two million barrels in 1907), vegetables and dairy products (the last a very large and important item), it is safe to estimate the agricultural products, with those mentioned which are akin to them, at more than $50,000,000 in an average year. In brief, Maine produces through its varied industries some $275 to $300 annually for each inhabitant.

FLORA AND FAUNA.—The forests of Maine cover the greater part of the state, and the value of its standing woods is immense. Spruce is first in quantity, as it is also in greatest demand. After spruce comes hemlock; next, white birch used in the manufacture of spools; poplar for pulpwood; cedar for shingles, and birch for the manufacture of furniture. The pine is also found, but no longer in large quantities. In addition to these are found the maple, ash, beech, and other varieties. Owing to the large extent of forest, game is so plentiful that Maine is called the "hunter's paradise". During the open or hunting season, which in general covers the period from 1 October to 1 December, the woods are filled with hunters from all parts of the Union. The hunter from abroad is in pursuit of the moose, caribou, or deer, but the local hunter adds to these the fox, beaver, marten, sable, mink, and wild cat. Along the coast especially, and to some extent in the lake regions, wild fowl abound. The various lakes, ponds, and streams abound with landlocked salmon, trout, and togue, for which the close time extends from 1 October until the ice has left the pond, lake, or river. Many other varieties of fish are also found, making Maine as attractive to the angler as to the hunter.

CLIMATE.—The climate of Maine, as its latitude indicates, is cold during a considerable portion of the year. In the extreme north the ground is covered with snow from the middle of November to the first of April (and even later) in the average year. But the climate is most healthful at all seasons. Tens of thousands of people from all parts of the country have their summer homes in Maine, or at least spend several months of each year in the state. Not at the famous summer resorts of Old Orchard and Bar Harbor only is the summer visitor found, but everywhere along the coast, in the interior of the state in the vicinity of some of its many lakes, and even at the northernmost extremity of the state in the St. John Valley. The marvellously beautiful scenery, which every successive season attracts people in increasing numbers to Maine, enjoys so wide a renown that anything more than a passing reference to it is unnecessary here.

POPULATION.—The population of the territory of Maine according to the census of 1790 was 96,540; it was 151,719 in 1800; 228,705 in 1810; 298,269 in 1820, when it became a state (15 March); 399,455 in 1830; 501,793 in 1840; 583,034 in 1850; 628,279 in 1860; 626,915 in 1870; 648,936 in 1880; 661,086 in 1890; 694,480 in 1900. The Catholic population is 123,547. It will be observed that, while the growth of population has not been rapid, it has been steady and regular, one decade only from 1860 to 1870 showing a slight decrease. This is accounted for by the fact that Maine furnished 70,107 soldiers to the Federal army in the Civil War, of whom 9398 died during the war. It is safe to predict that the census now being taken (1910) will add fully ten per cent to the figures of the last census, making the population about 765,000.

CONSTITUTION AND GOVERNMENT.—Its constitution was modelled after that of the Federal government. The legislative power is vested in a senate composed of thirty-one members and a house of representatives of one hundred and fifty-one members, both senators and representatives being chosen for a period of two years. The election is held on the second Monday of September in the even years, and the official term begins on the day before the first Wednesday of January following the election. Every bill or resolve passed is submitted to the governor for his approval, but, should he veto it, it may become a law without his approval, if passed by a two-thirds vote of each branch of the legislature.

Initiative and Referendum.—An amendment to the Constitution, which came into effect in the first Wednesday of January, 1909, established "a people's veto through the optional referendum and a direct initiative by petition and at general or special elections".

Executive Department.—In the executive department of the government, the governor has associated with him seven executive councillors, each representing one of the seven councillor districts into which the state is divided. These are chosen by the legislature in joint convention at the beginning of the session; and to this board the nominations made by the governor are submitted for confirmation. Under the state government, the following are the principal heads of departments: state auditor, chosen by popular vote at the September election; attorney-general; secretary of state; state treasurer; three state assessors, chosen by the legislature; superintendent of public schools; highway commissioner; auditor of state printing; land agent and forest commissioner; insurance commissioner; bank examiner; state liquor commissioner; pension clerk; commissioner of industrial and labour statistics; commissioner of agriculture; inspector of workshops, factories, and mines; three railroad commissioners; three enforcement commissioners; state librarian; three commissioners of inland fisheries and game; three commissioners of sea and shore fisheries; keeper of the state arsenal; three commissioners of harbours and tidal waters; three cattle commissioners; three commissioners of pharmacy; agent of the Penobscot Indians; agent of the Passamaquoddy Indians; three inspectors of prisons and jails; two inspectors of steamboats; inspectors of dams and reservoirs.

There are also appointed eight medical men to constitute a state board of health; six medical men to constitute a board of registration; five lawyers to make up a board of legal examiners; three veterinary surgeons to form a board of veterinary examiners, and five dentists to constitute a board of dental examiners. Besides these there are numerous boards of trustees to supervise the management of state institutions. All of these are nominated by the governor and confirmed by the council. The principal ones are: Maine Insane Hospital at Augusta; Eastern Maine Insane Hospital at Bangor; state prison at Thomaston; State School for Boys at South Portland; Maine Industrial School for Girls at Hallowell; Military and Naval Orphan Asylum at Bath; the University of Maine at Orono; College of Law of the University of Maine at Bangor; state normal schools at Castine, Farmington, Gorham, Presque Isle, and Calais; the Madawaska Training School at Fort Kent, and the Maine School for the Deaf at Portland. In this connexion, although not immediately under state authority, may be named certain institutions of a public nature, such as the Maine General Hospital at Portland, Central Maine General Hospital at Lewiston, Eastern Maine General Hospital at Bangor, the Eye and Ear Infirmary at Portland, Maine State Sanitorium Association and Maine Institution for the Blind—all of which have received assistance from the state.

Judicial Department.—The judicial department is composed in the first place of a supreme court of eight justices, viz. a chief justice and seven associate justices. These sit individually in the several counties of the state to hear cases at *nisi prius*, and as a court of law to hear cases brought before them on exceptions at three different places, namely Portland, Bangor, and Augusta. These judges are also vested with full equity powers to hear and determine cases in equity with or without the intervention of a jury. Besides these, superior courts have been established in the counties of Cumberland and Kennebec with a jurisdiction fixed by the acts establishing them, and broad enough to enable them to hear and decide the vast majority of cases arising within their respective counties. Each city and a number of the larger towns have municipal courts of limited jurisdiction in both civil and criminal matters, and finally in every county in the state are trial justices having jurisdiction in petty civil and criminal cases subject to an appeal to a higher court, and authority to issue warrants for the apprehension of offenders in all cases, and to bind over the party accused for trial at the Supreme or Superior Court as the case may be. The municipalities are divided into three classes: cities, towns and plantations. Augusta is the capital of the state. Portland, the largest city in the state, is one of the most beautiful residential cities in the whole country. Maine has 21 cities, 430 towns, and 73 plantations.

Religion.—The declaration of rights prefixed to the Constitution of Maine, article 1, section 3, reads as follows:—"All men have a natural and unalienable right to worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences, and no one shall be hurt, molested or restrained, in his person, liberty or estate, for worshipping God in the manner and season most agreeable to the dictates of his own conscience, nor for his religious professions or sentiments, provided he does not disturb the public peace nor obstruct others in their religious worship; and all persons demeaning themselves peaceably as good members of the state shall be equally under the protection of the laws and no subordination nor preference of any one sect or denomination to another shall ever be established by law, nor shall any religious test be required as a qualification for any office or trust under the state; and all religious societies in this state whether incorporate or unincorporate shall at all times have the exclusive right of electing their public teachers and contracting with them for their support and maintenance." The foregoing is the only constitutional provision having reference to religious opinions or practices.

Lord's Day.—The statute provides penalties for "whoever on the Lord's Day or at any other time, behaves rudely or indecently within the walls of any house of public worship; wilfully interrupts or disturbs any assembly for public worship within the place of such assembly or out of it"; for one "who on the Lord's Day, keeps open his shop, workhouse, warehouse or place of business on that day, except works of necessity or charity"; for an innholder or victualler who, "on the Lord's Day, suffers any person, except travellers or lodgers to abide in his house, yard or field, drinking or spending their time idly at play, or doing any secular business except works of charity or necessity." "No person conscientiously believing that the seventh day of the week ought to be observed as the Sabbath, and actually refraining from secular business and labour on that day, is liable to said penalties for doing such business or labour on the first day of the week, if he does not disturb other persons." Service of civil process on the Lord's Day is also forbidden, and, if in fact made, is void.

Administration of Oaths.—Oaths may be administered by all judges, justices of the peace, and notaries public in the form prescribed by statute as follows: the person to whom an oath is administered shall hold up his right hand, unless he believes that an oath administered in that form is not binding, and then it may be administered in a form believed by him to be binding; one believing any other than the Christian Religion, may be sworn according to the ceremonies of his religion. Persons conscientiously scrupulous of taking an oath may affirm.

Blasphemy and Profanity.—The statutes provide that "whoever blasphemes the Holy Name of God, by denying, cursing or contumeliously reproaching God, His creation, government, final judgment of the world, Jesus Christ, the Holy Ghost, or the Holy Scriptures as contained in the canonical books of the Old and New Testament or by exposing them to contempt and ridicule, shall be punished by imprisonment for not

more than two years or by fine not exceeding two hundred dollars". A fine of five dollars is provided for one who "profanely curses or swears."

Use of Prayer in Legislature.—There is no statute on this subject, but since Maine became a state it has been customary for the president of the senate and the speaker of the house of representatives to invite in turn the several clergymen of Augusta, Hallowell, and Gardiner, to open each day's session in their respective branches with prayer. Until some twenty years ago, Protestant clergymen alone were invited, but since that time Catholic priests are invited and officiate in their turn.

Recognition of Religious Holidays.—The statutes provide that "no person shall be arrested in a civil action, or mesne process or execution or on a warrant for taxes, on the day of annual fast or thanksgiving, the thirtieth day of May, the fourth day of July, or Christmas." The Legislature of 1907 passed an act abolishing the annual fast day and substituting Patriots' Day therefor.

Seal of Confession.—There is no record of any attempt to obtain from any priest information acquired by him through the confessional, by any tribunal of this state or by any one practising before the same.

Incorporation of Churches.—The statutes provide that "any persons of lawful age, desirous of becoming an incorporated parish or religious society, may apply to a justice of the peace", and full provision is made for their incorporation into a parish, and further that "every parish may take by gift or purchase any real or personal property, until the clear annual income thereof shall amount to three thousand dollars, convey the same and establish by-laws not repugnant to law." By Act of the Legislature approved 27 February, 1887, the Roman Catholic Bishop of Portland was created a corporation sole.

Exemption of Church Property from Taxation.—The statutes provide that "houses of religious worship, including vestries and the pews and furniture within the same, except for parochial purposes; tombs and rights of burial; and property held by a religious society as a parsonage, not exceeding six thousand dollars in value and from which no rent is received, are exempt from taxation. But all other property of any religious society, both real and personal, is liable to taxation, the same as other property."

Exemption of Clergy from certain Public Duties.—Settled ministers of the gospel are exempt by statute from serving as jurors, and by the constitution 'ministers' are among those entitled to be exempted from military duty.

Marriage and Divorce.—The statutes provide that "every justice of the peace, residing in the State; every ordained minister of the gospel and every person licensed to preach by an association of ministers, religious seminary or ecclesiastical body, duly appointed and commissioned for that purpose by the governor, may solemnize marriages within the limits of his appointment. The governor with the advice and consent of Council, may appoint women otherwise eligible under the constitution to solemnize marriages." Another section safeguards the rights of those contracting marriage in good faith by making it valid, although not solemnized in legal form, and although there may be a want of jurisdiction or authority in the justice or minister performing the ceremony.

The statutory grounds for divorce are prescribed in the following section: "A divorce from the bonds of matrimony may be decreed by the Supreme Judicial Court in the County where either party resides at the commencement of proceedings for cause of adultery, impotence, extreme cruelty, utter desertion continued for three consecutive years next prior to the filing of the libel, gross and confirmed habits of intoxication, cruel and abusive treatment, or, on the libel of the wife, where the husband being of sufficient ability, grossly or wantonly and cruelly refuses or neglects to provide suitable maintenance for her; provided that the parties were married in this state or cohabited here after marriage; or if the libellant resided here when the cause of divorce accrued or had resided here in good faith for one year prior to the commencement of the proceedings. But when both parties have been guilty of adultery, or there is collusion between them to procure a divorce, it shall not be granted." Either party may be a witness.

Education.—The law makes liberal and ample provision for a system of common schools covering the entire state. The number of school children in the state according to the report of the state superintendent for the year 1909 was 212,329, and the amount expended for school purposes was $2,368,890. The statutes relating to public schools contain no reference to religion or religious teaching. Free high schools are encouraged by reimbursing any town establishing one a certain proportion of the amount expended in connexion therewith. Such schools have been established in all of the cities and in more than half of the towns, and scholars from other towns are admitted without charge for tuition, the amount being charged to the town in which they reside. Under the head of normal schools we find the following statute: "Said schools, while teaching the fundamental truths of Christianity and the great principles of morality, recognized by law, shall be free from all denominational teachings and open to persons of different religious connections on terms of equality." The higher education is furnished by the University of Maine at Orono; Bowdoin College at Brunswick; Bates College at Lewiston; Colby College at Waterville; St. Mary's College at Van Buren. Concerning the Catholic schools, which are attended by 12,274 pupils, see Portland, Diocese of.

Charitable Institutions.—The statutes provide a method of organizing charitable societies, and there is also a provision exempting them from taxation. "The real and personal property of all literary institutions, and all benevolent, charitable and scientific institutions incorporated by the state, corporations whose property or funds in excess of their ordinary expenses are held for the relief of the sick, the poor or the distressed, or of widows and orphans, or to bury the dead, are benevolent and charitable institutions within the meaning of this specification, without regard to the sources from which such funds are derived, or the limitations in the classes of persons for whose benefit they are applied, except that so much of the real estate of such corporations as is not occupied by them for their own purposes, shall be taxed in the municipality in which it is situated."

Sale of Liquor.—On the first Wednesday of January, 1885, the following provision became a part of the constitution: "The manufacture of intoxicating liquors, not including cider, and the sale and keeping for sale of intoxicating liquors, are and shall be forever prohibited, except, however, that the sale and keeping for sale of such liquors for medicinal and mechanical purposes and the arts and the sale and keeping for sale of cider, may be permitted under such regulations as the legislature may provide. The legislature shall enact laws with suitable penalties for the suppression of the manufacture, sale and keeping for sale of intoxicating liquors, with the exceptions herein specified."

Prohibitory Legislation.—Beginning with 21 June, 1851, the date of the approval of the first act, the legislature has passed fifty-six acts intended to prevent the sale of intoxicating liquors. The law in its present state covers twenty pages of the Revised Statutes and is in substance as follows: (1) A law prohibiting the manufacture or sale by any one of such intoxicating liquors (except cider); (2) prohibiting peddling intoxicating liquors; (3) against the trans-

portation from place to place of intoxicating liquors with intent to sell; (4) prohibiting any sale of intoxicating liquors by self, clerk, servant, or agent; (5) to punish the offence of being a common seller; (6) to punish the keeping of a drinking house and tippling shop; (7) against keeping intoxicating liquors in one's possession intended for unlawful sale; (8) a law providing for a search and seizure of intoxicating liquors intended for unlawful sale, and for their forfeiture; (9) against advertising sale or keeping for sale of intoxicating liquors in newspapers. The penalties range, according to the gravity of the offence, from a fine of fifty dollars and costs to a fine of $1000 and costs, and imprisonment from thirty days to six months. For a second or subsequent offence the penalties are to be increased. Formerly the duty of enforcing the prohibitory law rested upon certain county officers, such as the sheriff and his deputies and the county attorney, and upon certain municipal officers. In addition to these, by act approved on 18 March, 1905, the governor was authorized to appoint a commission of three persons, who in turn may appoint such number of deputies as in their judgment may be necessary to enforce the laws against the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors.

State and Town Agencies.—A state agency exists "to furnish municipal officers of towns and cities with pure, unadulterated intoxicating liquors to be kept and sold for medicinal, mechanical and manufacturing purposes". The municipal officers are authorized to appoint "some suitable person, agent of said town or city", who is authorized to purchase liquors from the state agent and "to sell the same, at some convenient place therein, to be used for medicinal, mechanical and manufacturing purposes and no other." "No such agent shall have any interest in such liquors or in the profits of the sale thereof."

Prisons and Reformatories.—There is a state prison located at Thomaston, the Reform School being situated at Cape Elizabeth. There is a county jail in each county except Piscataquis, which uses the Penobscot jail at Bangor, and every city and large town has its police station or lock-up. There is also the Industrial School for Girls at Hallowell.

Wills and Testaments.—The statutes provide that "a person of sound mind and of the age of twenty-one years, may dispose of his real and personal estate by will in writing signed by him, or by some person for him at his request and in his presence, and subscribed in his presence by three credible attesting witnesses not beneficially interested under said will."

Charitable Bequests.—There is no statute on this subject, but a bequest, for any purpose not against public policy, will be sustained, provided there be a person or persons or corporation empowered to accept and receive the same.

Cemeteries.—The statutes provide as follows: "Section 1. Towns may raise and assess money, necessary for purchasing and suitably fencing land for a burying ground. Section 2. Persons of lawful age may incorporate themselves for the purpose of purchasing land for a burying ground." Another section requires that ancient cemeteries belonging to any town, parish, or religious society shall be fenced; still another exempts lots in public or private cemeteries from attachments and levy on execution.

History.—So conspicuous were the islands and the coast of Maine, that it is beyond question that they were known to nearly all of the early explorers. In 990 Biarne sailed from Iceland for Greenland and, driven by storms from his course, discovered an unknown land to the south, covered with forests. The account of his voyage leads one to believe that he passed in sight of the Maine coast. After him came other Northmen; the sons of Eric the Red successively made voyages to the coast of New England, Leif in 1000, Thorwald in 1002, and Thornstein in 1004. The last named came in search of the body of his brother Thorwald, slain in battle by the natives in the vicinity of what is now Boston Harbour; he remained through the winter, returning in 1005. After these came Thorfinn Karlsefne in 1006; Thorhall the hunter in 1008, who beyond question was actually upon the coast of Maine, and Thorfinn Karlsefne, who came again in 1009 in search of Thorhall the hunter, but probably did not quite reach the coast of Maine. During the period which elapsed until the time of Columbus (1492), while many voyages were made from Denmark and Iceland to "Vineland", which comprised the coast of Maine and New Hampshire, and to Markland, which was identical with Nova Scotia and New Brunswick of to-day, there is no certainty that any of the vessels of the Northmen landed on the coast of Maine proper. The prevailing opinion was that this region formed a part of Europe, and it is so set down in the maps of that period. Later it was believed to be a part of Asia. Columbus in voyaging westward was in search of a passage to India.

The first voyage of John Cabot and his son Sebastian in 1497, in which the land of North America was observed, left them under the impression that it was the coast of Eastern Asia. In 1498 Sebastian Cabot passed along the entire length of the coast of Maine going and returning. Then for the first time and to his disappointment, Sebastian Cabot discovered that this land stood as an apparently impassable barrier between him and "far-off Cathay". In 1524 the Italian, Verrazano, for the French Government, explored the coast bordering "on the gulf of Maine", and describes it very minutely. In 1525 Estevan Gomez, in behalf of the Spanish Government, made a voyage to the New World, and entered many of the ports and bays of New England. For a long time afterwards, the territory of which Maine forms a part was known on Spanish maps as the "Country of Gomez". In 1527 John Rut, on an English vessel, visited the coast, being the first Englishman to set foot upon American soil. It was at this time that the territory of Maine became known as Norumbega, called after an imaginary city located in the interior on the banks of the Penobscot. All of these expeditions were sent out in the hope of discovering a north-west passage to India. In 1541 Diego Maldonado visited the coast of Maine. He was in charge of a Spanish expedition sent out in search of Ferdinand De Soto, who had explored the southern coast of North America to take possession of it for the Spanish Government.

In 1556 André Thevet, a passenger on board a French vessel, landed with others on the banks of the Penobscot. This traveller has given a very complete and interesting account of his visit. In 1565 Sir John Hawkins explored the coast, and Sir Humphrey Gilbert perished on the way to establish an English colony at Norumbega on the Penobscot. In 1602 Bartholomew Gosnold appears to have landed in the vicinity of the city of Portland, and in 1603 Martin Pring entered Penobscot Bay, the mouth of the Kennebec, and Casco Bay.

The first attempt at founding a colony within the territory of Maine was made by Pierre du Guast, Sieur de Monts, who, having received authority from Henry IV of France in 1603 to colonize "Acadia", by which was meant all of the territory between the fortieth and fifty-sixth degrees of north latitude, sailed from Havre in company with the still more famous Samuel de Champlain in the spring of 1604, with two vessels carrying one hundred and twenty persons. After stopping at several places, among others at the mouth of the river which he named and which is still known as the St. John, he sailed into Passamaquoddy Bay, as it is now called, up the St. Croix River, as he named it, and landed on an island to which he gave the same name. This is now known

as De Monts Island, and is within the limits of the parish of the Immaculate Conception, which includes the city of Calais. Here, in a small chapel, quickly erected, the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass was offered for the first time on the soil of New England by Rev. Nicholas Aubry of Paris in July, 1604. From this little colony the Gospel spread among the Indians, the Abenakis being the first on the continent to embrace the Faith; this they did in a body, and they have stood steadfast in the Faith to this day. The colony was transferred near the close of the following year to a new location at Port Royal on Annapolis Bay. In July, 1605, Captain George Weymouth landed on the coast of Maine within the limits of the town of St. George.

On 10 April, 1606, James I of England granted a charter, called the Charter of Virginia, providing for two colonies, one between the thirty-fourth and thirty-eighth and the other between the forty-first and forty-fifth degrees of latitude, the latter including substantially the whole of the Maine coast, and extending a considerable distance into the interior. Under this charter a small colony was established in 1607 on the peninsula of Sagadahoc on the spot now commemorated by Fort Popham. This settlement appears to have been broken up. It was renewed, however, after a few years and has continued down to the present time. These settlements, the one made by De Monts on St. Croix Island, and that made at Fort Popham, have formed respectively the basis of the claim made by the French and the English to the territory of Maine—a controversy long, and bitter, and bloody, in which the religious element was ever present. The French king claimed as far west as the Kennebec; the English claimed as far east as the present line of the state. The English occupancy spread from the mouth of the Sagadahoc in both directions, so that in 1614, when Captain John Smith visited the coast, he found a few settlers on the island of Monhegan and around Pemaquid Bay. The history of the English settlement from 1616 until 1677 consists of the doings of Sir Ferdinando Gorges, his son Robert, and his nephew. Ferdinando Gorges in 1622 received from the English king a patent of the land between the Merrimac and the Kennebec, and in the next year sent his son Robert as governor and lieutenant-general of the Province of Maine. He was accompanied by a minister of the Church of England and several councillors. The first court was convened at Saco on 21 March, 1636. In 1639 he received a charter which made of the Province of Maine a palatinate of which Sir Ferdinando Gorges was lord palatine. This is the only instance of a purely feudal possession on the American continent. In 1641 the first chartered city in the United States, Gorgiana, now York, was established. In that period (1630–2) settlements were begun in Saco, Biddeford, Scarboro, Cape Elizabeth, and Portland, which progressed fairly well until the Indian war in 1675, during which they were almost destroyed.

In 1677 Massachusetts purchased the interest of the Gorges in the Province of Maine, and in 1691 it became definitively part of "The Royal Province of Massachusetts Bay", and so continued until 1820. The Maine men in the Revolutionary War were reckoned as Massachusetts troops, and a regiment of Maine men fought at Bunker Hill. The first naval battle was that at Machias, in which Jeremiah O'Brien and his five sons captured the British ship, Margaretta (11 July, 1775). The French occupancy consisted of a few missions, the principal being the one at Pentagoet (Castine) on the Penobscot and another at Narantsouac (Norridgewock) on the Kennebec. The history of the French occupancy is accordingly the history of the Catholic missions. In 1611 Jean de Biencourt, Sieur de Poutrincourt, having succeeded to the title of De Monts, landed on an island at the mouth of the Kennebec. He was accompanied among others by Father Biard. This is believed to have been the second place in Maine in which the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass was celebrated. In 1613 another attempt was made at founding a Catholic colony on the coast. Antoinette de Pons, Marchioness de Guercheville, sent out under the command of Sieur de la Saussaye an expedition which sailed from France on 12 March, 1613, and landed on the south-eastern shore of Mount Desert. Here the missionaries planted a cross, celebrated Mass, and gave the place the name of St. Sauveur. This settlement was destined to be short-lived. Captain Samuel Argall from Virginia, in a small man-of-war, attacked the colony, took, and destroyed it. Father Masse, with fourteen Frenchmen, was set adrift in a small boat, and the others were carried prisoners to Virginia. Soon after, the governor of Virginia sent Argall to destroy the remnant of the St. Croix and Port Royal colonies, which he did, burning such buildings as had been erected.

In 1619 the Recollects of the Franciscan Order were given charge of the territory, which included Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Maine. They ministered to the spiritual wants of Indians and whites alike, and so continued in charge until the year 1630. The Capuchins, another branch of the Franciscan Order, succeeded them three years later. From Port Royal as a centre, they had missions as far as the Penobscot and the Kennebec, the principal one in Maine being that at Pentagoet on the Penobscot. In 1646, at the request of the Indians of the Kennebec, the superior of the Jesuit mission in Canada sent Father Gabriel Druillettes, who founded the mission of the Assumption. He returned to Quebec the following year, but in 1650 was back at his post, being stationed at Norridgewock. He appears to have lived alternately there and at Quebec until 1657, when he returned finally to Quebec. The Capuchin mission at Pentagoet was broken up about this time by an expedition sent by Cromwell, and the missionary, Very Rev. Bernadine de Crespy, was carried off to England. In 1667, Pentagoet having been restored to France by the Treaty of Breda, Catholic worship was restored. Rev. Lawrence Molin, a Franciscan, was placed in charge, and from this point visited all the stations in the state. The Baron de Castine, from whom Castine (Pentagoet) derives its name, was a strong supporter of this mission at this period. After Father Molin came Father Morain in 1677 to minister to the Penobscots and Passamaquoddies. In 1684 Rev. Louis P. Thury was sent by Bishop Laval, and settled at Castine. In 1688 he built the church of St. Ann at Panawaniski (Indian for Oldtown), which exists to this day and is the oldest parish in New England. Baron de Castine appears to have been the chief promoter of this church, and also offered to maintain the missionary at his own expense. The baron had married the daughter of the Sagamore Modockewando. About 1701 he returned to France; but his half-breed son, Anselme, Baron de Castine, was long a prominent figure in the wars which were continually waged between the French and their Indian allies and the New Englanders, representing British interests. In the same year (1668) Father James Bigot built a chapel at Norridgewock. His brother, Rev. Vincent Bigot, also served the mission for some little time, leaving it in 1699. Besides these, and during the same period, the Jesuit fathers, Peter Joseph de la Chasse, Julien Binnetau, and Joseph Aubery, served the missions in Maine. Rev. Jacques Alexis de Fleury d'Eschambault succeeded Father Thury, who had been called elsewhere. Father d'Eschambault died in 1698, and was succeeded by Rev. Philip Rageot and Rev. Father Guay until 1701, and by Rev. Anthony Gaulin until 1703. Rev. Sebastian Rale was also located at Norridgewock during the same period, and continued there for thirty years.

In 1704–5 expeditions were sent from Massachusetts to destroy the mission stations in Maine. Those on the Penobscot were ravaged, and the church and all of the wigwams were burned. In 1722 another expedition sent out by the Governor of Massachusetts burned the church on the Penobscot. The same expedition in January, 1722, had proceeded to Norridgewock for the purpose of capturing or killing Father Rale. On this occasion, being warned in time, he and his flock escaped by taking to the woods. At last the end came. The frequent attempts, all more or less successful, to destroy the Maine mission stations, forced the Indians to prepare to defend themselves. After several battles between the Massachusetts forces with their Indian allies and the Indians of the Kennebec, a small force attacked the village of Norridgewock on 23 August, 1724. Father Rale, well knowing that he was the one whose life was sought, and apparently anxious to divert the attack from his people, went forth to meet the enemy and fell pierced by many bullets. After the death of Father Rale, the only missionaries in Maine appear to have been Fathers De Syresm and Lanverjat, and these remained only until 1731. In 1730 a chapel had been erected on the Kennebec, but for fifty years or more the Indians had to content themselves with occasional pilgrimages to certain places in Canada, notably Becancour and St. Francis on the Chaudière River. They were occasionally visited by Father Charles Germain from St. Anne's mission, now Fredericton, New Brunswick. At the beginning of the Revolutionary War, the Abenakis having taken the side of the patriots, all persecution for religious or other reasons ceased, and the General Council of Massachusetts desired to furnish them a priest, but were unable to obtain one at that time. At the close of the war, Rev. Father Ciquard, a Sulpician, was sent to Oldtown and remained there until 1794, whence he went to Fredericton.

The foundation of the Catholic Church in Maine practically dates from the arrival of Father (afterwards Bishop) Cheverus from Boston in July, 1797, to take charge of the two Indian missions at Pleasant Point. The few white Catholics scattered here and there claimed his attention equally with the red men. The progress made was slow, but on 17 July, 1808, he had the satisfaction of dedicating St. Patrick's church at Damariscotta. Fully two-thirds of its cost had been contributed by two gentlemen partners in business, Messrs. Kavanagh and Cottrill. It is a remarkable circumstance that the two most distinguished Catholic laymen of the past century in Maine were of their descendants. Edward Kavanagh, son of the senior partner, represented his native district in the twenty-second and twenty-third congresses, and after his second term was appointed by President Jackson minister to Portugal. In 1842 he was elected to the state senate, and was chosen president of that body. Governor Fairfield having been elected to the United States senate, Kavanagh became acting governor. A monument to the sterling Catholic principles of the Kavanagh family, exists in the splendid "Kavanagh School", which stands near the cathedral in Portland, erected with means contributed by a sister of the governor. James C. Madigan (b. in Damariscotta, 22 July, 1821; d. in Houlton, 16 October, 1879) was the grandson of Matthew Cottrill. He was sent by Governor Kavanagh to establish schools in the Madawaska territory in 1843, and made his home for a number of years at Fort Kent. He later removed to Houlton, where he spent the remainder of his days. He was the most conspicuous Catholic in New England for many years. A gentleman of noble presence, of rare culture, elegant manners, and high character, he was well fitted to adorn the highest office in the land. He was one of the five members of the commission appointed in 1875 by Governor Dingley to revise the constitution of the state. He was an able and learned lawyer, and an eloquent and powerful advocate. He was a devout Catholic and probably no layman in the entire country in his time stood so high in the estimation of the clergy. At Whitefield, Rev. Denis Ryan being pastor, a church was built and dedicated in June, 1822. Rev. Benedict Joseph Fenwick having been chosen to succeed Bishop Cheverus, who had returned to France, he was consecrated Bishop of Boston on 1 Nov., 1825. During his government of the Diocese of Boston, St. Dominic's church in Portland was built, and was dedicated on 11 August, 1833. In 1834 Bishop Fenwick, having secured a half township of land in Aroostook County, established the prosperous Catholic colony of Benedicta. In 1835 St. Joseph's Church in Eastport was dedicated; on 4 August, 1838, one in Gardiner; on 10 Nov., 1839, St. Michael's in Bangor.

Knownothingism. — The growth of the Catholic Church in Maine and New Hampshire was such that in 1853, these states were taken out of the Diocese of Boston to form the Diocese of Portland. On 22 April, 1855, Rev. David William Bacon was consecrated bishop. It was just after the outbreak of Knownothingism which resulted in the tarring, feathering, and riding on a rail of the saintly Father John Bapst at Ellsworth. This was on 15 October, 1854. On the preceding 8 July, the Knownothings had burned the church at Bath. Subsequent events appear to justify the belief that this persecution was the herald of the remarkable growth and development of the Catholic Church in Maine. It is not easy to foresee to what lengths this anti-Catholic agitation might have gone, had not events of national importance begun to loom on the horizon. The Civil War, in which so many Catholics of Maine and of all parts of the Union took part, and so many greatly distinguished themselves by their courage and valour, put an end to this persecution—it is to be hoped, for ever. An attempt was made during the period from 1890 to 1895 to establish an order of the same nature, under the name of the "American Protective Association", but it soon died a fitting death.

Early Catholic Settlers.—The State of Maine, although settled a few years earlier than Massachusetts, is peopled for the most part by inhabitants who claim descent from settlers from Massachusetts and other parts of New England. The Catholics of Maine are of either Irish or French extraction, the French-Canadians and Acadians constituting a majority. With the possible exception of a few Irishmen to be found here and there within its borders, the Acadians were first in point of time. At the period of the exportation of the Acadians from Grand Pré and other places in Acadia, a few escaped and formed the mission of St. Ann, at, above, and below the site of the city of Fredericton, N. B. Here they remained until the close of the Revolutionary War and the arrival of the Loyalists, otherwise called the Tories. Driven out of the United States by the patriots, these latter came to the St. John valley, landing in the city of St. John about 11 May, 1783. Compelled to yield up their possessions to the new-comers, the Acadians went a second time into exile, and settled in 1784, with the consent of the British authorities, on the upper St. John, occupying the territory now included in Madawaska County, New Brunswick, and so much of Aroostook County as is within the St. John valley. Until 9 August, 1842, the date of the Treaty of Washington, both sides of the St. John were under British rule. Hardly had the Acadians established themselves in their new homes, before they were visited by missionary priests, especially by Rev. Father Ciquart from St. Ann's mission, their former pastor. Soon after, in 1791, they applied to the Bishop of Quebec for leave to build a church; the church of St. Basil was built and dedicated on 7 July, 1793.

Rev. Father Paquet was in charge of the parish until the church was dedicated, but was succeeded soon afterwards by Father Ciquart, whose name appears in the parish records until the end of 1798. In 1838 the first church on the American side of the St. John River, St. Bruno's Church in Van Buren, was built, and Rev. Antoine Gosselin appointed its first pastor. At this time that region was in the Diocese of Quebec; after 1842 it was in the Diocese of St. John, and in 1870 it became portion of the Diocese of Portland. On the Maine side of the St. John River there are at present eleven churches, a college, seven convents (six with schools), and two hospitals. Soon after the Acadians settled in this region, they were joined by a few Canadians from the province of Quebec, and a few Irish immigrants. The population to-day is made up for the most part of Acadians and Canadians in about equal proportions. By the year 1800 there was a fair sprinkling of Irish immigrants within the borders, and they continued to arrive at intervals and in small numbers during the greater part of the past century. Probably the period of the Irish famine of 1847 would mark the date of the coming of the larger number. The Canadians came, for the most part, to the manufacturing centres during the building up of the manufacturing industries in Lewiston, Biddeford, Brunswick, Augusta, Waterville, Skowhegan, and Westbrook. This was chiefly during the period from 1860 to 1880. A large number had established themselves in Oldtown at an even earlier period.

When one considers the poverty of the Catholic immigrants, their achievements seem truly marvellous. Their zeal and devotion, as evidenced by the churches and religious institutions built up by an able, zealous, and pious clergy with their assistance, are beyond all praise. They have been most fortunate in their bishops and priests, and at no period have the growth and development of the Church and its interests been more rapid than at the present time. During the past century, many Catholics of Maine have ranked among the first in ability, endowments, and character. Several were eminent in the professions, and many in business. But the conditions were such as did not admit of any considerable political advancement. Times have changed, however, and to-day there is no perceptible difference in the support given to Protestant and Catholic candidates for public office.

At the session of 1907, by a unanimous vote, an appropriation to help to erect an additional building for St. Mary's College, was granted by the legislature, showing that in Maine, at least, no trace of the old-time bigotry now exists. That conditions are as they are, is due largely to the high character of the Catholic clergy, aided by many able and zealous laymen.

Collections of Maine Historical Society, I—(Portland, 1869—); HANNAY, *History of Acadia* (St. John, 1879); YOUNG, *History of the Cath. Church in the New England States*, I. *Diocese of Portland* (Boston, 1899); FITTON, *Sketches of the Establishment of the Church in New England* (Boston, 1872); STETSON, *History and Government of Maine* (New York); *Official Cath. Directory and Clergy List for 1910; Maine Register* (Portland, 1909); LYONS, *Report of Industrial and Labor Statistics* (Portland); *Statement of the case of the United States in matter referred to King of the Netherlands for Arbitration by Convention of Sept. 29, 1827* (Washington, 1829); RAYMOND, *History of the St. John River* (St. John, 1905); MAINE HISTORICAL SOCIETY, *Tercentenary of Martin Pring's landing* (1903), *of De Monts' settlement on De Monts Island* (1904), *of Weymouth's landing at St. George* (1905) (Portland); *Gov. Chamberlain's Address at the Centennial Exhibition at Philadelphia, 1876*, in *Laws of Maine* (Portland, 1877); SHEA, *The Cath. Church in the United States* (New York, 1856); SPRAGUE, *Sebastian Rale* (Boston); BAXTER, *Historical Manuscripts.*

PETER CHARLES KEEGAN.

Maine de Biran, FRANÇOIS-PIERRE-GONTHIER, philosopher; born at Grateloup near Bergerac, Dordogne, France, 29 November, 1766; died at Paris, 16 July, 1824. He studied at Périgueux, joined the army, but after a few years resigned and entered politics. In April, 1797, he was one of the Conseil des Cinq Cents; however, as he incurred the hostility of the Directory by his royalist sympathies he withdrew to Grateloup, where he devoted himself to philosophy. His constitution was delicate and sensitive and his philosophic bent had already manifested itself by his observations on the influence of the physical state on the moral. As an ideologist he won the prize at the Institut with his essay "Sur l'habitude" (1802); but his "Décomposition de la pensée" (1805) shows him deviating from the theory of that school, and in "La perception immédiate" (1807), and "Rapports du physique et du morale de l'homme" (1811), he is an opponent of the eighteenth-century philosophy. He then re-entered the political arena and was elected to parliament in 1812, 1815, and 1820. In his latter days his tendency to mysticism gradually brought him back towards practical Christianity, and he died a faithful child of the Church. Three stages mark the development of his philosophy. Up to 1804, a stage called by Naville "the philosophy of sensation", he was a follower of Condillac's sensism, as modified by de Tracy, which he soon abandoned in favour of a system based on an analysis of internal reflection. In the second stage—the philosophy of will—1804–18, to avoid materialism and fatalism, he embraced the doctrine of immediate apperception, showing that man knows himself and exterior things by the resistance to his effort. On reflecting he remarks the voluntary effort which differentiates his internal from his external experience, thus learning to distinguish between the ego and the non-ego. In the third stage—the philosophy of religion—after 1818, we find de Biran advocating a mystical intuitional psychology. To man's two states of life: representation (common to animals), and volition (volition, sensation, and perception), he adds a third: love or life of union with God, in which the life of Divine grace absorbs representation and volition. Maine de Biran's style is laboured, but he is reckoned by Cousin as the greatest French metaphysician from the time of Malebranche. His genius was not fully recognized till after his death, as the essay "Sur l'habitude" (Paris, 1803) was the only book that appeared under his name during his lifetime; but his reputation was firmly established on the publication of his writings, partly by Cousin ("Œuvres philosophiques de Maine de Biran", Paris, 1834–41), and partly by Naville ("Œuvres inédites de Maine de Biran", Paris, 1859).

NAVILLE, *Maine de Biran, sa vie et ses pensées* (Paris, 1877); COUSIN, *Preface* to his edition of the works (Paris, 1834–41); TURNER, *History of Philosophy* (Boston, 1903), 606–7; UEBERWEG, *History of Philosophy*, tr. MORRIS, II (New York, 1903), 340–1; TRUMAN, *Maine de Biran's Philosophy of Will* (New York, 1904); GÉRARD, *Philosophie de Maine de Biran*, an essay with unpublished fragments (Paris, 1876); MAYONADE, *Pensées et pages inédites de Maine de Biran* (Périgueux, 1896); COUAILHAC, *Maine de Biran* (Paris, 1905), an excellent study of his philosophy.

A. A. MACERLEAN.

Maintenon, FRANÇOISE, MARQUISE DE, b. at Niort, 28 November, 1635; d. at Saint-Cyr, 15 April, 1719. She was the granddaughter of the celebrated Protestant writer, Agrippa d'Aubigné. Constant d'Aubigné, son of Agrippa, imprisoned in the Château Trompette at Bordeaux on suspicion of intriguing with the English, had married in 1627 Jeanne de Cardillac, daughter of his gaoler. Again imprisoned at Niort on a charge of conspiring against Cardinal de Richelieu, he was accompanied into prison by his wife, and it was in this prison at Niort that Françoise was born. She was baptized a Catholic, her father having been already received into the Church. In 1639 the family went to Martinique, but came back to France in 1645. Françoise was then placed under the care of Mme de Villette, a Protestant aunt, who undermined the child's faith. An order of the court transferred Françoise to the care of a Catholic relative, Mme de Neuillant, but for a time neither the kindness nor the subsequent

strictness the latter employed, nor the efforts of the Ursulines of Niort, who kept Françoise gratuitously for some time, could counteract the influence of Mme de Villette. She was finally converted at the age of fourteen through the influence of the Ursulines of Rue Saint-Jacques, Paris. In June, 1652, Françoise, having lost her mother and finding herself reduced almost to poverty, consented to marry the celebrated burlesque poet, Scarron, who was a cripple. She took great care of him, was faithful to him, and gathered around him a group of celebrated writers. As she read Latin, and spoke Italian and Spanish, she had little difficulty in attaching them to her circle.

Scarron died on 7 October, 1660. Françoise, who had preserved her virginity during this odd marriage, was then a pretty widow of twenty-five years; she obtained from the queen-mother a pension of 2700 *livres* (approximately $540), and withdrew to the convent of the Hospitaller Sisters of Our Lady. Having received the *entrée* into the Albret and Richelieu circles, she there became acquainted with Mme de Sévigné, Mme de La Fayette, and Mme de Montespan. She was called "la charmante malheureuse", and society began to take an interest in her. In March, 1670, Mme de Montespan invited her to undertake the education of the children she had borne to Louis XIV. Françoise accepted and undertook the work in a house situated in Rue de Vaugirard, devoting herself enthusiastically to the young children, and the Duke of Maine especially was always very grateful to her. When in July, 1674, the children were legitimized, Françoise followed them to Court: it was the beginning of her fortune. At first, as she herself relates, she displeased the king very much; he considered her as a *bel esprit*, interested only in sublime things. Soon, however, he gave her 200,000 *livres* ($40,000); with this she bought the lands of Maintenon, and at the end of January, 1675, the king in full Court named her Mme de Maintenon, by which title she was thenceforth known. A silent struggle, the details of which may be found in the letters of Mme de Sévigné, began between her and Mme de Montespan. Abbé Gobelin, Mme de Maintenon's confessor, represented to her that the salvation of the king required her to remain at Court.

In 1680 she was appointed lady of the bed-chamber to the Dauphiness. The affection of the king for Mlle de Fontanges showed that Mme de Montespan's influence was waning. The earnest efforts of Mme de Maintenon to reconcile the king and the queen, Marie-Thérèse, were facilitated by the death of Mlle de Fontanges (1681), and brought about the disgrace of Mme de Montespan. The queen died, however, on 30 July, 1683, and from that time was verified the witticism of certain courtiers who, speaking of Mme de Maintenon in 1680, called her "Mme de Maintenant". Louis XIV used to say to her: "We address popes as 'Your Holiness', kings as 'Your Majesty'; of you we must speak as 'Your Firmness' (*Votre Solidité*)." In the beginning of 1684 Louis XIV married Mme de Maintenon secretly. This marriage is proved, principally: (1) by two letters which Godet des Marais, Bishop of Chartres and spiritual director of Mme de Maintenon, wrote to the king and Mme de Maintenon in 1697; (2) by the marriage contract of the Comte de Choiseul, a contract on which there may be seen, in the corner of the page, where the king and the Grand Dauphin had also signed, the signature "la marquise d'Aubigné".

Mme de Maintenon was to play a prominent part in politics for the next thirty-one years: the king used to come with his ministers to work in her room; she received foreign princes, generals, and ambassadors. It was not unusual for Louis XIV to remain with her from five to ten o'clock in the evening. She did not thrust herself on the public, but the more she endeavoured to efface herself, the more her power grew.

For a long time historians have formed an erroneous opinion of Mme de Maintenon; they judged her solely by the "Mémoires" of Saint-Simon, who hated her, by the letters of the Princess Palatine, which are bitterly antagonistic to her, and by the interpolations and forgeries of La Beaumelle, the first editor of Mme de Maintenon's letters. As a result of the labours of Lavallée, no importance is now attached to La Beaumelle's publications, and history passes on her a more equitable judgment. The letters written to her by Louis XIV during his military campaigns show how ardently and patriotically she was interested in the destinies of France. She supported Marshal de Villars against his enemies, who treated him as a madman, and it was largely owing to the advice of Mme de Maintenon that he was placed at the head of the army, and was thus enabled to save France by the victory of Denain. But Mme de Maintenon's influence was felt most in the matters of religion; and that is why she incurred the hatred of the Protestants and the Jansenists The extraordinary character of her destiny was represented to her by many of her advisers as a "marvellous vocation", which by "a kind of miracle" had placed her beside the most powerful monarch in the world. She was anxious that the king should not forget his spiritual responsibilities. It may be said that, but for the influence of Mme de Maintenon, the end of Louis XIV's reign would probably have resembled, by its depravity and excesses, the subsequent reign of Louis XV. It was largely owing to her that Louis was brought back to the right path, and it was due to her influence that the courtiers came to recognize that impiety, blasphemy, and licentiousness were obstacles to advancement.

Her great anxiety was for the conversion of the Court. This explains how it happened that, in her zeal for religion, she favoured some of the officials who displayed the greatest severity towards the Protestants; but "it is an error", writes M. Lavisse, "to blame Mme de Maintenon for the revocation of the Edict of Nantes." After having authorized Mme Guyon to come and lecture at Saint-Cyr, Mme de Maintenon, warned by des Marais, tried to arrest the spread of Quietism; the opposition which she met with on the part of Fénelon and Mme de la Maisonfort, was terminated in 1698 by the *lettres de cachet*, ordering the withdrawal of Mmes de la Maisonfort, du Tour, and de Montaigle to convents. It was Mme de Maintenon, who in August, 1695, had Louis-Antoine de Noailles, Bishop of Châlons, appointed to the See of Paris; but from 1699, under the influence of des Marais, she detached herself from Noailles, who was too much inclined to Jansenism. Mme de Maintenon, whose rôle was oftentimes so difficult and who was not unfrequently placed in very delicate situations, was wont to confess that she spent many a wearisome hour; she would compare herself to the fish in the ponds at Marly, which, languishing in the sparkling waters, longed for their muddy homes. But she always tried to shake off this lonesome feeling by engaging in teaching and charitable works. Her charity was celebrated, and at Versailles she was called the "mother of the poor". Of the 93,000 *livres* ($18,600), which the king gave her annually, she distributed from 54,000 to 60,000 in alms. Not only did she not profit by her position to enrich herself, but she did not make use of it to favour her family. Her brother, Comte d'Aubigné and formerly lieutenant-general, never became a marshal of France.

Mme de Maintenon's great glory is her work in the cause of education. She adored children. She brought up her nieces, the Comtesse de Caylus and the Duchesse de Noailles, and attended to the education of the Duchess of Burgundy, who seemed likely to become one day Queen of France. When the Court was at Fontainebleau, Mme de Maintenon loved to go to the little village of Avon to teach catechism to the children, who were dirty, ragged, and covered with vermin. She also organized a school for them. In 1682

she had fifty young girls educated at Rueil by an Ursuline, Mme de Brinon. Her zeal for education increased: the boarding-school at Rueil was transferred in February, 1684, to Noisy-le-Sec, where 124 girls were educated; then, in 1686, to Saint-Cyr, to the magnificent buildings which Mansart had begun to construct in June, 1685. The house at Saint-Cyr, called the "Institut de Saint-Louis", was intended to receive 200 young ladies, who had to be poor and also able to prove four degrees of nobility on their father's side; on leaving this house each one was to receive a dowry of 3000 crowns. Mme de Maintenon took an active interest in everything at Saint-Cyr; she was the stewardess and the servant of the house, looking after the provisions, knowing the number of aprons, napkins etc. The primary idea connected with the foundation of Saint-Cyr was very original. "The object of Saint-Cyr", wrote the Jesuit La Chaise, the king's confessor, "is not to multiply convents, which increase rapidly enough of their own accord, but to give the State well-educated women; there are plenty of good nuns, and not a sufficient number of good mothers of families. The young ladies will be educated more suitably by persons living in the world." The constitutions of the house were submitted to Racine and Boileau, and at the same time to Père La Chaise and Abbé Gobelin. Fénelon came to Saint-Cyr to preach; Lulli composed the music for the choirs; Mme de Brinon developed among the pupils a taste for declamation, Racine had the young ladies play Esther (January and February, 1689) and Athalie (5 April, 1691). But the very success of these pieces, at which Louis XIV and the Court assisted, finally disturbed many minds; both the Jesuits and Jansenists agreed in blaming the development of this taste for the theatre in young girls. At the instigation of des Marais, Mme de Maintenon transformed Saint-Cyr: on 1 December, 1692, the *pensionnat* became a monastic boarding-school, subject to the Order of St. Augustine. This transformation, however, did not change the end for which the house was founded: of the 1121 ladies, who passed through Saint-Cyr from 1686 to 1773, only 398 became nuns, 723 remaining in the world. And, even after the transformation of Saint-Cyr, the course of instruction remained, in the opinion of M. Gréard, incomparably superior, by its comprehensiveness and duration, to that of any other house of instruction in the eighteenth century. The "Entretiens", the "Conversations", and the "Proverbes" of Mme de Maintenon, by which she formed her students, hold a unique position in the contributions of women to French literature.

Mme de Maintenon left Versailles on the evening of 30 August, 1715, thirty-six hours before the death of the king, who recommended her to the Duc d'Orléans, and said of her finally: "She helped me in everything, especially in saving my soul." She went to live at Saint-Cyr in deep retirement, which was interrupted only by the visit paid to her on 10 June, 1717, by Tsar Peter the Great of Russia. The news of the imprisonment at Doullens of the Duke of Maine, who was compromised by the conspiracy of Cellamare (1718–9), saddened and perhaps shortened her closing years. In January, 1794, her tomb was desecrated by the revolutionaries, who stripped her corpse, mutilated it, and cast it into a large hole in the cemetery. As for the Institut de Saint-Louis, it was closed in 1793.

Besides the memoirs of the period (see bibliography to LOUIS XIV), consult MME DE MAINTENON, *Œuvres*, ed. LAVALLÉE (12 vols., Paris, 1854); GRÉARD, *Extraits de Mme de Maintenon sur l'éducation* (Paris, 1884); GODET DES MARAIS, *Lettres à Mme de Maintenon*, ed. BERTHIER (Paris, 1907); *Souvenirs sur Mme de Maintenon*, published by HAUSSONVILLE AND HANOTAUX (3 vols., Paris, 1902–4); DUC DE NOAILLES, *Hist. de Mme de M.* (4 vols., Paris, 1848–59); LAVALLÉE, *Mme de M. et la Maison royale de St-Cyr* (Paris, 1862); READ, *La petite-fille d'Agrippa d'Aubigné* in *Bulletin de la Soc. de l'hist. du protestantisme*, XXXVI–VII; DE BOISLISLE, *Scarron et Françoise d'Aubigné* (Paris, 1894); GEFFROY, *Mme de M. d'après sa correspondance* (2 vols., Paris, 1887); BAUDRILLART, *Mme de M. et son rôle politique* in *Revue des Questions histor.*, XLVIII (1890); BRUNETIÈRE, *Questions de critique* (Paris, 1889); DÖLLINGER, *Die einflussreichste Frau der französischen Gesch.* in *Akadem. Vorträge* (Munich, 1889); MAINTENON, *Secret correspondence with the Princess des Ursins* (tr., London, 1827); BILLINGTON, *Mme de Maintenon and St-Cyr* in *Irish Monthly*, XXXVII (Dublin, 1904), 524 31; 608–15; MORRISON, *Mme de Maintenon, une étude* (New York, 1886); MONTESPAN, *Triumph of Mme de Maintenon* in *Classic Memoirs*, I (New York, 1901), 180–202; DYSON, *Mme de Maintenon* (London, 1910).

GEORGES GOYAU.

Mainz, German town and bishopric in Hesse; formerly the seat of an archbishop and elector.

HISTORY.—(1) *Until the Suppression of the Former Archdiocese.*—Near the site of the modern Mainz there existed some centuries before the Christian era a Celtic settlement. Here, about 38 B. C., Agrippa established a Roman camp (*Moguntiacum*), which, under Drusus, became the centre of the Roman province of Upper Germany. About the camp gradually developed a considerable town. According to St. Irenæus, whose statement received valuable corroboration from the excavations of 1907–8, Mainz possessed a Christian community in the second century. Crescentius, whom legend identifies with the disciple of St. Paul, is mentioned as first bishop. Of the bishops before Boniface, however, little is known. Bothardus built a basilica in honour of St. Nicomedes; Riuthardus was imprisoned, when the Alamannian prince Rando sacked the town in 368, and Bishop Aureus was put to death by the Alamannian Crocus in 406. In 451 Mainz was pillaged by the Huns. Under the Frankish domination the town began again to prosper. Bishop Sidonius, who lived early in the sixth century, restored the old churches and built new ones. The Frankish king Dagobert surrounded Mainz with walls and established his residence there. Under him the Altmünsterkloster was erected by St. Bithildis. Bishop Gerold, who fell in battle against the Saxons, was succeeded in 743 by his son Gewilio.

The ecclesiastical and secular importance of Mainz may fitly be dated from the accession of St. Boniface (q. v.). Strictly speaking, however, Mainz was not then raised to metropolitan rank: Boniface was himself an archbishop as formerly, before he occupied any see in Germany, but the archiepiscopal dignity did not descend immediately to his successor, St. Lul or Lullus. The long quarrel between Lullus and the Monastery of Fulda ended in the complete exemption of the latter from the episcopal authority. Lullus thereupon built the Monastery of Hersfeld, in which he was later buried. In 780 or 782 Mainz was elevated to metropolitan rank. The dioceses of Lüttich, Cologne, Worms, Speyer, and Utrecht were first made subject to it, together with the sees of Erfurt, Buraburg, and Eichstätt, as dioceses founded by Boniface; then the Swabian dioceses of Augsburg, Strasburg, Constance, and Chur. The dioceses of Erfurt and Buraburg, however, lapsed on the death of their first occupants, and in 798 Cologne was made a metropolitan see with Lüttich and Utrecht among its suffragans (see COLOGNE). With the spread of Christianity in Saxony, the dioceses of Paderborn, Halberstadt, Hildesheim, and Verden were, on their erection, added to the suffragans of Mainz, and under Archbishop Willigis the newly-created sees of Prague and Olmütz were made subject to it. The ecclesiastical province then possessed fourteen suffragans, and extended from the Elbe to the Grison Alps and from the Vosges to the Thuringian Saale, thus representing the greatest ecclesiastical administration of the Middle Ages after the papacy. The actual power of the archbishops over their suffragans was, however, small. Mainz lost Prague and Olmütz during the fourteenth century, and Halberstadt and Verden through the Peace of Westphalia. In 1752 the addition of the newly-created Diocese of Fulda raised the number of suffragans to eleven.

Among the immediate successors of Lullus, Arch-

bishop Richulf (787–813), who built the Monastery of St. Alban (famous for its school), and especially Rabanus Maurus (q. v., 847–56) deserve mention. Under Liutbert (863–89) the dignity of Archchancellor of the German Empire was first associated with Mainz. Hatto I (q. v., 891–913) exercised a great influence on the fortunes of the whole empire. Hildebert (928–37) successfully upheld against Cologne and Trier Mainz's claim to crown the German king. The precedence of Mainz in the German Church was strongly emphasized by Frederick (937–54), when he sought the office of Vicar Apostolic for Germany. William (954–68), natural son of Otto I, acquired for himself and his successors the office of Archchancellor of the Empire. About Hatto II (968–70) is related the legend of the Mäusethurm near Bingen. Willigis (975–1010), who saved the empire from disintegration during the minority of Otto III, fostered the commerce of Mainz; he built a cathedral, which was burned down on the day of its consecration, and obtained from the pope the right of presiding over all synods held within the empire and of crowning the newly-elected king. Aribo (q. v.) played the chief rôle in the election of Conrad II. Bardo von Oppertshafen (1031–51) completed the new cathedral by Willigis (1037).

In the investiture strife (q. v.) the archbishops of Mainz, as the foremost spiritual princes of the empire, could not remain neutral. Count Siegfried I von Eppstein (1059–84) espoused the cause of the pope, promulgated the celibacy law of Gregory VII, and crowned Henry's two rivals, Rudolf of Swabia and Hermann of Luxemburg. Wezilo (1084–8), however, supported the emperor and his anti-pope. In Ruthard (1089–1109) and Adalbert I von Saarbrücken (1109–37) the emperor again found opponents; for his fidelity to the papal cause, the latter was imprisoned by Henry V for three years in the fortress of Trifels, until the citizens of Mainz secured his release by confining the emperor in their town until he guaranteed the archbishop's liberation. In recognition of this assistance, Adalbert granted the town a charter, which was engraved on the bronze doors of the Liebfrauenkirche. At Adalbert's proposal the right to participate in the imperial election was confined to certain princes, the foundation of the college of electors being thus laid. The popularity enjoyed by him and his brother and successor Adalbert II (1138–41) was not shared by Arnold von Selenhofen (1153–60), who alienated the good-will of the citizens by his sternness and his taxation to further Barbarossa's campaign against Italy, and was murdered by them in the Monastery of St. Jacob during a riot. To punish the citizens, Barbarossa deprived the city of its charter and levelled its walls. The rebuilding of the fortifications was begun by Conrad von Wittelsbach (1161–77): although appointed by Barbarossa, he refused to recognize the anti-pope Pascal, and had in consequence to fly from his see. Count Christian I von Buch (1165–83) was thereupon named archbishop by Barbarossa. On his death, Conrad, who had meanwhile become Archbishop of Salzburg, returned to his old see (1183–1200), now supported the emperor, and, at the Diet of Gelnhausen, persuaded the German bishops to espouse the emperor's cause against Rome. Count Siegfried II von Eppstein (1200–30) received in 1228 the right to crown the King of Bohemia—a right retained by Mainz until 1343. Siegfried exhausted the depleted exchequer of the see, and burdened the territory with a heavy debt. His nephew, Siegfried III von Eppstein (1230–49), supported Innocent III against the Swabians, ratified the deposition of the emperor, and crowned two of his rivals. In 1233 the chapter granted him the twentieth part of the ecclesiastical revenue for the liquidation of the archiepiscopal debts on his swearing in the presence of the clergy to incur no debts thereafter and to impose no further burdens on the clergy. The canons bound themselves by oath never to elect an archbishop who would not take the same oath as Siegfried. Thus originated the election capitulations, which were later used by the chapter to secure new rights and privileges from the candidates for the see. It was also under Siegfried (1244) that the government of the town passed into the hands of a municipal council elected by the citizens.

As a free town of the empire, the prosperity of Mainz steadily increased, its linen and woollen industries being the most important along the Rhine. It thus became known as the "Golden Mainz". Under its leadership was formed in 1254 the "League of the Rhenish Towns", supported by most of the Rhenish towns and princes. A great architectural activity also manifested itself; the glorious cathedral was then built, and numerous monastic institutions were established. The discovery of printing by Gutenberg (q. v.) extended the fame of the town, while the limitation of the right of voting to the seven electors had greatly increased the influence of the archbishops. At the end of the interregnum Werner von Eppstein (1259–84) secured the election of Rudolf of Hapsburg, whose support he hoped for against the Landgrave of Hesse. In the growing power of Hesse, Werner rightly saw the most dangerous menace to the safety of Mainz. Gerhard II von Eppstein (1289–1305) likewise played the chief part in the election of Adolf of Nassau, but, not receiving the expected assistance in his domestic politics, went over with King Wenzel of Bohemia to Adolf's rival, Albert of Austria. Under Peter von Aspelt (q. v., 1305–20) Mainz attained the pinnacle of its power. In opposition to Count Henry III of Virneburg (1328–46), appointed by John XXII, the chapter unanimously elected Baldwin of Trier, who granted to it or confirmed a series of important privileges. It was only on Baldwin's resignation that Henry could enter on his administration, having previously, in order to secure the chapter's recognition, granted it an important influence in the government of the archdiocese. As a partisan of Louis the Bavarian, he came into sharp conflict with Clement VI, who separated Prague and Olmütz from Mainz (1343), and deposed the archbishop (1346). However, Henry managed to retain the see until 1353, when Gerlach of Nassau (1346–71), appointed by the pope, entered into possession. By means of his personal property Gerlach greatly increased the power of the archdiocese. On his death Charles IV, fearing to see one of the powerful Nassau family in possession of the first see of the empire, secured the appointment of Count John I of Luxemburg in 1371, and of Margrave Louis of Meissen in 1375. The chapter, however, unanimously chose Adolf of Nassau, who took possession of the see. The fiercely contested war which ensued greatly weakened the power of Mainz, and increased the influence of Hesse. In 1381 an agreement was arrived at, Louis abdicating Mainz. Adolf founded the University of Erfurt in 1389. Conrad II von Weinsberg (1390–6) was succeeded by Adolf's brother, John II (1397–1419), who took a prominent part in the deposition of King Wenzel and the elevation of Rudolf of the Palatinate. Under Conrad von Daun (1419–34) Cardinal Branda, commissioned by Martin V, investigated the existing election capitulations, which he ordered to be replaced by a capitulation drafted by himself.

The contest between the rival archbishops, Diether von Isenberg and Adolf II of Nassau (the "Mainzer Stiftsfehde", 1461–3), resulted in great loss of men, money, and territory. To punish the guilds for supporting Diether, Adolf, having captured the town, deprived it of its charter. Diether (1475–82) founded the University of Mainz in 1477, which continued until 1798, but the town never regained its former prosperity. To retrieve the dangerous financial condition of the archdiocese by an alliance with a powerful family, the chapter petitioned the pope in 1480 to appoint Albert of Saxony archbishop. During his short reign

(1482–4) Albert brought Erfurt again into submission. However, even Berthold of Henneberg (q. v., 1484–1504), perhaps the greatest Archbishop of Mainz, was unable to stem the decline of its secular power. Under Jacob von Liebenstein (1504–8) the loss of Erfurt to Saxony seemed imminent. In open opposition to the Saxon house, the chapter chose, on the death of Uriel of Gemmingen (1508–14), Albert of Brandenburg archbishop, although he already held the sees of Magdeburg and Halberstadt (see ALBERT OF BRANDENBURG and GERMANY). The indulgent attitude, at first adopted by Albert towards the innovators, allowed the Reformation to spread fairly widely through the archdiocese which was soon convulsed by this and the Peasants' War. In preserving the Catholic Faith, Lorenz Thuchsess von Pommersfelden, the cathedral dean, performed ever-memorable services. Albert's reign is also important on account of the administrative reforms introduced by him. Electors Sebastian von Hausenstamm (1545–55) and Daniel Brendel of Homburg (1555–82), strove indefatigably to heal the scars of the Reformation; the latter summoned the Jesuits to Mainz. Wolfgang von Dalberg (1582–1601), however, gave such lukewarm support to the Counter-Reformation that he was suspected of conspiring with the Protestants. In the election capitulation the chapter imposed on his successor, John Adam von Bicken (1601–4), the obligation of founding a seminary, which, however, he failed to accomplish during his short reign. John Schweickhard von Cronenberg (1604–26) restored the Catholic religion in Eichsfeld and Bergstrasse, and adjusted the quarrel between Emperor Rudolf and his brother Matthias.

Mainz suffered grievously during the Thirty Years' War. Under George von Greifenklau (1626–9), who had a prominent share in the Restitution Edict, Mainz escaped practically unaffected, but Anselm Casimir von Wambold (1629–45) had to fly before Gustavus Adolphus in 1631. When the imperial troops reoccupied Mainz in 1636, the retiring Swedes committed many atrocities. Frightful ravage was also wrought by the French, when they later occupied the town (1644–8). The very existence, indeed, of the principality seemed threatened, as the Swedes demanded in the peace negotiations the secularization of the archdiocese. Its escape from dissolution was entirely due to the energetic protest of Saxony and the activity of John Philip von Schönborn (q. v., 1647–73). As its situation left Mainz most exposed, after Cologne, to French attack, Lothaire Frederick von Metternich-Burscheid (1673–5), to save the archdiocese, adopted a friendly attitude towards France during the wars between the emperor and Louis XIV. In 1688 his third successor, Anselm Franz von Ingelheim (1679–95), had to surrender Mainz to the French, who were, however, driven out of the town in the following year. Lothaire Francis von Schönborn (1695–1729), who supported the emperor in the War of the Spanish Succession, reorganized the university, founded the Hospital of St. Roch, and showed himself a cultivated patron of the arts and sciences. Under him the town enjoyed a return of prosperity, testified even to-day by the numerous ecclesiastical and civil buildings dating from that period.

On the death of Franz Ludwig von Pfalz-Neuburg (1729–32), who was also Bishop of Worms and Breslau and Archbishop of Trier, Philip Charles von Eltz-Kempenich (1732–43) was elected hastily to forestall the interference of the ruling houses. During the Seven Years' War, which occurred under Frederick Charles von Ostein (1743–63), the archdiocese was laid waste on various occasions. Emmerich Joseph von Breitbach-Bürresheim (1763–74) associated himself with the "enlightened" movement to found a national German Church, as far as possible independent of Rome. In 1766 he abolished many holy days, and issued decrees concerning the "reform" of the monasteries, the accumulation of real property in the "dead hand", etc. On the suppression of the Jesuits in 1773, he employed their property for the improvement of elementary education. Frederick Charles Joseph von Erthal (1774–1802), the last Elector of Mainz, laboured at first in the spirit of the Church, but later, going over to the Enlightened, formally renounced Austria and associated himself with Prussia (q. v.). During the French Revolution Mainz encountered varying fortunes. In 1792 the Confederation of the German Princes was founded in the town, which, after the first inglorious campaign of the German army, fell into the hands of the French during the same year. Though recovered by the Germans in 1793, it was ceded to France by the Treaty of Campo-Formio in 1797, and, after the Peace of Lunéville, became the capital of the French Department of Mont Tonnerre. During the negotiations of the Imperial Delegates the elector died on 25 July, 1802. By the Enactment of this assembly of 25 Feb., 1803, the greater part of the electorate was secularized. About five *Aemter* (administrative districts) remained ecclesiastical property, and were assigned to the coadjutor of the last elector, Theodore von Dalberg (q. v.), who was named electoral chancellor, metropolitan, and primate of Germany. The primatial see was transferred to Ratisbon. Under French rule, Mainz was changed into a simple diocese in Oct., 1802, and made subject to Mechlin, its jurisdiction being confined to that portion of the old archdiocese which lay on the left bank of the Rhine.

(2) *From the Foundation of the Modern Diocese of Mainz to the Present Day.*—The new diocese corresponded to the Department of Mont Tonnerre, and included portions of the earlier dioceses of Mainz, Worms, Speyer, and Metz. Under Ludwig Colmar (q. v., 1802–18) was accomplished the delimitation of the diocese. On his death the diocese, which was again under German rule, was left vacant and administered by a vicar general. On the reorganization of ecclesiastical affairs in Germany, which resulted in the erection of the Ecclesiastical Province of the Upper Rhine (q. v.), the Diocese of Mainz was made conterminous with the Grand Duchy of Hesse, and constituted suffragan of this newly erected province. Joseph Vitus Burg (1830–3), appointed by Pius VIII, had taken a prominent part in the negotiations concerning the erection of the new province; he was, however, affected by Josephism, and defended the ordinances (*Kirchenpragmatik*), which the Upper Rhine governments, in opposition to their earlier declarations, imposed on the bishops, although they had already been condemned by Rome. Burg also entered a very feeble protest when the seminary, founded by Colmar, was partially suppressed and its theological faculty transferred to the University of Giessen. On the death of John Jacob Humann (1833–4), Peter Leopold Kaiser (1835–48) found himself greatly hampered by government interference; while in the matter of the reopening of the seminary his action in parliament was not sufficiently energetic, he opposed unflinchingly the "German Catholic" movement of the followers of Ronge in his diocese, and was in his later years greatly influenced by the zealous Lennig (q. v.).

On Kaiser's death the chapter chose Professor Leopold Schmidt of Giessen, but Rome refused to confirm the election on account of the candidate's practically indifferentist religious and philosophical views. As the chapter, dispensing with a new election, then referred the selection to the Holy See, Pius IX appointed Wilhelm Emmanuel von Ketteler (q. v.) bishop on 15 March, 1850. Ketteler's closing years were clouded by the outbreak of the Kulturkampf in Hesse (q. v.), and, after his death, the see was left vacant in consequence of the attitude of the government, the payment of the episcopal dotation was suspended in 1880 and numerous parishes (about one fourth) left without a pastor.

The diocese was meanwhile administered by Christopher Monfang (q. v.). In 1886 an agreement was arrived at, and Paul Leopold Haffner, who had acquired a reputation as a philosopher and apologist, was appointed bishop. The seminary and diocesan colleges were reopened in 1887, and the task of filling the vacant parishes undertaken. In 1895 religious orders, which devoted themselves to education and the care of the sick, were readmitted. Haffner was followed by Heinrich Brück (q. v., 1899–1903). The present bishop, George Heinrich Maria Kirstein, was elected on 20 Nov., 1903, and consecrated on 19 March, 1904.

STATISTICS.—The present Diocese of Mainz coincides territorially with the Grand Duchy of Hesse (q. v.), except that three places belong to the Diocese of Limburg. Divided into 19 deaneries and 188 parishes, it possesses 186 parish priests and beneficiaries, 1 rector, 80 curates, 43 priests in other positions, 20 on leave or pensioned. The Catholics number 372,600; the non-Catholics 830,000. The chapter consists of the cathedral dean, 7 canons, 3 cathedral prebendaries; the ordinariate of a vicar general and 6 spiritual councillors; the *officialité* of the *official* and 7 counsellors. The bishop is elected by the chapter from a list of candidates, which must first be submitted to the government. The public authorities may erase the names of the less acceptable candidates, provided that enough be left to render a canonical election possible. The members of the chapter are selected alternately by the bishop and the chapter itself. The diocesan institutions include the seminary (8 professors and 50 students); 3 diocesan colleges; 4 episcopal boarding-schools and orphanages. Exclusively Catholic high-schools for boys are forbidden by the Hessian school laws, and the activity of the female orders in instructing girls is very restricted. There are very few houses of the male orders; the Capuchins have 2 monasteries (Mainz and Dieburg) with 12 fathers and 10 brothers; the Brothers of Mercy 1 house with 12 brothers; the Brothers of St. Joseph parent house in Kleinzimmern with 8 brothers; the Schulbrüder 1 house with a middle school in Mainz. The female orders are: the Sisters of Mercy from the mother-house at Trier, 2 houses with 26 sisters; the English Ladies, 7 houses with 165 sisters; the Franciscan Sisters from Aachen, 3 houses with 27 sisters; the Franciscan Sisters of the Perpetual Adoration, 1 house with 35 sisters; the Sisters of Divine Providence, mother-house at Mainz and 72 filial houses with 534 sisters; the Sisters of the Most Sacred Redeemer from the mother-house at Niederbronn, 19 houses with 66 sisters; the Sisters of the Good Shepherd, 1 house with 26 sisters; Sisters of St. Vincent de Paul, 8 houses with 120 sisters. Among the Catholic organs of the diocese, the "Katholik" and the "Archiv für katholisches Kirchenrecht" deserve special mention.

The principal churches of the diocese are: the Romanesque Cathedral of St. Martin at Mainz, one of the most interesting monuments for the history of architecture in Germany; the Early Gothic Church of St. Stephen (1257–1328); the Baroque Ignazkirche (1763–74); the cathedral and late Gothic Liebfrauenkirche at Worms; the basilica of the former Benedictine abbey at Seligenstadt (Carlovingian); the former church of the Dominicanesses (thirteenth century).

Concerning the town, see SCHUNCK, *Beiträge zur M. Gesch. mit Urkunden* (3 vols., Mainz and Frankfort, 1788–90); WERNER, *Der Dom zu M.* (3 vols., Mainz, 1827–36); SCHAAB, *Gesch. der Stadt. M.* (4 vols., Mainz, 1841–51;) HEGEL, *Chron. der mittelrhein. Städte*, II (Leipzig, 1882); BÖRCKEL, *M. Geschichtsbilder* (Mainz, 1890); SCHNEIDER, *Der Dom zu M. u. seine Denkmäler* (Mainz, 1903); *Beiträge zur Gesch. der Universität M. u. Giessen* (Giessen, 1907); NEEB, *M. u. Umgebung* (3rd ed., Stuttgart, 1908); HÖLER, *Das goldene M.*, I (Mainz, 1910). For the older literature on the See of Mainz, see CHEVALIER, *Topo-Bibl.*, s. v. *Mayence;* consult also SCHEPPLER, *Codex eccles. Mogunt. noviss.* (Aschaffenburg, 1802); JAFFÉ, *Monum. Mogunt* (Berlin, 1866); *Regesten zur Gesch. der Erzbischöfe von M.*, begun by BÖHMER AND WILL (from Boniface to 1280; Innsbruck, 1877–86), and continued by VOGT AND VIGENER (from 1289 to 1396; Marburg, 1907—); HENNES, *Die Erzbischöfe von M.* (3rd ed., Mainz, 1879); FALK, *Heiliges M.* (Mainz, 1897); IDEM, *Marianum Mogunt.: Gesch. der Marienverehr. im Bistum M.* (Mainz, 1906); HERMANN, *Die evangel. Bewegung zu M. im Reformationsalter* (Mainz, 1907); SIMON, *Stand u. Herkunft der Bischöfe der M. Kirchenprovinz im Mittelalter* (Weimar, 1908); HENSLE, *Verfassung u. Verwaltung von Kurmainz um* 1600 (Strasburg, 1908); GOLDSCHMIDT, *Zentralbehörden u. Beamtentum im Kurfürst. M. vom* 16. *bis zum* 18. *Jahrh.* (Berlin and Leipzig, 1908); STIMMING, *Die Wahlkapitul. der Erzb. u. Kurf. von M.* (Göttingen, 1909); WENCK, *Die Stellung des Erzstiftes M. im Gang der deutschen Gesch.* (Kassel, 1909); STUTZ, *Die M. Erzbischöfe u. die deutsche Königswahl* (Weimar, 1910); *Zeitschr. des M. Altertumsvereins* (Mainz, 1902—); *Schematismus der Diözese M.* (Mainz, 1909). See also under HESSE; UPPER RHINE, ECCLESIASTICAL PROVINCE OF THE, and the individual bishops.

JOSEPH LINS.

Maipure Indians (MAYPURE), a former important group of tribes on the Upper Orinoco River, from above the Meta about to the entrance of the Cassiquiare, in Venezuela and Colombia, speaking dialects of the Arawakan stock. The tribes were the Maipure proper; Meepure; Cavere, or Cabre; Avane, or Abani; Pareni; Guipuñave, or Guaypunavi, and Chirupa, or Quirupa. The Achagua, on the middle Meta, Colombia, were sometimes regarded as belonging to the same group. The Maipure tribes remained practically unknown up to the middle of the eighteenth century. Their chief and constant enemies were the cannibal Caribs of the Lower Orinoco. In the early part of the seventeenth century the Portuguese slave hunters of Brazil (see MAMELUCO) extended their inroads into the Upper Orinoco region through the assistance of the Guipuñave on the Inirida, who, though ferocious, were superior to the surrounding tribes, having clothes and palisaded forts with stores of extra weapons. These incursions at last became so threatening that in 1744 Father Roman, superior of the Jesuit missions of the Lower Orinoco, took the desperate resolution of ascending the river, without an escort of soldiers to try and arrange terms with the Guipuñave. Taking a few Indians, with a crucifix erected at the bow of his boat, he advanced to the Atabapo and then to Brazil by the Negro, returning to the Carichana mission after seven months' travel. He was thus the first to discover the connexion of the Amazon and the Orinoco by means of the rivers Cassiquiare and Negro. As a result the Guipuñave ceased their inroads, and some of the tribe settled at the cataract of Maipures, in 1744, the new mission being called San José de Maipures. It included Guipuñave and Pareni, with some remotely cognate Guariquena from the Cassiquiare. In 1748 the Jesuit Francisco Gonzales established the mission of San Juan Nepomuceno de los Atures, now Atures, Venezuela, gathering into it Ature (Salivan stock), Maipure proper, Meepure, Abani, and Quirupa. In 1749 arrived Father Gilii, the historian of the Jesuit missions of the Orinoco, to whom, according to Hervás, is due the conversion of the Maipure tribes.

When the Guipuñave ceased their warfare on the missions another neighbouring cannibal tribe, the Manitivitano, continued the work of destruction for the rewards held out by the Portuguese and Dutch. When in 1756 Solano, commander of the boundary expedition, reached the confluence of the Atabapo with the Orinoco he found there a settlement of Guipuñave, whose chief, won over by Roman years before, not only consented to the establishment of a garrison and mission, San Fernando de Atabapo, but also promised to enter the mission with all his people. This mission, practically of government origin, was placed in charge of the Observantines. About the same time the mission at Atures had 320 Indians, and that at Maipures 600, where Humboldt in 1800 found only 47 and 60 respectively. Besides religion, the fathers taught their neophytes habits of regularity and industry, suppressed the more barbarous practices and, the Jesuits especially, introduced cattle, goats, and European fruits and vegetables. But not-

withstanding the greater security and plenty of the mission, the Venezuelan savage preferred the life of the forest. His superstition also made him fear to stay near the spot where one of his friends had died. Unsanitary habits, secret abortion, and frequent fever epidemics from periodical river floods, made a high death rate, especially among the children.

The expulsion of the Jesuits from Spanish America in 1767 meant the ruin of most of the missions on the Orinoco. The Jesuit establishments were placed under civil officers who appropriated all movable property, leaving the rest to decay and destruction. In 1785 the missions were placed in charge of the Observantines. It was too late, however, to repair the ruin. Of the Indians, only a small fraction remained, the rest having returned to their forests or perished of disease and starvation. The missionaries themselves were no longer free, but constantly subject to the annoying interference of government officials. In 1800 hardly a hundred Indians were left in the two principal Maipure missions. By the shifting of tribes the Atures mission was then occupied, not by descendants of its original inhabitants, but by Guahibo and Maco, of entirely alien stocks. San Fernando de Atabapo had suffered less than the rest and was still a station of importance with its Indian fields and neat priest's house, although the former herds of cattle had disappeared. To-day the missions are extinct. Of the Maipure proper only a few half-breeds keep the name.

Except for a scant breech-cloth, the Maipure went entirely naked, but painted their whole bodies usually with a bright red obtained from vegetable dyes. Their chief diet was cassava bread, bananas and fish. They used very little meat, which they seasoned with a few drops of a mineral solution which took the place of salt. Their favourite exhilarant was the *chicha*, or *chiza*, fermented from corn or bananas. Their huts were open structures roofed with palm or banana leaves, with simple furniture of reed mats, earthen pots, fishing nets, and sleeping hammocks. Their weapons were the bow and arrow, and the blowgun with arrows tipped with the deadly *curari* poison. The men were expert canoeists. All the Maipure tribes were especially noted for the pottery manufactured by their women, which excelled in execution and in colour, artistic design and glazing. They were all cannibals. Their government was rather patriarchal than tribal, eight or ten families usually living together, and combining in larger numbers only for war purposes. Polygamy was the rule, and polyandry among brothers was common with the Maipure. They believed in nature gods, and ridiculed the idea of churches, saying their gods would not be confined in houses. The missionaries met this by holding services in the open air. Their cult centred around a sacred earthenware trumpet, called *botuto*, which was periodically sounded in elaborate ceremonial processions under the palm trees to insure abundant fruit, was consulted as an oracle, and for a woman to approach within sight of it, the penalty was death.

Gilii, *Saggio di Storia Americana* (Rome, 1784); Gumilla, *El Orenoco Ilustrado* (Madrid, 1745); Humboldt, *Travels to the Equinoctial Regions of America* (London, 1881); Hervás, *Catálogo de las Lenguas*, I (Madrid, 1800); Brinton, *American Races* (New York, 1891).

James Mooney.

Maistre, Joseph-Marie, Comte de, French philosophical writer, b. at Chambéry, in Savoy, in 1753, when Savoy did not belong to France; d. at Turin, 26 Feb., 1821. His family, which was of French origin, had settled in Savoy a century earlier, and had attained a high position, his father being president of the Senate. Joseph, the eldest of ten children, was a pupil of the Jesuits, who, like his parents, inspired him with an intense love of religion and detestation of the eighteenth-century philosophical rationalism, which the always resolutely opposed. In 1774 he entered the magistracy; in 1780 he was assistant fiscal advocate general; in 1788 he was appointed senator, being then thirty-five years old. Four years later, he was forced to fly before the invading French, and discharged for four years at Lausanne a confidential mission for his sovereign, the King of Sardinia. That monarch having lost the capital of his kingdom, de Maistre lived in poverty at Venice, but, on the restoration of the king, went to Sardinia as keeper of the great seal (1799) and, three years later, to St. Petersburg, as plenipotentiary. This mission lasted fourteen years, till 1817. Though weakly supported by his Government, which was at times displeased with his frankness, poor amidst a lavish aristocracy, he nevertheless successfully defended the interests of his country with the Czar Alexander, who, like most of the leading personages at St. Petersburg, highly appreciated his character and his ability. He afterwards returned to Turin, to fill the post of minister of State and keeper of the great seal until his death.

The writings of Joseph de Maistre (as well as those of his younger brother—q. v., below) were all in French, then the literary language of Piedmont. Joseph's first important work was written during his sojourn in Switzerland. He was then forty years of age. He had previously composed some speeches and a few comparatively unimportant essays. We may mention "L'éloge de Victor Amédée III", attacking the intolerance which had lighted the fires of the stake, and glorifying the war of the Americans against their oppressors. After the outbreak of the French Revolution, he published some writings on current events, e. g. "Discours à M. le Marquis Costa de Beauregard sur la vie et la mort de son fils" and "Cinq paradoxes à la Marquise de Nav . . ." (1795). In the following year appeared his "Considérations sur la France" (London and Lausanne, in folio); although its dissemination was rigorously forbidden by the French authorities, several editions were exhausted within a year. The author maintains the thesis that France has a mission from God: she is the principal instrument of good and of evil on earth. De Maistre looks on the Revolution as a providential occurrence: the monarchy, the aristocracy, the whole of the old French society, instead of turning the powerful influence of French civilization to benefit mankind, had used it to foster the doctrines of the eighteenth-century philosophers: the crimes of the Reign of Terror were the punishment thus merited. The author added that the foreign nations were dupes of a foolish dream, in undertaking the dismemberment of France, "the most beautiful kingdom after that of heaven". Finally, he predicted a speedy restoration, and disappearance of the abuses of the past.

In connexion with this work must be mentioned a little book composed in 1809, under the title "Essai sur le principe générateur des constitutions politiques et des autres institutions humaines". Its main idea is, that constitutions are not the artificial products of the study, but come in due time and under suitable circumstances from God, who slowly brings them to maturity. After the appearance in 1816 of the treatise "Sur les délais de la justice divine dans la punition des coupables", translated from Plutarch, with additions and notes, Joseph de Maistre published at Lyons in 1819 his masterpiece "Du Pape". The work (2 vols. in 8vo.) is divided into four parts. In the first the author proves that in the Church the pope is sovereign, and that it is an essential characteristic of all sovereign power that its decisions should be subject to no appeal. The doctrinal declarations of the pope are binding on man without right of appeal. Consequently, the pope is infallible in his teaching, since it is by his teaching that he exercises his sovereignty. And in point of fact "no sovereign pontiff, speaking freely to the Church, has ever made a mistake in the matter of faith". In the remaining divisions of his work the author examines

the relations of the pope and the temporal powers; civilization and the welfare of nations; the schismatical Churches. He establishes that nations require to be guaranteed against abuses of the power to which they are subject by a sovereignty superior to all others; now, this sovereignty can be none but the papacy, which, even in the Middle Ages, had, in fact, already saved European civilization from the barbarians. As to the schismatical Churches, the writer thinks that they will inevitably fall into Protestantism, and from Protestantism through Socinianism into philosophic indifference. For "no religion can resist science, except one."

The treatise, "L'Eglise Gallicane dans ses rapports avec les souverains pontifes" (Paris, 1821, in 8vo), formed, in the original plan of the author, the fifth part of the preceding work. De Maistre at the last moment resolved, on the advice of his friends, to make it a separate work. He discusses vigorously, and at times, from the Gallican standpoint, harshly, the celebrated Declaration of the Assemblée of 1682. Besides a voluminous correspondence, Joseph de Maistre left two posthumous works. One of these, "L'examen de la philosophie de Bacon" (Paris, 1836, 2 vols. in 8vo), is an attack on Locke and Condillac, and in general on the French philosophers of the eighteenth century, in the person whom the author considers as the father of their system. This work is not among the most highly esteemed of De Maistre's writings. The "Soirées de St. Pétersbourg" (Paris, 1821, 2 vols. 8vo) is a reply in the form of a dialogue to the objection against Providence drawn from the existence of evil in the world. For Joseph de Maistre, the existence of evil, far from obscuring the designs of God, throws a new light on them; for the moral world and the physical world are inter-related. Physical evil exists only because there has been, and there is, moral evil. All wrong must be expiated. So humanity, which has always believed in the necessity of this expiation, has had recourse, to accomplish it, not only to prayer, but to sacrifice, that is, the shedding of blood, the merits of the innocent being applied to the guilty—a law as mysterious as it is indubitable, and which, in the opinion of the author, explains the existence and the perpetuity of war. The fame of Joseph de Maistre has been enhanced, too, by his "Correspondance". Almost six hundred of his letters have been preserved. In them one finds the tender father, the loving, devoted friend, and at the same time a keen, ingenious, unaffected, joyous writer. His complete works were published in fourteen volumes, 8vo, at Lyons, 1884–87.

To appreciate de Maistre in his writings as a whole, one may remark that his ideas are bold and penetrating, and his views so clear and accurate that at times they seem prophetic. An enthusiastic believer in the principle of authority, which the Revolution tried to destroy, he defends it everywhere: in the State by extolling the monarchy; in the Church by exalting the privileges of the papacy; in the world by glorifying the rights and the conduct of God. His style is strong, lively, picturesque; animation and good humour temper his dogmatic tone, and he might even be deemed eloquent. It is true he does not disdain paradox in his thinking or violence in his language: he has neither the moderation nor the serenity of Bossuet. But he possesses a wonderful facility in exposition, precision of doctrine, breadth of learning, and dialectical power. He influenced the age that followed him: he dealt Gallicanism such decisive blows that it never rose again. In a word, he was a great and virtuous man, a profound thinker, and one of the finest writers of that French language of which his works are a distinguished ornament.

RAYMOND, *Eloge du Comte Joseph de Maistre* (Chambéry, 1827); DE MARGERIE, *Le Comte Joseph de Maistre* (Paris, 1882); DESCOTTES, *Joseph de Maistre avant la Révolution* (Paris, 1893); COGORDAN, *Joseph de Maistre* (Paris, 1894).

GEORGES BERTRIN.

Maistre, XAVIER DE, French romance-writer, younger brother of the preceding, b. at Chambéry, Savoy, in 1763; d. at St. Petersburg, 12 June, 1852. Being an officer in the Sardinian Army when Savoy was reunited to France in 1792, he became expatriated like his brother. In 1799 he was in the Austro-Russian army in Italy. He followed General Suvaroff to Russia, but, his protector having fallen into disgrace, was reduced to earn his living by painting, being a landscape artist of great ability. The arrival of his brother Joseph as envoy extraordinary of the King of Sardinia, changed his situation. He entered the Admiralty Office and became, in 1805, librarian of the Admiralty Museum; he was then named to the staff of the army, took part in the Caucasian War, was made a general, and married a lady-in-waiting of the empress. From that time he looked on himself as a Russian subject. He did not visit Savoy again till 1825. After a short stay in Paris in 1839, he returned to St. Petersburg, where he died at the age of eighty-nine.

It may be said that de Maistre became a writer by chance. When a young officer at Alexandria, in Piedmont, he was arrested for duelling. Having been sentenced to remain in his quarters for forty-two days, he composed his "Voyage autour de ma chambre". He added some chapters later, but did not judge the work worthy of being published; but his brother, however, having read the manuscript, had it printed (1794). It is a delightful chat with the reader, filled with delicate observations, in which an artless grace, humour, and spontaneous wit are wedded to a gentle and somewhat dreamy philosophy. In 1811 appeared "Le Lépreux de la cité d'Aoste". This little dialogue, of about thirty pages, between an isolated leper and a passing soldier (the author), breathes a touching spirit of resignation, and unites an impressive simplicity of form with suppressed emotion and exalted moral and religious ideas. It is a little gem, a masterpiece. The same must be said of the two novels published some years later: "Les prisonniers du Caucase" and "La jeune Sibérienne". In the former the author relates the vicissitudes of the captivity of Major Kascambo, who has fallen, with his ordnance, into an ambuscade. "La jeune Sibérienne" is the story of a young girl who comes from Siberia to St. Petersburg to ask for the pardon of her parents. It is the fact round which Madame Cottin has woven her romance "Elisabeth, ou les exilés de la Sibérie"; but the story of Xavier de Maistre is by far the truer to life and more pathetic. In 1825 de Maistre wrote, as a pendant to his first work, in the same vein and with the same charm, the "Expédition nocturne autour de ma chambre".

Xavier de Maistre, it is true, has written only booklets, but these booklets are masterpieces of their kind. His style is ingenious, graceful, and brilliant, while its simplicity, lucidity, and rhythm wonderfully enhance its charm for readers. He may be regarded as one of the first among French authors of the second rank.

SAINTE-BEUVE, *Portraits contemporains.*

GEORGES BERTRIN.

Maitland, DIOCESE OF (MAITLANDENSIS), in New South Wales. Maitland, the principal settlement on Hunter River, was chosen as the title for a bishop in 1848, when Dr. William Henry Davis, O.S.B., was sent as coadjutor to the Right Rev. Dr. Polding, O.S.B., Archbishop of Sydney, with the title of Bishop of Maitland. However, it did not become a residential see until some twenty years later, when the first suffragan dioceses of New South Wales were established: Goulburn in 1864, and Bathurst and Maitland in 1865. The Right Reverend James Murray, then secretary to Cardinal Cullen, was appointed Bishop of Maitland, and, after being consecrated in the pro-cathedral of Dublin by Cardinal Cullen on 14 November, 1865, proceeded to his distant diocese, of which he took pos-

session on 1 November, 1866. The Diocese of Maitland, which served as an episcopal title to Bishop Davis, O. S. B., consisted of the borough of East Maitland only. The diocese, as constituted by Papal Brief of 1866, was very extended, and in 1887, at Bishop Murray's request in the first Plenary Council of Sydney, a considerable reduction in its territory was made, bringing it to its present limits. The present Diocese of Maitland comprises that portion of New South Wales, which lies between Camden Haven and Red Head, stretching west as far as Wollar and Cassilis and north as far as Murrurundi. It thus lies between 31° 31′ and 33° 7′ S. lat., and between 149° 50′ and 152° 51′ E. long. The area is about 12,000 sq. miles. The rainfall ranges from 30 to 40 inches annually in the parts near the coast, and from 20 to 30 in the other parts. The mean annual temperature is 63°. The diocese contains a large area of coal-measures in the vicinity of Maitland and Newcastle; large stretches of rich arable land lie on the banks of Hunter and Manning Rivers, and fine pastoral tracts throughout.

Among its population of some 150,000, Maitland has a Catholic population of 30,000. The Catholics are for the most part of Irish descent, but in a few places those of German descent are fairly numerous. There are twenty parochial districts, each possessing a church and presbytery with one or more resident secular priests (in all 40), and in nearly every district are one or more convents of teaching sisters (in all 30 convents and 250 sisters). Catholic parochial schools unaided by the state have been established in every district, and are attended by about 4000 children. There is a Redemptorist monastery at Waratah, which is the centre of popular missions. The Marist Brothers have boys' schools at Maitland and Newcastle. The Dominican Nuns from Kingstown, Ireland, have boarding and day schools, and are engaged in both secondary and primary education. The Sisters of Mercy, from Ennis and Callan, Ireland, have a large number of primary schools, besides boarding and select schools. The Sisters of St. Joseph from Bathurst have several day schools and a boarding-school—all for primary education. The only Catholic Institute for Deaf Mutes in Australasia is conducted at Waratah by the Dominican Nuns. The Sisters of Mercy conduct an orphanage for girls at West Maitland. The building and maintenance of the churches is carried on entirely by charitable offerings; schools are also dependent on the small fees paid and on the charitable support of Catholics. Maitland's first bishop, Right Rev. James Murray, d. in 1909. He was succeeded by Right Rev. Patrick Vincent Dwyer, the first Australian-born bishop, ordained a priest in 1882, and consecrated coadjutor-bishop in 1897.

P. V. Dwyer.

Majano, Benedetto da, a well-known Florentine sculptor and architect of the Renaissance, b. at Majano, Tuscany, 1442; d. at Florence, 24 May, 1498. During his early life he cultivated the art of woodmosaic, at which he was singularly expert. King Corvinus of Hungary invited him to his court, and it is said that the destruction on the journey of some preciously executed inlay work he was taking to his royal patron induced the artist to seek more durable material. In 1471–72 he carved the monumental altar for the Duomo of Faenza dedicated to San Savino; in 1474, the bust of Pietro Mellini, shrewd and life-like, in the Bargello; in 1480, the framework of the doorway at the Palazzo Vecchio, a delicate piece of chiselling still in place. Also in 1480, with his brother Giuliano, he built and made the sculptures for the little oratory of the Madonna dell'Olivo, outside Prato. The charming adolescent St. John of the Bargello is ascribed to the year 1481. In 1489 Benedetto designed the Strozzi Palace at Florence which still stands (continued by Cronaca), one of the most picturesque memorials of its day. It is believed he went to Naples in 1490, and there executed various sculptures, among others an Annunciation at the church of Monte Oliveto. The tomb of Filippo Strozzi, with its lovely roundel of Mother and Child supported by cherubs (S. Maria Novella, Florence), dates from about 1491. In 1493–94 he made carvings at San Gimignano in the chapel of the child-patron, Santa Fina; a bust of Onofrio Vanni in the sacristy; and the beautiful tomb of San Bartolo in the church of Sant' Agostino; the circular high-relief in the arch of the Madonna and Infant Blessing is one of his most exquisite creations. Benedetto's best-known and most esteemed production is the pulpit at the Franciscan church of Santa Croce, Florence (about 1495). Minor works are the group of the seated Madonna and Child at the oratory of the Misericordia, Florence; the bust of Giotto at the Duomo, and of Squarcialupi in the Bargello; in Siena, the reliefs of the Evangelists at the Duomo, and a marble ciborium in the church of S. Domenico; a fine bust of Filippo Strozzi in the Louvre, Paris, and another in Berlin; and a door found at Borgo San Sepolcro, now in a private collection at Palermo. The portico of S. Maria delle Grazie, at Arezzo, is his. He was buried in the crypt of S. Lorenzo. Bode is of the opinion that he was the Florentine who most nearly approached the German School, but, in his best works, he retains the subtilty and distinction, the fineness and nervous beauty of Donatello and of Rossellino.

Vasari, *Lives*, tr. Foster (London, 1887); Lübke, *Outlines of the History of Art* (New York, 1879); Perkins, *Historical Handbook of Italian Sculpture* (New York, 1883); Bode, *Florentine Sculptors of the Renaissance* (London, 1908).

M. L. Handley.

Majorca and Iviza, Diocese of (Majoricensis et Ibusensis), suffragan of Valencia, with the episcopal residence at Palma on the Island of Majorca. The see is said to have existed in the fifth century, there being mention of a Bishop Elias of Majorca in 480. The first historical reference is in 898, at which time Pope Romanus placed Majorca and Minorca under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Gerona. The episcopal succession was interrupted by the Moorish invasion, but in the eleventh century the Moorish king, Mugeyd, authorized the Bishop of Barcelona to exercise jurisdiction over Majorca. Don Jaime I of Aragon overcame the Moors in 1229 and caused Mass to be said in the ancient mosque at Palma. Gregory IX re-established the see in 1230, and the first bishop was Raimundo de Torrelles (1237–66). The cathedral, begun in 1230, is dedicated to the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin. The cathedral chapter dates from 1244, and was confirmed by Innocent IV, 5 April, 1245. By the Bull "Ineffabilis Dei benignitas" (30 April, 1782) Pius VI made Iviza and Majorca a joint diocese. It was suppressed by the Concordat of 1857 and is now governed by a capitular vicar. The present Bishop of Majorca and Iviza is Pedro Campins y Barceló, b. at Palma, 14 Jan., 1859, ordained in 1882, appointed Bishop of Majorca 21 April, 1898, and consecrated 7 July following. There are in Majorca and Iviza 326,000 Catholics, 61 parishes, 656 priests, 211 churches and chapels.

Blanche M. Kelly.

Majordomo (Latin, *Major domus;* Italian, *Maggiordomo*).—The majordomo or chief steward of the household of the pope is one of the three (formerly four) palatine prelates (prelati palatini), concerning whom particulars have been given in the article Maestro di Camera. He belongs also to the four "*prelati di fiocchetto*", so called because they have the right to ornament the harness of their horses with violet and peacock-coloured feathers. The four *prelates di fiocchetto* are, first the Governor of Rome in his quality of Vice-Chamberlain, and after him the Auditor and the Treasurer of the Apostolic Chamber, and then comes

the Major-domo. In the "Introitus et Exitus Cameræ Apostolicæ" of the Vatican Archives, which begins with the year 1295, the officials of the Apostolic Household are given in regular order according to their stipends. But, although even at this date there undoubtedly existed a supreme steward of the papal palace, the name and duties attached to the office of a majordomo were not strictly defined until later. The alterations in the domestic administration of the papal household, necessitated under Clement V and John XXII by the transition from the "natural economy" to the "economy of money", were of a far-reaching nature; but it was only after the return of Martin V from Avignon in 1418 that the present offices were gradually evolved, to attain subsequently during the Renaissance a full development. In the sixteenth century a *maestro di casa* stood at the head of the whole administration of the papal household. Towards the end of that century the same official was accorded the title of *prefetto del Sacro Palazzo Apostolico*, and under Urban VIII (1623–44) he was first granted the title of *Maggiordomo Pontificio*. It was then his duty, on the accession of a new pope, to form the papal *famiglia*, that is, to suggest candidates for the various household offices and then to direct the whole household. In so far as this duty necessitated expenditure, the Treasurer of the Holy Roman Church, the minister of finance for the time being, exercised sharply defined control over the majordomo and his assistants. This circumstance did not, however, constitute the treasurer a household official, or the *Præfectus Sacri Palatii* an administrative official; the Majordomo is, and has always been, exclusively a household official. A complete list of the occupants of the office from 1534 is preserved. The general rule recognized by the Curia at the close of the Middle Ages, that the head of any important department should have jurisdiction over all his assistants, extended to the Majordomo. Not merely in civil matters, but likewise in criminal charges, *sedebat pro tribunali*—he pronounced judgment on all officials of the papal palace. In the course of time his duties as majordomo were sharply distinguished from those which he performed as Prefect of the Palace, so that the majordomo was said to be simultaneously Prefect of the Palace. To the prefecture belonged the management of the museums and of all establishments of a special kind existing in the palaces—provided they were not autonomous. The keeping of the palace accounts also fell to the prefect.

After 1870 there was a great change in these conditions. The important office of the prefect was separated from that of the majordomo, and entrusted to the commission of cardinals appointed to administer the business affairs of the Holy See. The arrangement of Leo XIII was so far altered by Pius X, that the Secretary of State was made Prefect of the Apostolic Palaces. Subordinate to him are the subprefect, the forriere maggiore, the cavallerizzo maggiore, the segreteria della prefettiora, the computisteria, the architetto and the juristic counsellors, who form, in their corporate capacity, the divisional boards of direction of the palace administration. The museums and galleries are also entrusted to this body. The above-mentioned alteration by Leo XIII took place on 29 Dec., 1891, after the prefecture had been separated by a *Motus proprius* of 7 Dec. The present rights of the Majordomo are briefly as follows: He enjoys his old privilege of accompanying His Holiness, and remains Governor of the Conclave. In this capacity he has the general control of the personnel of the palaces, and is responsible for the quiet and good order therein during the Conclave. In the *Congresso Palatino* (Palatine Commission), should it be hereafter convened, he has a seat and a vote. He conducts the Congregation of the Apostolic Hospice, and is director of the *Cappella Sistina*, the musical direction of which is (1910) entrusted to Maestro Perosi. All ordinary and extraordinary religious functions, in which the pope and papal court participate, are under his arrangement and direction. The appointments of papal chamberlains are forwarded by him at the pope's order, and he distributes the annual medals to the members of the papal household. His earlier duty of issuing cards of admission to the galleries and museums for purposes of study and copying is now withdrawn from him. The Majordomo is the chief Prelate of the Household, has a distinctive dress, and enjoys a free official residence in the papal palace.

In addition to the very numerous references in Moroni, *Dizionario di Erudiz. Storico-Eccles.*, consult Galetti, *Memorie di tre antiche chiese di Rieti* (Rome, 1765); Sickel, *Ein Ruolo di Famiglia des Papstes Pius IV* in *Mitteil. des Instit. für österreich. Geschichtsforschung*, suppl. vol. IV; *Die kathol. Kirche u. ihre Diener in Wort u. Bild*, I (Berlin, 1899), 277–8. There is a short reference in Humphrey, *Urbs et Orbis* (London, 1899), 122–4. For the officials themselves the various series *Gerarchia Cattolica*, *Notizie di Roma*, and the old *Relationi della Corte di Roma*, should be consulted.

Paul Maria Baumgarten.

Majority (Lat. *majoritas*), the state of a person or thing greater, or superior, in relation to another person or thing. In canon law the expression has three principal acceptations: (1) In the elections or deliberations of any assembly, majority signifies a higher number of votes. There is an "absolute majority", when the number of votes exceeds half the number of the voters; a "relative majority" when the votes for the one candidate, or party, numerically exceed those given to any other. There are also certain special majorities required in certain cases, such as that of two-thirds required for pontifical elections (see Conclave; Election); (2) In reference to persons, majority is the state of persons who have reached the age required for such and such definite acts; in particular, for acts of civil life. As a rule, the age of majority is fixed at twenty-one years (see Minors); (3) In the hierarchical sense, majority is the superiority of certain persons over certain others by reason of the charge or dignity held by the former. It connotes authority, or at least precedence; and its correlative is obedience when there is question of jurisdiction, deference and respect when there is question of dignity. Thus, in the Church, the clergy are superior to the laity; among the clergy, individuals are ranked according to their jurisdiction, their Holy orders, etc. In a certain sense, even church buildings have a hierarchical precedence, the first of churches being St. John Lateran's, the pope's cathedral, "mother and head of all the churches of Rome and of the world"; next come the "major" basilicas, then the primatial churches, the metropolitan, cathedral, collegiate, etc. (cf. Decretal, I, tit. xxxiii, "De majoritate et obedientia").

A. Boudinhon.

Major Orders. See Orders, Holy.

Majunke, Paul, Catholic journalist, b. at Gross-Schmograu in Silesia, 14 July, 1842; d. at Hochkirch near Glogau, 21 May, 1899. He entered the University of Breslau in 1861, and devoted four years to the study of civil and canon law and Catholic theology. In 1867 he was ordained priest, and from 1869 to 1870 was editor of the "Kölnische Zeitung". From 1871 to 1878 he was editor-in-chief of the "Germania"; in 1874 he was elected member of the Reichstag, and in 1878 also of the Prussian House of Deputies, attaching himself to the Centre party. He encouraged Catholic journalism and, during the *Kulturkampf*, was a most zealous and fearless champion of the Catholic cause, at the cost of great personal sacrifices. Unfortunately, his uncompromising zeal frequently incited him to give expression to ill-timed utterances in both the public press and Parliament, and these led to an estrangement between him and the leading Catholics of the day. In 1874 he was condemned to one year's

imprisonment for violation of the press laws. Even a motion in his favour carried by the Reichstag failed to secure the remission of his sentence. From 1878 to 1884 he was editor of the "Korrespondenz der Zentrumsblätter". After his appointment as parish priest of Hochkirch in 1884, he withdrew from but still continued his activity in journalism. His principal works are: "Geschichte des Kulturkampfs" (1886; 3rd ed., 1902); "Geschichtslügen" (1884; 17th ed., 1902), in collaboration with Galland and other friends. Some of his works—e. g., "Louise Lateau" (2nd ed., 1875)—awakened surprise by their pronounced mystical and prophetic strain. In "Luther's Selbstmord" (1892) he attempted to establish the untenable theory of Luther's suicide (concerning this question see Paulus, "Luther's Lebensende", 1898).

BETTELHEIM, *Biograph. Jahrbuch*, IV (1900), 258 sq.

THOMAS KENNEDY.

Makarska. See SPALATO, DIOCESE OF.

Makil, MATHEW. See CHANGANACHERRY, VICARIATE APOSTOLIC OF.

Malabar.—In its narrower application Malabar is the name of a district of British India stretching about 145 miles along the west coast, south of Mangalore, and belonging to the Madras Presidency, bounded on the north by South Canara, on the east by Coorg, Mysore State, the Nilgiris and Coimbatore, and on the south by the Native State of Cochin. Its chief towns are Cannanore, Tellicheri, Calicut (the capital), and Palghat. In its older, wider, and popular significance the Malabar Coast includes, not only the district of Malabar, but also the Native States of Cochin and Travancore down to Cape Comorin—in fact the whole south-west corner of India as far back as the ghaut line. The ancient form of the name was *Male*, "where the pepper grows", whence the name *Malayalam* for the prevailing language. Ecclesiastically, British Malabar belongs to the Diocese of Mangalore; the Cochin State comprises the Padroado, Diocese of Cochin, the Archdiocese of Verapoly, and the three Vicariates Apostolic of Trichur, Changanachery, and Ernaculam; while the Travancore State is covered by the Diocese of Quilon, the divisions being in each case approximate. The name *Malabar* is used in the connexion with the "Syrian Christians of Malabar", chiefly found at the present day in the three vicariates just mentioned. The so-called "Malabar Rites" had nothing to do with Malabar proper, since the scene of the dispute was at Madura, on the opposite side of the peninsula. The term seems to have arisen from the fact that the Madura mission was part of the Malabar Province of the Society of Jesus. (See MALABAR RITES; THOMAS CHRISTIANS; and the various dioceses above mentioned.)

ERNEST R. HULL.

Malabar Rites.—A conventional term for certain customs or practices of the natives of South India, which the Jesuit missionaries allowed their neophytes to retain after conversion, but which were afterwards prohibited by the Holy See. The missions concerned are not those of the coast of south-western India, to which the name Malabar properly belongs, but those of inner South India, especially those of the former "kingdoms" of Madura, Mysore and the Karnatic. The question of Malabar Rites originated in the method followed by the Jesuits, since the beginning of the seventeenth century, in evangelizing those countries. The prominent feature of that method was a condescending accommodation to the manners and customs of the people the conversion of whom was to be obtained. But, when bitter enemies asserted, as some still assert, that the Jesuit missionaries, in Madura, Mysore and the Karnatic, either accepted for themselves or permitted to their neophytes such practices as they knew to be idolatrous or superstitious, this accusation must be styled not only unjust, but absurd. In fact it is tantamount to affirming that these men, whose intelligence at least was never questioned, were so stupid as to jeopardize their own salvation in order to save others, and to endure infinite hardships in order to establish among the Hindus a corrupt and sham Christianity.

The popes, while disapproving of some usages hitherto considered inoffensive or tolerable by the missionaries, never charged them with having adulterated knowingly the purity of religion. On one of them, who had observed the "Malabar Rites" for seventeen years previous to his martyrdom, the Church has conferred the honour of beatification. The process for the beatification of Father John de Britto was going on at Rome during the hottest period of the controversy upon the famous "Rites"; and the adversaries of the Jesuits asserted beatification to be impossible, because it would amount to approving the "superstitions and idolatries" maintained by the missioners of Madura. Yet the cause progressed, and Benedict XIV, on 2 July, 1741, declared "that the rites in question had not been used, as among the Gentiles, with religious significance, but merely as civil observances, and that therefore they were no obstacle to bringing forward the process". (Brief of Beatification of John de Britto, 18 May, 1852.) There is no reason to view the "Malabar Rites", as practised generally in the said missions, in any other light. Hence the good faith of the missionaries in tolerating the native customs should not be contested; on the other hand, they, no doubt, erred in carrying this toleration too far. But the bare enumeration of the Decrees by which the question was decided shows how perplexing it was and how difficult the solution.

Father de Nobili's Work.—The founder of the missions of the interior of South India, Roberto de Nobili, was born at Rome, in 1577, of a noble family from Montepulciano, which numbered among many distinguished relatives the celebrated Cardinal Roberto Bellarmine. When nineteen years of age, he entered the Society of Jesus; and, after a few years, the young religious, aiming at the purest ideal of self-sacrifice, requested his superiors to send him to the missions of India. He embarked at Lisbon, 1604, and in 1606 was serving his apostolic apprenticeship in South India. Christianity was then flourishing on the coasts of this country. It is well known that St. Francis Xavier baptized many thousands there, and from the apex of the Indian triangle the faith spread along both sides, especially on the west, the Malabar coast. But the interior of the vast peninsula remained almost untouched. The Apostle of the Indies himself recognized the insuperable opposition of the "Brahmins and other noble castes inhabiting the interior" to the preaching of the Gospel (Monumenta Xaveriana, I, 54). Yet his disciples were not sparing of endeavours. A Portuguese Jesuit, Gonsalvo Fernandes, had resided in the city of Madura fully fourteen years, having obtained leave of the king to stay there to watch over the spiritual needs of a few Christians from the coast; and, though a zealous and pious missionary, he had not succeeded, within that long space of time, in making one convert. This painful state of things Nobili witnessed in 1606, when together with his superior, the Provincial of Malabar, he paid a visit to Fernandes. At once his keen eye perceived the cause and the remedy.

It was evident that a deep-rooted aversion to the foreign preachers hindered the Hindus of the interior, not only from accepting the Gospel, but even from listening to its message. But whence this aversion? Its object was not exactly the foreigner, but the Prangui. This name, with which the natives of India designated the Portuguese, conveyed to their minds the idea of an infamous and abject class of men, with

whom no Hindu could have any intercourse without degrading himself to the lowest ranks of the population. Now the Prangui were abominated because they violated the most respected customs of India, by eating beef, and indulging in wine and spirits; but much as all well-bred Hindus abhorred those things, they felt more disgusted at seeing the Portuguese, irrespective of any distinction of caste, treat freely with the lowest classes, such as the pariahs, who, in the eyes of their countrymen of the higher castes, are nothing better than the vilest animals. Accordingly, since Fernandes was known to be a Portuguese, that is a Prangui, and besides was seen living habitually with men of the lowest caste, the religion he preached, no less than himself, had to share the contempt and execration attending his neophytes, and made no progress whatever among the better classes. To become acceptable for all, Christianity must be presented in quite another way. While Nobili thought over his plan, probably the example just set by his countryman Matteo Ricci, in China, stood before his mind. At all events, he started from the same principle, resolving to become, after the motto of St. Paul, all things to all men, and a Hindu to the Hindus, as far as might be lawful.

Having ripened his design by thorough meditation and by conferring with his superiors, the Archbishop of Cranganore and the provincial of Malabar, who both approved and encouraged his resolution, Nobili boldly began his arduous career by re-entering Madura in the dress of the Hindu ascetics, known as *saniassy*. He never tried to make believe that he was a native of India; else he would have deserved the name of impostor, with which he has sometimes been unjustly branded; but he availed himself of the fact that he was not a Portuguese, to deprecate the opprobrious name Prangui. He introduced himself as a Roman râja (nobleman), desirous of living at Madura in practising penance, in praying and studying the sacred law. He carefully avoided meeting with Father Fernandes and he took his lodging in a solitary abode in the Brahmins' quarter obtained from the benevolence of a high officer. At first he called himself a râja, but soon he changed this title for that of brahmin, better suited to his aims. The râjas or kshatryas, being the second of the three high castes, formed the military class; but intellectual avocations were almost monopolized by the Brahmins. They held from time immemorial the spiritual if not the political government of the nation, and were the arbiters of what the others ought to believe, to revere, and to adore. Yet, it must be noted, they were in no wise a priestly caste; they were possessed of no exclusive right to perform functions of religious cult. Nobili remained for a long time shut up in his dwelling, after the custom of Indian penitents, living on rice, milk, and herbs with water, and that once a day; he received attendance only from Brahmin servants. Curiosity could not fail to be raised, and all the more as the foreign *saniassy* was very slow in satisfying it. When, after two or three refusals, he admitted visitors, the interview was conducted according to the strictest rules of Hindu etiquette. Nobili charmed his audience by the perfection with which he spoke their own language, Tamil; by the quotations of famous Indian authors with which he interspersed his discourse, and, above all, by the fragments of native poetry which he recited or even sang with exquisite skill.

Having thus won a benevolent hearing, he proceeded step by step on his missionary task, labouring first to set right the ideas of his auditors with respect to natural truth concerning God, the soul, etc., and then instilling by degrees the dogmas of the Christian faith. He took advantage also of his acquaintance with the books revered by the Hindus as sacred and divine. These he contrived, the first of all Europeans, to read and study in the Sanskrit originals. For this purpose he had engaged a reputed Brahmin teacher, with whose assistance and by the industry of his own keen intellect and felicitous memory he gained such a knowledge of this recondite literature as to strike the native doctors with amazement, very few of them feeling themselves capable of vying with him on the point. In this way also he was enabled to find in the Vedas many truths which he used in testimony of the doctrine he preached. By this method, and no less by the prestige of his pure and austere life, the missionary had soon dispelled the distrust and prejudices of many, and before the end of 1608, he conferred baptism on several persons conspicuous for nobility and learning. While he obliged his neophytes to reject all practices involving superstition or savouring in any wise of idolatrous worship, he allowed them to keep their national customs, in as far as these contained nothing wrong and referred to merely political or civil usages. Accordingly, Nobili's disciples continued, for example, wearing the dress proper to each one's caste; the Brahmins retaining their *codhumbi* (tuft of hair) and cord (cotton string slung over the left shoulder); all adorning, as before, their foreheads with sandalwood-paste, etc. Yet, one condition was laid on them, namely, that the cord and the sandal, if once taken with any superstitious ceremony, be removed and replaced by others with a special benediction, the formula of which had been sent to Nobili by the Archbishop of Cranganore.

While the missionary was winning more and more esteem, not only for himself, but also for the Gospel, even among those who did not receive it, the fanatical ministers and votaries of the national gods, whom he was going to supplant, could not watch his progress quietly. By their assaults, indeed, his work was almost unceasingly impeded, and barely escaped ruin on several occasions; but he held his ground in spite of calumny, imprisonment, menaces of death and all kinds of ill-treatment. In April, 1609, the flock which he had gathered around him was too numerous for his chapel and required a church; and the labour of the ministry had become so crushing that he entreated the provincial to send him a companion. But then fell on him a storm from a part whence it might least have been expected. Fernandes, the missioner already mentioned, may have felt no mean jealousy, when seeing Nobili succeed so happily where he had been so powerless; but certainly he proved unable to understand or to appreciate the method of his colleague; probably, also, as he had lived perforce apart from the circles among which the latter was working, he was never well informed of his doings. However that may be, Fernandes directed to the superiors of the Jesuits in India and at Rome a lengthy report, in which he charged Nobili with simulation, in declining the name of Prangui; with connivance at idolatry, in allowing his neophytes to observe heathen customs, such as wearing the insignia of castes; lastly, with schismatical proceeding, in dividing the Christians into separate congregations. This denunciation at first caused an impression highly unfavourable to Nobili. Influenced by the account of Fernandes, the provincial of Malabar (Father Laerzio, who had always countenanced Nobili, had then left that office), the Visitor of the India Missions and even the General of the Society at Rome sent severe warnings to the missionary innovator. Cardinal Bellarmine, in 1612, wrote to his relative, expressing the grief he felt on hearing of his unwise conduct.

Things changed as soon as Nobili, being informed of the accusation, could answer it on every point. By oral explanations, in the assemblies of missionaries and theologians at Cochin and at Goa, and by an elaborate memoir, which he sent to Rome, he justified the manner in which he had presented himself to the Brahmins of Madura; then, he showed that the national customs he allowed his converts to keep were

such as had no religious meaning. The latter point, the crux of the question, he elucidated by numerous quotations from the authoritative Sanskrit law-books of the Hindus. Moreover, he procured affidavits of one hundred and eight Brahmins, from among the most learned in Madura, all endorsing his interpretation of the native practices. He acknowledged that the infidels used to associate those practices with superstitious ceremonies; but, he observed, "these ceremonies belong to the mode, not to the substance of the practices; the same difficulty may be raised about eating, drinking, marriage, etc., for the heathens mix their ceremonies with all their actions. It suffices to do away with the superstitious ceremonies, as the Christians do." As to schism, he denied having caused any such thing: "he had founded a new Christianity, which never could have been brought together with the older: the separation of the churches had been approved by the Archbishop of Cranganore; and it precluded neither unity of faith nor Christian charity, for his neophytes used to greet kindly those of F. Fernandes. Even on the coast there are different churches for different castes, and in Europe the places in the churches are not common for all." Nobili's apology was effectually seconded by the Archbishop of Cranganore, who, as he had encouraged the first steps of the missionary, continued to stand firmly by his side, and pleaded his cause warmly at Goa before the archbishop, as well as at Rome. Thus the learned and zealous primate of India, Alexis de Menezes, though a synod held by him had prohibited the Brahmin cord, was won over to the cause of Nobili. And his successor, Christopher de Sa, having thought fit to take a contrary course, remained almost the only opponent in India.

At Rome the explanations of Nobili, of the Archbishop of Cranganore, and of the chief Inquisitor of Goa brought about a similar effect. In 1614 and 1615 Cardinal Bellarmine and the General of the Society wrote again to the missionary, declaring themselves fully satisfied. At last, after the usual mature examination by the Holy See, on 31 January, 1623, Gregory XV, by his Apostolic Letter, "Romanæ Sedis Antistes", decided the question provisionally in favour of Father de Nobili. Accordingly, the *codhumbi*, the cord, the sandal, and the baths were permitted to the Indian Christians, "until the Holy See provide otherwise"; only certain conditions are prescribed, in order that all superstitious admixture and all occasion of scandal may be averted. As to the separation of the castes, the pope confines himself to "earnestly entreating and beseeching (*etiam atque etiam obtestamur et obsecramus*) the nobles not to despise the lower people, especially in the churches, by hearing the Divine word and receiving the sacraments apart from them". Indeed, a strict order to this effect would have been tantamount to sentencing the new-born Christianity of Madura to death. The pope understood, no doubt, that the customs connected with the distinction of castes, being so deeply rooted in the ideas and habits of all Hindus, did not admit an abrupt suppression, even among the Christians. They were to be dealt with by the Church, as had been slavery, serfdom, and the like institutions of past times. The Church never attacked directly those inveterate customs; but she inculcated meekness, humility, charity, love of the Saviour who suffered and gave His life for all, and by this method slavery, serfdom, and other social abuses were slowly eradicated.

While imitating this wise indulgence to the feebleness of new converts, Father de Nobili took much care to inspire his disciples with the feelings becoming true Christians towards their humbler brethren. At the very outset of his preaching, he insisted on making all understand that "religion was by no means dependent on caste; indeed it must be one for all, the true God being one for all; although [he added] unity of religion destroys not the civil distinction of the castes nor the lawful privileges of the nobles". Explaining then the commandment of charity, he inculcated that it extended to the pariahs as well as others, and he exempted nobody from the duties it imposes; but he might rightly tell his neophytes that, for example, visiting pariahs or other people of low caste at their houses, treating them familiarly, even kneeling or sitting by them in the church, concerned perfection rather than the precept of charity, and that accordingly such actions could be omitted without any fault, at least where they involved so grave a detriment as degradation from the higher caste. Of this principle the missionaries had a right to make use for themselves. Indeed charity required more from the pastors of souls than from others; yet not in such a way that they should endanger the salvation of the many to relieve the needs of the few. Therefore Nobili, at the beginning of his apostolate, avoided all public intercourse with the lower castes; but he failed not to minister secretly even to pariahs. In the year 1638, there were at Tiruchirapalli (Trichinopoly) several hundred Christian pariahs, who had been secretly taught and baptized by the companions of Nobili. About this time he devised a means of assisting more directly the lower castes, without ruining the work begun among the higher.

Besides the Brahmin *saniassy*, there was another grade of Hindu ascetics, called *pandaram*, enjoying less consideration than the Brahmins, but who were allowed to deal publicly with all castes, and even hold intercourse with the pariahs. They were not excluded from relations with the higher castes. On the advice of Nobili, the superiors of the mission with the Archbishop of Cranganore resolved that henceforward there should be two classes of missionaries, the Brahmin and the *pandaram*. Father Balthasar da Costa was the first, in 1540, who took the name and habit of *pandaram*, under which he effected a large number of conversions, of others as well as of pariahs. Nobili had then three Jesuit companions. After the comforting decision of Rome, he had hastened to extend his preaching beyond the town of Madura, and the Gospel spread by degrees over the whole interior of South India. In 1646, exhausted by forty-two years of toiling and suffering, he was constrained to retire, first to Jafnapatam in Ceylon, then to Mylapore, where he died 16 January, 1656. He left his mission in full progress. To give some idea of its development, we note that the superiors, writing to the general of the Society, about the middle and during the second half of the seventeenth century, record an annual average of five thousand conversions, the number never being less than three thousand a year even when the missioners' work was most hindered by persecution. At the end of the seventeenth century, the total number of Christians in the mission founded by Nobili and still named Madura mission, though embracing, besides Madura, Mysore, Marava, Tanjore, Gingi, etc., is described as exceeding 150,000. Yet the number of the missionaries never went beyond seven, assisted however by many native catechists.

The Madura mission belonged to the Portuguese assistance of the Society of Jesus, but it was supplied with men from all provinces of the Order. Thus, for example, Father Beschi (c. 1710–1746), who won so high a renown among the Hindus, heathen and Christian, by his writings in Tamil, was an Italian, as the founder of the mission had been. In the last quarter of the seventeenth century, the French Father John Venantius Bouchet worked for twelve years in Madura, chiefly at Trichinopoly, during which time he baptized about 20,000 infidels. And it is to be noted that the catechumens, in these parts of India, were admitted to baptism only after a long and careful preparation. Indeed the missionary accounts of the time bear frequent witness to the very commendable

qualities of these Christians, their fervent piety, their steadfastness in the sufferings they often had to endure for religion's sake, their charity towards their brethren, even of the lowest castes, their zeal for the conversion of pagans. In the year 1700 Father Bouchet, with a few other French Jesuits, opened a new mission in the Karnatic, north of the River Kaveri. Like their Portuguese colleagues of Madura, the French missionaries of the Karnatic were very successful, in spite of repeated and almost continual persecutions by the idolaters. Moreover several of them became particularly conspicuous for the extensive knowledge they acquired of the literature and sciences of ancient India. From Father Cœurdoux the French Academicians learned the common origin of the Sanskrit, Greek, and Latin languages; to the initiative of Nobili and to the endeavours of his followers in the same line is due the first disclosure of a new intellectual world in India. The first original documents, enabling the learned to explore that world, were drawn from their hiding-places in India, and sent in large numbers to Europe by the same missionaries. But the Karnatic mission had hardly begun when it was disturbed by the revival of the controversy, which the decision of Gregory XV had set at rest for three quarters of a century.

The Decree of Tournon.—This second phase, which was much more eventful and noisy than the first, originated in Pondicherry. Since the French had settled at that place, the spiritual care of the colonists was in the hands of the Capuchin Fathers, who were also working for the conversion of the natives. With a view to forwarding the latter work, the Bishop of Mylapore or San Thomé, to whose jurisdiction Pondicherry belonged, resolved, in 1699, to transfer it entirely to the Jesuits of the Karnatic mission, assigning to them a parochial church in the town and restricting the ministry of the Capuchins to the European immigrants, French or Portuguese. The Capuchins were displeased by this arrangement and appealed to Rome. The petition they laid before the pope, in 1703, embodied not only a complaint against the division of parishes made by the bishop, but also an accusation against the methods of the Jesuit mission in South India. Their claim on the former point was finally dismissed, but the charges were more successful. On 6 November, 1703, Charles-Thomas-Maillard de Tournon, a Piedmontese prelate, Patriarch of Antioch, sent by Clement XI, with the power of *legatus a latere*, to visit the new Christian missions of the East Indies and especially China, landed at Pondicherry. Being obliged to wait there eight months for the opportunity of passing over to China, Tournon instituted an inquiry into the facts alleged by the Capuchins. He was hindered through sickness, as he himself stated, from visiting any part of the inland mission; in the town, besides the Capuchins, who had not visited the interior, he interrogated a few natives through interpreters; the Jesuits he consulted rather cursorily, it seems.

Less than eight months after his arrival in India, he considered himself justified in issuing a decree of vital import to the whole of the Christians of India. It consisted of sixteen articles concerning practices in use or supposed to be in use among the neophytes of Madura and the Karnatic; the legate condemned and prohibited these practices as defiling the purity of the faith and religion, and forbade the missionaries, on pain of heavy censures, to permit them any more. Though dated 23 June, 1704, the decree was notified to the superiors of the Jesuits only on 8 July, three days before the departure of Tournon from Pondicherry. During the short time left, the missionaries endeavoured to make him understand on what imperfect information his decree rested, and that nothing less than the ruin of the mission was likely to follow from its execution. They succeeded in persuading him to take off orally the threat of censures appended, and to suspend provisionally the prescription commanding the missionaries to give spiritual assistance to the sick pariahs, not only in the churches, but in their dwellings.

Examination of the Malabar Rites at Rome.—Tournon's decree, interpreted by prejudice and ignorance as representing, in the wrong practices it condemned, the real state of the India missions, affords to this day a much-used weapon against the Jesuits. At Rome it was received with reserve. Clement XI, who perhaps overrated the prudence of his zealous legate, ordered, in the Congregation of the Holy Office, on 7 January, 1706, a provisional confirmation of the decree to be sent to him, adding that it should be executed "until the Holy See might provide otherwise, after having heard those who might have something to object". And meanwhile, by an *oraculum vivæ vocis* granted to the procurator of the Madura mission, the pope declared the missionaries to be obliged to observe the decree, "in so far as the Divine glory and the salvation of souls would permit". The objections of the missionaries and the corrections they desired were propounded by several deputies and carefully examined at Rome, without effect, during the lifetime of Clement XI and during the short pontificate of his successor Innocent XIII. Benedict XIII grappled with the case and even came to a decision, enjoining "on the bishops and missionaries of Madura, Mysore, and the Karnatic" the execution of Tournon's decree in all its parts (12 December, 1727). Yet it is doubted whether that decision ever reached the mission, and Clement XII, who succeeded Benedict XIII, commanded the whole affair to be discussed anew. In four meetings held from 21 January to 6 September, 1733, the cardinals of the Holy Office gave their final conclusions upon all the articles of Tournon's decree, declaring how each of them ought to be executed, or restricted and mitigated. By a Brief dated 24 August, 1734, Clement XII sanctioned this resolution; moreover, on 13 May, 1739, he prescribed an oath, by which every missionary should bind himself to obeying and making the neophytes obey exactly the Brief of 24 August, 1734.

Many hard prescriptions of Tournon were mitigated by the regulation of 1734. As to the first article, condemning the omission of the use of saliva and breathing on the candidates for baptism, the missionaries, and the bishops of India with them, are rebuked for not having consulted the Holy See previously to that omission; yet, they are allowed to continue for ten years omitting these ceremonies, to which the Hindus felt so strangely loath. Other prohibitions or precepts of the legate are softened by the addition of a *Quantum fieri potest*, or even replaced by mere counsels or advices. In the sixth article, the *taly*, "with the image of the idol Pulleyar", is still interdicted, but the Congregation observes that "the missionaries say they never permitted wearing of such a *taly*". Now this observation seems pretty near to recognizing that possibly the prohibitions of the rather overzealous legate did not always hit upon existing abuses. And a similar conclusion might be drawn from several other articles, e. g. from the fifteenth, where we are told that the interdiction of wearing ashes and emblems after the manner of the heathen Hindus, ought to be kept, but in such a manner, it is added, "that the Constitution of Gregory XV of 31 January, 1623, 'Romanæ Senis Antistes', be observed throughout". By that Constitution, as we have already seen, some signs and ornaments, materially similar to those prohibited by Tournon, were allowed to the Christians, provided that no superstition whatever was mingled with their use. Indeed, as the Congregation of Propaganda explains in an Instruction sent to the Vicar Apostolic of Pondicherry, 15 February, 1792, "the Decree of Cardinal de Tournon and the Constitution of Gregory

XV agree in this way, that both absolutely forbid any sign bearing even the least semblance of superstition, but allow those which are in general use for the sake of adornment, of good manners, and bodily cleanness, without any respect to religion."

The most difficult point retained was the twelfth article, commanding the missionaries to administer the sacraments to the sick pariahs in their dwellings, publicly. Though submitting dutifully to all precepts of the Vicar of Christ, the Jesuits in Madura could not but feel distressed, at experiencing how the last, especially, made their apostolate difficult and even impossible amidst the upper classes of Hindus. At their request, Benedict XIV consented to try a new solution of the knotty problem, by forming a band of missionaries who should attend only to the care of the pariahs. This scheme became formal law through the Constitution "Omnium sollicitudinum", published 12 September, 1744. Except this point, the document confirmed again the whole regulation enacted by Clement XII in 1734. The arrangement sanctioned by Benedict XIV benefited greatly the lower classes of Hindu neophytes; whether it worked also to the advantage of the mission at large, is another question, about which the reports are less comforting. Be that as it may, after the suppression of the Society of Jesus (1773), the distinction between Brahmin and pariah missionaries became extinct with the Jesuit missionaries. Henceforth conversions in the higher castes were fewer and fewer, and nowadays the Christian Hindus, for the most part, belong to the lower and lowest classes. The Jesuit missionaries, when re-entering Madura in the year 1838, did not come with the dress of the Brahmin *saniassy*, like the founders of the mission; yet they pursued a design which Nobili had also in view, though he could not carry it out, as they opened their college of Negapatam, now at Trichinopoly. A wide breach has already been made into the wall of Brahminic reserve by that institution, where hundreds of Brahmins send their sons to be taught by the Catholic missionaries. Within recent years, about fifty of these young men have embraced the faith of their teachers, at the cost of rejection from their caste and even from their family; such examples are not lost on their countrymen, either of high or low caste.

BERTRAND, *La Mission du Maduré d'après des documents inédits* (4 vols., Paris, 1848–54); JUVENCIUS, *Historiæ Societatis Jesu Pars Quinta*, II (Rome, 1710), 493–509; CORDARA, *Historiæ Societatis Jesu Pars Sexta*, I (Rome, 1750), 165–169, 310–314; *Lettres édifiantes et curieuses écrites des Missions Etrangères par quelques Missionnaires de la Compagnie de Jésus*, 5th series (Paris, 1705), *Lettre du P. Martin, 1 June, 1700* (on Nobili etc.); 6th series (Paris, 1707), *Lettre du P. Mauduit, 1 Jan., 1702* (on the new mission of the Karnatic); PRAT, *Histoire du B. Jean de Britto* (Paris, 1853); SUAU, *Au Maduré: Brahmes et Pariahs* in *Etudes* (20 March, 1909), 853–862, this paper gives some extracts from the *Annual Letters* of the mission of Madura, 1643–46; constitution *Romanæ Sedis Antistes* in *Juris Pontificii de Propaganda Fide cura R. de Martinis*, I, t. I (Rome, 1888), 15–17; DE BACKER-SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibliothèque des écrivains de la Compagnie de Jésus*, V, 1779–1780, s. v. *Nobili*.

Constitution *Omnium sollicitudinum* of BENEDICT XIV, containing also the Decree of TOURNON and the decisions of CLEMENT XI, BENEDICT XIII, and CLEMENT XII in *Juris Pont. de Prop. F.*, pt. I, t. III, 116, and in *Collectanea S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide* (Rome, 1893), 714–734; see also in the latter collection the answers and instructions of the Propaganda on the same matter; LAINEZ, *Defensio Indicarum missionum; Madurensis nempe, Mayzurensis et Carnatensis, edita occasione Decreti ab Illmo Do Patriarcha Antiocheno D. Carolo Maylard de Tournon Visitatore Apostolico in Indiis Orientalibus* (Rome, 1707); BRANDOLINI, *Giustificazione del praticato sin' ora da' Religiosi della Compagnia di Giesù nelle Missioni del Madurey, Mayssur e Carnate* (Rome, 1724); LUCINO, *Ragioni proposte ed esaminate a favore del Decreto publicato dal Sigre Cardinale di Tournon, Commissario et Visitatore Apostolico con potestà di Legato a latere, in Puduscerì, li 4 Luglio, 1704, per le Missioni di Maduré, Mayssur e Carnate: su li fatti confessati dal Padre Laynez e dal Padre Brandolini della Compagnia di Giesù: esposte per commando della Congregazione particolare tenuta avanti l'Emo Sigre Cardinale Imperiali* (Rome, 1725); IDEM, *Esame e Difesa del Decreto pubblicato in Puduciery da Monsignor Carlo Tommaso di Tournon . . .* (Rome, 1728); [BRANDOLINI], *Risposta alle accuse date al praticato sin' ora da' Religiosi della Cia di Giesù, nelle Missioni del Madurey, Mayssur e Carnate, in due libri diversi dal Rmo P. Fra Luigi Maria Lucino,* etc. (Rome, 1729); [VILLERMAULES], *Anecdotes sur l'état de la religion dans la Chine. Contenant l' histoire des Superstitions des Malabares*, III (Paris, 1734), 1–17; *Décret de Mgr. de Tournon*, 18–33; *Explication du décret de M. le Card. de Tournon, par un missionnaire des Indes*, 34–155; *Extrait du livre intitulé: Examen et défense du Decret etc. par le I. R. P. Louis Maria Lucino.* The *Anecdotes*, a Jansenist work, is exceedingly biased against the Jesuits; and still more the would-be *Historic Memoirs* of CUREL PARISOT (*alias* ABBÉ PLATEL, sometime FATHER NORBERT, CAPUCHIN), which came out, under varying titles, first in one volume (Lucca, 1742), then in 2, 4, 8 volumes, in French and in Italian (Lucca, 1744, 1745, 1760), last in seven volumes (Lisbon, 1766); [PATOUILLET], *Lettres à M. l'Evêque de . . . . sur le livre du P. Norbert* (1745); Ital. tr. in *Raccolta d'Apologie sulla dottrina e condutta de'RR. PP. della Cia di Gesù*, t. VII (1760), ed. in fol., I, 19–50 (1762); PFÜLF in *Kirchenlexikon*, s. v. *Parisot;* KIRSCH, *Zur Geschichte der Censurierung des P. Norbert* in *Theologische Quartalschrift*, LXXXVI (Tübingen, 1904), 364–378; IDEM, *Papst Benedict XIV und seine Bullen bezüglich der chinesischen und malabarischen Gebräuche* in *Th. Quartsch.*, LXXXIII (Tübingen, 1901), 374–388. On the latest period: LAUNAY, *Histoire des missions de l'Inde, Pondichéry, Maïssour, Coïmbatour*, I (Paris, 1898); *Lettres édifiantes et curieuses de la nouvelle mission du Maduré*, edited by BERTRAND (Paris, 1865); COUBÉ, *Au pays des castes* (Paris, 1889–1901); SUAU, *L'Inde tamoule* (Paris, 1902); DAHLMANN, *Indische Fahrten*, II (Freiburg im Br., 1908), 326–350.

JOSEPH BRUCKER.

Malacca, DIOCESE OF (MALACENSIS), comprises the southern portions of the Malay Peninsula, otherwise known as the Straits Settlements. It includes Singapore Island, the Malacca territory proper, Province Wellesley and Penang Island, the Negri Sembilan, Selangor, Perak, Kedah, Pahang, Kelantan, and Trengganu districts—an area of about 400 miles north to south, and 200 east to west. Although outside India proper, the See of Malacca is suffragan to Pondicherry. The Catholic population is reckoned at about 28,000, out of a total of about 1,800,000. Both bishop and clergy, as in all the other dioceses of the Pondicherry province, belong to the Paris Society of Foreign Missions. The priests number forty-two, having charge of fifty-seven churches and chapels. Besides these there are five religious communities for men (Brothers of the Christian Schools), and seven for women (Dames de St-Maur.) The cathedral is at Singapore (Cathedral of the Good Shepherd). There is a college for the education of native clergy at Penang. The mission possesses 49 schools, in which 6660 children are educated.

HISTORY.—Malacca was erected by Paul IV into a diocese under the Portuguese Patronage in 1557, and so continued till 1838, when, by the Brief "Multa Præclare" jurisdiction was withdrawn from the see and transferred to the Vicariate Apostolic of Ava and Pegu (Burma). But the clergy of this vicariate being insufficient to cope with the work, the whole Malay Peninsula was in 1840 placed under the jurisdiction of the Vicar Apostolic of Siam, with a view to its erection into a separate vicariate. This was effected by the Brief "Universi Dominici Gregis" of 10 September, 1841. First called Western Siam, and then the Vicariate Apostolic of the Malay Peninsula, it was on 10 August, 1888, elevated into a diocese, the old See of Malacca being revived by Leo XIII, and by a subsequent decree made suffragan to Pondicherry. Rt. Rev. Edouard Gasnier, who had been vicar Apostolic from 1878, was appointed the first bishop. He was succeeded in 1896 by Rt. Rev. René Fée (1896–1904). The present bishop is Rt. Rev. Emil Barrilon.

Madras Catholic Directory (1909); LAUNAY, *Hist. générale de la Soc. des Missions-Etrangères* (3 vols., Paris, 1894); IDEM, *Atlas des Missions* (Paris).

ERNEST R. HULL.

Malachias (Hebrew *Mál'ākhî*), one of the twelve minor prophets.

I. PERSONAGE AND NAME.—It is the last book of the collection of the twelve Minor Prophets which is inscribed with the name of Malachias. As a result, the author has long been regarded as the last of the canonical prophets of the Old Testament. All that is known of him, however, is summed up in the tenor of his preaching and the approximate period of his minis-

try. The Jewish schools identified him quite early with the scribe Esdras. This identification, which is without historical value and is based according to St. Jerome on an interpretation given to Mal., ii, 7, was at first probably suggested by the tradition which beheld in Esdras the intermediary between the prophets and the "great synagogue", whose foundation was attributed to him and to which he was considered to have transmitted the deposit of doctrine handed down by the prophets (Pirqe Abhôth, I, 2). The position of intermediary fully belonged to Esdras on the hypothesis that he was the last of the prophets and the first member of the "great synagogue". The name Μαλαχίας figures at the head of the book in the Septuagint. The Alexandrine translator, however, did not understand Mal., i, 1, to contain the mention of the author's proper name; he translates the passage: "The word of the Lord by the hand of his Angel," so that he has evidently understood the Hebrew expression to be the common noun augmented by the suffix; he has, moreover, read *Mâl'ākhô* instead of *Mâl'ākhî*. We cannot say whether this reading and interpretation should not be considered as an effect of Jewish speculations concerning the identity of the author of the book with Esdras, or whether an interpretation of this kind was not at the foundation of the same speculation. However that may be, the interpretation of the Septuagint found an echo among the ancient Fathers and ecclesiastical writers, and even gave rise, especially among the disciples of Origen, to the strangest fancies.

A large number of modern authors likewise refuse to see in Mâl'ākhî the proper name of the author. They point out that in Mal., iii, 1, the Lord announces: "Behold I send my angel (*mâl'ākhî*) . . . ". According to them, it is from this passage that the name *Mâl'ākhî* was borrowed by a more recent author, who added the inscription to the book (i, 1). But, in the first place, this epithet Mâl'ākhî could not have the same value in i, 1, as in iii, 1, where it is the noun augmented by the suffix (*my* angel). For in i, 1, the Lord is spoken of in the third person, and one would expect the noun with the suffix of the third person, as in fact is given in the Septuagint (*his* angel). The messenger of the Lord is moreover announced in iii, 1, to arrive thereafter (cf. iv, 5; Hebrew text, iii, 23); consequently no one could have imagined that this same messenger was the author of the book. There would remain the hypothesis that Mâl'ākhî in i, 1, should be understood as a qualifying word signifying *angelicus*—i. e. he who was concerned with the angel, who prophesied on the subject of the angel (iii, 1). This explanation, however, is too far-fetched. It is at least more probable that Mâl'ākhî in i, 1, should be understood as the proper name of the author, or as a title borne historically by him and equivalent to a proper name. We are no doubt in presence of an abbreviation of the name *Mâl'ākhîyah*, that is "Messenger of Yah".

II. Contents of the Book.—The Book of Malachias in the Hebrew comprises three chapters. In the Greek Bible and in the Vulgate it contains four, chapter iii, 19 sqq., of the Hebrew forming a separate chapter. The book is divided into two parts, the first extending from i, 2, to ii, 16, and the second from ii, 17, to the end. In the first the prophet first inveighs against the priests guilty of prevarication in their discharge of the sacrificial ritual, by offering defective victims (i, 6–ii, 4), and in their office of doctors of the Law (ii, 5–9). He then accuses the people in general, condemning the intestine divisions, the mixed marriages between Jews and Gentiles (ii, 10–12), and the abuse of divorce (ii, 13–16). The second part contains a discourse full of promise. To a first complaint concerning the impunity which the wicked enjoy (ii, 17), Yahweh replies that the Lord and the angel of the New Testament are about to come for the purpose of purifying the sons of Levi and the entire nation (iii, 1–5); if the people are faithful to their obligations, especially with respect to the tithes, they will be loaded with Divine blessings (iii, 6–12). To a second complaint concerning the afflictions that fall to the lot of the just, while the wicked succeed in everything (iii, 13), Yahweh gives answer that on the day of his justice the good will take a glorious revenge (iii, 14 sqq.). The book closes with a double epilogue; the first recalls the remembrance of Moses, and the laws promulgated on Mount Horeb (iv, 4; Hebrew text, iii, 22); the second announces the coming of Elias before the day of Yahweh (iv, 5–6; Heb., iii, 23–24). The unity of the book taken as a whole is unquestionable; but many critics consider as the addition of another hand either both the epilogues or at least the second. There is indeed no connexion between these passages and what goes before, but from this consideration alone no certain conclusion can be drawn.

III. Date of Composition.—The opinion brought forward some time ago, that the book of Malachias was composed in the second century B. C., has received no support. Critics are practically agreed in dating the book from about the middle of the fifth century B. C. The text itself does not furnish any explicit information, but many indications are in favour of the assigned date: (a) in the first place the mention of the *Peha* (i. 8), as the political head of the people takes us back to the Persian period; the title of Peha was indeed that borne by the Persian governor especially at Jerusalem (Agg., i, 1; I Esd., v, 14; II Esd., v, 14–15); (b) the book was not composed during the first years that followed the return from the Babylonian captivity, because not only the Temple exists, but relaxation in the exercise of worship already prevails (Mal., i, 6 sqq.); (c) on the other hand it is hardly probable that the discourses of Malachias are of later date than Nehemias. In the great assembly which was held during the first sojourn of Nehemias at Jerusalem, among other engagements, the people had taken that of paying the tithes regularly (II Esd., x, 38), and history testifies that in this respect the adopted resolutions were faithfully carried out, although in the distribution of the tithes the Levites were unjustly treated (II Esd., xiii, 5, 10, 13). Now Malachias complains not of the injustice of which the Levites were the object, but of the negligence on the part of the people themselves in the payment of the tithes (iii, 10). Again, Malachias does not regard mixed marriages as contrary to a positive engagement, like that which was taken under the direction of Nehemias (II Esd., x, 30); he denounces them on account of their unhappy consequences and of the contempt which they imply for the Jewish nationality (Mal., ii, 11, 12); (d) it is not even during the sojourn of Nehemias at Jerusalem that Malachias wrote his book. Nehemias was Peha, and he greatly insists upon his disinterestedness in the exercise of his functions, contrary to the practices of his predecessors (II Esd., v, 14 sqq.); but Malachias gives us to understand that the Peha was severely exacting (i, 8); (e) the date of composition can only fall within some short time before the mission of Nehemias. The complaints and protestations to which this latter gives expression (II Esd., ii, 17; iv, 4 sq.; v, 6 sqq., etc.) are like an echo of those recorded by Malachias (iii, 14, 15). The misfortune that weighed so heavily upon the people in the days of Malachias (iii, 9 sqq.) were still felt during those of Nehemias (II Esd., v, 1 sqq.). Lastly and above all, the abuses condemned by Malachias, namely, the relaxation in religious worship, mixed marriages and the intestine divisions of which they were the cause (Mal., ii, 10–12; cf. II Esd., vi, 18), the negligence in paying the tithes, were precisely the principal objects of the reforms undertaken by Nehemias (II Esd., x, 31, 33, sqq., 38 sqq.). As the first mission of Nehemias falls in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes I (II Esd., ii, 1), that is in 445 B. C., it follows that the

composition of the Book of Malachias may be placed about 450 B. C.

IV. Importance of the Book.—The importance lies (1) in the data which the book furnishes for the study of certain problems of criticism concerning the Old Testament, and (2) in the doctrine it contains.

(1) For the study of the history of the Pentateuch, it is to be remarked that the Book of Malachias is directly connected with Deuteronomy, and not with any of those parts of the Pentateuch commonly designated under the name of priestly documents. Thus Mal., i, 8, where the prophet speaks of the animals unfit for sacrifice, brings to mind Deut., xv, 21, rather than Lev., xxii, 22 sq.; the passage in Mal., ii, 16, relating to divorce by reason of aversion, points to Deut., xxiv, 1. What is even more significant is that, in his manner of characterizing the Tribe of Levi and its relations with the priesthood, Malachias adopts the terminology of Deuteronomy; in speaking of the priests, he brings into evidence their origin not from Aaron but from Levi (ii, 4, 5 sqq.; iii, 3 sq.). Consequently, it would be an error to suppose that in this respect Deuteronomy represents a point of view which in the middle of the fifth century was no longer held. Let us add that the first of the two epilogues, with which the book concludes (iv, 4; Hebrew, text, iii, 32), is likewise conceived in the spirit of Deuteronomy.

The examination of the Book of Malachias may be brought to bear on the solution of the question as to whether the mission of Esdras, related in I Esd., vii–x, falls in the seventh year of Artaxerxes I (458 B. C.), that is to say, thirteen years before the first mission of Nehemias, or in the seventh year of Artaxerxes II (398 B. C.), and therefore after Nehemias. Immediately after his arrival in Jerusalem, Esdras undertakes a radical reform of the abuse of mixed marriages, which are already considered contrary to a positive prohibition (I Esd., x). He tells us also that, supported by the authority of the King of Persia and with the co-operation of the governors beyond the river, he laboured with full success to give to religious worship all its splendour (I Esd., vii, 14, 15, 17, 20—viii, 36). And nothing whatever justifies the belief that the work of Esdras had but an ephemeral success, for in that case he would not in his own memoirs have related it with so much emphasis without one word of regret for the failure of his effort. Can data such as these be reconciled with the supposition that the state of affairs described by Malachias was the immediate outcome of the work of Esdras related in I Esd., vii–x?

(2) In the doctrine of Malachias one notices with good reason as worthy of interest the attitude taken by the prophet on the subject of divorce (ii, 14–16). The passage in question is very obscure, but it appears in v. 16 that the prophet disapproves of the divorce tolerated by Deut., xxiv, 1, viz., for cause of aversion.

The Messianic doctrine of Malachias especially appeals to our attention. In Mal. iii, 1, Yahweh announces that he will send his messenger to prepare the way before Him. In the second epilogue of the book (iv, 5, 6; Heb., text, iii, 23 sq.), this messenger is identified with the prophet Elias. Many passages in the New Testament categorically interpret this double prophecy by applying it to John the Baptist, precursor of our Lord (Matt., xi, 10, 14; xvii, 11–12; Mark, ix, 10 sqq.; Luke, i, 17). The prophecy of Malachias, iii, 1, adds that, as soon as the messenger shall have prepared the way, "the Lord, whom you seek, and the Angel of the testament, whom you desire," will come to His temple. The Lord is here identified with the angel of the testament; this is evident from the construction of the phrase and from the circumstance that the description of the mission of the angel of the testament (vv. 2 sq.) is continued by the Lord speaking of Himself in the first person in v. 5.

A particularly famous passage is that of Mal., i, 10–11. In spite of a difficulty in the construction of the phrase, which can be avoided by vocalizing one word otherwise than the Massoretes have done (read *miqṭar*, Sept. *θυμίαμα*, instead of *muṭṭar* in v. 11), the literal sense is clear. The principal question is to know what is the sacrifice and pure offering spoken of in v. 11. A large number of non-Catholic exegetes interpret it of the sacrifices actually being offered from east to west at the time of Malachias himself. According to some, the prophet had in view the sacrifices offered in the name of Yahweh by the proselytes of the Jewish religion among all the nations of the earth; others are more inclined to the belief that he signifies the sacrifices offered by the Jews dispersed among the Gentiles. But in the fifth century B. C. neither the Jews dispersed among the Gentiles nor the proselytes were sufficiently numerous to justify the solemn utterances used by Malachias; the prophet clearly wants to insist on the universal diffusion of the sacrifice which he has in view. Hence others, following the example of Theodore of Mopsuestia, think they can explain the expression in v. 11 as referring to the sacrifices offered by the pagans to their own gods or to the Supreme God; those sacrifices would have been considered by Malachias as materially offered to Yahweh, because in fact Yahweh is the only true God. But it appears inconceivable that Yahweh should, by means of Malachias, have looked upon as "pure" and "offered to his name" the sacrifices offered by the Gentiles to this or that divinity; especially when one considers the great importance Malachias attaches to the ritual (i, 6 sqq., 12 sqq.; iii, 3 sq.) and the attitude he takes towards foreign peoples (i, 2 sqq.; ii, 11 sq.). The interpretation according to which chap. i, 11, concerns the sacrifices in vogue among the Gentiles at the epoch of Malachias himself fails to recognize that the sacrifice and the pure offering of v. 11 are looked upon as a new institution succeeding the sacrifices of the Temple, furnishing by their very nature a motive sufficient to close the doors of the house of God and extinguish the fire of the altar (v. 10). Consequently v. 11 must be considered as a Messianic prophecy. The universal diffusion of the worship of Yahweh is always proposed by the prophets as a characteristic sign of the Messianic reign. That the phrase is construed in the present tense only proves that here, as on other occasions, the prophetic vision contemplates its object absolutely without any regard to the events that should go before its accomplishment. It is true that Mal., iii, 3–4, says that after the coming of the angel of the testament the sons of Levi will offer sacrifices in justice, and that the sacrifice of Juda and Jerusalem will be pleasing to the Lord. But the new institutions of the Messianic reign might be considered, either inasmuch as they were the realization of the final stage in the development of those of the Old Testament (and in this case they would naturally be described by the help of the images borrowed from the latter), or inasmuch as they implied the cessation of those of the Old Testament in their proper form. In Mal., iii, 3–4, the religious institutions of the Messianic reign are considered from the former point of view, because the language is consolatory; in Mal., i, 10, 11, they are considered from the latter point of view, because the language here is menacing.

Certain authors, while admitting the Messianic character of the passage, think that it should be interpreted not of a sacrifice in the strict sense of the word, but of a purely spiritual form of devotion. However, the terms employed in v. 11 express the idea of a sacrifice in the strict sense. Moreover, according to the context, the censured sacrifices were not considered impure in their quality of material sacrifices, but on account of the defects with which the victims were affected; it is consequently not on account of an opposition to material sacrifices that the offering spoken of in v. 11 is called pure. It is an alto-

gether different question whether or not the text of Malachias alone permits one to determine in a certain measure the exact form of the new sacrifice. A large number of Catholic exegetes believe themselves justified in concluding, from the use of the term *minhah* in v. 11, that the prophet desired formally to signify an unbloody sacrifice. The writer of the present article finds it so much the more difficult to decide on this question, as the word *minhah* is several times employed by Malachias to signify sacrifice in the generic sense (i, 13; ii, 12, 13; iii, 3, 4, and, in all probability, i, 10). For the rest, the event has shown how the prophecy was to be realized. It is of the Eucharistic sacrifice that Christian antiquity has interpreted the passage of Malachias (cf. Council of Trent, Sess. XXII, 1).

TORREY, *The Prophecy of Malachi* in *Journal of Soc. for Biblical Lit.* (1898), pp. 1 sqq.; PEROWNE, *Book of Malachi* (Cambridge, 1896); REINKE, *Der Prophet Maleachi* (1856). Consult also Commentaries on the Minor Prophets by SMITH (1900); DRIVER (*Nahum-Malachi; Century Bible*); KNABENBAUER (1886); WELLHAUSEN (1898); NOWACK (1904); MARTI (1904); VAN HOONACKER (1908); also Introductions to the Old Testament. (See AGGEUS.)

A. VAN HOONACKER.

Malachy, SAINT, whose family name was O'Morgair, b. in Armagh in 1094. St. Bernard describes him as of noble birth. He was baptized Maelmhaedhoc (a name which has been Latinized as Malachy) and was trained under Imhar O'Hagan, subsequently Abbot of Armagh. After a long course of studies he was ordained priest by St. Cellach (Celsus) in 1119. In order to perfect himself in sacred liturgy and theology, he proceeded to Lismore, where he spent nearly two years under St. Malchus. He was then chosen Abbot of Bangor, in 1123. A year later, he was consecrated Bishop of Connor, and, in 1132, he was promoted to the primacy of Armagh. St. Bernard gives us many interesting anecdotes regarding St. Malachy, and highly praises his zeal for religion both in Connor and Armagh. In 1127 he paid a second visit to Lismore and acted for a time as confessor to Cormac MacCarthy, Prince of Desmond. While Bishop of Connor he continued to reside at Bangor, and when some of the native princes sacked Connor, he brought the Bangor monks to Iveragh, Co. Kerry, where they were welcomed by King Cormac. On the death of St. Celsus (who was buried at Lismore in 1129), St. Malachy was appointed Archbishop of Armagh, 1132, which dignity he accepted with great reluctance. Owing to intrigues, he was unable to take possession of his see for two years; even then he had to purchase the Bachal Isu (Staff of Jesus) from Niall, the usurping lay-primate.

During three years at Armagh, as St. Bernard writes, St. Malachy restored the discipline of the Church, grown lax during the intruded rule of a series of lay-abbots, and had the Roman Liturgy adopted. St. Bernard continues: "Having extirpated barbarism and re-established Christian morals, seeing all things tranquil he began to think of his own peace". He therefore resigned Armagh, in 1138, and returned to Connor, dividing the see into Down and Connor, retaining the former. He founded a priory of Austin Canons at Downpatrick, and was unceasing in his episcopal labours. Early in 1139 he journeyed to Rome, via Scotland, England, and France, visiting St. Bernard at Clairvaux. He petitioned Pope Innocent for palliums for the Sees of Armagh and Cashel, and was appointed legate for Ireland. On his return visit to Clairvaux he obtained five monks for a foundation in Ireland, under Christian, an Irishman, as superior: thus arose the great Abbey of Mellifont in 1142. St. Malachy set out on a second journey to Rome in 1148, but on arriving at Clairvaux he fell sick, and died in the arms of St. Bernard, on 2 November. Numerous miracles are recorded of him, and he was also endowed with the gift of prophecy. St. Malachy was canonized by Pope Clement (III), on 6 July, 1199, and his feast is celebrated on 3 November, in order not to clash with the Feast of All Souls.

An account of the relics of St. Malachy will be found in Migne, "Patrologiæ cursus completus", CLXXXV. For a discussion of the "prophecies" concerning the popes, known as "St. Malachy's Prophecies", the reader is referred to the article PROPHECIES.

O'HANLON, *Life of St. Malachy* (Dublin, 1854); LANIGAN, *Eccl. Hist. of Ireland* (Dublin, 1829); O'LAVERTY, *Life of St. Malachy* (Belfast, 1899); HEALY, *Ireland's Ancient Schools and Scholars* (4th ed., Dublin, 1902).

W. H. GRATTAN-FLOOD.

Malaga, DIOCESE OF (MALACITANA), Spain, by the Concordat of 1851 made a suffragan of Granada, having previously been dependent on Seville. Malaga was the Μάλακα of Strabo and Ptolemy and the *Malaca fœderatorum* of Pliny. It was important during the Carthaginian period, because a *municipium* under Roman rule, and under the Visigoths was made an episcopal see. The earliest known bishop was Patricius, consecrated about 290, and present at the Council of Eliberis. Hostegesis governed the see from 845 to 864. After the battle of Guadalete the city passed into the hands of the Arabs, and the bishopric was suppressed. Malaga then became for a time a possession of the Caliphate of Cordova. After the fall of the Omayyad dynasty, it became the capital of a distinct kingdom, dependent on Granada. In 1487 Ferdinand and Isabella besieged the city, which after a desperate resistance was compelled to surrender; and, with the Christian religion, the episcopal see was restored. The first bishop after the restoration was Pedro Diaz. The see was vacant from 1835 to 1848. The present incumbent is Bishop Juan Muñoz y Herrera, born at Antequera, in the Diocese of Malaga, 6 October, 1835.

The city of Malaga is the capital of the maritime province of the same name and, next to Barcelona, is the most important seaport on the Spanish Mediterranean coast. It lies at the southern base of the Axarqua hills, on the left bank of the Guadalmedina. The climate is mild and equable, the mean annual temperature being about 66° Fahrenheit. For its clear sky and broad expanse of bay the city has been compared to Naples. Since 1892 the harbour, which had been obstructed, has been cleared and improved, and from it are shipped the quantities of produce—grapes, oranges, almonds, oil, and wine—for which this district is famous. The cathedral, in the Græco-Roman style, stands on the site of an ancient Moorish mosque. It was begun in 1528 and completed in 1719. Since the Concordat of 1851 the Cathedral Chapter has numbered 20 canons and 11 beneficed clerics. There are in the diocese (1910) 520,000 Catholics, a few Protestants; 123 parishes, 481 priests, and 200 churches and chapels. The Augustinian Fathers have a college at Ronda; the Piarists are engaged in teaching at Archidona and the Brothers of St. John of God have schools at Antequera, at which place there is also a Capuchin monastery. In the town of Malaga there are convents for women, including Bernardines, Cistercians, Augustinians, Poor Clares, Carmelites, and Dominicans. The Little Sisters of the Poor maintain homes for the aged and infirm at Malaga, Antequera, and Ronda. BLANCHE M. KELLY.

Malagrida, GABRIEL, a Jesuit missionary to Brazil, b. 18 Sept., or 6 Dec., 1689, at Menaggio, in Italy, d. 21 Sept., 1761, at Lisbon. He entered the Jesuit order at Genoa in 1711. He set out from Lisbon in 1721 and arrived on the Island of Maranhão towards the end of the same year. Thence he proceeded to Brazil, where for twenty-eight years he underwent numerous hardships in the Christianization of the natives. In 1749 he was sent to Lisbon, where he was received with great honours by the aged King John V. In 1751 he re-

turned to Brazil, but was recalled to Lisbon in 1753 upon the request of the queen dowager, Marianna of Austria, mother of Joseph, who had succeeded to the Throne upon the death of his father John V.

The great influence which he exerted at the Court of Lisbon was a thorn in the side of Pombal, the prime minister. By intrigues and calumnies he induced the young king, Joseph I, to banish Malagrida to Setubal, Nov., 1756, and to remove all the Jesuits from the Court. An attempt upon the life of the royal chamberlain Teixeira, during which the king was accidentally wounded, was amplified by Pombal into a conspiracy headed by Malagrida and other Jesuits. Without proof, Malagrida was declared guilty of high treason but, being a priest, he could not be executed without the consent of the Inquisition. Meanwhile the officials of the Inquisition, who were friendly towards Malagrida, were replaced by tools of Pombal, who condemned him as a heretic and visionary, whereupon he was strangled at an *auto-da-fé*, and his body burnt. The accusation of heresy is based on two visionary treatises which he is said to have written while in prison. His authorship of these treatises has never been proved, and they contain such ridiculous statements that if he wrote them he must previously have lost his reason in the horrors of his two and a half years' imprisonment. That he was not guilty of any conspiracy against the king, is admitted even by the enemies of the Jesuits. A monument in his honour was erected in 1887 in the parochial church of Menaggio.

Mury, *Histoire de Gabriel Malagrida* (Paris, 1864: 2nd ed., Strasburg, 1899; German tr. Salzburg, 1890); *Un monumento al P. Malagrida* in *La Civiltà Cattolica*, IX, series XIII (Rome, 1888), 30–43, 414–430, 658–679: Sommervogel, *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus*, V (Brussels, 1894), 394–5; Butina, *Vida de Malagrida* (Barcelona, 1886).

Michael Ott.

Malalas, John. See John Malalas.

Malatesta, House of, an Italian family prominent in the history of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, famous alike in the poetry of Dante and in the annals of the early Renaissance. The founder of their power was Malatesta da Verrucchio (d. 1312), the leader of the Guelphs in Romagna, who in 1295 made himself master of Rimini by the slaughter of the chief members of the rival Ghibelline family, the Parcitati. Thenceforth the Malatesti ruled over a number of cities in Romagna and the March of Ancona, including Rimini until 1500, Pesaro until 1446, Fano, Cesena, Fossombrone, and Cervia, sometimes with papal investitures, sometimes merely by the sword. While many of the family were notorious for their crimes and cruelty, two were men of remarkable virtue: Carlo (d. 1429), a staunch supporter of the Church, who represented Gregory XII at the Council of Constance, and Galeotto Roberto (d. 1432), who became a Franciscan and shortened his life by his austerities.

Giovanni Malatesta (d. 1304), known, from his lameness, as Gianciotto, or Giovanni, lo Sciancato, was the eldest son of Malatesta da Verrucchio. From 1275 onwards he played an active part in the Romagnole wars and factions. He is chiefly famous for the domestic tragedy of 1285, recorded in the "Inferno" of Dante, when, having detected his wife, Francesca da Polenta, in adultery with his brother Paolo, he killed them both with his own hands. He captured Pesaro in 1294, and ruled it as podestà until his death.

Sigismondo Malatesta (b. 1417; d. 1468) was a son of Pandolfo di Galeotto Malatesta, the descendant of a half-brother of Gianciotto. On the abdication of his half-brother, Galeotto Roberto, in 1432, he succeeded to the lordship of Rimini, Fano, and Cesena, as papal vicar. From his childhood he was a skilful and daring soldier, and throughout his life was regarded as almost the first captain in Italy. An appalling picture of his character is given by Pope Pius II in his "Commentaries". He was undoubtedly one of the worst tyrants of the Renaissance, without fear of God or man. At the same time, he shared to a high degree in the Renaissance cult of art and letters, and many humanists and poets found shelter at his court. The wonderful temple of San Francesco at Rimini, the most pagan of all professedly Christian churches, was built for him by Leon Battista Alberti; Piero de' Franceschi painted him as kneeling before St. Sigismund, and Pisanello cast his portrait in a splendid medal which is a masterpiece of its kind. Sigismondo is accused of the murder of his two wives, Ginevra d'Este and Polissena Sforza. He afterwards married his mistress, the famous Isotta degli Atti, in whose honour he composed poems which are still extant. In 1465 he commanded the Venetian army in the unsuccessful campaign undertaken against the Turks in the Morea, and on this occasion he discovered the remains of Gemisthus Pletho (the Byzantine scholar who introduced Platonism into Italy), which he brought back with him to Rimini and solemnly enshrined in San Francesco. Pius II, who held him in peculiar abhorrence, partly because of his treachery towards Siena, had begun by degrees to deprive him of his dominions, and Paul II continued the same course until only Rimini itself remained. Infuriated at a demand to surrender Rimini also, Sigismondo went to Rome in 1468, with the intention of slaying the pope with his own hands. Either opportunity or resolution failed him. Paul seems to have pardoned him and even confirmed him in the possession of Rimini, but Sigismondo returned home a broken man, and died a few months later.

Roberto Malatesta (d. 1482), an illegitimate son of Sigismondo, possessed himself of Rimini by treachery on his father's death. He murdered his two half-brothers, the sons of Sigismondo by Isotta, and is said to have poisoned Isotta herself. In 1475 he was invested with the vicariate of Rimini by Sixtus IV. Roberto inherited his father's military talent, and recovered some of the territory that he had lost. His great achievement was the liberation of Rome by the victory of Campo Morto, 21 August, 1482, when, at the head of the Venetian and papal forces, he completely defeated the royal army of Naples under the command of Duke Alfonso of Calabria. He died of fever, while pursuing the campaign, in the following month. His son, Pandolfo, a cruel and contemptible tyrant, was expelled from Rimini by Cesare Borgia in 1500, and, after several brief restorations of the Malatesti, the city was finally incorporated into the Papal States in 1528.

Clementini, *Raccolto istorico della fondatione di Rimini, e dell' origine e vite de' Malatesti* (Rimini, 1617–1627); Tonini, *Della storia civile e sacra riminese*, vols. III-V (Rimini, 1862–1882); Yriarte, *Un Condottiere au XV^e Siècle* (Paris, 1882); Passerini, *Malatesta di Rimini* (supplement to Litta, *Famiglie celebri italiane*) (Milan, 1869–1870); Symonds, *Sketches and Studies in Italy and Greece*, II (London, 1898); Hutton, *Sigismondo Pandolfo Malatesta* (London, 1906).

Edmund G. Gardner.

Malchion of Antioch. See Paul of Samosata.

Malchus (Μάλχος), Greek form of Malluch (i. e. counsellor), a name common in the Semitic languages and of special interest as being that borne by the Jewish servant whose ear was struck off by St. Peter. The incident is described by all the Evangelists (Matt., xxvi, 51; Mark, xiv, 47; Luke, xxii, 50; John, xviii, 10), though St. John alone furnishes us the names of the servant and the disciple, and only St. Luke mentions the miraculous healing of the injury. According to the Fourth Gospel, Judas, accompanied by a band of soldiers and servants sent out by the high-priests and Pharisees, set out from the city to apprehend Jesus. After the meeting, when the soldiers were about to seize Jesus, St. Peter drew his sword and cut off the right ear of a servant of the high-priest. We may conclude that Malchus was in the van of the hostile party and showing particular zeal, for St. Peter would

hardly have singled him out without reason. Christ at once healed the wound and took occasion to teach His followers a lesson of peace. Later in the evening a servant, related to Malchus, wrung the second denial from St. Peter (John, xviii, 26–7). Since St. John alone gives the name of the servant, we may conclude that he himself was the disciple known to the high priest (John, xviii, 15). The silence of the other sacred writers with regard to Peter's identity may be ascribed to a motive of prudence, for at the time they wrote the Jews might have punished the disciple, had they known his name.

JOSEPH V. MOLLOY.

Maldonado (MALDONATUS), JUAN, theologian and exegete; b. in 1533 at Casas de Reina, in the district of Llerena, 66 leagues from Madrid; d. at Rome, 5 Jan., 1583. At the age of fourteen or fifteen he went to the University of Salamanca, where he studied Latin with two blind professors, who, however, were men of great erudition, Greek with Fernan Nuñez (el Pinciano), philosophy with Toledo (afterwards a cardinal), and theology with Padre Domingo Soto. He declared, as late as the year 1574, that he had forgotten nothing he had learned in grammar and philosophy. Having finished his course of three years in the latter of these two studies, Maldonado would have devoted himself to jurisprudence with a view to the exalted offices of the magistracy; but, persuaded by one of his fellow-students, though to the disgust of those upon whom he was dependent, he turned his attention to theology—a choice of which he never repented. Having studied the sacred sciences for four years, and passed through the examination and exercises of the doctorate, he taught philosophy, theology, and Greek for some time in the University of Salamanca. The register of the Salamanca College of the society states that he was admitted there in 1558 and sent to Rome to be received. He took the Jesuit habit in the Novitiate of San Andrea, 10 August, 1562, was ordained priest in the following year, and for some months heard cases of conscience in the Roman College.

The Collège de Clermont having been opened in Paris, Maldonado was sent thither in the autumn of 1563. In February, 1564, he commenced lecturing on Aristotle's "De Anima". From 1565 to 1569 he lectured in theology. His health beginning to fail, a year of rest followed, during which (1570) he gave missions in Poitou, where Calvinism was prevalent, and he was so successful that the people of Poitiers petitioned for a Jesuit College. From 1570 to 1576 he again lectured in theology, also delivering conferences to the court, by royal command, and effecting the conversion of various Protestant princes. At the instance of the Duc de Montpensier, he proceeded to Sedan, to convert the Duchess de Bouillon, the duke's daughter, who had become a Calvinist. He held, in her presence, some very notable disputations with Protestant preachers. During the absence of the provincial, he also acted for some months as vice-provincial, when his uprightness was vindicated in an action brought against him by the heirs of the President de Montbrun de Saint-André, and in the case of the novice Jannel, who entered the Society in opposition to his parents' wishes. The Parliament proclaimed his innocence.

In consequence of rivalries on the part of the professors of the university, the pope assigned him to teach theology at Toulouse, but this was prevented by the Calvinists, who blocked the roads leading thither, and he withdrew to Bourges to write his "Commentary on the Gospels". In 1578–79 he was visitor of the French Province of the Society, and then returned to continue his labours at Bourges. The province chose him, in 1580, as elector at the fourth general congregation, at Rome, where he delivered the opening discourse. Acquaviva, having been elected general, ordered him to remain at Rome, and Gregory XIII appointed him to the commission for revising the text of the Septuagint, to the excellence of which revision Maldonado largely contributed. In 1583, fifteen days before his death, when he had not yet completed his fiftieth year, he delivered to the general his unfinished commentaries. He was a man of eminent virtue, of subtle intellect, excellent memory, immense reading and erudition, and was consulted by the most illustrious personages of France, and sought after by the King of Poland for the good of his dominions. He has been accused, but upon insufficient grounds, of certain rash utterances and of inordinate attachment to his own opinions.

His Teaching.—Theology in Paris had fallen into decay through the prevalence of philosophical quibbles and barbarous Latin; this Maldonado remedied, giving due precedence to Scripture, the Fathers, tradition and the theologians, relegating the philosophers to the lowest place, and keeping useless questions within bounds; he spoke Latin elegantly, and drew up a scheme of theology more complete than that which had been in use, adapting it to the needs of the Church and of France. The lecture-room and, after it, the refectory were found to be too small; Maldonado therefore carried on his classes, when the weather permitted, in the college courtyard. Nobles, magistrates, doctors of the Sorbonne, college professors, prelates, religious, and even Huguenot preachers went to hear him, engaging their places in advance, and sometimes arriving three hours before the beginning of the lecture. Bishops and other great personages living away from Paris employed copyists to transmit his lectures to them.

In 1574 the university accused him of impugning the Immaculate Conception of Mary. This was untrue; he only held that the doctrine was not as yet an article of faith, but that one might properly take a vow to defend it; Mgr Goudy, Bishop of Paris, decided in his favour (January, 1575). Again, he was accused of teaching that the pains of purgatory last ten years at most. What he really taught was that the duration of those pains is unknown and it would be rash to attempt to determine it; however, he favoured the opinion of Soto, that in some cases purgatory did not last longer than ten years.

Being an excellent theologian, well grounded, at Salamanca, in Latin and Greek, having also learned Hebrew, Syriac, Chaldaic, and Arabic in Paris, and knowing all that was then known of ancient history, the Fathers, and the false interpretations of the heretics, Maldonado became, according to the opinion of Kuhn, superior to most exegetes of his time, and inferior to none. In Cornely's opinion, his "Commentaries on the Gospels" are the best ever published. He excelled, according to Simon, in explanation of the literal sense; according to Andrés, in his comprehension of the text and in gathering the aptest and truest sense, leaving no difficulty unexamined.

His Works.—"Commentarii in quatuor Evangelistas", early editions: Pont-a-Mousson, 2 vols., folio 1596–97 (Lyons, 1598, 1607, 1615); (Mainz, 1602, 1604); (Paris, 1617, 1621); (Brescia, 2 vols., 4°, 1598); (Venice, 1606); modern editions: (Mainz, 5 vols., 8°, 1840; 2 vols., 1853–63; id., 1874); (Barcelona, 10 vols., 1881–82); "Commentary on St. Matthew" in Migne, "Curs. Script." Maldonado's "Commentaries" have been translated by G. I. Davie (London, 1868). Five of the fathers at Pont-a-Mousson completed the "Commentaries", chief among them being Dupuy and Fronton le Duc who substituted, except where the text would not have corresponded with the exposition, the Clementine version for that of Plantin, which Maldonado had used. Until 1607 the editions agree with the first (Prat), which, according to Calmet, is rare, but is the best. The

other editions vary, and contain the Clementine text exclusively; that of Lyons (1615), with notes and indexes by Madur, came out uncorrected; the Mainz 1853 edition was adapted to actual necessities. "Commentarii in Prophetas IV (Jeremias, Baruch, Ezechiel, Daniel): Expositio Psalmi IX: Epistola de Collatione Sedanensi" (Lyons, 1609; Paris, 1610, etc.). "Ezechiel" is in Migne, "Curs. Script.", XIX, 654–1016, and since 1693 "Commentarii in præcipuos Sacræ Scripturæ libros V. T." have been added. "Disputationum ac controversiarum decisarum et circa septem Ecclesiæ Romanæ Sacramenta" (2 vols., Lyons, 1614). This work is incorrect and was placed on the Spanish Index in 1667; but not on the Roman Index. Dubois and Faure published a corrected edition in "Opera varia theologica" (3 vols., folio, Paris, 1677), together with "De libero arbitrio, gratia, peccato originali, providentia, justitia, justificatione"; a disputation "De Fide", the existence of which is doubted by Sommervogel; "De Cæremoniis Tractatus", I–CCX, in Vol. III of Zaccaria's "Biblioth. ritual." Simon gives extracts in "Lettres choisies". Apocryphal are: "Traicté des anges et demons", a translation of some of Maldonado's expositions collected by one of his pupils, and "Summula R. P. Maldonati", a compilation made by Martin Codognat, placed on the Index, 16 December, 1605. Manuscripts, exegetical and theological, attributed to Maldonado, are preserved in many libraries of France (especially the National), Switzerland, Italy, and Spain; many of them are copies made by his pupils.

PRAT, *Maldonat et l'Université de Paris au XVI^e siècle* (Paris, 1856); SALYGNI, *La Vie du P. Jean Maldonat* in *Apend. aux Mémoires du Père Broet* (Le Puy, 1885); NIEREMBERG, *Honor del Gran Patriarca S. Ignacio de Loyola* (Madrid, 1649), 453–55; HYVER, *Maldonat et les commencements de l'Université de Pont-a-Mousson* (Nancy, 1873); ALCAZAR, *Chrono-Historia de la Compañia de Jesús en la Provincia de Toledo*, II (Madrid, 1710), 42–45; BARRANTES, *Aparato Bibliográfico para la Historia de Extremadura* (Madrid, 1875), 460–468; ASTRAIN, *Historia de la Compañía de Jesús en la Asistencia de España*, II (Madrid, 1905), iv–xi; FOUQUERAY, *Histoire de la Compagnie de Jésus en France*, I (Paris, 1910), 572 etc.; HURTER, *Nomenclator literarius* (Innsbruck, 1892), 1–89; SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus*, V (Paris, 1894), col. 403–412; IX, col. 631; DIAZ Y PEREZ, *Diccionario de Extremeños Ilustres*, II (Madrid, 1884), 6.

A. PÉREZ GOYENA.

Malebranche, NICOLAS, philosopher and theologian, priest of the Oratory of St. Philip Neri; b. at Paris, 6 Aug., 1638; d. 13 Oct., 1715. He was the youngest child of Nicolas Malebranche, secretary to Louis XIII; being slightly deformed in person and of a weak constitution, he received his early education from a domestic tutor, until he was old enough to enter the course of philosophy at the Collège de La Marche, whence he passed to the Sorbonne for the study of theology. On the completion of his studies, declining a canonry at Notre-Dame, he joined the Paris house of the Oratory, 1660. There he was first engaged on ecclesiastical history, but neither his talents nor his taste lay in this direction, and on the recommendation of Richard Simon he turned to the study of Scripture, only to find this study equally uncongenial. A chance reading of Descartes' "Traité de l'homme ou de la formation du fœtus" determined his future career, and he became an enthusiastic Cartesian. He published "Recherche de la Vérité" in 1674, and his subsequent works represent developments or special aspects of the same doctrine.

Sensation and imagination, he maintains, are produced not by the objects but by God, and are intended to serve man's practical needs only, and not to reveal the nature of things, the essence of matter being extension and its only real property motion. The real nature of the external world must be found in ideas. Now in accordance with Descartes' divorce of mind and matter, matter cannot act on mind; and mind cannot produce its own ideas, for they are spiritual beings whose creation requires a greater power even than the creation of things material. Therefore we see all things in God. God Himself, he argues, sees all things in His own perfections, and He is so closely united to the soul by His Presence that He may be said to be the place of spirits, as space is the place of bodies. And so the mind may see in God all the works of God, supposing God willing to reveal them. That God should so will seems more in accord with His economy in nature, where He works by the most direct and simple methods. But the strongest proof of all, Malebranche finds in the idea we have of the Infinite; for it must be prior to the idea of the finite, and all particular ideas are participations of that general idea of the Infinite, just as God derives not His Being from creatures but all creatures have their subsistence from Him. Thus of all the things that come under our knowledge, we know none but God in Himself without the mediation of any idea: bodies and their properties are seen in God and by their ideas. As for our own soul, he adds, it is known only by consciousness, that is, by our sensations, so that, though we know the existence of our soul better than the existence of our body or of the things about us, we have not so perfect a knowledge of the nature of the soul. As for the souls of other men, we know them only by conjecture (Recherche, bk. III, pt. ii, cc. 1–8). It is obvious that Malebranche's occasionalism not only makes our certainty of the external world depend upon God's revelation; it suggests the objection that there is no purpose in a material universe which is out of all contact with human thought and volition. What is peculiar, however, to his system is its Ontologism, and its consequences; for God is made not only the immediate cause of our sensations, but also the "place of our ideas", and moreover our first idea is of the infinite. From this it would appear to follow that we see God's Essence, though Malebranche protested explicitly against this consequence. And, if, as Malebranche maintains, the essence of mind consists only in thought, as the essence of matter consists only in extension, there is at least a suggestion of the Pantheism which he so vigorously repudiated.

With regard to free-will also, the desire of Malebranche to emphasize the union of the soul with its Creator exposed him to many objections. The soul, he says, has the capacity of withholding its consent to a particular object, so that the intellect may recognize the lower as the higher good. But volition, according to him, being an effect of God's action on the soul, it was objected that God was thus the author of sin. To this Malebranche answered that sin was due to an intermission of activity; therefore sin is nothing and though God does all He is not the author of sin. This account of evil Malebranche utilizes to maintain a sort of Optimism in his account of creation. Finite creation as such would be unworthy of God; it is made a worthy object of God's will by the Incarnation; and as for the evil that is in creation, it is due to particular wills, and it does actually enhance the real good.

Antoine Arnauld was the first to attack Male-

branche's system, and he was supported by Bossuet who styled the system "*pulchra, nova, falsa*". Naturally a chief topic of discussion was the question of grace, though the Jansenist and the Oratorian both claimed the authority of St. Augustine. The discussion gradually became very bitter, and ended not altogether to the credit of Malebranche's orthodoxy, for it was Malebranche who had been on his defence, and his work had been censured at Rome. Among other opponents of Malebranche were Pierre Silvain Regis and Dom François Lamy, who attacked his explanation of pleasure and of good. His answer in "Traité de l'amour de Dieu" was well received in Rome and had the further good fortune of reconciling him with Bossuet. His "Entretiens d'un philosophe chrétien et d'un philosophe chinois sur l'existence de Dieu", in which he accused the Chinese of Atheism, drew from the Jesuits, Fr. Tournemine and Fr. Hardouin, a counter charge of Spinozism and Atheism against his own system. There can be little question of the novelty and dangerous character of his publications. But his own loyalty, his zeal, and piety are still less questionable. He led a simple and austere life, giving himself but little rest from his studies, and finding his chief relaxation in the company of little children. He was of an affable disposition, always ready to converse with the numerous visitors who called to see him. And during his lifetime his reputation as a thinker and writer was remarkably high. The following are his principal works:—"Recherche de la Vérité" (1674); two English versions; "Conversations chrétiennes" (1677); "Traité de la nature et de la grâce" (1680); "Méditations chrétiennes et métaphysiques" (1683); "Traité de morale" (1684); "Entretiens sur la métaphysique et sur la religion" (1687); "Traité de l'amour de Dieu" (1698); "Réponses" (to Arnauld), published together, 1709, etc; two editions of his works by Jules Simon, 2nd (1871) not complete.

BOUILLIER, *Hist. de la Philos. Cartésienne;* BLAMPIGNON, *Etude sur Malebranche d'après des documents manuscrits, suivie d'une correspondance inédite* (Paris, 1862); OLLÉ-LAPRUNE, *La Philosophie de Malebranche* (1870); JOLY, *Malebranche* in *Grands Philosophes series* (Paris, 1901); GAONACH, *La théorie des idées dans la philosophie de Malebranche* (Brest, 1908); CAIRD, *Essays on Literature and Philosophy* (New York, 1892).

JAMES BRIDGE.

Malediction (IN SCRIPTURE).—Four principal words are rendered *maledictio* in the Vulgate, "curse" in Douay Version: (1) ארר the most general term, used more often perhaps of men than of God. (2) קלל literally "to treat lightly", but also used in the sense of "cursing", whether of God, Deut., xxi, 23, or of men, Prov., xxvii, 14. It frequently expresses no more than "to revile", II Kings, xvi, 6–13; and so perhaps I Pet., ii, 23, in Sept. ἐπικαταράομαι. (3) אלה, "to curse", Deut., xxix, 19–20, more correctly "to take an oath", apparently from the root אלה and meaning "to call God to witness", Gen., xxvi, 28; Lev., v, 1; Deut., xxix, 13, also in the sense of "calling God down on any one", Job, xxxi, 30, hence in margin of R. V. "adjuration", in Sept. ἀρα, or ὅρκος. (4) חרם "to devote a thing", the thing may be devoted to God, Lev., xxvii, 28, or condemned to destruction, Deut., ii, 34. The Sept. seems from the MSS. to use ἀνάθημα of the thing devoted to God, but ἀνάθεμα of a thing doomed to destruction, cf. Luke, xxi, 5; and Thackeray, "Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek", p. 80. The accepted translation of חרם is "ban", signifying that something is interdicted and hence accursed, cf. Deut., vii, 26; Mal., iii, 24.

Amongst the Semitic peoples cursing was a religious act; and the Sinaitic legislation was rather of the nature of a purification of already existing usages than a newly-bestowed religion; as appears from the Code of Hammurabi. For the Semites the tribal deity was the protector of his people (III Kings, xx, 23, and cf. the Moabite Stone 11, 4, 5, 14), and to "curse" was but to call down his vengeance on their opponents. Again, the Hebrews were a chosen people, they were set apart, and in this seclusion lay their defence; hence at the conquest we find the cities and peoples of Chanaan declared to be חרם, or under a "ban"; their religion was to bring salvation to the world, so it required the highest sanction and needed to be hedged about with anathemas against all who infringed its regulation. Again, the curses of the O. T. must be interpreted in the light of the times, and those times were hard, the "lex talionis" was the rule not only in Palestine but in Babylonia as well, cf. the Code of Hammurabi, nos. 196, 197, 200. It was the special feature of the New Testament that it abolished this spirit of retaliation, Matt., v, 38–45; the abuse of cursing was, however, forbidden by the Old Law as well, Lev., xx, 9; Prov., xx, 20. At the same time there are passages where the use of curses is hard to explain. The so-called comminative psalms must always remain a difficulty; few would be now prepared to defend St. Augustine's view that they expressed not a desire but a real prescience of what would happen ("Contra Faustum", xvi, 22, and "Enarr. in Ps. cix."; see PSALMS). Similarly the curse of Eliseus on the little boys, IV Kings, ii. 23–24, is at first repellent to modern ears, but it is to be viewed "in speculo æternitatis", as St. Augustine says expressly (Enarr. in Ps. lxxxiii, 2, and in Ps. lxxxiv, 2). But though cursing plays a very prominent part in the Bible, we rarely find irrational curses in the mouths of Biblical characters. Nowhere do we find in the Bible curses on those who shall violate the tombs of the dead, such as we find everywhere in Egypt and Babylonia, or on the sarcophagus of Eshmunazar at Sidon.

We referred above to the חרם, or "anathema". This is the most important of the O. T. curses in its bearing on N. T. doctrines. The doctrine enshrined in this word lies at the root of S. Paul's expressions touching the Atonement, e. g. in Gal., iii, 10–14; and it is the precise meaning of the word "cherem" which enables him to treat of our redemption from sin as he does; cf. II Cor., v, 21. The same idea is manifested in the words of the Apocalypse, xxii, 3: "And there shall be no curse any more." Cf. also I Cor., xii, 3, and xvi, 22.

SCHÜRER, *A History of the Jewish People in the time of Jesus Christ*, II, ii, 61; GIRDLESTONE, *Synonyms of the O. T.* (London, 1871); ROBERTSON-SMITH, *Religion of the Semites* (Edinburgh, 1907), 180.

HUGH POPE.

Malherbe, FRANÇOIS, French poet, b. at Caen, Normandy, in 1555; d. at Paris, 16 October, 1628. He was the eldest son of François Malherbe, councillor of the inferior court of judicature at Caen, and of Louise de Valois. It was the elder Malherbe's wish that François should follow his profession and succeed him in his office, and with this end in view, he sent his son, after his early studies at Caen and Paris, to complete his education at the Universities of Basle and Heidelberg. But the natural bent of his mind was not towards the law, and when he was barely twenty François entered the service of Henri d'Angoulême, *grand prieur* of France and Governor of Provence. Malherbe's earliest experience in Provence was his infatuation for a young woman of the country, whose praises he sang under the name of Nérée; but on 1 October, 1581, he married Madeleine de Coriolis, and the union seems to have been a happy one. He remained ten years in Provence, becoming known through his "Larmes de St. Pierre", an imitation of Tansillo's verses and at best a puerile production. In 1586 Henri d'Angoulême was slain in a duel by Philip Altoviti, and Malherbe returned to Caen. He addressed an ode to Henry IV on the capture of Marseilles in 1596, and in 1600 presented to Maria de' Medici, who stopped at Aachen on her way to become the queen of Henry IV, verses which show his talent to have reached its maturity.

Du Perron about this time recommended Malherbe to the favour of the king, and when in 1605 he came to Paris, Henry had him remain near him. The Duke of Bellegarde received the poet into his household, settled on him a pension, and made it possible for him to live at Court. At this time began his acquaintance with Racan, who became his first disciple, and a little later he started his correspondence with Peiresc. Since his arrival at Court Malherbe had assumed the rôle of literary master and reformer. He made relentless war on the provincial expressions, neologisms, and defects of style in the prose writers and poets of the time. Hegatheredabout him a select body of followers, to whom his opinions were oracular, and he was pitiless in his criticism of whatever fell below his canons of taste. He himself henceforth wrote few verses, his most touching lines being on the tragic death of the king in 1610. His son's death in a duel in 1627 did much to bring about Malherbe's own end, which came in the following year, and he was buried in Saint-Germain-l'Auxerrois. Malherbe has been charged with having "slain lyricism" and the reproach has been made against him that his crusade produced only Maynard, but the French language and its literature are indebted to him for a service which could hardly have been rendered by a man of greater genius.

ALPHÉRAN, *Recherches biographiques sur Malherbe et sa famille* (1840); HIPPEAU, *Les écrivains normandes* (Caen, 1858); BRUNOT, *La doctrine de Malherbe* (Paris, 1890); ALLAIS, *Malherbe* (Paris, 1892).

BLANCHE M. KELLY.

Malines. See MECHLIN, DIOCESE OF.

Maliseet Indians, also MALECITE, MARESCHITE, and AMALECITE, the last being the official Canadian form, a tribe of Algonquian stock, occupying territory upon the lower St. John River, St. Croix River, and Passamaquoddy Bay, in western New Brunswick and northeastern Maine, and closely connected linguistically and historically with the Abnaki (Penobscot, etc.) of Maine. Their chief settlement was Medoctec, on the St. John, about ten miles below the present Woodstock, N. B. The name by which they are commonly known is of disputed origin, but may be derived, as claimed by one authority, from their Micmac name, meaning "broken talkers". To the French explorers they were known as Etchemin, also of uncertain origin and meaning. Those about the bay are usually distinguished as Passamaquoddies.

The acquaintance of the Maliseet with the French began probably even earlier than the voyage of Cartier in 1535, through the medium of the fishing fleets which frequented the coast. The St. John River was known to the French as early as 1558, but the tribe is first mentioned, under the name of Etchemin, in 1604, by Champlain, who entered the mouth of the river and was welcomed by the Indians with feasts and dances. They seem at this period to have been enemies to the Abnaki, who were afterward their closest allies. In the same year de Monts made a temporary settlement on an island in the bay and shortly afterward the French fort La Tour was built on the St. John. By this means the Maliseet obtained European goods and firearms, and formed a firm attachment for the French, on whose side they fought in all the later colonial wars. In 1646 they were at war with the Gaspesiens, a Micmac band about Cape Gaspé at the mouth of the St. Lawrence, but in general they were in alliance with the Micmac (q. v.) and Abnaki, and like them in deadly hostility with the Iroquois of New York.

The first mission teacher among the Maliseet was the Jesuit Pierre Biard, who visited them from his station among the Micmac in Nova Scotia in 1611–12. He estimated them at about 2500 souls.

In 1677–8 the Jesuit father Jean Morain established the mission of Bon Pasteur at Rivière du Loup, on the south bank of the lower St. Lawrence, P. Q., jointly for the Gaspesien Micmac and the Maliseet, who ranged over that territory. The former were already under missionary influence, but the latter, as yet uninstructed, were opposed to Christianity, and given to drunkenness, superstition, and polygamy. They were nomadic and depended entirely upon hunting and fishing. Their houses were light structures of poles covered with bark, and their beds were skins spread upon the ground. Until the nomad habit was to some extent overcome, the missionaries found it necessary to accompany their flock in its wanderings.

In 1688 the Recollect Fr. Siméon established a mission at Medoctec, which was soon after abandoned, probably in consequence of the outbreak of King William's war. About the same time others of the tribe attended the Abnaki mission at Sillery. In 1701 the Medoctec mission was re-established by the Jesuit Fr. Joseph Aubery, noted for his later work in Abnaki linguistics. Under his successors the tribe has long since been completely Christianized, being all consistent Catholics with a high reputation for morality and law-abiding qualities. Medoctec was finally abandoned about the year 1765. Except about 100 at Viger, P. Q., the Maliseet are all in New Brunswick, distributed upon small reserves, of which the most important is Tobique, with nearly 200 souls. The entire tribe, according to official report for 1909, numbers 843, with probably a few others in eastern Maine.

Jes. Rel., ed. THWAITES, especially I (*Lescarbot*), II and III (*Biard*), LX (*Morain*), LXI-LXVI; RAYMOND, *Old Medoctec Fort* in *N. B. Hist. Soc. Colls.*, I (1896), no. 2 (*Saint John*); *Annual Repts.* (*Canadian*) *Dept. Ind. Affs.* (Ottawa).

JAMES MOONEY.

Mallard, ERNEST-FRANÇOIS, French mineralogist, b. 4 February, 1833, at Châteauneuf-sur-Cher; d. 6 July, 1894, in Paris. From 1872 he was professor of mineralogy at the Ecole des Mines, from 1890 member of the Academy of Science. Mallard has accomplished much of importance in mineralogy by his untiring and successful research. Numerous scientific reports appeared year after year in the "Bulletin de la Société minéralogique de France" and in the "Annales des Mines", several also in the "Compt. Rend." By far the greater number of these discuss difficult problems in crystallography, especially the *physical* attributes of crystals. The so-called optical anomalies of some crystals he endeavoured to grasp clearly in their actual relationship and then to explain ingeniously by a hypothesis which supposes that the highly symmetrical form of these crystals is caused by a great number of smaller crystals with a smaller number of symmetrical planes, which are arranged in a certain manner. The best general explanation he advanced in his lecture "Crystallic Groupings" which appeared in the "Revue Scientifique" in 1887. His hypothesis found many defenders, and, of course, also many dissenters; especially his German colleagues drew him frequently into controversies. Equally known are Mallard's writings about isomorphism which he discovered in chlorates and nitrates, and about isomorphic mixtures, especially feldspars, the optical qualities of which he traced mathematically

from the proportions in which the components were mixed. His reports about different crystallographical instruments, as well as those regarding the production of thin sections of crystals for microscopic study, are important for the science of crystallography. His investigations of the combustion of explosive gas mixtures, of mine explosions, and the safety lamp, have great scientific but even greater practical value. Worth mentioning is his participation in the geological cartographing of France. His chief work is the voluminous "Treatise on Geometrical and Physical Crystallography" (Paris, 1879 and 1884); the third volume has never appeared. His religious opinions were expressed by himself during a lecture in 1872: "Man has been created in the image of the Lord and therefore he is capable of penetrating by the power of his reason into the plans and thoughts of the Creator of all things; that must be his highest ambition here below." These words contain Mallard's programme of life during the following two decades.

De Lapparent in *Annales des mines* (Paris, 1895).

M. Rompel.

Mallinckrodt, Hermann von, German parliamentarian; b. 5 Feb., 1821, at Minden, Westphalia; d. 26 May, 1874, at Berlin. His father, Detmar von Mallinckrodt, was vice-governor at Minden (1818–23) and also at Aachen (1823–29); and was an Evangelical, his highly accomplished and pious mother (*née* Bernhardine von Hartmann) was a Catholic, and the children followed her creed (see Mallinckrodt, Pauline von). Hermann von Mallinckrodt attended the gymnasium at Aachen and studied law at Berlin and Bonn. He became *auscultator* in the district court of Paderborn in 1841, *referendar* at Münster and Erfurt in 1844, and government assessor in 1849. As such he worked at Minden, Erfurt, Stralsund, and Frankfort-on-the-Oder. At Erfurt he was also for a time commissary to the first burgomaster, and in recognition of his services he received the freedom of the city. In 1859 he was appointed assistant in the Ministry of the Interior, and in 1860 was appointed government councillor at Düsseldorf. In 1867 he was sent to Merseburg against his will, and was pensioned off at his own request in 1872.

As early as 1852 the Westphalian constituency of Beckum-Ahaus had elected him to the Prussian House of Representatives, and he took part in the founding of the "Catholic Fraction" for the defence of the rights and liberties of the Church, which since 1859 has been called the Centre. When the House of Representatives was dissolved in 1863, owing to the debate on the military law, Mallinckrodt lost his mandate. In 1867, however, he was elected to the Constituent Diet of the North German Confederation, and in 1868 returned to the Prussian Lower House. In the North German Diet he was the leading member of the federal constitutional union. In 1867 he made a speech condemning the war against Austria (1866) and the annexation of Hanover and Hesse, and attacked the idea of substituting a single (federal) government for the confederation of states. From 1870 till his death he stood at the head of the new Centre Party, in both the Reichstag and the Prussian Landtag, that party gaining strength during the Kulturkampf (q. v.). He shared this leadership with the brothers Reichensperger and, after 1872, also with Ludwig Windthorst. Mallinckrodt was an unrivalled parliamentarian. "Never", to repeat the words of a colleague, "was so much force and dignity, energy and learning, strength of character and prudence, piety and vigour, united in one person as in Hermann von Mallinckrodt." Distinguished and dignified in appearance, as tactful as he was winning in society, clear in his thoughts, honourable in his dealings, of spotless life, and moreover a strong and highly cultivated mind, a mature and grave, though good-natured and friendly, character, and an orator who carried his audience with him by his force, lucidity, and fire—with all this he could not but be eminent in every sphere upon which he entered. Whatever he believed to be right, that he advocated with all his power; and he won the esteem of even his most determined opponents. Even Herr Falk, the Minister of Worship, with whom he had often enough been in conflict, called him "the most honourable member of the Centre Party, a man who had only lived and fought for his convictions." And the President of the Prussian Diet, von Bennigsen, also a vigorous antagonist, said: "In spite of his resolute party attitude, he succeeded in gaining and retaining not only the confidence of his political friends, but also the high regard of his political opponents." While he was always an energetic orator, willingly listened to, he rose to the height of his eloquence in the Kulturkampf. Mallinckrodt took the leading part in the defence of the Church, to which he entirely devoted himself. Windthorst's sparkling wit and Reichensperger's Ciceronian swing he had not. His speeches, on the other hand, are distinguished by a full command of the subject, lucidity of form, and strictly logical argument. Reichensperger said of him that in a parliamentary experience of forty years he had never known a parliamentarian as serious and conscientious in the preparation of his speeches as Mallinckrodt. The keen force of his words was lauded by his opponents. He spoke for the last time on 19 May, 1874, and concluded with the poetical words: *Per crucem ad lucem* (Through the cross to light). Death carried him away only a few days after. During all the years of his parliamentary career hardly a bill of leading importance had been debated without his taking a distinguished part in the debate.

A deeply religious man, whom his faith ever refined and ennobled, Mallinckrodt also led a truly Christian family life. His first wife, Elizabeth (*née* von Bernhard), bore him seven children, of whom two died young; his second wife, her half-sister, had but three months of married life with him, and when his children had grown up, she became a religious.

Pfülf, *Hermann v. Mallinckrodt* (Freiburg, 1892; 2nd ed., 1901); Mertens, *Die Totenklage um Hermann v. Mallinckrodt* (Paderborn, 1880) (with newspaper articles and obituaries).

Klemens Löffler.

Mallinckrodt, Pauline, a sister of the Catholic political leader Hermann Mallinckrodt (q. v.), and foundress of the Sisters of Christian Charity; b. at Minden, Westphalia, 3 June, 1817; d. at Paderborn, 30 April, 1881. Before she became a religious she had charge of an institution for the blind and an infant school at Paderborn. After the death of her father she went to Paris to induce Mother Barat (q. v.) to take the Paderborn institution for the blind under the care of her congregation. As, however, the Prussian Government would not permit a French congregation in Prussia, Pauline founded the Congregation of the Sisters of Christian Charity, 21 Aug., 1849, and became its first superioress. The congregation was approved by Pius IX, 21 Feb., 1863. It increased so rapidly that before the Kulturkampf, which temporarily annihilated it, it numbered 20 establishments and 250 members in various parts of Germany.

On 1 May, 1873, the first sisters of this congregation arrived in the United States and took charge of the school in St. Henry's Parish, New Orleans. On 7 June, Pauline herself arrived, and made preparations for the foundation of a mother-house at Wilkesbarre, Pa. She then returned to Europe and temporarily transferred the European mother-house to Mont Guibert near Brussels. In 1879 she went to South America, visiting her recent foundation in Chili. Thence she travelled by way of Panama to revisit the United States, where numerous houses of her institute had sprung up since 1873. (See Christian Charity, Sisters of.)

HUFFER, *Pauline von Mallinckrodt* (Münster, 1892; 2nd ed., 1902); KEITER, *Pauline von Mallinckrodt* (Einsiedeln, 1891).
MICHAEL OTT.

Mallory, STEPHEN RUSSELL, American statesman; b. in the Island of Trinidad, W. I., 1813; d. at Pensacola, Florida, United States, 9 Nov., 1873. He was educated at the Jesuit College at Springhill, Mobile, Alabama, then studied law, and was admitted to the Bar of the State of Florida in or about the year 1839. In the Seminole War (1835–42) he served as a volunteer through many arduous campaigns. After serving the State of Florida as probate judge and the United States as collector of customs at Key West, he was elected to the United States Senate from Florida in 1851, and re-elected in 1857. At the breaking out of the Civil War he followed the fortunes of his own state, resigning his seat in the Senate in 1861, and entering actively into the organization of the Southern Confederacy. President Jefferson Davis appointed him Secretary of the Navy of the Southern Confederacy (7 Feb., 1861), and Mallory found himself in the most responsible post of the naval department at the very moment when one of the most bloody wars in history was on the point of breaking out, without any naval stores or even a solitary vessel of war. He was obliged to create his navy literally out of the raw material. History records the success with which this desperate situation was handled (see also SEMMES, RAPHAEL). When the end came, in April, 1865, he accompanied Jefferson Davis in his flight from Richmond. He then went to La Grange, Georgia, where his family were residing, was arrested there (20 May, 1865), and was kept a prisoner for ten months in Fort Lafayette, on a small island in New York harbour. Released on parole in 1866, he returned to Pensacola, Florida, where he practised law until his death.

SEMMES, *Memoirs of Service Afloat during the War between the States* (Baltimore, 1689); *Rebellion Records* (Washington, D. C.); *The Freeman's Journal* (New York, Nov., 1873) files; *Encycl. Nat. Biog.* s. v.; *Appleton's Cyclop. of American Biography*, s. v.
THOMAS F. MEEHAN.

Mallus, a titular see of Cilicia Prima, suffragan of Tarsus. According to legend, Mallus was founded by the soothsayers Amphilochus and Mopsus, sons of Apollo. It was situated at the mouth of the Pyramus, on a hill opposite Magarsus which served as its port. It is to-day the place known as Kara Tash, in the vilayet of Adana. The district was called from it, Mallotis. Alexander built a bridge there and exempted the town from paying taxes. It allied itself with Tarsus against Antiochus IV Epiphanes, who had presented both cities to his concubine Antiochis (II Mach., iv, 30, 31). Numerous coins from Mallus have been preserved, and those of the third century bear the inscription *Mallus Colonia* or *Colonia Metropolis Mallus*. The city is mentioned by numerous ancient authors, and in the Middle Ages by Arabian, Armenian, and Italian writers. It must have disappeared with the Armenian kingdom of Cilicia. It figures in the various revisals of the Antiochene "Notitiæ Episcopatuum" as suffragan of Tarsus. Six bishops are recorded: Bematius, present at the Council of Antioch (377); Valentine, at Ephesus (431) and at Tarsus (434); Chrysippus at Chalcedon (451). Le Quien (Oriens Christianus, II, 883) confounds Mallus with another bishopric, Mallus or Malus, situated in Pisidia.

SMITH, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Geogr.*, s. v.; BEURLIER in VIGOUROUX, *Dict. de la Bible*, s. v. *Mallotes;* ALISHAN, *Sissouan* (Venice, 1899), 420 sq.; VAILHÉ in *Echos d'Orient*, X (1907), 90, 139, 363.
S. PÉTRIDÈS.

Malmesbury, a small decayed market town in Wiltshire, England, ninety-five miles west of London, formerly the seat of a mitred parliamentary abbey of Benedictine monks. It owed its origin to Maildubh or Maildulf, an Irish monk and teacher who settled in the place about the middle of the seventh century. Bladon as the British, Inglebourn as the English called it, was then a border settlement between the Welsh and English, and on the confines of the kingdoms of Wessex and Mercia. It was strongly placed on a high bluff almost surrounded by two small rivers, and an ancient stronghold or castle still further defended it. The school which Maildubh opened attracted many pupils, and chief amongst them Ældhelm or Aldhelm (q. v.), son of Kenten, and a near relation of King Ina of Wessex. Aldhelm was sent twice to Canterbury to study under St. Adrian the African, then abbot of the monastery of SS. Peter and Paul (afterwards St. Augustine's). Returning to Malmesbury between 671 and 675, he was placed in charge of the school, and appointed abbot of a monastery founded there by Lothair (Leutherius), Bishop of Dorchester. Under his rule the monastery greatly prospered. On the division of the Wessex Diocese, Aldhelm was made first Bishop of Sherborne, in Dorset, while Daniel, monk of Malmesbury, became Bishop of Winchester. The former retained the management of Malmesbury and the monasteries of Frome and Bradford-on-Avon, which he had founded. The house suffered under Edwy, who in 958 expelled the monks; sixteen years later they were restored by King Edgar (974). Edward the Confessor sanctioned a proposal of Bishop Herman of Wilton to transfer his see to Malmesbury; the monks and Earl Godwin opposed this, and Old Sarum was chosen instead. Like King Athelstan and other Saxon monarchs, so did William the Conqueror, John, Richard II, Henry IV, and Henry V befriend the house in later times.

Under John the place was attacked by Robert, a marauding soldier who had gained possession of Devizes Castle; he slew all the monks who failed to escape (1140). John bestowed on the abbey the site of Malmesbury Castle, which he pulled down to enlarge their enclosure, which covered forty-five acres. The town of Malmesbury was walled and had four gates, all now vanished. A preceptory of Knights of St. John of Jerusalem, three churches, and one or two nunneries, a mint, an important merchant's guild, and a large population marked the prosperity of the place. The abbey church was a vast and noble building with a western tower, and a central tower and spire seven yards higher than that of Salisbury Cathedral. Besides the above-named, the abbey was connected with other celebrated men: Pecthelm, first Bishop of Whithorn (Galloway); Ethelhard, Bishop of Winchester and Archbishop of Canterbury; Ælfric, Bishop of Crediton; John Scotus Erigena; Faricius of Arezzo, physician and monk, later Abbot of Abingdon; Oliver or Elmer, mechanician, astronomer, and aeronaut; an anonymous Greek monk who planted vineyards here; Godfrey, and one or two anonymous writers; and most famous of all, William Somerset, known as William of Malmesbury (d. about 1143), who ranks after Bede as the greatest of the English medieval historians. Of the abbots who ruled the house and its dependency, Pilton Priory, Devonshire, in the last four hundred years of its existence, few attained any special celebrity. On the whole they seem to have been good administrators and great builders. One or two came under censure from the English Benedictine general chapters for their negligence in sending the due proportion of their junior monks to the universities. The monastery, which had an annual revenue of £803, was surrendered in 1539 by its last abbot, Robert Selwyn, or Frampton, and twenty-one of the monks, who received pensions. Of the whole abbey only five bays of the nave are standing; the cloisters, etc., which were to the north of the church, have entirely disappeared.

DUGDALE, *Monasticon Anglicanum* (London, 1846); STEVENS, *History of the Ancient Abbeys* (London, 1722); REYNER, *Apostolatus Benedictinorum in Anglia* (Douai, 1626); MOFFAT, *History of the town of Malmesbury* (Tetbury, 1805); LEE in *Dict. Nat. Biog.* (London, 1900); BROWNE, *St. Ald-*

helm; His life and Times (London, 1903); WILDMAN, *Life of St. Ældhelm* (Sherborne, 1905).

GILBERT DOLAN.

Malmesbury, THE MONK OF, supposed author of a chronicle among the Cottonian MSS. in the British Museum (Vesp. D. IV. 73) which Tanner states to be only a copy of a part of the chronicle written by Alfred of Beverley in the twelfth century, but which, according to Sir Thomas Hardy, is almost entirely based on that of Geoffrey of Monmouth. It is a valueless compilation, describing English history from the Saxon invasion to the year 1129. From the fact that the MS. bears the name "Godfridus de Malmesbury", it was originally conjectured that it was written by Godfrey of Malmesbury, a native of Jumièges, who became Abbot of Malmesbury in 1081. As he founded the library of that abbey he was regarded as a man of literary tastes, but his authorship of the MS. was sufficiently disproved, apart from its identity with Alfred of Beverley, by the fact that his death took place in or before 1107, when Edulf became abbot. Probably the signature merely indicates previous ownership. It is said that a fifteenth-century Italian writer, Baptista Fulgosus, includes the work of "Gotfredus Anglus Historicus" among the authorities he had consulted.

TANNER, *Bibliotheca Brit.-Hibernica* (London, 1748); HARDY, *Catalogue of Documents illustrating British History*, I (London, 1862), 667; KINGSFORD in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, s. v. *Godfrey of Malmesbury.*

EDWIN BURTON.

Malo, SAINT. See MACHUTUS, SAINT.

Malone, WILLIAM, Jesuit missioner and writer; b., according to the best authorities, in 1585; d. at Seville, 1655. His father, Simon Malone, was a Dublin merchant, and his mother was Margaret Bexwick, a native of Manchester. William entered the Society of Jesus at Rome in 1606, and, after studying there and in Portugal, was sent as a missioner to Ireland in 1615. In 1635 he was summoned to Rome, where he was made rector of the Irish College, a post which he held for many years. He was again sent to Ireland in 1647 as superior of the Irish Mission of the Society. His term of office fell in most difficult times. In a letter dated from Waterford, 15 March, 1649, he says that the burden was heavier on his shoulders than Mount Etna, so that he could say with the Apostle that he was weary even of life. He was at Waterford when the town was taken by the Parliamentarians, and being captured he was banished. On reaching Seville his talents for government were again utilized, and he was made rector of the Jesuit College of St. Gregory in that city. Dr. Oliver says of Malone that during nearly a quarter of a century he rendered good service to the Irish Mission by his splendid talents, apostolic zeal, and extraordinary prudence. Dodd, in his "Church History of England", testifies that "he was a person of learning and conduct, and well esteemed not only by those of his own order, but by all others that had any knowledge of him".

As a writer he is well known from his controversy with Ussher, the famous Protestant Archbishop of Armagh. Malone himself tells us how the controversy arose. At the request of his friend, Sir Piers Crosby, not long after Malone had come to Ireland in 1615, he wrote a "Demand concerning the alteration of Faith and Religion in the Roman Church." Although both Dodd and Sommervogel put this paper down as one of his "Works", it was in reality nothing more than a thesis, proposition, or brief statement of the Catholic position in the religious controversy. It was hurriedly drawn up by Malone at the request of his Protestant friend, who said that he was convinced that it could be answered by Ussher, then Dean of Finglas. The thesis was printed both by Ussher, in his "Answer to a Challenge made by a Jesuit in Ireland", published in London, 1625, and also by Malone himself in his "Reply to Mr. James Ussher his Answere, wherein it is discovered how Answerlesse the said Mr. Ussher returneth. The uniform consent also of Antiquity is declared to stande for the Roman Religion: and the Answerer is convinced of vanity in challenging the Patronage of the Doctors of the Primitive Church for his Protestancy." Apparently this book was printed at Douai in 1627, and was dedicated to Charles I, King of England, in an "Epistle Dedicatory" which breathes a spirit of ardent patriotism and loyalty. The author protests against his thesis being called a "Challenge" by Ussher. It was nothing more than a brief statement of the well-known argument from prescription, and it was answered neither by Dr. Synge, nor by Dr. Hoyle, nor by Puttock, a Protestant minister at Navan, although all of them wrote against the book. It is the only work written by Malone, and has never been reprinted.

OLIVER, *Collections* (London, 1845); FOLEY, *Records of the English Province S. J.* (London, 1882), vii; USSHER, *Works* (Dublin, 1847); GILBERT in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, s. v.; SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus* (Paris, 1894).

T. SLATER.

Malory, SIR THOMAS.—Of Malory no single biographical statement is beyond conjecture save that he was a knight, that his "booke was ended in the 9th yeer of the reygne of King Edward the Fourth", and that it was not printed until 1485 when Caxton, the first of English printers, published it with an illuminating preface from his own hand. Upon an unsound derivation of Bale's, Malory was long considered a Welshman: a belief largely sustained through the gratification of identifying the birthplace of the romancer with the scenes of the Arthurian epic. It has remained for modern scholarship to advance the more probable conjecture that Malory was a gentleman of an ancient house of Warwickshire and that, as a young man, he served in France in the retinue of that estimable "Father of Courtesy", Richard Beauchamp, Earl of Warwick. (See "Who Was Sir Thomas Malory?" by G. S. Kittredge, in "Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature", V, Boston, 1897.) The obscurity of the author is in somewhat dramatic contrast to the unfailing clarity of appreciation which his "Morte Arthure" has aroused for the past four centuries. While the "Morte" is a compilation, or mosaic, of the French romances of Merlin, Lancelot and Tristan, and the English version of the "Morte Arthure" from Geoffrey of Monmouth, Malory succeeded in changing the episodical character of his material and its intuitions of varying racial points of view into unvarying ideals of conduct in epic conflict of fate, ideals that were to affect profoundly subsequent artistic conceptions, the poetry of Spenser, Milton, Tennyson, Arnold, Morris, and Swinburne, the painting of Rossetti, Watts, and Burne-Jones, and the lyric drama of Wagner.

In addition to being a permanent contribution to the content of artistic expression, the "Morte Arthure" lays claim to being the earliest production of English prose, the matter of Pecock and Fortescue having given as yet no hint that the prose of the vernacular could be fashioned into a medium of adequate literary expression. "Malory's prose is conscious without the jarring egoism of the younger prose; it adopts new words without the risk of pedantry and harshness; and it expresses the varying importance of the passages of the story in corresponding fluctuation in the intensity of its language."

For complete bibliography of editions and critical estimate, consult the *Cambridge History of English Literature*, vol. II; see also MORLEY, *English Writers*, vol. VI; KER, *Essay in Medieval Literature* (London, 1905); SMITH, *The Transition Period* (New York, 1900); SAINTSBURY, *Flourishing of Romance and Rise of Allegory* (London, 1897).

JARVIS KEILEY.

Malpighi, MARCELLO, founder of comparative physiology, b. at Crevalcore, 10 March, 1628; d. at Rome,

29 Sept., 1694. The year of his birth was that of the publication of Harvey's book on the circulation of the blood, a work which Malpighi was destined to complete by his observations on the capillaries. Brought up on the paternal farm, he became at the age of about seventeen a student at the University of Bologna. He devoted himself to philosophy, but during the last year of his undergraduate course his father, mother, and paternal grandmother died. As he was the eldest of the children, and the next three were girls, he had to leave the university to settle the financial affairs of the family. It was more than two years before he could resume his studies, and then he had to take up a profession that would enable him to help the family. In the medical school Malpighi attracted the attention of Professor Massari, who was not only a teacher but an investigator, and in 1653 obtained the degree of doctor in medicine and philosophy. The following year he married Francesca Massari, younger and favourite sister of his distinguished professor, who died the year after. Malpighi's independence of thought, and his refusal to follow Galen blindly, aroused opposition. Still, he was offered in 1656 the chair of medical practice at the university, and, towards the end of the same year, a special chair of theoretical medicine was created for him at the recently established University of Pisa. After three years' work at Pisa he returned to Bologna, and two years later was called to the University of Messina in Sicily. Here he remained four years, and, on his return to Bologna, was greeted as one of her greatest citizens.

GOVERNOR'S PALACE, VALETTA, MALTA

Everything that Malpighi had touched had meanwhile turned to science. He had used the microscope on human tissues with such good effect that one of the layers of the skin is still called the *rete Malpighi;* certain bodies in the spleen and in the kidneys are called by his name, and important discoveries in the liver are due to him. The first good comparative study of the liver, from the snail through the fishes, reptiles, and mammals up to man, is due to Malpighi, and he was the first to give an adequate description of the formation of the chick in the egg. One day he studied the jagged bark of a green branch, and found little vessels in the wood. His study of the capillary circulation in man gave him an interest in this, and the result was his book on the anatomy of plants, which was published by the Royal Society of England ("Anatome plantarum idea", London, 1675). The Royal Society suggested his study of silk-worms. This book is still consulted, though Malpighi had few aids for such minute anatomy at that time. When he was about sixty-four and at the height of his fame, Pope Innocent XII, who had been his personal friend, invited him to Rome as papal physician and professor of medicine in the Papal Medical School. He was held in high honour during his last years, and died there of apoplexy in the sixty-seventh year of his age.

Notizie Biografiche intorno a Marcello Malpighi, Raccolte dal Dr. Ercole Ferrario (Milan, 1860); JOURDAIN in *Biographie Medicale* (Paris, 1824); WALSH, *Malpighi* in *The Messenger* (New York, Aug., 1905); MCCALLUM in *Johns Hopkins Bulletin* (Aug., 1905). His scientific work is largely contained in *Opera* (London, 1696), issued at the expense of the Royal Society.

JAMES J. WALSH.

Malta.—The group of Maltese islands, including Malta (91½ sq. m.), Gozo (24¾ sq. m.), Comine (1 sq. m.) and a few inconsiderable islets, lies 58 miles south of Sicily and about 180 miles S.E. by E. of Cape Bon in Tunisia. Malta is the headquarters of the British Mediterranean fleet, and the principal coaling station in the Mediterranean. Owing to the prosperity consequent upon its important position, the island is able to support a population out of all proportion to its size. The estimated civil population of the islands was 205,059 on 1 April, 1906. If about 18,000 be added for the garrison and the Royal Navy, we reach a total of over 223,000. Without reckoning the fluctuating population of the harbours, the density of the population in Malta itself works out at over 2000 persons per sq. mile. Of the civil population over 99% are Catholics. In 1901 there were in the civil population 696 lunatics, 418 blind, 80 lepers, 211 lawyers, and 190 doctors. In the same year the secular clergy consisted of 698 priests and 251 clerics; the regular clergy of 249 priests, 151 clerics and novices, and 140 lay brothers. There were 470 religious women including novices and lay-sisters. In Malta and Gozo there are 27 religious houses of men and 36 convents and institutes of religious women. There are about 190 schools, in which some 20,000 persons are being educated. Besides the university (about 120 students), the Lyceum (400), and 79 government elementary schools, there are 53 other government schools, 2 seminaries (312), 22 schools under religious direction, the rest under the direction of private individuals. The overflow of the population is mainly to other Mediterranean ports. In 1901, 33,948 Maltese returned as residing in countries bordering on the Mediterranean. Of these, 15,208 were in Tunis and 6984 in Egypt.

The government consists of an Executive Council of eleven members besides the governor, who is usually a distinguished general, and of a Legislative Council consisting of ten official and eight elected members. All the judges and most of the other government officials are Maltese. Italian and English are the languages of the educated in Malta. Both are taught in every school but only a small percentage of the population speak either fluently. The revenue for the year 1903–04 was £464,590, of which £274,251 came from the customs. Under this latter head the duty on imported grain amounted to £97,210. In 1879 proposals were made to reduce the grain duty, which weighs heavily on the poorer classes. Strangely enough, both the people and their representatives stoutly opposed the reduction. There is no direct taxation in Malta and strictly speaking no public debt. The higher education at the university is paid for by public tax. In 1902–3 the total expenditure under this head was £3950, of which £3674 was paid out of the treasury. In 1904, 38,748 acres, i.e. 60½ sq. miles,

were under cultivation in the Maltese islands. Of these 6546 belonged to Government, 6682 to the Church and pious institutions, and 25,520 to private individuals. Wheat and barley, potatoes, cotton, and grapes form the chief produce of the land. The Maltese honey, from the superior quality of which the island was supposed to derive its name of Melita (i. e. Greek μέλι, gen. μέλιτος=honey), now lives mostly on its reputation. Agriculture in Malta has been starved by trade. A peculiarly national industry is the Maltese lace, chiefly made in Gozo.

Civil History.—There can be no doubt that, at a very early date, Malta was colonized by the Phœnicians. Numerous megalithic and other remains, as well as inscriptions, testify to this fact. It is even probable that the Phœnicians gave the island its name, which seems to be derived from the verb "malat" (Heb. מלט), "to take refuge" and to mean, therefore, "the place of refuge". It is often asserted that Malta, during the eighth century B. C., passed into the possession of the Greeks and was held by them for three centuries, but there is little evidence to support this view. It is clear, however, that the Carthaginians became masters of the island, probably in the fifth century B. C., at a time when the weaker Phœnician states united, for mutual protection, under the leadership of Carthage. It is certain, too, that Malta, about the time of the Second Punic war, though the precise date of its capture cannot be fixed (cf. Livy, xxi, 51), became a Roman possession and, after the destruction of the Roman power in the West, remained subject to the Byzantine Empire until 870. In that year the Arabs established themselves in the island where, it appears, they were, as in Sicily and elsewhere, welcomed as deliverers from the hated Byzantine yoke.

The principal and almost the only monument of the Arab dominion is said to be the Maltese language, which is Semitic and has much in common with Arabic. The weight of the best authority seems, however, to incline decidedly to the view that the present Maltese language is directly descended from the Phœnician with but little modification by the Arabic. The Arabs, in fact, seem to have left the Maltese very much to themselves and to have interfered with their language as little as they interfered with their religion and their popular customs. The account of the capture of Malta by the Normans, as given by Matateria, the secretary of Count Roger, does not, certainly, convey the idea that the Saracens were sufficiently numerous to offer any serious resistance to the invaders. If the Arab influence had prevailed so far as to make a complete change in the language of the islanders, this could only have been the sequel to a process of denationalization which had no counterpart in the neighbouring island of Sicily and which would have implied the presence of a strong army of occupation. History and philology alike point to the conclusion that the Maltese, in spite of powerful outside influences, are still, substantially, a Phœnician people. Count Roger of Sicily, who landed in Malta in 1090, was welcomed, it seems, not as a deliverer from an oppressive yoke, but because the islanders naturally preferred a Christian to a Mohammedan rule. The Norman domination established by him lasted about a century. It was probably during this period that the absence of a national literature, the need of employing foreign notaries, and other causes, forced the Maltese to adopt Sicilian as their written language. Later on, when the more fully developed Italian asserted itself in Sicily it naturally became the medium of legal and commercial transactions in Malta. Its influence on the spoken language was confined to the vocabulary, which contains a number of Italian words, the structure remaining unaltered. At least conjointly with Latin and other languages, Italian has remained the literary language of the island right down to our own times.

PORTE DES BOMBOS, VALETTA, MALTA

NEW OPERA HOUSE, VALETTA, MALTA

In 1199 Malta, along with Sicily, passed into the hands of the Swabian emperors, but, after the battle of Beneventum (1266) in which Charles of Anjou put an end to the Swabian rule in Apulia and Sicily, it remained for seventeen years in the possession of the French. In 1283, the year after the "Sicilian Vespers", the island, which had fared badly under the Swabians and worse still under the French, once more changed masters and became the property of King Peter III of Aragon. Under the Spanish rule, which lasted two centuries and a half, Malta made considerable progress in civilization. This was very largely owing to the influence of the religious orders, especially the Franciscans, Dominicans, and Augustinians, but partly also to the influx of foreign beneficiaries who, if they lived on the wealth of the land, made some return in the higher culture which they helped to diffuse. Early in 1523, the Knights of St. John, after the fall of Rhodes, left that island with the honours of war, and being unable, for nearly seven years, to find a lodgment that was convenient to all parties concerned, they were at length established in Malta, which was conferred upon them by the Emperor Charles V in the year 1530. The earlier period of their rule was the golden age of the history of the island, for during that time Malta was one of the chief bulwarks of Christendom against the power of the Turks. The successful defence of the island by the Grand Master La Vallette, in 1565, ranks as high as the Battle of Lepanto among the feats of Christian chivalry. The invaders, numbering over 40,000 men, must have considerably outnumbered the total population of the island which contained but 8500 men bearing arms, including the 592 members of the order. Yet such was the spirit which the brave islanders imbibed from their leaders

that they compelled the enemy to retire, with heavy loss, after a siege of nearly four months.

The decline of the Ottoman power meant the decay of the Order of St. John. By the end of the eighteenth century, so rife was the spirit of the Revolution, so powerful the clique of traitors among the Knights, and so great the disaffection of the people, that, when Napoleon Bonaparte appeared before Malta in June, 1798, he found that there was little left for him to do but to take quiet possession of the island. After a few days' sojourn, during which he drew up a new scheme of government and made French the national language, he departed on his fatal expedition to Egypt, carrying with him a great part of the loot which, to the value of £250,000, had been taken from the churches and palaces of Malta. Shortly after his departure the French garrison, cut off by Nelson's fleet from all chance of reinforcements, was shut up in Valetta by the Maltese who were aided, at the last, by English and Neapolitan troops, and was compelled to surrender in September, 1800, after a siege of two years. Immediately after this event the Maltese, who had no reason for desiring the return of the Knights and still less of falling into the power of France or Russia, offered to place the island under the protection of the British flag. The offer was accepted on the distinct understanding that their religion and institutions should be respected. The British sovereignty was confirmed at the treaty of Paris (1814). The population of Malta and Gozo was over 25,000 in 1535; over 40,000 in 1621; 54,463 in 1632, and 114,000 in 1798. Since this last date it has nearly doubled.

Auberge de Castile, Valetta, Malta

Ecclesiastical History.—The Church in Malta was founded by St. Paul, and St. Publius, whose name is mentioned in the Acts, was its first bishop. After ruling the Maltese Church for thirty-one years he was, we are told, transferred in A. D. 90 to the See of Athens, where he was martyred in 125. Though a complete list of bishops from the days of St. Paul to Constantine has been made out, its authenticity is more than doubtful. Still there seems no reason to suppose that, during the early days of persecution, the flock was long without a shepherd. In 451 there was an Acacius, Melitenus Episcopus, whose name is subscribed to the Acts of the Council of Chalcedon. In 501 Constantinus, Episcopus Melitenensis, was present at the Fifth General Council. In 588 Tucillus, Miletinæ civitatis episcopus, was deposed by St. Gregory, and his successor Trajan elected by the clergy and people of Malta in 599. The last bishop before the Saracen conquest was the Greek Manas. After the Council of Chalcedon in 868, he was unable to return to his see, which was being invaded by the Arabs, and not long after we find him in chains in a Saracen prison at Palermo. Of successors of his under the Arabs there are no records, though probably such were appointed. Hence, if probable breaks in the episcopate be no bar to their claim, the Maltese can boast of belonging to the only extant Apostolic see, with the single exception of Rome. Except under Charles of Anjou, who caused Maltese prelates to be appointed, the Bishop of Malta was commonly a Sicilian. There was one Maltese bishop under the Spaniards, one Maltese and one half Maltese under the Knights. Since 1808 all the bishops have been natives of the island. No Maltese was allowed to become a knight of St. John. This arrangement was made with the purpose, among others, of preventing the existence, within the order, of a faction supported by the native population. Ecclesiastical grades, however, were open to natives, and we find the names of three Maltese who were grand priors of the order.

The clergy in Malta have always been the natural leaders of the people. It was a priest, Gaetano Mannarino, who headed an abortive revolt against the government of the Knights in 1775. In 1788 Canon F. X. Caruana acquired a more enviable reputation by accepting the leadership of the people in their insurrection against the French invaders. It was he too who demanded the annexation of Malta to Great Britain. He became bishop in 1831. Since 1864 the island of Gozo has had its own bishop. Hence, with their two bishops and nearly a thousand priests, the Maltese islands are more plentifully provided with pastors than any other country in the world. The place occupied by religion in the life of the people is betokened not only by the large number of the secular clergy and of religious men and women, but also by the frequent festas and processions which stay the traffic of the streets, by the constant ringing of bells, and by the size and beauty of even the village churches. The church of the village of Musta boasts the third largest dome in the world. Canon law prevails in Malta as the law of the land. Hence mixed marriages are illegal unless performed by a Catholic priest. The large number of clerics in Malta is due, in some measure, to the smallness of the patrimony fixed as a condition for receiving the priesthood. The necessary minimum is £10. Equivalent to this is a benefice of £5 rental. In 1777 Pius VI, in order to lessen the excessive number of clerics in the island, raised the minimum patrimony from 45 Maltese ducats or scudi (abt. $19) to 80 (abt. $34).

The earlier history of Malta has still to be written, and the materials for it may yet be found among the Sicilian and other archives. The Maltese writers Abela (*Malta Illustrata*, 1647) and his successor Ciantar (*Malta Illustrata*, 1780) have been, until lately, the commonly accepted authorities. More critical work has been done recently by Caruana, *Sull' Origine della Lingua Maltese* (Malta, 1896). Other works are Mège, *Histoire de Malte* (Paris, 1841); Vassallo, *Storia di Malta* (Malta, 1854); Ferris, *Storia Ecclesiastica di Malta* (Malta, 1877); Panzavecchia, *Ultimo periodo della storia di Malta* (Malta, 1835); Porter, *Knights of St. John;* Azopardi, *Giornale della Presa di Malta* (Malta, 1836); Ransijat, *Assedio et Blocco di Malta.*

James Kendal.

Malta, Knights of. See Hospitallers of St. John of Jerusalem.

Malthusian Theory. See Population, Theories of.

Maltret or Maltrait, Claude, French Jesuit, b. at Puy, 3 Oct., 1621; d. at Toulouse, 3 Jan., 1674.

He entered the Society of Jesus, 12 Oct., 1637. On the completion of his studies, he was engaged for eleven years in teaching belles-lettres and rhetoric and became widely known as a classical scholar. He was then appointed to a professorship in Sacred Scripture, a position which he held for the next nine years. In 1662 he was made rector of the College of Montauban. In the following year he brought out his greatest and best-known work, an edition of the histories of Procopius, with a critical commentary. This work went through many editions, being edited and augmented with notes by other scholars, and was included in the "Synopsis Historiæ Byzantinæ", published at Venice. From 1672 to 1674 Father Maltret was rector of the novitiate of Toulouse. His principal works are the following: (1) "Procopii Cæsariensis Historiarum Libri VIII"; (2) "Procopii Cæsariensis Arcana Historia. Qui est liber nonus Historiarum". This is an edition, with critical notes, of the Latin translation of Procopius, made by Nicolaus Alemannus. In the preface of this work Father Maltret promised a translation, with comments, of a Greek poem by Paulus Silentiarius entitled: "Descriptio Ecclesiæ Sanctæ Sophiæ". This translation, however, was never published, and it is not known whether it was ever completed. (3) "Procopii Cæsariensis Historiarum sui temporis de bello Gothico libri quatuor".

There seems to be some doubt as to the correct spelling of Father Maltret's name. Sommervogel gives it as "Maltrait", while Hurter, in his "Nomenclator Litterarius", spells it "Maltres".

SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibliothèque de la C. de J.*; DE BACKER, *Bibliothèque des Ecrivains de la C. de J.*; HURTER, *Nomenclator.*

JAMES A. TAAFFE.

Malvenda, THOMAS, exegete and historical critic, b. at Játiva, Valencia, 1566; d. 7 May, 1628. He entered the Dominicans in his youth; at the age of thirty-five he seems to have already taught philosophy and theology. His criticisms on the "Annales" of Baronius, embodied in a letter to the author (1600), discovered so much ability that Baronius used his influence to have Malvenda summoned to Rome. Here he was of material assistance as a critical adviser to the cardinal, while also employed in revising the Dominican Breviary, annotating Brasichelli's "Index Expurgatorius", and writing certain annals of the order. These last were published against his wishes and without his revision. To this period also belong his "De Antichristo libri XI" (Rome, 1604), and "De paradiso voluptatis" (Rome, 1605).

Returning to Spain in 1608, Malvenda undertook a new version of the Old Testament in Latin, with commentaries. This he had carried as far as Ezech., xvi, 16, when he died. It gives the closest possible rendering into Latin of every word in the original; but many of the Latin words employed are intelligible only through equivalents supplied in the margin. The work was published at Lyons in 1650 as "Commentaria in S. Scripturam, una cum nova de verbo in verbum ex hebræo translatione" etc.

HURTER, *Nomenclator.*

E. MACPHERSON.

Malvern, Worcestershire, England, a district covered by a lofty range between the Severn and Wye, known as the Malvern Hills. On its eastern side were formerly two houses of Benedictine monks, the priories of Great and Little Malvern.

(1) GREAT MALVERN began soon after the death of St. Werstan, a monk of Deerhurst, who, flying from the Danes and taking refuge in the woods of Malvern, was there slain, and afterwards honoured as a saint. A hermitage was established there before the Norman Conquest; one Aldwyn, who had been made a monk at the cathedral priory of Worcester by St. Wulstan, bishop of that see, and a companion called Guy, were apparently the first to settle here. Aldwyn, by St. Wulstan's advice, gave up his contemplated pilgrimage to Jerusalem and began a monastery at Malvern, the saint promising him that the place would be wonderfully favoured by God. A convent of thirty monks gathered there under Aldwyn's direction (1135); the usual number was twenty-six (and thirty poor men), and four at the dependent cell, Avecot Priory, Warwickshire, established by William Burdet in 1159. Aldwyn was succeeded by Walcher, a Lorrainer, a man celebrated as an astronomer, divine, and philosopher. He was probably one of those sent by Abbot Gilbert of Westminster to establish a regular community at Malvern on land previously given for the purpose by Urso D'Abitot and Edward the Confessor. William the Conqueror confirmed these grants and was himself a benefactor, as also was Henry I. This connexion with Westminster led later on to a famous and protracted conflict between the bishops of Worcester and the Abbot of Westminster. For a long time the bishop's right of visitation over Great Malvern had been unquestioned; on the election however of a prior John in 1242, the abbot opposed the bishop's action in confirming and installing the new superior. Under his successor, William de Ledbury, matters came to a head. Ledbury was accused of serious crimes by some of his monks and was promptly deposed by Bishop Godfrey Giffard. On this the monks chose instead the bishop's nephew, William de Wykewan, prior of Avecot. Wykewan proceeded to Shrewsbury, where the Abbot of Westminster was then on a visit, for confirmation in his new office. The abbot arrested him and his followers and sent them in chains to Westminster. The bishop retaliated by suspending and excommunicating Ledbury and his adherents, and the whole countryside was made to feel the inconveniences of a disputed jurisdiction. Westminster claimed exemption by papal grant for itself and all its dependencies, and in this was supported by the king; the bishop was supported by the Archbishop of Canterbury, and to some extent by other bishops.

An appeal to the Holy See led to fuller enquiry, and for some time things went as the bishop wished; but his harsh dealing with the monks went so far that they, the unfortunate victims of all this litigation, were taken under the king's protection. Finally an end was put to a long and intricate process, wherein all powers and parties in Church and State were involved, by a truce agreed to at Acton Burnell. Ledbury was reinstated and then deposed by his abbot; the monks gave the bishop the manor of Knightwick, and he on his part released them absolutely from his own jurisdiction, "in accordance with privileges heretofore granted by divers Roman pontiffs". The episcopal jurisdiction was retained only over their parish churches. Peace was arrived at, and all was amicably settled in 1314, when Bishop Walter Maydeston gave the monks the church of Powyke to reimburse them for all their losses, and confirmed the grant to them of that of Langley, for the maintenance of the great charity shown by them to the poor and pilgrims. A long period of prosperity followed. The church was magnificently rebuilt (c. 1460); it is cruciform with a central tower—Sir Reginald Bray, designer of Henry VII's chapel, Westminster, is believed to have been the architect. It is 171 feet long, 63 wide and high. Its stained glass is famous, as are its ancient tiles, made at the priory. Both are memorials of many royal and noble benefactors. The church, St. Mary's, was purchased by Richard Berdes and others at the dissolution, and the old parish church (St. Thomas the Apostle) has now disappeared. The priory rental was £308 (Dugdale) or £375 (Speed). Latimer pleaded in vain for the preservation of the monastery as a refuge for learned and studious men.

(2) LITTLE MALVERN PRIORY (Our Lady and St. Giles), three miles south of the former, was a small monastery founded from Worcester cathedral about 1171. The choir and tower of its church alone remain;

portions of the monastery are incorporated in The Court, an old Catholic mansion, the seat of the Beringtons.

DUGDALE, *Monasticon Anglicanum* (London, 1846); THOMAS, *Antiquitates Prioratus Majoris Malverniæ* (London, 1725); PARSONS, *Hist. of the Priory of Little Malvern* (London, s. d.); NOAKE, *Guide to Worcestershire* (London, 1868); GASQUET, *Henry VIII and the English Monasteries* (London, 1889).

GILBERT DOLAN.

Mamachi, THOMAS MARIA, Dominican theologian and historian, b. at Chios in the Archipelago, 4 December, 1713; d. at Corneto, near Montefiascone, Italy, 7 June, 1792. At the age of sixteen he entered the convent of Chios and passed later to St. Mark's at Florence and the Minerva at Rome. In 1740 he was appointed professor of physics in the Sapienza, and in 1743 taught philosophy at the Propaganda. His residence at Florence and Rome brought him into contact with brilliant men of his order, e. g. Orsi, Divelli, and Concina, and greatly facilitated his progress in his studies. He collaborated with Orsi in his "De Romani pontificis in synodos œcumenicas et earum canones potestate". Soon Benedict XIV appointed him prefect of the Casanatensian Library, master of theology and consultor of the Congregation of the Index. Owing to his office he had to take part in the controversy between the Appellants (Jansenists) and the Jesuits, and displayed an impartiality which greatly increased the difficulties of his anxious and laborious position. He engaged in lively theological controversies with Mansi and Cadonici. He had, likewise, to intervene in the controversy concerning the beatification of Blessed Palafox. In a published writing on this question, he dealt severely with the Jesuit party who opposed the beatification; but he was not less energetic in dealing with their opponents, the Appellants and the Jansenist Church of Utrecht. He was director of the ecclesiastical journal of Rome (1742–85), and established at his residence a reunion of the learned Roman society.

Mamachi was a zealous supporter of the power of the Roman Pontiff. Involved in all the controversies of the day, he was one of the first to take issue with Febronius. Pius VI made him secretary of the Index (1779) and afterwards Master of the Sacred Palace, and frequently availed himself of his advice and of his pen. Mamachi's great work was to have been his "Christian Antiquities", but his labours in the field of dogma and jurisprudence absorbed so much of his time that he published only four of the twenty books that he had planned. Moreover, he lived in an age when the good method inaugurated by Bosio had been abandoned, and, considered as an archæological work, the synthesis which he had projected is valueless. A second edition, however, appeared in 1842–1851. His chief writings are: "De ratione temporum Athanasiorum deque aliquot synodis IV sæculo celebratis" (Florence, 1748); "Originum et antiquitatum christianarum libri XX" (4 vols., Rome, 1749–55); "Dei costumi dei primitivi cristiani" (3 vols., Rome, 1753 sqq.); "Epistolæ ad Justinum Febronium de ratione regendæ christianæ reipublicæ (2 vols., Rome, 1776–77).

HURTER, *Nomenclator;* HEFELE in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.

R. MAERE.

Mame, ALFRED-HENRI-AMAND, printer and publisher, b. at Tours, 17 Aug., 1811; d. at Tours, 12 April, 1893.

The founder of the Mame firm, Charles Mame, printed two newspapers at Angers in the last quarter of the eighteenth century; General Hoche had at one time hoped to marry his daughter. His eldest son, bookseller and publisher in Paris, under the First Empire, edited Chateaubriand's famous opuscule, "Buonaparte et les Bourbons", also Madame de Staël's works; and the persecutions directed against these books by the Napoleonic police caused the financial ruin of the editor. But the third son, Amand Mame, came to Tours and founded there a firm which, under the management of Alfred Mame, son of Amand, was destined to become very important. After having edited, together with his cousin Ernest Mame, from 1833 to 1845, some classics and a few devotional books, Alfred conceived and carried out, for the first time, the idea of uniting in the same publishing house, a certain number of workshops, grouping all the industries connected with the making of books: printing, binding, selling, and forwarding. By analogy with the great iron works of Le Creusot, the Mame firm has been called the literary "Creusot". Mame was also one of the principal owners of the paper-mills of La Haye-Descartes; and it could thus be said that a book, from the time when the rags are transformed into paper up to the moment when the final binding is put on, passed through a succession of workers, all of whom were connected with Mame. Daily, as early as 1855, this interesting and enterprising publishing-house brought out from three to four thousand kilograms of books; it employed seven hundred workers within and from four hundred to five hundred outside. While it put into circulation numberless books of devotion, it was also publishing the "Bibliothèque de la jeunesse chrétienne", a rich series of books destined for prize distributions, the religious tone of which was guaranteed by an express approval given by the Archbishop of Tours. On the other hand, the Alfred Mame Press issued splendid publications: "La Touraine", exhibited at the Universal Exhibition of 1855, which was in its day the finest of illustrated books; the "Bible" with illustrations from Gustave Doré; Vétault's "Charlemagne"; Wallon's "St. Louis"; the authoritative collection of "Chefs d'œuvres de la langue française". Quantin, the publisher, calculated that, in 1883, the Mame publishing-house issued yearly six million volumes, of which three million were bound.

Inspired by the social Catholic ideal, Alfred Mame established for his employees a pension fund which allowed an income of six hundred francs to those over sixty years, and this fund was wholly maintained by the head of the firm. He opened schools for the labouring classes, which caused him to receive one of the ten thousand franc awards reserved for the "établissements modèles où régnaient au plus haut degré l'harmonie sociale et le bien-être des ouvriers". During the Vatican Council at Rome, Bishop Ketteler, meeting Alfred Mame at Spithoever's library, interviewed him earnestly on his philanthropic efforts for the benefit of the working-men of Tours. In 1874 Mame organized a system by which his working-men shared in the profits of the firm. His dying words were recalled by Cardinal Meignan, Archbishop of Tours, in his funeral oration: "My consolation is that I never published a single line that might grieve religion and virtue." At one time he tried but unsuccessfully to enter political life; at the election of 14 Oct., 1877, he presented himself in the first district of Tours as candidate for the Chamber of Deputies, on the conservative side, against Belle, the republican deputy who had founded in Tours the first lay school for girls. Mame was defeated, having 7456 votes, against 12,006 obtained by Belle.

PAUL MAME (1833–1903), a son of Alfred, was the head of the firm until 1900.

MEIGNAN, *Discours aux funérailles de M. Alfred Mame* (Tours, 1893); QUANTIN, *M. Alfred Mame et la Maison Mame* (Paris, 1883); *Paul Mame, 1833–1903* (Tours, 1903).

GEORGES GOYAU.

Mameluco (from the Arabic, *memluk*, "slave", the household cavalry of the former sultans of Egypt, recruited chiefly from the children of Christian slaves), the general term applied in South America to designate the mixed European-Indian race, and more specifically applied in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries to the organized bands of Portuguese slave-hunters who desolated the vast interior of South



CHAPEL OF ST. PETER IN CARCERE, MAMERTINE PRISON, ROME

America from the Atlantic to the slopes of the Andes, and from the Paraguay to the Orinoco. The enslavement of the Indians by the conquerors began almost with the discovery of America, being recommended and put in practice by Columbus himself as early as 1493, occasioning his first serious rebuke by Isabella. In 1511 the Dominicans throughout Hispaniola (Haiti) publicly preached against it, and sent one of their number to Spain to protest against it at court; their actions resulted in a royal edict against the abuse, and the official appointment of the celebrated Dominican father, and later bishop, Bartolome de Las Casas, as "Protector of the Indians". In 1531 Paul III issued a Bull restoring liberty to all enslaved Indians. In 1543, largely through the effort of Las Casas, the Spanish Government published a code of new laws for the government of the Indians, limiting the existing power of holding slaves, and prohibiting all future enslavement of Indians. The law applied only to the native Indians, not to negroes. It served as a check upon the worst abuses and was carried out strictly wherever the watchful eye of the viceroy could reach, but elsewhere it was treated with contempt.

The Portuguese who colonized Brazil in the sixteenth century were already the professional slave-dealers of Europe, and their settlements along the coast soon became a rendezvous for a lawless class of slavers, pirates, and other desperadoes. Intermarrying with the women of the wild tribes, they produced the mixed breed of Mamelucos, which combined the courage and persistence of the white race, and the woodcraft and linguistic faculty of the Indian, with a cruelty untempered by any restraining influence whatever. São Paulo on the South Brazilian coast, and Pará at the mouth of the Amazon became their two great headquarters, from which, beginning about 1560, for a period of nearly two centuries, regular armies of slave-hunters, sometimes a thousand strong, fully armed and equipped with horses, guns, and blood-hounds, set out periodically, year after year, to slaughter and capture the helpless natives. In this work they were encouraged both by the Brazilian colonists, who wanted slaves for the plantations and the mines, and by the Portuguese Government, which favoured them as a formidable barrier to the Spanish colonization, of which the Jesuit missions were considered outposts. Among all the Mamelucos, those of São Paulo, the Paulistas as they were called, were most noted.

The first of the Guaraní missions of the Paraguay territory was established in 1610. In 1629 the Paulista armies invaded the territory, and within two years had destroyed all but two of the twelve prosperous missions, plundering and desecrating the churches, slaughtering thousands of the inhabitants, and carrying off 60,000 Christian Indians for sale at São Paulo and Rio de Janeiro. The result was the entire abandonment of these first missions and the exodus of the survivors, led by Father Montoya, into the remote southern province of Corrientes, Eastern Argentina, where the work was begun anew. The slave-hunters followed, and again the outlying missions were abandoned until at last, in 1638, Fathers Montoya and Taño sailed to Europe and personally obtained from Urban VIII a letter threatening the church penalties upon the enslavers of the mission Indians, and from Philip IV permission for the Indians to be furnished with guns and drilled in their use by Jesuit soldier veterans. This was done and at the next invasion, in 1641, the Christian Guaraní, armed with guns and led by their own chief, inflicted such a defeat on the Mamelucos as kept them aloof for ten years. Then in 1651, taking advantage of the war between Spain and Portugal, the Mameluco army advanced again, but was scattered by the neophytes led by the Fathers themselves. Thenceforth to the close of the Jesuit period the Guaraní missions were protected by an army of drilled and equipped Christian Indians.

Defeated in one direction, the Mamelucos turned in another, and began a s ries of raids upon the flourishing Chiquito missions of Southern Bolivia, of which the first had been established by the Jesuits in 1691. Whole villages were swept away one after another, until Father Arcé gathered his people together, drilled and armed them, and then with a few Spaniards led them against the Mamelucos, whom he defeated and drove across the Paraguay, never to appear again on its western bank. On the Upper Amazon, according to Hervás, the principal cause of the ruin and dispersion of the numerous tribes gathered into the Mainas missions was the repeated raids of the Portuguese slave-hunters, who in several attacks from 1682 to 1710 carried off more than 50,000 Indians, besides the thousands butchered. Of the Omagua alone more than 16,000 were taken. Of those who escaped the majority fled to their original forests and reverted to barbarism. In the Orinoco missions the same destruction was wrought by slavers from Pará, ascending the Rio Negro and engaging the wild cannibal tribes as their allies, until checked by the heroic enterprise of Father Roman in 1744, and finally made impossible by the establishment of Spanish frontier garrisons about 1756. The entire number of Indians slaughtered or enslaved by the Mamelucos from the beginning of their career for a period of about 130 years has been estimated by Father Muratori at two millions. (See also GUARANÍ; MAINA; MAIPURE.)

BANCROFT, *Hist. Cent. Am.*, I (San Francisco, 1886); DOBRIZHOFFER, *Hist. Abiponibus* (tr. London, 1822); GRAHAM, *A Vanished Arcadia* (London, 1901). HERVÁS, *Catálogo de las Lenguas*, I (Madrid, 1800); HUMBOLDT, *Travels to the Equinoctial Regions of Am.* (1799–1804), (London, 1881); PAGE, *La Plata*, etc. (New York, 1859).

JAMES MOONEY.

Mamertine Prison.—The so-called "Mamertine Prison", beneath the church of S. Giuseppe dei Falegnami, via di Marforio, Rome, is generally accepted as being identical with "the prison . . . in the middle of the city, overlooking the forum", mentioned by Livy (I, xxxiii). It consists of two chambers, one above the other. The lower, known as the *Tullianum*, was probably built originally as a cistern, whence its name, which is derived from the archaic Latin word *tullius*, a jet of water—the derivation of Varro from the name of King Servius Tullius is erroneous. The Tullianum is a circular chamber, partly excavated from the rock, and partly built of tufa blocks, each layer of masonry projecting a little over that immediately below so as to form a conical vault. When the upper chamber was constructed, the top of the cone was probably cut off, and the present roof, consisting of a flat arch of tufa blocks, substituted. The upper chamber is an irregular quadrilateral, and contains an inscription recording a restoration made in A. D. 21. Sallust describes the Tullianum, or lower chamber, as a horrible dungeon, "repulsive and terrible on account of neglect, dampness, and smell" (Cat., lv). In the floor of the Tullianum is a well, which, according to the legend, miraculously came into existence while St. Peter was imprisoned here, enabling the Apostle to baptize his jailers, Sts. Processus and Martinianus. The well, however, existed prior to this date, and there is no reliable evidence that the Chief of the Apostles was ever imprisoned in the Tullianum. The Acts of Sts. Processus and Martinianus are of the sixth century. The two chambers are at present connected by a stairway, but originally there was no means of communication between them save a hole in the floor of the upper chamber, through which such famous prisoners as King Jugurtha and the Catiline conspirators were thrown into the lower dungeon, where they died of starvation or were strangled. The name Mamertine Prison is medieval, and is probably derived from the temple of Mars Ultor in the vicinity. The medieval "Itinerary" of Einsiedeln alludes to the "fountain of St. Peter, where also is his prison". From the eighth

century the tradition of the Acts of Sts. Processus and Martinianus relative to the imprisonment of St. Peter in the Tullianum was universally accepted; the earliest allusion to the prison in the character of a church is that of Maffeo Veggio, in the fifteenth century, who speaks of it as "S. Petrus in carcere" (St. Peter in prison).

MIDDLETON, *Ancient Rome* (Edinburgh, 1885); MARUCCHI, *Eléments d'Archéologie chrétienne*, III (Rome, 1902).

MAURICE M. HASSETT.

Mamertus, SAINT, Bishop of Vienne, date of birth unknown; d. shortly after 475. Concerning the life of Mamertus before his elevation to the See of Vienne, nothing certain is known. The fact that his brother, Claudianus Mamertus, the theological writer, received in his youth a sound training in rhetoric, and enjoyed the personal acquaintance of Bishop Eucherius of Lyons (434–50), suggests that the brothers belonged to a wealthy Gallic family from the neighbourhood of Lyons. Like his brother, St. Mamertus was distinguished for his knowledge of profane subjects as well as of theology, and, before his elevation to the episcopate, appears to have been married. His election and consecration took place shortly before 462. As bishop he enlisted the services of his brother, who had withdrawn to a cloister, and ordained him priest of Vienne. The activity of the brothers is described in a letter of Sidonius Apollinaris (Epist., IV, xi), another of whose letters (VII, i) is addressed to Bishop Mamertus. In 463 Mamertus was engaged in a dispute with Pope Hilarius on the question of the privileges of the Bishop of Arles. Pope Leo I had regulated the boundaries of the ecclesiastical provinces of Arles and Vienne: under the latter he left the Dioceses of Valence, Tarentaise, Geneva, and Grenoble, but all the other dioceses in this district were made subordinate to Arles. Regardless of this decision and infringing on the rights of his colleague of Arles, Mamertus consecrated in 463 a bishop for the city of Die (Dea). King Gundiac of Burgundy complained to Pope Hilary of this action, whereupon the latter wrote to Bishop Leontius of Arles on 10 Oct., 463, bidding him summon a synod of bishops from the different provinces to enquire into the matter. In a subsequent letter to the bishops of the provinces of Lyons, Vienne, Narbonnensis I and II, and Alpina, he also refers to the matter, and directs them to obey Leontius's summons to a regularly constituted synod (Thiel, "Epist. Rom. Pont.", I, cxlvi, cli; Jaffé, "Regesta Rom. Pont.", I, 2nd ed., dlvi, dlix). The synod decided against Mamertus, as we learn from another letter of the pope dated 25 February, 464 (Thiel, op. cit., I, cxlviii; Jaffé, op. cit., I, dlvii). In this Hilary declares that Mamertus and the bishop unlawfully consecrated by him should really be deposed; desiring, however, that clemency be used, he commissioned Bishop Veranus to inform Mamertus that, if he did not recognize and submit to the regulations of Pope Leo, he would be deprived also of the four suffragan dioceses, still subject to Vienne. The bishop invalidly installed by Mamertus was to be confirmed in his office by Leontius, after which he might retain the bishopric. Mamertus evidently submitted, since we find no subsequent reference to the incident.

During his episcopate, the remains of St. Ferreolus were discovered, and were translated by Mamertus to a church in Vienne, built in honour of that holy martyr (Gregory of Tours, "De gloria mart.", II, ii). St. Mamertus was the founder of the Rogation Processions (see ROGATION DAYS), as we learn on the testimony of Sidonius Apollinaris (Epist., V, xiv; VII, i), and his second successor, Avitus ("Homilia de Rogat." in P. L., LIX, 289–94). In connexion with these intercessory processions, Mamertus summoned a synod at Vienne between 471 and 475. About 475 he attended a synod at Arles, which dealt with the predestination teaching of Lucidus, a Gallic priest. As this is the latest information we possess concerning him, we may assume that he died shortly afterwards. After his death he was venerated as a saint. His name stands in the "Martyrologium Hieronymianum" and in the "Martyrologium" of Florus of Lyons under 11 May, on which day his feast is still celebrated (Quentin, "Les martyrologes historiques", 348).

DUCHESNE, *Fastes épiscopaux de l'ancienne Gaule*, I (Paris, 1894), 147; HEFELE, *Konziliengesch.*, II (2nd ed.), 580 sqq., 596, 597; *Acta SS.*, II, 629 sq.; TILLEMONT, *Mémoires pour servir à l'hist. eccl.*, XVI, 104; TERREBASSE, *Notice sur le tombeau de St. Mamert récemment découvert dans l'église de St-Pierre à Vienne* (Vienne, 1861).

J. P. KIRSCH.

Mamertus, CLAUDIANUS. See CLAUDIANUS MAMERTUS.

Mammon, Μαμωνᾶ; the spelling Μαμμωνᾶ is contrary to the textual evidence and seems not to occur in printed Bibles till the edition of Elzevir. The derivation of the word is uncertain, perhaps from טמן as seen in מטמון, though the Targums, which use the word frequently, never regard it as the equivalent of מטמון, which the Greek always renders θησαύροι, cf. Job, iii, 4; Prov., ii, 4. But cf. also Hebrew Ecclus., xlii, 9, מטמון בת לאב מטמנת שקר where the margin reads "to the father his daughter is as ill-gotten treasure." In N. T. only Matt., vi, 24, and Luke, xvi, 9, 11, 13, the latter verse repeating Matt., vi, 24. In Luke, xvi, 9 and 11 Mammon is personified, hence the prevalent notion, emphasized by Milton, that Mammon was a deity. Nothing definite can be adduced from the Fathers in support of this; most of their expressions which seem to favour it may be easily explained by the personification in Luke; e. g. "Didascalia", "De solo Mammona cogitant, quorum Deus est sacculus"; similarly St. Augustine, "Lucrum Punice Mammon dicitur" (Serm. on Mt., ii); St. Jerome in one place goes near to such an identification when (Dial. cum Lucif., 5) he quotes the words: "No man can serve two masters", and then adds, "What concord hath Christ with Belial?" But in his "Commentary on Matt ," and in Ep. xxii, 31, he lends no countenance to it: "'Ye cannot serve God and Mammon.' Riches, that is; for in the heathen tongue of the Syrians riches are called Mammon." But Mammon was commonly regarded as a deity in the Middle Ages; thus Peter Lombard (II, dist. 6) says, "Riches are called by the name of a devil, namely Mammon, for Mammon is the name of a devil, by which name riches are called according to the Syrian tongue." Piers Plowman also regards Mammon as a deity.

The expression "Mammon of iniquity" has been diversely explained, it can hardly mean riches ill-gotten, for they should of course be restored. If we accept the derivation from אמן we may render it "riches in which men trust", and it is remarkable that the Sept. of Ps. xxxvii, 3, renders אמונה by πλούτῳ, or "riches", as though hinting at such a derivation. The expression is common in the Targums, where ממון is often followed by שקר corresponding to the ἀδικίας of Luke, thus see on Prov., xv, 27; but it is noteworthy that Ecclus., v, 8 (10, Vulg.) "goods unjustly gotten" χρήμασιν ἀδίκοις, reads in Hebrew נכס-שקר and not מטמון. For the various explanations given by the Fathers see St. Thomas, II-II, Q. xxxii, a. vii, ad 3um.

TRENCH, *Notes on the Parables of our Lord* (15th ed., London, 1886); DALMANN, *Die Worte Jesu* (tr., Edinburgh, 1902).

HUGH POPE.

Man (Anglo-Saxon *man*=a person, human being; supposed root *man*=to think; Ger., *Mann, Mensch*).

I. *The Nature of Man.*—According to the common definition of the School, Man is a rational animal. This signifies no more than that, in the system of classification and definition shown in the *Arbor Porphyriana*, man is a substance, corporeal, living, sentient, and rational. It is a logical definition, having reference to a metaphysical entity. It has been said that man's animality is distinct in nature from his rationality,

though they are inseparably joined, during life, in one common personality. "Animality" is an abstraction as is "rationality". As such, neither has any substantial existence of its own. To be exact we should have to write: "Man's animality is rational"; for his "rationality" is certainly not something superadded to his "animality". Man is one in essence. In the Scholastic synthesis, it is a manifest illogism to hypostasize the abstract conceptions that are necessary for the intelligent apprehension of complete phenomena. A similar confusion of expression may be noticed in the statement that man is a "compound of body and soul". This is misleading. Man is not a body *plus* a soul—which would make of him two individuals; but a body that is what it is (namely, a *human* body) by reason of its union with the soul. As a special application of the general doctrine of matter and form which is as well a theory of science as of intrinsic causality, the "soul" is envisaged as the substantial form of the matter which, so informed, is a human "body". The union between the two is a "substantial" one. It cannot be maintained, in the Thomistic system, that the "substantial union is a relation by which two substances are so disposed that they form one". In the general theory, neither "matter" nor "form", but only the composite, is a substance. In the case of man, though the "soul" be proved a reality capable of separate existence, the "body" can in no sense be called a substance in its own right. It exists only as determined by a form; and if that form is not a human soul, then the "body" is not a human body. It is in this sense that the Scholastic phrase "incomplete substance", applied to body and soul alike, is to be understood. Though strictly speaking self-contradictory, the phrase expresses in a convenient form the abiding reciprocity of relation between these two "principles of substantial being".

Man is an individual, a single substance resultant from the determination of matter by a human form. Being capable of reasoning, he verifies the philosophical definition of a person (q. v.): "the individual substance of a rational nature". This doctrine of St. Thomas Aquinas (cf. I, Q. lxxv, a. 4) and of Aristotle is not the only one that has been advanced. In Greek and in modern philosophy, as well as during the Patristic and Scholastic periods, another celebrated theory laid claim to pre-eminence. For Plato the soul is a spirit that *uses* the body. It is in a non-natural state of union, and longs to be freed from its bodily prison (cf. Republic, X, 611). Plato has recourse to a theory of a triple soul to explain the union —a theory that would seem to make personality altogether impossible (see MATTER). St. Augustine, following him (except as to the triple-soul theory) makes the "body" and "soul" two substances; and man "a rational soul using a mortal and earthly body" (De Moribus, I, xxvii). But he is careful to note that by union with the body it constitutes the human being. St. Augustine's psychological doctrine was current in the Middle Ages up to the time and during the perfecting of the Thomistic synthesis. It is expressed in the "Liber de Spiritu et Anima" of Alcher of Clairvaux (?) (twelfth century). In this work "the soul rules the body; its union with the body is a friendly union, though the latter impedes the full and free exercise of its activity; it is devoted to its prison" (cf. de Wulf, "History of Philosophy", tr. Coffey). As further instances of Augustinian influence may be cited Alanus ab Insulis (but the soul is united by a *spiritus physicus* to the body); Alexander of Hales (union *ad modum formæ cum materia*); St. Bonaventure (the body united to a soul consisting of "form" and "spiritual matter"—*forma completiva*). Many of the Franciscan doctors seem, by inference if not explicitly, to lean to the Platonic Augustinian view; Scotus, who, however, by the subtlety of his "formal distinction *a parte rei*", saves the unity of the individual while admitting the *forma corporeitatis;* his opponent John Peter Olivi's "mode of union" of soul and body was condemned at the Council of Vienne (1311–12).

The theories of the nature of man so far noticed are purely philosophical. No one of them has been explicitly condemned by the Church. The ecclesiastical definitions have reference merely to the "union" of "body" and "soul". With the exception of the words of the Council of Toledo, 688 (Ex libro responionis Juliani Archiep. Tolet.), in which "soul" and "body" are referred to as two "substances" (explicable in the light of subsequent definitions only in the hypothesis of abstraction, and as "incomplete" substances), other pronouncements of the Church merely reiterate the doctrine maintained in the School. Thus Lateran in 649 (against the Monothelites), canon ii, "the Word of God with the flesh assumed by Him and animated with an intellectual principle shall come . . . "; Vienne, 1311–12, "whoever shall hereafter dare to assert, maintain, or pertinaciously hold that the rational or intellectual soul is not *per se* and essentially the form of the human body, is to be regarded as a heretic"; Decree of Leo X, in V Lateran, Bull "Apostolici Regiminis", 1513, ". . . with the approval of this sacred council we condemn all who assert that the intellectual soul is mortal or is the same in all men . . . for the soul is not only really and essentially the form of the human body, but is also immortal; and the number of souls has been and is to be multiplied according as the number of bodies is multiplied"; Brief "Eximiam tuam" of Pius IX to Cardinal de Geissel, 15 June, 1857, condemning the error of Günther, says: "the rational soul is *per se* the true and immediate form of the body".

In the sixteenth century Descartes advanced a doctrine that again separated soul and body, and compromised the unity of consciousness and personality. To account for the interaction of the two substances—the one "thought", the other "extension"—"Occasionalism" (Malebranche, Geulincx), "Pre-established Harmony" (Leibniz), and "Reciprocal Influx" (Locke) were imagined. The inevitable reaction from the Cartesian division is to be found in the Monism of Spinoza. Aquinas avoids the difficulties and contradictions of the "two substance" theory and, saving the personality, accounts for the observed facts of the unity of consciousness. His doctrine: (1) disproves the possibility of metempsychosis; (2) establishes an inferential, though not an apodictic argument, for the resurrection of the body; (3) avoids all difficulties as to the "seat of the soul", by asserting formal actuation; (4) proves the immortality of the soul from the spiritual and incomplex activity observed in the individual man; it is not my soul that thinks, or my body that eats, but "I" that do both. The particular creation of the soul is a corollary of the foregoing. This doctrine—the contradiction of Traducianism and Transmigration—follows from the consideration that the formal principle cannot be produced by way of generation, either directly (since it is proved to be simple in substance), or accidentally (since it is a subsistent form). Hence there remains only creation as the mode of its production. The complete argument may be found in the "Contra Gentiles" of St. Thomas, II, lxxxvii. See also Summa Theologica, I, Q. cxviii, aa. 1 and 2 (against Traducianism) and a. 3 (in refutation of the opinion of Pythagoras, Plato and Origen—with whom Leibniz might be grouped as professing a modified form of the same opinion—the creation of souls at the beginning of time).

II. *The Origin of Man.*—This problem may be treated from the standpoints of Holy Scripture, theology, or philosophy. A. The Sacred Writings are entirely concerned with the relations of man to God, and of God's dealings with man, before and after the Fall. Two accounts of his origin are given in the Old Testament. On the sixth and last day of the creation "God created man to his own image: to the

image of God he created him" (Gen., i, 27); and "the Lord God formed man of the slime of the earth: and breathed into his face the breath of life, and man became a living soul" (Gen., ii, 7; so Ecclus., xvii, 1: "God created man of the earth, and made him after his own image"). By these texts the special creation of man is established, his high dignity and his spiritual nature. As to his material part, the Scripture declares that it is formed by God from the "slime of the earth". This becomes a "living soul" and fashioned to the "image of God" by the inspiration of the "breath of life", which makes man man and differentiates him from the brute.

B. This doctrine is obviously to be looked for in all Catholic theology. The origin of man by creation (as opposed to emanative and evolutionistic Pantheism) is asserted in the Church's dogmas and definitions. In the earliest symbols (see the Alexandrian: *δι οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο, τὰ ἐν οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς, ὁρατά τε καὶ ἀόρατα*, and the Nicene), in the councils (see especially IV Lateran, 1215; "Creator of all things visible and invisible, spiritual and corporeal, who by this omnipotent power . . . brought forth out of nothing the spiritual and corporeal creation, that, is the angelic world and the universe, and afterwards man, forming as it were one composite out of spirit and body"), in the writings of the Fathers and theologians the same account is given. The early controversies and apologetics of St. Clement of Alexandria and Origen defend the theory of creation against Stoics and neo-Platonists. St. Augustine strenuously combats the pagan schools on this point as on that of the nature and immortality of man's soul. A masterly synthetic exposition of the theological and philosophical doctrine as to man is given in the "Summa Theologica" of St. Thomas Aquinas, I, QQ. lxxv–ci. So again the "Contra Gentiles", II (on creatures), especially from xlvi onwards, deals with the subject from a philosophical standpoint—the distinction between the theological and the philosophical treatment having been carefully drawn in chap. iv. Note especially chap. lxxxvii, which establishes Creationism.

C. Scholastic philosophy reaches a conclusion as to the origin of man similar to the teaching of revelation and theology. Man is a creature of God in a created universe. All things that are, except Himself, exist in virtue of a unique creative act. As to the mode of creation, there would seem to be two possible alternatives. Either the individual composite was created *ex nihilo*, or a created soul became the informing principle of matter already pre-existing in another determination. Either mode would be philosophically tenable, but the Thomistic principle of the successive and graded evolution of forms in matter is in favour of the latter view. If, as is the case with the embryo (St. Thomas, I, Q. cxviii, a. 2, ad 2um), a succession of preparatory forms preceded information by the rational soul, it nevertheless follows necessarily from the established principles of Scholasticism that this, not only in the case of the first man, but of all men, must be produced in being by a special creative act. The matter that is destined to become what we call man's "body" is naturally prepared, by successive transformations, for the reception of the newly created soul as its determinant principle. The commonly held opinion is that this determination takes place when the organization of the brain of the fœtus is sufficiently complete to allow of imaginative life; i. e. the possibility of the presence of phantasmata. But note also the opinion that the creation of, and information by, the soul takes place at the moment of conception.

III. *The End of Man.*—In common with all created nature (substance, or essence, considered as the principle of activity or passivity), that of man tends towards its natural end. The proof of this lies in the inductively ascertained principle of finality. The natural end of man may be considered from two points of view. Primarily, it is the procuring of the glory of God, which is the end of all creation. God's intrinsic perfection is not increased by creation, but extrinsically He becomes known and praised, or glorified by the creatures He endows with intelligence. A secondary natural end of man is the attainment of his own beatitude, the complete and hierarchic perfection of his nature by the exercise of its faculties in the order which reason prescribes to the will, and this by the observance of the moral law. Since complete beatitude is not to be attained in this life (considered in its merely natural aspect, as neither yet elevated by grace, nor vitiated by sin) future existence, as proved in psychology, is postulated by ethics for its attainment. Thus the present life is to be considered as a means to a further end. Upon the relation of the rational nature of man to his last end—God—is founded the science of moral philosophy, which thus presupposes as its ground, metaphysics, cosmology, and psychology. The distinction of good and evil rests upon the consonance or discrepancy of human acts with the nature of man thus considered; and moral obligation has its root in the absolute necessity and immutability of the same relation.

With regard to the last end of man (as "man" and not as "soul"), it is not universally held by Scholastics that the resurrection of the body is proved apodictically in philosophy. Indeed some (e. g. Scotus, Occam) have even denied that the immortality of the soul is capable of such demonstration. The resurrection is an article of faith. Some recent authors, however (see Cardinal Mercier, "Psychologie", II, 370), advance the argument that the formation of a new body is naturally necessary on account of the perfect final happiness of the soul, for which it is a condition *sine qua non*. A more cogent form of the proof would seem to lie in the consideration that the separated soul is not complete *in ratione naturæ*. It is not the human being; and it would seem that the nature of man postulates a final and permanent reunion of its two intrinsic principles.

But there is *de facto* another end of man. The Catholic Faith teaches that man has been raised to a supernatural state and that his destiny, as a son of God and member of the Mystical Body of which Christ is the Head, is the eternal enjoyment of the beatific vision. In virtue of God's infallible promise, in the present dispensation the creature enters into the covenant by baptism; he becomes a subject elevated by grace to a new order, incorporated into a society by reason of which he tends and is brought to a perfection not due to his nature (see CHURCH). The means to this end are justification by the merits of Christ communicated to man, co-operation with grace, the sacraments, prayer, good works, etc. The Divine law which the Christian obeys rests on this supernatural relation and is enforced with a similar sanction. The whole pertains to a supernatural providence which belongs not to philosophical speculation but to revelation and theological dogma. In the light of the finalistic doctrine as to man, it is evident that the "purpose of life" can have a meaning only in reference to an ultimate state of perfection of the individual. The nature tending towards its end can be interpreted only in terms of that end; and the activities by which it manifests its tendency as a living being have no adequate explanation apart from it.

The theories that are sometimes put forward of the place of man in the universe, as destined to share in a development to which no limits can be assigned, rest upon the Spencerian theory that man is but "a highly-differentiated portion of the earth's crust and gaseous envelope", and ignore or deny the limitation imposed by the essential materiality and spirituality of human nature. If the intellectual faculties were indeed no more than the developed animal powers, there would seem to be no possibility of limiting their

progress in the future. But since the soul of man is the result, not of evolution, but of creation, it is impossible to look forward to any such advance as would involve a change in man's specific nature, or any essential difference in its relation to its material environment, in the physiological conditions under which it at present exists, or in its "relation" to its Divine Creator. The "Herrenmoralität" of Nietzsche —the "transvaluation of values" which is to revolutionize the present moral law, the new morality which man's changing relation to the Absolute may some day bring into existence—must, therefore, be considered to be not less inconsistent with the nature of man than it is wanting in historical probability.

ST. THOMAS AQUINAS, *Opera* (Parma, 1852–72); BRADLEY, *Appearance and Reality* (London, 1890); CATHREIN, *Philosophia Moralis* (Freiburg, 1895), DE WULF, *Historie de la Philosophie Médiévale* (Louvain, 1905), tr. COFFEY (London, 1909); DUCKWORTH in *Cambridge Theological Essays* (London, 1905); HAGENBACH, *History of Doctrines* (Edinburgh, 1846); HURTER, *Theologiæ Dogmaticæ Compendium* (Innsbruck, 1896); LODGE, *Substance of Faith* (London, 1907); LOTZE, *Microkosmos* (Edinburgh, 1885); MAHER, *Psychology* in *Stonyhurst Series* (London, 1890); MERCIER, *Psychologie* (Louvain, 1908); NIETZSCHE, *Jenseits von Gut und Böse* (Leipzig, 1886); NYS, *Cosmologie* (Louvain, 1906); RICKABY, *Moral Philosophy* in *Stonyhurst Series* (London, 1888); RITTER AND PRELLE, *Historia Philosophiæ Graecæ* (Gotha, 1888); SCOTUS, *Opera* (Lyons, 1639); SUAREZ, *Metaphysicarum Disputationum tomi duo* (Mainz, 1605); WINDELBAND, tr. TUFTS, *History of Philosophy* (New York, 1893).

FRANCIS AVELING.

Man, ANTIQUITY OF. See RACE, HUMAN.

Manahem (מנחם), "the consoler"; Septuagint, Μαναήμ, Aquila, Μαναήν, was king over Israel, according to the chronology of Kautsch (Hist. of O. T. Literature, 185), from 743 B. C.; according to Schrader, from 745–736 B. C. The short reign of Manahem is told in IV Kings, xv, 13–22. He was "the son of Gadi", maybe a scion of the tribe of Gad. Josephus (Antiq. Jud., ix, xi, 1) tells us he was a general of the army of Israel. The sacred writer of IV Kings is apparently synopsizing the "Book of the Words (Hebrew, 'Deeds') of the Days of the Kings of Israel", and gives scant details of the ten years that Manahem reigned. When Sellum conspired against and murdered Zacharias in Samaria, and set himself upon the throne of the northern kingdom, Manahem refused to recognize the usurper; he marched from Thersa to Samaria, about six miles westwards, laid siege to Samaria, took it, murdered Sellum, and set himself upon the throne. He next destroyed Thapsa, which has not been located, put all its inhabitants to death, and treated even pregnant women in the revolting fashion of the time. The Prophet Osee (vii, 1–xiii, 15) describes the drunkenness and debauchery implied in the words "he departed not from the sins of Jeroboam."

The reign of this military adventurer is important from the fact that therein the Assyrian first entered the land of Israel. "And Phul, king of the Assyrians, came into the land, and Manahem gave Phul a thousand talents of silver" (IV Kings, xv, 19). It is now generally admitted that Phul is Tiglath-Pileser III of the cuneiform inscriptions. Phul was probably his personal name and the one that first reached Israel. His reign (745–728 B. C.) had begun at most two years before Manahem's. The Assyrians may have been invited into Israel by the Assyrian party. Osee speaks of the two anti-Israelitic parties, the Egyptian and Assyrian (vii, 11). The result of the expedition of Tiglath-Pileser was an exorbitant tribute imposed upon Rezin of Damascus and Manahem of Samaria (Mi-ni-hi-im-mi Sa-mi-ri-na-ai). This tribute, 1000 talents of silver (about $1,700,000) was exacted by Manahem from all the mighty men of wealth. Each paid fifty shekels of silver—about twenty-eight dollars. There were, at the time, then, some 60,000 "that were mighty and rich" in Israel. In view of this tribute, Tiglath-Pileser returned to Assyria. Manahem seems to have died a natural death. His son Phaceia reigned in his stead.

KITTEL, *History of the Hebrews*, II (tr., London, 1896); SCHRADER, *Keilinschriften und das Alte Test.*, II (Berlin, 1902), 264.

WALTER DRUM.

Manahen (Μαναήν), SAINT, a member of the Church of Antioch, foster-brother, or household-friend (σύντροφος, Vulg. *collactaneus*), of Herod Antipas (who had St. John the Baptist put to death) and one of those who, under the influence of the Holy Spirit, laid hands upon Saul and Barnabas and sent the two Apostles on the first of St. Paul's missionary journeys (Acts, xiii, 3). As St. Luke was an Antiochene (see Eusebius, "Hist. eccl.", III, iv), it is not at all unlikely that this influential member of "the prophets and doctors" of the Church of Antioch was one of the "eye-witnesses and ministers of the word" (Luke, i, 2), who delivered unto Luke the details which that sacred writer has in regard to Antipas and other members of the Herodian family (see Luke, iii, 1, 19, 20; viii, 3; ix, 7–9; xiii, 31, 32; xxiii, 8–12; Acts, xii). St. Manahen may have become a disciple of Jesus with "Joanna, the wife of Chusa, Herod's steward" (Luke, viii, 3). Antipas left for Rome, A. D. 39, in order to obtain the favour of Caligula, and received instead condemnation to perpetual exile (Jos., "Ant.", XVIII, vii, 2). At this time, the Church of Antioch was founded by Jewish Christians, who "had been dispersed by the persecution that arose on the occasion of Stephen" and had taught the Gospel also to the Greeks of Antioch, (Acts, xi, 19–24). It is quite likely that St. Manahen was one of these founders of the Antiochene Church. His feast is celebrated on 24 May.

Acta SS., May, V, 273.

WALTER DRUM.

Manaos. See AMAZONES, DIOCESE OF.

Manasses, the name of seven persons of the Bible, a tribe of Israel, and one of the apocryphal writings.

THE INDIVIDUALS.—(1) MANASSES (Heb. מנשה; Sept. Μανασσῆ), eldest son of Joseph and the Egyptian Aseneth (Gen., xli, 50–51; xlvi, 20). The name means "he that causes to forget"; Joseph assigned the reason for its bestowal: "God hath made me to forget all my toils, and my father's house" (Gen., xli, 51). Jacob blessed Manasses (Gen., xlviii); but gave preference to the younger son Ephraim, despite the father's protestations in favour of Manasses. By this blessing, Jacob put Manasses and Ephraim in the same class with Ruben and Simeon (verses 3–5), and gave foundation for the admission of the tribes of Manasses and Ephraim.

(2) MANASSES, Judith's husband, died of sunstroke in Bethulia (Judith, viii, 2–3).

(3) MANASSES, a character in the story of Ahikar (not in Vulg., but in Sept.) told by Tobias on the point of death. The Vatican MS. mentions Manasses (Μανασσῆς) as one "who gave alms and escaped the snare of death"; the Sinaitic MS. mentions no one, but clearly refers the almsgiving and escape to Achiacharus. The reading of the Vatican MS. is probably an error ("Rev. Bibl.", Jan., 1899).

(4) MANASSES, son of Bani, one of the companions of Esdras who married foreign wives (I Esd., x, 30).

(5) MANASSES, son of Hasom, another of the same companions of Esdras (I Esd., x, 33).

(6) MANASSES (according to k'thibh of Massoretic Text and Sept.), ancestor of Jonathan, a priest of the tribe of Dan (Judges, xviii, 30). The Vulgate and k'ri of the Massoretic Text give Moses, the correct reading.

(7) MANASSES, thirteenth King of Juda (692–638 B. C.—cf. Schrader, "Keilinschr. und das A. T."), son and successor to Ezechias (IV Kings, xx, 21 sq.). The historian of IV Kings tells us much about the evil of his reign (xxi, 2–10), and the punishment thereof foretold by the Prophets (verses 10–15), but practically nothing about the rest of the doings of Manasses. He brought back the abominations of Achaz; imported the adoration of "all the host of heaven", seemingly the astral, solar, and lunar myths

of Assyria; introduced the other enormities mentioned in the Sacred Text; and "made his son pass through fire" (verse 6) in the worship of Moloch. It was probably in this frenzy of his varied forms of idolatry that "Manasses shed also very much innocent blood, till he filled Jerusalem up to the mouth" (verse 16). The historian of II Par. tells much the same story, and adds that, in punishment, the Lord brought the Assyrians upon Juda. They carried Manasses to Babylon. The Lord heard his prayer for forgiveness and deliverance, and brought him again to Jerusalem, where Manasses did his part in stemming the tide of idolatry that he had formerly forced upon Juda (xxxiii, 11–20). At one time, doubt was cast on the historicity of this narrative of II Par., because IV Kings omits the captivity of Manasses. Schrader (op. cit., 2nd ed., Giessen, 1883, 355) gives cuneiform records of twenty-two kings that submitted to Asarhaddon during his expedition against Egypt; second on the list is Mi-na-si-i sar ir Ya-u-di (Manasses, king of the city of Juda). Schrader also gives the list of twenty-two kings who are recorded on a cuneiform tablet as tributaries to Asurbanipal in the land of Hatti; second on this list is Mi-in-si-i sar mat Ya-u-di (Manasses, king of the land of Juda). Since a Babylonian brick confirms the record of the historian of II Par., his reputation is made a little more secure in rationalistic circles. Winckler and Zimmern admit the presence of Manasses in Babylon (see their revision of Schrader's "Keilinschr. und das A. T.", I, Berlin, 1902, 274). Conjectures of the Pan-Babylonian School, as to the causes that led to the return of Manasses, the groundwork of the narrative in IV Kings, etc., do not militate against the historical worth of the Inspired Record.

THE TRIBE.—Deriving its name from MANASSES (1), son of Joseph, this tribe was divided into two half-tribes—the eastern and the western. The tribe east of the Jordan was represented by the descendants of Machir (Judges, v, 14). Machir was the first-born of Manasses (Jos., xvii, 1). The children of Machir took Galaad (Num., xxxii, 39); Moses gave the land of Galaad to Machir (verse 40). Two other sons of Manasses, Jair and Nobe, also took villages in Galaad, and gave thereto their own names (verses 41–42). The territory of the western half-tribe is roughly sketched in Jos., xvi, 1–3. It was that part of Samaria which lay between the Jordan and the Mediterranean, the plain of Esdrelon and the towns of Jericho, Sichem, and Samaria. The eastern half-tribe occupied north Galaad, all Basan, and Argob (Jos., xiii, 30–31; cf. Deut., iii, 13)—an immense tract of land extending east of Jordan to the present Mecca route (*darb el-haj*) and far beyond, so as to include the Hauran.

THE WRITING.—The Prayer of Manasses is an apocryphal writing which purports to give the prayer referred to in II Par., xxxiii, 13, 18–19. Its original is Greek. Nestle thinks that the prayer and other legends of Manasses in their present form are not earlier than the "Apost. Const.", xi, 22; and that the prayer found its way into some MSS. of the Septuagint as part, not of the Sept., but of the "Apost. Const." (see "Septuaginta Studien", III, 1889). The prayer is not in the canon of Trent, nor has there ever seemed to have been any serious claim to its canonicity.

WALTER DRUM.

Mance, JEANNE, foundress of the Montreal Hôtel-Dieu, and one of the first women settlers in Canada, b. at Nogent-le-Roi, Champagne, 1606; d. at Montreal, 19 June, 1673. Born of a family who belonged to the magistracy, she lived with her father, Pierre Mance, *procureur du roi* (king's attorney) until his death in 1640. In this year she met M. de La Dauversière, who, with M. Olier, was actively interested in the foundation of Montreal. For the first time Mlle Mance heard of New France (Canada) and of the women who were going there to consecrate themselves to the spreading of the Faith. She embarked at La Rochelle in June, 1641, with Père Laplace, a dozen men, and a pious young Dieppe woman. The following (probably 24) August she reached Quebec, and devoted herself during the entire winter to the care of the settlers. They wished to retain her at Quebec, but on 8 May, 1642, she went up the river with M. de Maisonneuve and her early companions, and reached Montreal on 17 May. It was she who decorated the altar on which the first Mass was said in Montreal (18 May, 1642). The same year she founded a hospital in her own home, a very humble one, into which she received the sick, settlers or natives. Two years later (1644) she opened a hospital in Rue St-Paul, which cost 6000 francs—a gift of Mme de Bullion to Jeanne on her departure for Canada—and stood for fifty years. For seventeen years she had sole care of this hospital.

In 1650 she visited France in the interests of the colony, and brought back 22,000 livres of the 60,000 set apart by Mme de Bullion for the foundation of the hospital. On her return to Montreal, finding that without reinforcements the colonists must succumb under the attacks of the Iroquois and the many hardships of their position, she lent the hospital money to M. de Maisonneuve, who proceeded to France and organized a band of one hundred men for the defence of the colony. In 1659 Jeanne made a second trip to France to secure religious to assist her in her work. She had for twenty months been suffering from a fractured wrist badly reduced, but in Paris, while praying at Saint-Sulpice where M. Olier's heart was preserved, she was suddenly cured (2 Feb., 1659). She was so fortunate as to secure three Hospital Sisters of St. Joseph from the convent of La Flèche in Anjou, Judith Moreau de Brésoles, Catherine Macé, and Marie Maillet. They had a rough passage and the plague broke out on board. On their arrival, Mgr de Laval vainly tried to retain the three sisters at Quebec in the community of the Hospital Sisters of St. Augustine. Every obstacle having been overcome, they reached Montreal on 17 or 18 October. Jeanne's good work being now fully established, she lived henceforth a more retired life. On her death after a long and painful illness, she was buried in the church of the Hôtel-Dieu, the burning of which in 1695 destroyed at once the remains of the noble woman and the house that she had built. Her work, however, was continued, and two centuries later (1861) the hospital was transferred to the foot of Mount Royal, on the slope which overlooks the city and the river. The Hôtel-Dieu still flourishes, and in 1909 the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the arrival of the first three Hospital Sisters (1659) was solemnly celebrated. On the initiative of Mgr Bruchési, Archbishop of Montreal, a fine monument in bronze on a granite base, by the sculptor Philip Hébert, representing "Jeanne Mance soignant un colon blessé", has been decided on. The hospital contains more than 300 beds. It is estimated that the hospital cared for 82,000 patients between 1760 (date on which Canada was ceded to England) and 1860; 128,000 patients have been received between 1860 and 1910. A street and a public park in Montreal bear the name of Mance.

Annales de la Sœur Morin (MS.), from 1697 to 1725 and continued by other annalists; FAILLON, *Vie de Mlle Mance et histoire de l'Hôtel-Dieu de Ville-Marie* (2 vols., Paris, 1854); BRUMATH, *Vie de Mlle Mance et commencements de la colonie de Montréal* (Montreal, 1883); LAUNAY, *Histoire des religieuses hospitalières de St-Joseph* (2 vols., Paris, 1887); AUCLAIR, *Les fêtes de l'Hôtel-Dieu en 1909* (Montreal, 1909), illustrated.

ELIE-J. AUCLAIR.

Manchester, DIOCESE OF (MANCHESTERIENSIS), suffragan of the Archdiocese of Boston, U. S. A. The city of Manchester is situated on the Merrimac River, in the State of New Hampshire, and was granted its charter 10 July, 1846. Its population is about 70,000, nearly three-fifths of which is Catholic. There are in

the city nine large Catholic churches with flourishing parish schools. There are also two small churches, a succursal chapel of the cathedral, and a Ruthenian Catholic church.

The Diocese of Manchester was established 4 May, 1884, by a division of the Diocese of Portland which had included both Maine and New Hampshire. It comprises the entire State of New Hampshire, an area of 9305 sq. miles. The total population of the diocese is 412,000, of which 126,034 are Catholics.

Much of the early history of Manchester is bound up in the records of the Diocese of Portland, of which it formed a part for twenty-nine years. Mass was first celebrated in New Hampshire as early as 1694, but the real history of Catholicity can hardly be said to begin until a century and a quarter later. So few were Catholics at first, that up to 1822 there were not enough families in the entire state to warrant the appointment of even one resident priest. The first priest to be permanently located in New Hampshire was Rev. Virgil Barber, whom Bishop Cheverus in 1822 sent to Claremont, his native town, there to form the first Catholic parish in the state. Eight years later a small church was built at Dover. Two missionary priests, Fathers Canavan and John B. Daly, cared for the spiritual interests of the Catholics scattered throughout the state. In 1848 Manchester, with a Catholic population of 300, was given its first resident pastor, Rev. William McDonald, notable on account of his personal character and his establishment of religious, charitable, and educational institutions.

Denis Mary Bradley, the first bishop, was born in Castle Island, County Kerry, Ireland, 23 Feb., 1846; d. 13 Dec., 1903. At the age of eight he came to the United States, settling at Manchester. His early education was obtained at the parochial schools of Manchester and at Holy Cross College, Worcester, Massachusetts. On the completion of his academic course he entered St. Joseph's Seminary, Troy, New York, where, on 3 June, 1871, he was ordained. He was assigned duties in Portland, Maine, and three years later Bishop Bacon appointed him chancellor of the diocese and rector of the cathedral, which offices he filled until June, 1880, when he came to Manchester as pastor of St. Joseph's Church. This appointment proved to be the first step towards the formation of the Diocese of Manchester, as four years later (4 May, 1884), Father Bradley was appointed Bishop of the newly-erected See of Manchester, and selected his parish church for the cathedral. His consecration took place 11 June, 1884. Bishop Bradley was a man of tireless activity and rare sanctity. For almost twenty years he devoted his best efforts to the cause of religion in New Hampshire, and with wonderful success. At his consecration the diocese comprised a Catholic population of 45,000. The number of priests engaged in parish work and missionary labours was 37, officiating in as many churches. There were 3 orders of women with 89 members. At the bishop's death the Catholic population was 104,000, and the priests numbered 107. There were resident pastors in 65 parishes, 67 missions were regularly attended, and there were 8 orders of women, and 4 of men, engaged in the Christian education of children and in charitable work.

John Bernard Delany, second Bishop of Manchester, b. 9 Aug., 1864, in Lowell, Massachusetts; d. 11 June, 1906; pursued his classical and philosophical studies at Holy Cross College, Worcester, Massachusetts, and Boston College, from which he was graduated in June, 1887. He studied for the priesthood at St. Sulpice, Paris, where he was ordained 23 May, 1891. He served as curate at St. Anne's Church, Manchester, and the Immaculate Conception Church, Portsmouth, and in 1898 came to the cathedral at Manchester as chancellor of the diocese and secretary to Bishop Bradley. While serving in this capacity he founded the "Guidon", a Catholic monthly magazine and the official organ of the diocese, of which he was editor till his elevation to the episcopate (6 July, 1904). His consecration took place 8 Sept., 1904.

George Albert Guertin, third Bishop of Manchester and present (1910) incumbent of the see, b. 17 Feb., 1869, in Nashua, New Hampshire, was educated in the parochial schools of his native city, after which he went to St. Charles College, Sherbrooke, Province of Quebec, and St. Hyacinthe College, Province of Quebec, to pursue his classical studies. He then entered St. John's Seminary, Brighton, Massachusetts, and was the first graduate of that institution who became a bishop. He was ordained on 17 Dec., 1892. Having displayed zeal and ability in parochial work, he was appointed third Bishop of Manchester, 2 Jan., 1907, and consecrated 19 March, 1907. Under his guidance the diocese continues to grow steadily and healthily. It has a well-equipped educational system. There are 38 parochial schools, with a corps of 309 teachers and an enrolment of 13,100 pupils. There are: one boarding school conducted by the Sisters of Mercy, and three academies presided over by the Sisters of Jesus and Mary, Sisters of Providence, and Presentation Nuns respectively. A boarding college for boys and young men is under the supervision of the Benedictine Fathers. There are also five high schools for boys.

There are 4 hospitals; 7 orphan asylums, with 710 orphans; 1 infant asylum; 1 night refuge for girls; 5 homes for working girls; 4 homes for aged women; and 1 for old men. The Sisters of Mercy do most of this good work, and the Grey Nuns and Sisters of Providence care for three hospitals and orphanages.

There are 118 secular and 19 regular priests labouring in the diocese. The Benedictine Fathers, the Christian Brothers, the Brothers of the Sacred Heart, the Marist Brothers, and the Xaverian Brothers have communities, as have also the Sisters of Mercy, Sisters of Jesus and Mary, Sisters of the Holy Cross, the Grey Nuns, the Benedictine Nuns, Presentation Nuns, Sisters of Providence, Sisters of the Precious Blood, and the Felician Sisters.

Diocesan Archives; History of Catholic Church in New England; Guidon, files: *Life of Bishop Bradley* (Manchester, 1905); *Life of Rev. Wm. McDonald* (Manchester, 1909); *Official Catholic Directory* (Milwaukee).

THOMAS M. O'LEARY.

Manchuria, a north-eastern division of the Chinese Empire and the cradle of the present imperial dynasty. It lies to the north-east of the Eighteen Provinces of China, and extends from 38° 40′ to 49° N. lat. and from 120° to 133° E. long. It is bounded on the north by the Amur and Russian territory, on the east by the Usuri, on the south by Corea (Yalu River), the Gulf of Liao-tung, and the Yellow Sea, and on the west by the Nonni River and the line of palisades (Liuch'êng), running from the sea to the Great Wall of China. On account of its situation, its southern portion is sometimes called *Shan-hai-kwan-wai Man-chou san-sheng*, that is, the three Manchou provinces beyond Shan-hai-kwan, and also *Kwan-tung*, or the Country East of the Pass (Shan-hai-kwan). The markets opened to foreign trade are New-chwang, Ngantung (Japanese Antoken) Dalny (Jap. Dairen), and Harbin: Port Arthur (Liu Shun-k'ou), being the terminus of the Siberian railway, is a port of great importance. Manchuria is divided into three provinces, Tung-san-sheng (the three eastern provinces); Fêng-tien, also known as Sheng-king (Holy Court) from its capital Mukden, with 6 *fu* and 2 *t'ing* (prefectures), 4,000,000 inhabitants; Kirin or Ki-lin, with six prefectures, 6,500,000 inhabitants; and He-lung-kiang or Tsitsihar (Amur), with 5 prefectures, 2,000,000 inhabitants. The northern part of the country is watered by the Sungari and its affluent the Nonni, belonging to the Amur region; the southern part is watered by the Liao-ho and its affluent the Kara-muren, which empty themselves into the Gulf of Liao-tung. The country is generally moun-

tainous, but it includes two plains, the Liao-ho and the Central Sungari. The two chief ranges are the Hing-ngan-ling in the west, and the Ch'ang-peshan or Shan-a-lin, the "long white mountain", in the east.

The Chinese administration was reorganized by an Imperial Decree of 20 April, 1907, and, instead of a *Tsiang-kiun* (military governor), a *Tsung-tu* (governor general and imperial high commissioner) with residence at Mukden, is placed at the head of the three provinces. The present (1910) occupant of this office is Siu Chih-ch'ang. He is assisted by the three *Siun-fu* (governors) of the provinces, a senior and a junior secretary to the government (Tso Ts'an-tsan and Yu Ts'an-tsan) and commissioners of education, of justice, for foreign affairs, for banner affairs, for internal affairs, of finance, for Mongolian affairs. The Eight Banners (*Pa-k'i*) of the Manchu army are divided into two classes, the three superior and five inferior banners, distinguished by their colours: (1) Bordered yellow; (2) plain yellow; (3) plain white; (4) bordered white; (5) plain red; (6) bordered red; (7) plain blue; (8) bordered blue. There are eight banners of each of the following nationalities: Manchu, Mongolian, Chinese (Han-kiun), consisting of the descendants of the natives of northern China who helped the Manchu invaders in the seventeenth century. Each nationality is called *Ku sai* (Ku shan), and as each has eight banners or *k'i*, the whole force thus includes twenty-four banners. At the head of the banners is a *Chu-fang Tsiang-kiun* or general, with an assistant (*Ts'an-tsan-ta-tch'en*); then come the *Tu T'ung*, *Fu Tu-tung*, etc. They are garrisoned not only at Peking, but also in various provincial towns.

History.—The Liao (K'i-tan) and the Kin (Niu-chen), two Tatar tribes which governed northern China from the tenth to the thirteenth century, sprang from Manchuria. The present imperial Manchu dynasty of China, the Ts'ing, comes from the Ngai-sin family, and is related closely to the Kiu, both being descended from a common stock, the Su-shen of Kirin. The Manchu chieftains, ancestors of the present dynasty, bear the dynastic title (*miao-hao*) of Chao Tsu Yuan, Hing Tsu Chih, King Tsu Yih, Hien Tsu Yih, Hien Tsu Siuan (1583), T'ai Tsu Kao, and T'ai Tsung Wen; the two last have the title of reign or *nien-hao* of T'ien Ming (1616) and T'ien Tsung (1627), the latter changed into Ts'ung Teh (1636). These kings are buried at Mukden. The first emperor at Peking was Shun-che (1644), with the dynastic title of She Tsu Chang. During the war between China and Japan, after the severe engagement at Ping Yang (16 Sept., 1894) and the naval fight at the mouth of the Yalu River (17 Sept., 1894), the Japanese crossed the river, entered Manchuria, and marched on Feng-huang-cheng and Haï-cheng, whilst another army under the command of Count Oyama landed at Kin-chou and captured Ta-Lien-Wan and Port Arthur (21 Nov., 1894). Under Article II of the treaty of peace signed between China and Japan at Shimonoseki on 17 April, 1895, China ceded to Japan in perpetuity full sovereignty over the southern portion of the province of Fêng-tien, including all the islands belonging to it, which are situated in the eastern portion of the Bay of Liao-tung and in the northern part of the Yellow Sea. By a new convention signed at Peking on 8 Nov., 1895, Japan retroceded this portion of Fêng-tien to China for a compensation of 30,000,000 Kuping taels; this gain to China was obtained through the action at Tokio of Russia, France, and Germany. Russia was to reap the benefit of it. By a convention signed at Peking on 27 March, 1898, China agreed to lease to Russia Port Arthur, Ta-Lien-Wan, and the adjacent waters, while an additional agreement, defining the boundaries of leased and neutral territory in the Liao-tung peninsula, was signed at St. Petersburg on 7 May, 1898. Six years later, war broke out between Russia and Japan. In the night of the 8–9 Feb., 1904, the Russian fleet anchored at Port Arthur was attacked by Admiral Togo. The culminating point of the defence was Port Arthur, which surrendered on 2 Jan., 1905. Manchuria was the field of the action between the two contending armies, the chief battles being those of Liao-yang (25 Aug.–3 Sept., 1904) between Kuropatkin and Oyama, of Sha-ho (9–14 Oct.), and of Mukden (1–9 March, 1905). By the Treaty of Portsmouth both Russia and Japan agreed to evacuate simultaneously Manchuria, with the exception of the portion of the Liao-tung peninsula leased to Russia and surrendered to Japan, and to retrocede the administration of the province to China.

Railways.—On 8 Sept., 1896, an agreement was signed between the Chinese Government and the Russo-Chinese Bank for the construction and management of a line called the Chinese Eastern Railway, and running from one of the points on the western borders of the province of Heh Lung Kiang to one of the points on the eastern borders of the province of Kirin; also for the connexion of this railway with those branches which the Imperial Russian Government was to construct to the Chinese frontier from Trans-Baikalia and the Southern Usuri lines. An agreement between Russia and China with regard to Manchuria was signed at Peking on 26 March (8 April), 1902, by which Russia agreed to the re-establishment of the authority of the Chinese Government in that region, which remains an integral part of the Chinese Empire. By the regulations for mines and railways, approved by the Emperor of China on 19 Nov., 1893, it had been stipulated that mining and railway questions in the three Manchurian provinces, in Shan-tung, and at Lung-chou, being affected by international questions, shall not hereafter be invoked as precedents by the Chinese or foreign authorities. The Russian line from the Lake Baikal to Vladivostok passes via Hâilar, Tsitsihar, and Harbin, whence a line branches southwards to Port Arthur via Ch'ang-ch'un and Mukden. A short line runs from Port Arthur to Dalny; another from Tashi-li-k'iao to Yingk'ou (New-chwang); another from Liao-yang to the Yen-t'ai mines; another from Mukden to Ngantung at the mouth of the Yalu River. The Peking-T'ientsin line is extended through Shan-hai-kwan to Sinmint'un and Mukden, and has a branch line which diverges to New-chwang. Express trains with Pullman cars began running towards the end of October, 1908; a train leaves Dalny every Monday and Friday morning, connecting with the Russian express at Kwan-cheng-tze, and returning on Tuesdays and Saturdays.

Trade.—We give the revenue of the various customs districts according to the statistics of 1908, the last published (1 Haikwan tael = 65 cents):—Gross value of the trade in taels: Ngantung, 6,941,986; Tatungkau, 353,517; Dalny, 32,688,186; Suifenho, 12,754,878; Manchouli, 4,078,788; New-chwang, 41,-437,041. Net value of the trade: Ngantung, 6,188,799; Tatungkau, 350,850; Dalny, 32,258,461; Suifenho, 11,985,705; Manchouli, 3,829,785; New-chwang, 41,-199, 027. Suifenho and Manchouli form the Harbin District. On 11 Sept., 1908, the Japanese and Chinese commissioners signed at Mukden the detailed working regulations of the Sino-Japanese Yalu Timber Company, the re-establishment of which was first provided for by Article X of the Komura Agreement signed at Peking on 22 Dec., 1905, and later made the subject of a more definite compact when the Yalu Forestry Agreement was concluded at Peking on 14 May, 1908.

Vicariates Apostolic.—The Vicariate Apostolic of Manchuria was created in 1838 at the expense of the Bishopric of Peking, and the first vicar Apostolic was Emmanuel-Jean-François Verrolles, of the Society of Foreign Missions, Paris (b. 12 April, 1805; created Bishop of Colombia, 8 Nov., 1840; d. 29 April, 1878). The names of his successors, who all belonged to the same congregation, are: Constant Dubail, Bishop of

Bolina, d. 7 Dec., 1837; Joseph André Boyer, Bishop of Myrina, coadjutor to Mgr Dubail, d. 8 March, 1887; Aristide Louis Hippolyte Raguit, Bishop of Trajanopolis, d. 17 May, 1889; Laurent Guillon, Bishop of Eumenia, d. 2 July, 1900. By Decree of 10 May, 1898, Manchuria was divided into two vicariates Apostolic: Northern Manchuria and Southern Manchuria, which Mgr Guillon retained. The present vicars Apostolic are Pierre Marie Lalouyer, Bishop of Raphanea, for Northern Manchuria (1898), residing at Kirin, and Marie Felix Choulet, Bishop of Zela, for Southern Manchuria (1901), residing at Mukden. This mission suffered dreadfully during the Boxer rebellion; not only missionaries like Emonet were massacred, but Bishop Guillon himself was burnt to death at Mukden. Southern Manchuria (Mukden) includes 32 European and 8 native priests, 23,354 Christians, and 8406 catechumens; 4 churches and 86 chapels; 32 schools for boys and 31 for girls; 11 orphanages; 15 sisters of Providence of Portieux and 30 native sisters. Northern Manchuria (Kirin) includes 25 European and 8 native priests, 19,350 Christians; 21 churches and 66 chapels; 74 schools for boys and 49 for girls; 9 orphanages; 35 native sisters of the Immaculate Heart of Mary and 135 native sisters.

HENRI CORDIER.

Mandæans. See NASOREANS.

Mandan Indians—A formerly important, but now reduced, tribe occupying jointly with the Hidatsa (Minitari or Grosventre) and Arikara (Ree) the Fort Berthold reservation, on both sides of the Missouri, near its conjunction with the Knife River, North Dakota. The Mandan and Hidatsa are of Siouan linguistic stock, the latter speaking the same language as the Crows. The Mandan call themselves Numañkaki, "people", the name by which they are commonly known—Mawatani in the Sioux form—being said to be of Cree origin. According to the Mandan genesis myth they originally lived underground, beside a subterranean lake. Some of the more adventurous climbed up to the surface by means of a grapevine and were delighted with the sight of the earth, which they found covered with buffalo and rich with every kind of fruits; returning with the grapes they had gathered, their countrymen were so pleased with the taste of them that the whole nation resolved to leave their dull residence for the charms of the upper region; men, women, and children ascended by means of the vine; but when about half the nation had reached the surface, the vine broke, and the light of the sun was lost to the remainder. When the Mandan die they expect to return to the original seats of their forefathers, the good reaching the ancient village by means of the lake, which the burden of the sins of the wicked will not enable them to cross. It is possible that the tradition regarding the "ground-house" Indians who once lived in that section and dwelt in circular earth lodges, partly underground, applies to this tribe. Their traditional migration was up the Missouri, and the remains of their former villages can be traced as far down as White River, S. D. The earliest white explorer to visit them was the French La Verendrye in 1738, but their villages were even then the trading rendezvous and trail centre for all the tribes of the upper Missouri. About the year 1750 they were living about the mouth of Heart River, in the vicinity of the present cities of Mandan and Bismarck, in nine villages, two of which were on the east bank of the Missouri. They probably numbered then about 3600 souls. Between that time and the visit of the American explorers, Lewis and Clark, who wintered among them in 1804–5, they had been reduced by smallpox (1780–2) and wars with the Sioux to about 1200 souls in two villages on opposite sides of the Missouri, below Knife river. Here they were visited between 1832 and 1837 by the German traveller, Prince Maximilian, and the artist Catlin, both of whom, like Lewis and Clark, have much to say of their peculiar ceremonies, manly character and friendly disposition. In 1837–8 a great epidemic of smallpox which swept the whole northern plains almost exterminated the tribe, leaving alive only about 130 out of 1600 souls. A few years later (1845–1858) the survivors followed the Hidatsa up to a new situation about the former Fort Berthold, where a reservation was later established for the three tribes. The Mandan now number about 260, the Arikara 405, and the Hidatsa 460, a total of about 1125, as compared with perhaps 9000 about 1780. Excepting for some trouble with the Arikara in 1823, all three tribes have maintained friendly terms with the whites.

With the possible exception of the priests who accompanied La Verendrye, the first regular mission teacher among the Mandan and associated tribes was Father Francis Craft, best known for his work among the Sioux, who with the help of some of his Sioux Indian sisterhood, began what is now the Sacred Heart mission, at Elbowoods, McLean Co., N. D., on the east side of the Missouri and within the reservation, which claims now over 500 communicants in the three tribes, served by a secular priest. Plans are completed for a Benedictine mission house to be in operation before the close of 1910. The Mandan and associated tribes were equestrian in habit and depended about equally on hunting and agriculture, cultivating large fields of corn, beans, pumpkins, and sunflowers (for the edible seeds), which they traded to the Plains tribes for horses and buffalo robes. According to Maxmilian the Mandan were vigorous, well made, rather above medium stature, many of them being broad-shouldered and muscular. They paid the greatest attention to their headdress. Tattooing was practised to a limited extent, mostly on the left breast and arm, with black parallel stripes and a few other figures. Some of the women were robust and rather tall, though usually they where short and broad-shouldered, and were adept potters. Their houses were large circular communal structures of stout logs covered with earth, and their villages were sometimes palisaded. They had the same organization of military societies common to the Plains tribes generally. Polygamy was common. Besides the Sun and the Buffalo, they invoked a number of supernatural personages, among whom was the "Old Woman who Never Dies", who presided over the fields and harvests, and in whose honour they performed ritual dances and sacrifices at planting and gathering. They had numerous shrines and sacred places, and their great palladium was a sacred "ark", which was connected with their genesis myth, and which was carefully guarded in a house by itself. Their great ceremony of the Sun Dance—described by Catlin under the name of Okeepa—exceeded that of all other tribes in the extent of barbarous self-torture practised by the participants. Sketches of the language are given by Hayden and Maximilian. (See also SIOUX.)

CATLIN, *North Am. Inds.* (New York, 1841); IDEM, *Okeepa, a Religious Ceremony of the Mandans* (Philadelphia, 1867); *Commissioner of Ind. Affairs, Annual Repts.* (Washington); DORSEY, *Study of Siouan Cults, in 11th Rept., Bur. Ethnology* (Washington, 1894); HAYDEN, *Ethnog. and Philology of the Ind. Tribes of the Missouri Valley* (Philadelphia, 1862); LEWIS AND CLARK, *Explorations*, ed. THWAITES (New York, 1904–5); MATTHEWS, *Hidatsa Indians* (Washington, 1877); MAXIMILIAN, PRINCE OF WIED, *Travels* (Coblenz, 1839–41); Eng. tr. (London, 1843); *Director. Bur. Cath. Ind. Missions, Annual Reports* (Washington); MARGRY, *Découvertes*, etc., VI (Paris, 1886) (La Verendrye report).

JAMES MOONEY.

Mandatum. See HOLY WEEK; MAUNDY THURSDAY.

Mandeville (MAUNDEVILLE, MONTEVILLA), JEAN DE, author of a book of travels much read in the Middle Ages, d. probably in 1372. The writer describes himself as an English knight born at St. Albans. In 1322, on the feast of St. Michael, he set out on a jour-

ney that took him first to Egypt where he participated as mercenary in the sultan's wars against the Bedouins. He next visited Palestine, then, by way of India, also the interior of Asia and China, and served for fifteen months in the army of the Great Khan of Mongolia. After an absence of thirty-four years he returned in 1356, and at the instance and with the help of a physician, whose acquaintance he had made in Egypt at the court of the sultan, he wrote in Lüttich an account of his experiences and observations. In the manuscripts 1372 is given as the year of his death. Later investigation, however, made it clear that the real author was Jean de Bourgoigne, or à la Barbe, a physician from Lüttich, to whom several medical works are also attributed. He really lived for some time in Egypt, and during his sojourn may have conceived the idea of describing a journey to the Orient. Having visited no foreign country except Egypt, he was compelled to make use of the descriptions of others and to publish his compilation under a pseudonym. He discloses, in the situations borrowed often word for word from various authors, an extraordinarily wide range of reading, and he understood how to present his matter so attractively that the work in manuscript and print had a wonderful popularity.

His chief sources are the accounts of the travels of the first missionaries of the Dominican and Franciscan orders (see GEOGRAPHY AND THE CHURCH), who were the first to venture into the interior of Asia. He describes Constantinople and Palestine almost entirely according to the "Itinerarius" of the Dominican William of Boldensele written in 1336; he made use moreover of the "Tractatus de distantiis locorum terræ sanctæ" of Eugesippus, the "Descriptio terræ sanctæ" of John of Würzburg (c. 1165), and the "Libellus de locis sanctis" of Theodoricus (c. 1172). He was able out of his own experiences to give particulars about Egypt. What he has to say about the Mohammedan is taken from the work "De statu Saracenarum" (1273) of the Dominican William of Tripolis. His account of the Armenians, Persians, Turks, etc., is borrowed from the "Historia orientalis" of Hayton, the former Prince of Armenia and later Abbot of Poitiers. For the country of the Tatars and China he made use almost word for word of the "Descriptio orientalium" of the Franciscan Odoric of Pordenone, and in parts of the "Historia Mongolorum" of the Franciscan John of Plano Carpini. Apart from books of travels he plagiarised from works of a general nature, the old authors Pliny, Solinus, Josephus Flavius, and the comprehensive "Speculum Historiale" of Vincent of Beauvais. The numerous manuscripts and printed editions are enumerated by Röhricht ("Bibliotheca Geographica Palestinæ", Berlin, 1890, pp. 79–85). The oldest impressions are: in French (Lyons, 1480); German (Augsburg, 1481, 1482); English (Westminster, 1499). Modern editions: "The voiage and travaile of Sir Mandeville", with introd. by J. O. Halliwell (London, 1839); "The Buke of John Maundeuill", ed. by G. F. Warner (Westminster, 1889), in Roxburghe Club, Publications, No. 30; "Travels of Mandeville. The Version of the Cotton Manuscript in Modern Spelling" (London, 1900).

Consult SCHÖNBORN, *Bibliogr. Untersuchungen über die Reisebeschreibung des Sir John Mandeville* (Breslau, 1840); NICHOLSON in *The Academy*, 11 Nov., 1876, and 12 February, 1881; NICHOLSON AND YULE in *Encycl. Brit.*, s. v. MANDEVILLE, JEHAN DE; NICHOLSON in *The Academy*, 12 April, 1884; BOVENSCHEN, *Untersuchungen über Johann v. Mandeville und die Quellen seiner Reisebeschreibung* in *Zeitschr. der Ges. E. Erdkunde zu Berlin*, XXIII (Berlin, 1888), pp. 177–306; MURRAY, *John de Burdeus or John de Burgundia otherwise Sir John de Mandeville and the pestilence* (London, 1891).

O. HARTIG.

Manes. See MANICHÆISM.

Manfredonia, ARCHDIOCESE OF (SIPONTINA). The city of Manfredonia is situated in the province of Foggia in Apulia, Central Italy, on the borders of Mount Gargano. It was built by King Manfred in 1256 not far from the ruins of the ancient Sipontum, destroyed by an earthquake in 1233. Sipontum was a flourishing Greek colony; having fallen into the hands of the Samnites, it was retaken about 335 B. C. by King Alexander of Epirus, uncle of Alexander the Great. In 189 B. C. it became a Roman colony, and in A. D. 663 it was taken and destroyed by the Slavs. In the ninth century, Sipontum was for a time in the power of the Saracens; in 1042 the Normans made it the seat of one of their twelve counties. The latter won a decisive victory there over the Byzantine general Argyrus in 1052. According to legend, the Gospel was preached at Sipontum by St. Peter and by St. Mark; more trust, however, may be placed in the tradition of the martyrdom of the priest St. Justin and his companions under Gallienus and Maximian about 255. The first bishop, whose date may be fixed, was Felix, who was at Rome in 465. In the time of Bishop Lawrence, during the reign of Gelasius I (492–496), took place on Mt. Gargano the apparition of St. Michael, in memory of which the famous Monastery of the Archangel was founded. About 688 Pope Vitalian was obliged to entrust to the bishops of Benevento the pastoral care of Sipontum, which was almost abandoned, but the see was re-established in 1034, and under Bishop Saint Gerard (1066) it became an archdiocese. The ancient cathedral remained still at Sipontum, but, with the building of Manfredonia, the archiepiscopal see was transferred to the latter city. Among the other bishops were Matteo Orsini (1327), later cardinal; Cardinal Bessarione (1447), administrator; Niccolò Pecotto (1458), a Greek scholar and theologian; Giovanni del Monte (1512), subsequently pope under the name of Julius III; Domenico Ginnasio (1586), who suppressed the use of the Greek Rite at the high altar of the cathedral of Sipontum, a custom which had obtained until his day; Antonio Marcello (1643) who founded the seminary and restored the cathedral destroyed by the Turks in 1620; Vincenzo Orsini (1675), afterwards pope under the name of Benedict XIII. In 1818 the Archbishop of Manfredonia was made perpetual administrator of the Diocese of Viesti, a see that dates at least from the eleventh century. The archdiocese is divided into 16 parishes; contains 101,800 faithful, 1 religious house of men and 4 of women, and 4 educational institutes for girls.

CAPPELLETTI, *Le Chiese d'Italia*, XX (Venice, 1857).

U. BENIGNI.

Mangalore, DIOCESE OF (MANGALORENSIS), on the west coast of India, suffragan of Bombay. It comprises the whole collectorate of South Canara, and a portion of Malabar from Ponany to Mount Deli; it stretches inland as far as the Ghauts, a distance varying from 40 to 60 miles. The total Catholic population is reckoned at about 93,028. South Canara is divided into four ecclesiastical districts, each with its Vara (almost equivalent to rural dean), in which there are thirty-three churches with resident priests besides a number of chapels; while in Malabar there are churches at Cannanore, Tellicherry and Calicut. The clergy are partly of the Venetian province of the Society of Jesus, and partly native secular clergy, the former numbering 41 and the latter 56. There is also a house of the Convent of the Carmelite Congregation, Syro-Malabar rite, besides Carmelite Tertiaries and Sisters of Charity. The episcopal residence and seminary are at Mangalore.

History.—Originally the South Canara portion belonged to the Archidocese of Goa, while the Malabar portion belonged to the Archbishopric of Cranganore. St. Francis Xavier was at Cannanore for a few hours, but there is no evidence for the popular tradition that he missionised Canara. The pioneer work seems to have been done by the Franciscans, who early in the sixteenth century had founded several stations along

the coast; and the number of Christians was augmented by immigrations from Salcete near Goa. In the seventeenth century, on account of the decline of the Portuguese supremacy in India, Canara seems to have become destitute of resident clergy. In consequence the Holy See placed the country under the already existing Carmelite vicar Apostolic of Malabar—an arrangement which soon gave rise to rivalry and disputes with the Goa authorities. Between 1685 and 1712 some Oratorians were working in the districts, of whom the chief was the Ven. Joseph Vas. In 1764 Canara fell under the dominion of Hyder Ali of Mysore, whose attitude towards the Christians was favourable. But his successor Tipu Sultan (1782–1799) showed himself so fanatical and violent that the Christians were for the most part seized and reduced to captivity. A few were suffered to remain unmolested round about Mangalore, while others escaped to Coorg and certain parts of the Carnatic. Meanwhile the country still remained under the Carmelite Vicar Apostolic of Verapoly (Malabar) whose domain comprised not only South but also North Canara (Sunkery or Carwar mission) while Coorg fell to the lot of the vicar Apostolic of the Great Mogul at Bombay. In 1838, in consequence of the brief "Multa Praeclare", and its definitive restriction of the Padroado jurisdiction, great rivalry and discord was renewed between the Propaganda and Padroado parties. In 1840 the people of Canara hoped to put an end to these dissensions by petitioning for a separate vicariate; but the movement was opposed by the Carmelite vicar Apostolic. In 1845 the Vicariate of Verapoly was divided into three parts (Quilon, Verapoly and Mangalore) and the pro-vicar Apostolic appointed for Mangalore was a Carmelite, Father Bernardine of St. Agnes. In 1853 South Canara was made into a separate vicariate but remained under Italian Carmelite rule until 1858, when it was transferred to the French Carmelites, and finally in 1878 to the Jesuits. On the formation of the hierarchy in 1886 Mangalore became a bishopric, which in 1893, together with Trichinopoly, was made suffragan to Bombay.

Succession of Prelates.—Previous to 1845, see VERAPOLY, ARCHDIOCESE OF.

Pro-Vicar Apostolic.—Bernardine of St. Agnes, O. C. Disc., 1845–52.

Vicars Apostolic.—Michael Anthony of St. Aloysius, O. C. Disc., 1853–71.

Mary Ephrem Garrelon, O. C. Disc., 1868–73.

Nicholas Pagani, S. J., 1885–95 (became first bishop in 1886).

Abundius Cavadini, S. J., 1895–1910 (see vacant).

Institutions.—St. Aloysius's College, Mangalore, affiliated to Madras University, the only First Grade College on the Malabar Coast, with 1000 pupils. Classes from elementary to B. A. taught by Jesuit Fathers and lay-teachers; boarding house with 80 boarders, and hostels for Hindu students. About 350 non-Christian pupils of various castes and creeds are among the pupils. St. Joseph's Seminary, Jeppoo, with 43 clerical students under Jesuit professors; Sacred Heart House of students of the Carmelite Congregation; St. Anne's High School under Tertiary Carmelite Sisters, for Eurasian and Indian girls, with 449 pupils, prepares for matriculation and teacher's certificate examination; Victoria Caste Girls' School with 159 pupils, and St. Mary's School, Milagres, with 175 pupils, both conducted by the same Sisters; St. Anthony's Boys' and Girls' Schools with 200 pupils; schools at Cannanore with 686 pupils, at Tellicherry with 132 pupils, at Calicut with 139 pupils; European Boys School at Calicut with 164 pupils, besides 70 other schools scattered over the district. Boarding houses attached to four schools; Catechumenates at Mangalore, Cannanore and Calicut; St. Joseph's Asylum work-shops at Jeppoo, Mangalore; three orphanages at Mangalore, and two at Cannanore and Calicut. Fr. Müller's establishments at Kankanady comprise: (1) Homœopathic Poor Dispensary, where the medicines dispensed to about 100 out-patients a day are the Soleri-Bellotti specifics, of which Fr. Müller possesses the secret; (2) St. Joseph's Leper Asylum; (3) Our Lady's Home, with male and female wards, each containing 36 beds; (4) Plague Hospital for cases of bubonic plague. Fr. Müller is assisted by a qualified doctor and a number of infirmarians and nurses. There is a hospital at Jeppoo under the Sisters of Charity, and another is situated at Calicut under Carmelite Tertiaries. New mission stations have been opened at Suratkal and Narol, each served by a Jesuit. Other establishments are St. Vincent's Society, Calicut; Catholic Union Club, Milagres; The Provident Fund with its office at Codialbail; Codialbail Press, at which the "Mangalore Magazine" is published and the Cloistered Carmelite Convent at Kankanady with 16 choir-nuns, 5 lay-sisters, and 4 *tourières*. The finest buildings in the diocese are St. Aloysius's college and church; St. Joseph's seminary, and the (Gothic) convent of Cloistered Carmelite nuns.

History of the Diocese of Mangalore, ed. MOORE (1905); *Madras Catholic Directory* for 1909; *The Mangalore Magazine*; *Status Missionis Mangalorensis* (1909).

ERNEST R. HULL.

Mangan, JAMES CLARENCE, Irish poet, b. in Dublin, 1 May, 1803; d. there, 20 June, 1849. He was the son of James Mangan, a grocer, and of Catherine Smith. He attended a school in Saul's Court, but when still young he had to work for the support of his family. For seven years he was a scrivener's clerk and for three years earned meagre wages in an attorney's office. Mitchel accepts the story, related by Mangan himself, but which O'Donaghue is inclined to make light of, that he passed through an unhappy love affair, which infused the bitter and mocking note into his subsequent verses, and even drove him to that intemperance which clouded the remainder of his days. In 1831, as a member of the Comet Club, he contributed verses to the club's journal, to which he sent his first German translations. His connexion with "The Dublin University Magazine" was terminated because his habits rendered him incapable of regular application. When Charles Gavan Duffy inaugurated "The Nation", in 1842, Mangan was for a time paid a fixed salary, but, as on former occasions, these relations were broken off, though he continued to send verses to "The Nation", even after he had cast in his lot with Mitchel, who in 1848 began to issue "The United Irishman". For these journals, as well as for "The Irish Tribune", "The Irishman", and "Duffy's Irish Catholic Magazine", Mangan wrote under various fantastic signatures.

In his clerical positions his eccentricities of manner and appearance had made him the object of persecution on the part of those employed with him, and his growing habits of intemperance gradually estranged him from human society. There are many descriptions of his personal appearance at this time, all of them dwelling on his spare figure, his tight blue cloak, his witch's hat, his inevitable umbrella. Still, there were distinguished men who recognized his ability and pitied his weaknesses, among them Anster, Petrie, Todd, O'Curry, O'Daly, and the various editors who printed his contributions. O'Donoghue thinks he has traced all of Mangan's poems and ascribes to him between 800 and 900. In these there is necessarily great inequality, but, at his best, it is difficult to gainsay Mitchel's enthusiastic estimate of him. His verses range from the passionate lament of the patriot to the whimsical satire and the apocryphal translation. He knew little or nothing of the languages from which his translations affected to be made. He was dependent for his renderings of Irish themes on the literal prose translations made by O'Curry and O'Daly.

Mangan fell an easy victim to the cholera which raged in Dublin in 1849. Before his death he was attended by the Rev. C. P. Meehan, who appreciated and loved him, and who, in 1884, edited a collection of his poems. A shabby stone marks his grave in Glasnevin Cemetery. The chief editions of his poems are Mitchel's (New York, 1859), Miss Guiney's (1897), and the centenary edition (Dublin and London, 1903).

McCall, *Life of James Clarence Mangan* (Dublin, 1887); Mitchel, *Introduction to Poems* (New York, 1859); O'Donoghue, *Life and Writings of James Clarence Mangan* (Dublin, 1897).

Blanche M. Kelly.

Mangan, John. See Kerry and Aghadoe, Diocese of.

Manharter, a politico-religious sect which arose in Tyrol in the first half of the nineteenth century. Its founder was a priest, Kaspar Benedict Hagleitner of Aschau, who was the only one of the clergymen of Brixenthal to refuse to take the oath of allegiance prescribed by Napoleon's edict of 30 May, 1809, for the ecclesiastical and secular authorities of the province of Salzburg, of which Brixenthal was then a part. His notion was that priests who took this oath were by that act excommunicated jointly with Napoleon. It was not long before zealous supporters rallied to him from among Austrian sympathizers and patriots in the Brixenthal villages of Westendorf, Brixen im Thal, Hopfgarten, Itter, and from Unter-Innthal, principally in the villages of Wörgl and Kirchbichl. There were two laymen also with Hagleitner at the head of this movement, Thomas Mair, a tanner, and Hagleitner's brother-in-law, and Sebastian Manzl, the parish magistrate of Westendorf. The latter was surnamed Manhart after his estate, the "Untermanhartsgut", and it was from him that the sect derived its name. Hagleitner himself lost his cure, and in 1811 went to Vienna, where he was appointed curate in Wiener-Neustadt. He kept in touch, however, with his partisans in Brixenthal, and on Tyrol being restored to Austrian rule, he was given once more a cure in Wörgl in November, 1814. But new intrigues again resulted in his removal the following summer. He thenceforth lived a private life in and around Innsbruck until the summer of 1818, when he was ordered by the Government to repair to Vienna. He was named *Kaplan* shortly after in Kalksburg near Vienna, and died there as parish-priest in 1836.

The schism reached its full development at Easter, 1815, when for the first time Manzl and his household refused to receive the sacraments from the vicar of his home parish of Westendorf. Thenceforth Hagleitner was looked upon by the Manharter as the only priest of that region who "had the power" to confess and to administer Holy Communion. As a rule they no longer attended public Catholic worship, but held independent reunions of their own. They refused even to receive the Last Sacraments. Thus the Manharter first of all cut themselves off from their priests, because they considered them to have been excommunicated. They went further and proclaimed that the majority of French and German bishops and priests, as supporters of Napoleon in the established Church, had severed themselves from the supreme pontiff, and therefore from the Catholic Church itself. Consequently, they were now devoid of sacerdotal powers; all of their ecclesiastical functions were null and void; they could neither consecrate nor absolve validly. The Manharter thus believed themselves to be the only genuine Catholics in the land, and they professed to be true adherents of the pope. As strictly conservative champions of traditional custom, they protested likewise against a series of innovations which had been introduced into the Austrian Church, against the abolition of indulgences and pilgrimages, the abrogation of feast-days, the abolition of the Saturday fast, and the mitigation of that prescribed for the forty days of Lent. They likewise opposed text-books recently brought into the schools, which were not Christian in tone, and finally they combated the vaccination of children, as an offence against faith, and for this additional reason reproached the clergy with countenancing and supporting this state regulation. A spell of apocalyptic extravagance took hold of the Manharter about this period, when they united with the so-called "Michael Confraternity", or the Order of the Knights of Michael. This was a fanatical secret society founded in Carinthia by the visionary, Agnes Wirsinger, and by a priest, Johann Holzer of Gmünd. Its adherents awaited the impending destruction of the wicked by the Archangel Gabriel, at which time they, the undefiled, were to be spared and to receive the earth in heritage. The heads of the Manharter began their relations with this society in the autumn of 1815, and in 1817 Hagleitner secured their formal admittance into it. One phase of this society's apocalyptic expectations led its members to regard Napoleon as Antichrist already come upon the earth.

In vain did the new administrator of the Archdiocese of Salzburg, Count Leopold von Firmian, exert himself on his pastoral visitations during the summer of 1819 to convince the Manharter of their error. The latter questioned the genuineness of his episcopal character and refused to hear anyone but the pope. The efforts of Bernhard Galura, spiritual counsellor to the Government, remained equally fruitless. Even punishments inflicted by the civil authorities for the holding of secret reunions and for continued disobedience failed to accomplish any result. The Manharter persisted in their request that they be permitted to send a deputation to Rome to obtain a decision from the pope in person, but this the Government refused to allow. The majority of the members of the sect were at last brought back into the fold of the Church under the distinguished Archbishop of Salzburg, Augustin Gruber. It is true that his endeavours to correct them in the course of a pastoral tour made through Brixenthal in 1824, and his appeals to them in a pastoral letter of 25 May, 1825, bore no direct fruit; but he obtained their promise to believe in and to obey him, provided the pope himself should declare that he was their lawful bishop. Archbishop Gruber then secured leave from the emperor for Manzl, Mair, and Simon Laiminger, to make the journey to Rome with an interpreter. They started in September, 1825, were received affectionately in the Eternal City, and, by order of the Holy Father, were given a long and exhaustive course of instruction by the Camaldolese abbot, Mauro Capellari (afterwards Gregory XVI). Finally, on 18 December, they were received in private audience by Leo XII, who confirmed everything to them and received their submission. The three deputies returned home in January, 1826, appeared before the archbishop, and declared to him their allegiance. Two canons, sent into Brixenthal as representatives of the archbishop, received the profession of allegiance of the remaining Manharter. However, while this brought back into the Church the majority of the sect, which disappeared entirely from Brixenthal, a certain minority in Innthal, led by a fanatical woman, Maria Sillober of Kirchbichl, refused to submit and continued to persist in their sectarianism. These fanatics extended their opposition even to the pope himself, declaring that Leo XII, having set himself in contradiction to Pius VII, was not a lawful pope, and that the Holy See was for the time vacant. Thus the sect endured still a few dozen years with a restricted following until at last it disappeared completely with the death of its last adherents.

Flir, *Die Manharter. Ein Beitrag zur Gesch. Tirols im 19. Jahrh.* (Innsbruck, 1852).

Friedrich Lauchert.

Manichæism is the religion founded by the Persian Mani in the latter half of the third century. It purported to be the true synthesis of all the religious systems then known, and actually consisted of Zoroastrian Dualism, Babylonian folklore, Buddhist ethics, and some small and superficial addition of Christian elements. As the theory of two eternal principles, good and evil, is predominant in this fusion of ideas and gives colour to the whole, Manichæism is classified as a form of religious Dualism. It spread with extraordinary rapidity both in East and West and maintained a sporadic and intermittent existence in the West (Africa, Spain, France, North-Italy, the Balkans) for a thousand years, but it flourished mainly in the land of its birth (Mesopotamia, Babylonia, Turkestan) and even further East in Northern India, Western China, and Tibet, where, c. A. D. 1000, the bulk of the population professed its tenets and where it died out at an uncertain date.

I. Life of the Founder.—Mani (Gr. Μάνης, gen. usually, Μάνητος, sometimes Μάνεντος, rarely Μάνου; or Μανιχαῖος; Lat. *Manes*, gen. *Manetis;* in Augustine always *Manichæus*) is a title and term of respect rather than a personal name. Its exact meaning is not quite certain, ancient Greek interpretations were σκεῦος and ὁμιλία, but its true derivation is probably from the Babylonian-Aramaic *Mânâ*, which among the Mandæans was a term for a light-spirit, *mânâ rabba* being the "Light-King". It would therefore mean "the illustrious". This title was assumed by the founder himself and so completely replaced his personal name that the precise form of the latter is not known; two latinized forms however are handed down, Cubricus and Ubricus, and it seems likely that these forms are a corruption of the not unusual name of Shuraik. Although Mani's personal name is thus subject to doubt, there is no doubt concerning that of his father and family. His father's name was Fâtâk Bâbâk (Πατέκιος, or the "Well-preserved"), a citizen of Ecbatana, the ancient Median capital, and a member of the famous Chascanian Gens. The boy was born A. D. 215–216 in the village of Mardinu in Babylonia, from a mother of noble (Arsacide) descent whose name is variously given as Mes, Utâchîm, Marmarjam, and Karossa. The father was evidently a man of strong religious propensities, since he left Ecbatana to join the South-Babylonian Puritans (Menakkede) or Mandæans and had his son educated in their tenets. Mani's father himself must have displayed considerable activities as a religious reformer and have been a kind of forerunner of his more famous son, in the first years of whose public life he had some share. It is not impossible that some of Patekios's writing lies embedded in the Mandæan literature which has come down to us. Through misunderstanding the Aramaic word for disciple (*Tarbitha*, stat abs. *Tarbi*), Greek and Latin sources speak of a certain Τερέβινθος, Terebinthus of Turbo, as a distinct person, whom they confound partially with Mani, partially with Patekios, and as they also forgot that Mani, besides being Patekios' great disciple, was his bodily son, and that in consequence the Scythian teacher, Scythianus, is but Fatak Babak of Hamadam, the Scythian metropolis, their account of the first origins of Manichæism differs considerably from that given in Oriental sources. Notwithstanding Kessler's ingenious researches in this field, we cannot say that the relation between Oriental and Western sources on this point has been sufficiently cleared up, and it may well be that the Western tradition going back through the "Acta Archelai" to within a century from Mani's death, contains some truth.

Mani's father was at first apparently an idolator, for, as he worshipped in a temple to his gods he is supposed to have heard a voice urging him to abstain from meat, wine, and women. In obedience to this voice he emigrated to the south and joined the Mughtasilah, or Mandæan Baptists, taking the boy Mani, with him, but possibly leaving Mani's mother behind. Here, at the age of twelve Mani is supposed to have received his first revelation. The angel Eltaum (God of the Covenant; Tamiel, of Jewish rabbinical lore?), appeared to him, bade him leave the Mandæans and live chastely, but to wait still some twelve years before proclaiming himself to the people. It is not unlikely that the boy was trained up to the profession of painter, as he is often thus designated in Oriental (though late) sources.

Babylon was still a centre of the pagan priesthood; here Mani became thoroughly imbued with their ancient speculations. On Sunday, 20 March, A. D. 242, Mani first proclaimed his Gospel in the royal residence, Gundesapor, on the coronation day of Sapor I, when vast crowds from all parts were gathered together. "As once Buddha came to India, Zoroaster to Persia, and Jesus to the lands of the West, so came in the present time this Prophecy through me, the Mani, to the land of Babylonia", sounded the proclamation of this "Apostle of the true God". He seems to have had but little immediate success and was compelled to leave the country. For many years he travelled abroad, founding Manichæan communities in Turkestan and India. When he finally returned to Persia he succeeded in converting to his doctrine Peroz, the brother of Sapor I, and dedicated to him one of his most important works, the "Shapurakan". Peroz obtained for Mani an audience with the king and Mani delivered his prophetical message in the royal presence. We soon find Mani again a fugitive from his native land; though here and there, as in Beth Garmia, his teaching seems to have taken early root. While travelling, Mani spread and strengthened his doctrine by epistles or encyclical letters, of which some fourscore are known to us by title. It is said that Mani afterwards fell into the hands of Sapor I, was cast into prison, and only released at the king's death in 274. It seems certain that Sapor's successor, Ormuzd I, was favourable to the new prophet; perhaps he even personally released him from his dungeon, unless, indeed, Mani had already effected his escape by bribing a warder and fleeing across the Roman frontier. Ormuzd's favour, however, was of little avail, as he occupied the Persian throne only a single year, and Bahram I, his successor, soon after his accession, caused Mani to be crucified, had the corpse flayed, the skin stuffed and hung up at the city gate, as a terrifying spectacle to his followers, whom he persecuted with relentless severity. The date of his death is fixed at 276–277.

II. System of Doctrine and Discipline.—*Doctrine.* —The key to Mani's system is his cosmogony. Once this is known there is little else to learn. In this sense Mani was a true Gnostic, as he brought salvation by knowledge. Manichæism professed to be a religion of pure reason as opposed to Christian credulity; it professed to explain the origin, the composition, and the future of the universe; it had an answer for everything and despised Christianity, which was full of mysteries. It was utterly unconscious that its every answer was a mystification or a whimsical invention; in fact, it gained mastery over men's minds by the astonishing completeness, minuteness, and consistency of its assertions.

We are giving the cosmogony as contained in Theodore Bar Khoni, embodying the results of the study of François Cumont. Before the existence of heaven and earth and all that is therein, there were two Principles, the one Good the other Bad. The Good Principle dwells in the realm of light and is called the Father of Majesty (Grandeur or Greatness, Μέγεθος, Abba D'rabbutha), or the Father with the Four Faces or Persons (τετραπρόσωπον), probably because Time, Light, Force, and Goodness were regarded as essential manifestations of the First Being by the Zervanites (see Cosmogony: *Iranian*). Outside the Father there are his Five Tabernacles or *Shechinatha*, Intelligence,

Reason, Thought, Reflection, and Will. The designation of "Tabernacle" contains a play on the sound *Shechina* which means both dwelling or tent and "Divine glory or presence" and is used in the Old Testament to designate God's presence between the cherubim. These five tabernacles were pictured on the one hand as stories of one building—Will being the topmost story—and on the other hand as limbs of God's body. He indwelt and possessed them all, so as to be in a sense identical with them, yet again in a sense to be distinct from them. They are also designated as *æons* or worlds, *beata sæcula* in St. Augustine's writings. In other sources the five limbs are; Longanimity, Knowledge, Reason, Discretion, and Understanding. And again these five as limbs of the Father's spiritual body were sometimes distinguished from the five attributes of his pure Intelligence: Love, Faith, Truth, Highmindedness, and Wisdom. This Father of Light together with the light-air and the light-earth, the former with five attributes parallel to his own and the latter with the five limbs of Breath, Wind Light, Water, and Fire constitute the Manichæan Pleroma. This light world is of infinite extent in five directions and has only one limit, set to it below by the realm of Darkness, which is likewise infinite in all directions barring the one above, where it borders on the realm of light. Opposed to the Father of Grandeur is the King of Darkness. He is never actually called God, but otherwise, he and his kingdom down below are exactly parallel to the ruler and realm of the light above. The dark Pleroma is also triple, as it were firmament, air, and earth inverted. The first two (Heshuha and Humana) have the five attributes, members, æons, or worlds: Pestilent Breath, Scorching Wind, Gloom, Mist, Consuming Fire; the last has the following five: Wells of Poison, Columns of Smoke, Abysmal Depths, Fetid Marshes, and Pillars of Fire. This last five-fold division is clearly borrowed from ancient Chaldean ideas current in Mesopotamia.

These two Powers might have lived eternally in peace, had not the Prince of Darkness decided to invade the realm of light. On the approach of the monarch of chaos the five æons of light were seized with terror. This incarnation of evil, called Satan or Ur-devil (Διάβολος πρῶτος, *Iblis Kadim*, in Arabic sources), a monster, half fish, half bird, yet with four feet and lion-headed, threw himself upward towards the confines of light. The echo of the thunder of his onrush went through the blessed æons till it reached the Father of Majesty, who bethinking himself said: I will not send my five æons, made for blessed repose, to engage in this war, I will go myself and give battle. Hereupon the Father of Majesty emanated the Mother of Life and the Mother of Life emanated the First Man. These two constitute with the Father a sort of Trinity in Unity, hence the Father could say: "I myself will go". Mani here assimilates ideas already known from Gnosticism (q. v., subtitle *The Sophia Myth*) and resembling Christian doctrine, especially when it is borne in mind that "Spirit" is feminine in Hebrew-Aramaic and could thus easily be conceived as a mother of all living. The Protanthropos or "First Man" is a distinctly Iranian conception, which likewise found its way into a number of Gnostic systems (q. v.), but which became the central figure in Manichæism. The myth of the origin of the world out of the members of a dead giant or Ur-man is extremely ancient, not only in Iranian speculations but also in Indian mythology (Rig-Veda, X, 90). Indeed if the myth of Giant Ymir in Norse Cosmogonies (see Cosmogony) is not merely a medieval invention, as is sometimes asserted, this legend must be one of the earliest possessions of the Aryan race.

According to Mani the First-Man now emanates sons as a man who puts on his armour for the combat. These five sons are the five elements opposed to the five æons of darkness: Clear Air, Refreshing Wind, Bright Light, Life-giving Waters, and Warming Fire. He put on first the aerial breeze, then threw over himself light as a flaming mantle, and over this light a covering of water; he surrounded himself with gusts of wind, took light as his lance and shield, and cast himself downward towards the line of danger. An angel called Nahashbat (?), carrying a crown of victory, went before him. The First-Man projected his light before him, and the King of Darkness seeing it, thought and said: "What I have sought from afar, lo, I found it near me". He also clothed himself with his five elements and engaged in combat with the First-Man. The struggle went in favour of the King of Darkness. The First-Man, when being overcome, gave himself and his five sons as food to the five sons of Darkness, "as a man having an enemy, mixes deadly poison in a cake, and gives it to his foe". When these five resplendent deities had been absorbed by the sons of Darkness, reason was taken away from them and they became through the poisonous admixture with the sons of Darkness, like unto a man bitten by a wild dog or serpent. Thus the evil one conquered for a while. But the First-Man recovered his reason and prayed seven times to the Father of Majesty, who being moved by mercy, emanated as second creation, the Friend of the Light, this Friend of the Light emanated the Great Ban, and the Great Ban emanated the Spirit of Life. Thus a second trinity parallel to the first (Father of Light, Mother of Life, First Man) comes into existence. The first two personages of the latter trinity have not yet been explained and particularly the meaning of the Great Ban is a puzzle, but as in the former trinity, it is the third person, who does the actual work, the Spirit of Life (Τὸ Ζῶν Πνεῦμα), who becomes the demiurge or world-former. Like the First-Man he emanates five personalities: from his intelligence the Ornament of Splendour (Sefath Ziva, Splenditenens, φεγγόκατοχος in Greek and Latin sources), from his reason the Great King of Honour, from his thought Adamas, Light, from his self-reflection the King of Glory, and from his will the Supporter (Sabhla; Atlas and Ὠμοφόρος of Greek and Latin sources). These five deities were objects of special worship amongst Manichæans, and St. Augustine (Contra Faustum, XV) gives us descriptions of them drawn from Manichæan hymns.

These five descend to the realm of Darkness, find the First-Man in his degradation and rescue him by the word of their power; his armour remains behind, but lifting him by the right hand the Spirit of Life brings him back to the Mother of Life. The fashioning of the world now begins. Some of the sons of the Spirit of Life kill and flay the archons or sons of Darkness and bring them to the Mother of Life. She spreads out their skins and forms twelve heavens. Their corpses are hurled on the realm of Darkness and eight worlds are made, their bones form the mountain ranges. The Ornament of Splendour holds the five resplendent deities by their waist and below their waist the heavens are extended. Atlas carries all on his shoulders, the Great King of Honour sits on top of the heavens and guards over all. The Spirit of Life forces the sons of Darkness to surrender some of the light which they had absorbed from the five elements and out of this he forms the sun and the moon (vessels of light, *lucidæ naves* in St. Aug.) and the stars. The Spirit of Life further makes the wheels of the wind under the earth near the Supporter. The King of Glory by some creation or other enables these wheels to mount the surface of the earth and thus prevents the five resplendent deities from being set on fire by the poison of the archons. The text of Theodore Bar Khoni is here so confused and corrupt that it is difficult to catch the meaning; probably wind, water, air, and fire are considered protective coverings, encircling and enveloping the gross material earth, and revolving around it.

At this stage of the cosmogony the Mother of Life,

the First-Man, and the Spirit of Life beg and beseech the Father of Majesty for a further creation and as third creation he emanated the Messenger; in Latin sources this is the so-called Legatus Tertius. This Messenger emanates twelve virgins with their garments, crowns, and garlands, namely Royalty, Wisdom, Victory, Persuasion, Purity, Truth, Faith, Patience, Righteousness, Goodness, Justice, and Light. The Messenger dwells in the sun and, coming towards these twelve virgin-vessels, he commands his three attendants to make them revolve and soon they reach the height of the heavens. All this is a transparent metaphor for the planetary system and the signs of the zodiac. No sooner do the heavens rotate than the Messenger commands the Great Ban to renovate the earth and make the Great Wheels (Air, Fire, and Water) to mount. The Great Universe now moves, but as yet there is no life of plants, beasts, or man. The production of vegetative, animal, and rational life on earth is a process of obscenity, cannibalism, abortion, and prize-fighting between the Messenger and the sons and daughters of Darkness, the details of which are better passed over. Finally Naimrael, a female, and Ashaklun a male devil, bring forth two children, Adam and Eve. In Adam's body were imprisoned a vast number of germs of light. He was the great captive of the Power of Evil. The Powers of Light had pity and sent a Saviour, the luminous Jesus. This Jesus approached innocent Adam, awoke him from his sleep of death, made him move, drew him out of his slumber, drove away the seductive demon, and enchained far away from him the mighty female archon. Adam reflected on himself and knew that he existed. Jesus then instructed Adam and showed him the Fathers, dwelling in the celestial heights, and Jesus showed him his own personality, exposed to all things, to the teeth of the panther, the teeth of the elephant, devoured by the greedy, swallowed by gluttons, eaten by dogs, mixed with and imprisoned in all that exists, encompassed by the evil odours of Darkness. Mani's weird but mighty imagination had thus created a "suffering Saviour" and given him the name of Jesus. But this Saviour is but the personification of the Cosmic Light as far as imprisoned in matter, therefore it is diffused throughout all nature, it is born, suffers, and dies every day, it is crucified on every tree, it is daily eaten in all food. This captive Cosmic Light is called *Jesus patibilis*. Jesus then made Adam stand up and taste of the tree of life. Adam then looked around and wept. He mightily lifted up his voice as a roaring lion. He tore his hair and struck his breast and said, "Cursed be the creator of my body and he who bound my soul and they who have made me their slave." Man's duty henceforth is to keep his body pure from all bodily stain by practising self-denial and to help also in the great work of purification throughout the universe. Manichæan eschatology is in keeping with its cosmogony. When, mainly through the activity of the elect, all light-particles have been gathered together, the Messenger, or Legatus Tertius, appears, the Spirit of Life comes from the west, the First-Man with his hosts comes from north, south, and east, together with all light æons and all perfect Manichæans. Atlas, the World-Supporter, throws his burden away, the Ornament of Splendour above lets go, and thus heaven and earth sink into the abyss. A universal conflagration ensues and burns on until nothing but lightless cinders remain. This fire continues during 1486 years, during which the torments of the wicked are the delight of the just. When the separation of light from darkness is finally completed, all angels of light who had functions in the creation return on high; the dark world-soul sinks away in the depth, which is then closed forever and eternal tranquillity reigns in the realm of light, no more to be invaded by darkness. With regard to the after-death of the individual, Manichæism taught a three-fold state prepared for the Perfect, the Hearers, and the Sinners (non-Manichæans). The souls of the first are after death received by Jesus, who is sent by the First-Man accompanied by three æons of light and the Light-Maiden. They give the deceased a water-vessel, a garment, a turban, a crown, and a wreath of light. In vain do evil angels lie in his path, he scorns them and on the ladder of praise he mounts first to the moon, then to the First Man, the Sun, the Mother of Life, and finally to the Supreme Light. The bodies of the Perfect are purified by sun, moon and stars; their light-particles, set free, mount to the First Man and are formed into minor deities, surrounding his person. The fate of the heavens is ultimately the same as that of the Perfect, but they have to pass through a long purgatory before they arrive at eternal bliss. Sinners, however, must after death wander about in torment and anguish, surrounded by demons and condemned by the angels, till the end of the world, when they are, body and soul, thrown into hell.

Discipline.—To set the light-substance free from the pollution of matter was the ultimate aim of all Manichæan life. Those who entirely devoted themselves to this work were the "Elect" or "the Perfect", the *Primates Manichæorum;* those who through human frailty felt unable to abstain from all earthly joys, though they accepted Manichæan tenets, were "the Hearers", *auditores*, or catechumens. The former bear a striking similarity to Buddhist monks, only with this difference that they were always itinerant, being forbidden to settle anywhere permanently. The life of these ascetics was a hard one. They were forbidden to have property, to eat meat or drink wine, to gratify any sexual desire, to engage in any servile occupation, commerce or trade, to possess house or home, to practise magic, or to practise any other religion. Their duties were summed up in the three *signacula*, i. e., seals or closures, that of the mouth, of the hands, and of the breast (*oris, manuum, sinus*). The first forbade all evil words and all evil food. Animal food roused the demon of Darkness within man, hence only vegetables were allowed to the perfect. Amongst vegetables, some, as melons and fruit containing oil, were specially recommended, as they were thought to contain many light-particles, and by being consumed by the perfect these light particles were set free. The second forbade all actions detrimental to the light-substance, slaying of animals, plucking of fruit, etc. The third forbade all evil thoughts, whether against the Manichæan faith or against purity. St. Augustine (especially "De Moribus Manich.") strongly inveighs against the Manichæans' repudiation of marriage. They regarded it as an evil in itself because the propagation of the human race meant the continual re-imprisonment of the light substance in matter and a retarding of the blissful consummation of all things; maternity was a calamity and a sin and Manichæans delighted to tell of the seduction of Adam by Eve and her final punishment in eternal damnation. In consequence there was a danger that the act of generation, rather than the act of unchastity was abhorred, and that this was a real danger Augustine's writings testify.

The number of the Perfect was naturally very small and in studying Manichæism one is particularly struck by the extreme paucity of individual Perfecti known in history. The vast bulk of Mani's adherents—ninety-nine out of every hundred—were Hearers. They were bound by Mani's Ten Commandments only, which forbade idolatry, mendacity, avarice, murder (i. e. all killing), fornication, theft, seduction to deceit, magic, hypocrisy (secret infidelity to Manichæism), and religious indifference. The first positive duty seems to have been the maintenance and almost the worship of the Elect. They supplied them with vegetables for food and paid them homage on bended knee, asking for their blessing. They regarded them as superior beings, nay, collectively, they were thought to constitute the

æon of righteousness. Beyond these ten negative commandments there were the two duties common to all, prayer and fasting.

Prayer was obligatory four times a day: at noon, late in the afternoon, after sunset, and three hours later. Prayer was made facing the sun, or, in the night, the moon; when neither sun nor moon was visible, then the North, the throne of the Light-King. It was preceded by a ceremonial purification with water or for lack of water with some other substance in the Mohammedan fashion. The daily prayers were accompanied by twelve prostrations and addressed to the various personalities in the realm or light: the Father of Majesty, the First Man, the Legatus Tertius, the Paraclete (Mani), the Five Elements, and so on. They consist mainly of a string of laudatory epithets and contain but little supplication. As time and attitude of prayer were intimately connected with astronomical phenomena, so likewise was the duty of fasting. All fasted on the first day of the week in honour of the sun, the Perfect also fasted on the second day in honour of the moon. All kept the fast during two days after every new moon; and once a year at the full moon, and at the beginning of the first quarter of the moon. Moreover a monthly fast, observed till sunset, was begun on the eighth day of the month.

Of rites and ceremonies amongst the Manichæans but very little is known to us. They had one great solemnity, that of the Bema (בימא), the anniversary of Mani's death. This was kept with a vigil of prayers and spiritual reading. An empty chair was placed on a raised platform to which five steps led up. Further details are as yet unknown. St. Augustine complains that though Manichæans pretended to be Christians, their feast of the death of Mani exceeded in solemnity that of the Death and Resurrection of Christ.

Manichæans must have possessed a kind of baptism and eucharist. The epistle on baptism, which occurred among the sacred literature of the Manichæans, is unfortunately lost, and in Oriental sources the matter is not referred to, but Christian sources suppose the existence of both these rites. Of greater importance than baptism was the *Consolamentum* or "Consolation", an imposition of hands by one of the Elect by which a Hearer was received amongst their number. The Manichæan hierarchy and constitution is still involved in obscurity. Mani evidently intended to provide a supreme head for the multitude of his followers. He even decided that his successor in this dignity should reside in Babylon. This high priesthood is known in Arabic sources as the *Imamate*. In the East it seems to have possessed at least some temporary importance, in the West it seems hardly known or recognized. No list of these Supreme Pontiffs of Manichæism has come down to us; hardly a name or two is known to history. It is doubtful even whether the chair of Mani did not remain vacant for long periods. On the duties and privileges of the Imamate we possess at present no information. According to Western and Eastern sources the Manichæan Church was divided into five hierarchical classes; St. Augustine names them *magistri, episcopi, presbyteri, electi,* and *auditores;* this Christianized terminology represents in Manichæan mystical language the sons of meekness, of reason, of knowledge, of mystery, and of understanding. Mani's astrological predilections for the number five, so evident in his cosmogony, evidently suggested this division for his Church or kingdom of the light on earth. The Teachers and Administrators (*magistri* et *episcopi*) are probably an adaptation of the λέγοντες and δρῶντες, the speakers and the doers, known in Greek and Babylonian mysteries; and the name "priests" is probably taken over from the Sabian Kura.

With regard to the relation of Manichæism to Christianity two things are clear: (a) Some connexion with Christianity was intended from the very first by Mani himself, it was not an after-thought, introduced when Manichæism came in touch with the West, as is sometimes asserted. Christianity was the predominant religion in Osrhoene, and perhaps the principal religion in all Mesopotamia in Mani's time. Mani, whose object was to found a system, comprehensive of all religions then known, could not but try to incorporate Christianity. In the first words of his proclamation on the coronation day of Sapor I, he mentioned Jesus, who had come to the countries of the West. (b) The connexion was purely external and artificial. The substance of Manichæism was Chaldean astrology and folklore cast in a rigid dualistic mould; if Christianity was brought in, it was only through force of historical circumstances. Christianity could not be ignored. In consequence (1) Mani proclaimed himself the Paraclete promised by Jesus; (2) rejected the whole of the Old Testament, but admitted as much of the New as suited him; in particular he rejected the Acts of the Apostles, because it told of the descent of the Holy Ghost in the past. The Gospels were corrupted in many places, but where a text seemed to favour him the Manichee knew how to parade it. One has to read St. Augustine's anti-Manichæan disputes to realize the extreme ingenuity with which Scripture texts were collected and interpreted. (3) Though Mani called himself the Paraclete, he claimed no Divinity but with show of humility styled himself "Apostle of Jesus Christ by the Providence of God the Father"; a designation which is obviously adapted from the heading of the Pauline Epistles. Mani, however, was the Apostle of Jesus Christ, i. e. the Messenger of Christ's promise, that Paraclete whom He sent (ἀπόστολος, from ἀποστέλλω, to send). Mani's blasphemous assumption was thus toned down a little to Christian ears. (4) Jesus Christ was to Mani but an æon or subsistent personification of the Light in the world; as far as it had already been set free it was the luminous Jesus or *Jesus patibilis*. (5) The historical Jesus of Nazareth was entirely repudiated by Mani. "The son of a poor widow" (Mary), "the Jewish Messias, whom the Jews crucified", "a devil, who was justly punished for interfering in the work of the Æon Jesus", such was, according to Mani, the Christ whom Christians worshipped as God. Mani's Christology war purely Docetic, his Christ appeared to be man, to live, suffer, and die to symbolize the light suffering in this world. Though Mani used the term "Evangel" for his message, his Evangel was clearly in no real sense that of the Christians. (6) Mani finally beguiled the unwary by the use of such apparently Christian terms as Father, Son, and Holy Ghost to designate Divine personalities, but a glance at his cosmogony shows how flimsy was the disguise. Nevertheless, Manichæans spoke so cautiously, urging only faith in God, His light, His power, and His wisdom (in reality "the Father of Majesty"; the sun and moon; the five blessed æons, his sons; and the Manichæan religion), that they deceived many.

III. History in the East.—Notwithstanding the bitterest persecution by the Sassanides in Persia as well as by the emperors at Rome, Manichæism spread very rapidly. Its greatest success was achieved in countries to the east of Persia. In A. D. 1000 the Arab historian Al-Beruni wrote: "The majority of the Eastern Turks, the inhabitants of China and Tibet and a number in India belong to the religion of Mani." The recent finds of Manichæan literature and painting at Turfan corroborate this statement. Within a generation after Mani's death his followers had settled on the Malabar Coast and gave the name to Manigrama, i. e. "Settlement of Mani". The Chinese inscriptions of Kara Belgassum, once thought to refer to the Nestorians, doubtless have reference to the existence of Manichæism. The great Turkish tribe of the Tuguzguz in 930 threatened reprisals on Mohammedans in their power if the Manichæans in Samar-

cand were molested by the Prince of Chorazan, in whose dominion they were very numerous. Detailed information on the extreme Eastern Manichæans is still lacking. In Persia and Babylonia proper, Manichæism seems never to have been the predominant religion, but the Manichæans enjoyed there a large amount of prosperity and toleration under Mahommedan rule. Some caliphs were actually favourable to Manichæism, and it had a number of secret sympathizers throughout Islam. Though not numerous in the capital, Bagdad, they were scattered in the villages and hamlets of the Irak. Their prosperity and intimacy of social intercourse with non-Manichæans aroused the indignation of the Puritan party amongst Mani's followers, and this led to the formation of the heresy of Miklas, a Persian ascetic in the eighth century.

As Manichæism adopted three Christian apocrypha, the Gospel of Thomas, the Teaching of Addas, and the Shepherd of Hermas, the legend was soon formed that Thomas, Addas, and Hermas were the first great apostles of Mani's system. Addas is supposed to have spread it in the Orient (*τὰ τῆς ἀνατολῆς*), Thomas in Syria, and Hermas in Egypt. Manichæism was certainly known in Judea before Mani's death; it was brought to Eleutheropolis by Akouas in 274 (Epiph., "Hær.", LXVI, 1). St. Ephrem (378) complained that no country was more infected with Manichæism than Mesopotamia in his day, and Manichæism maintained its ground in Edessa even in A. D. 450. The fact that it was combated by Eusebius of Emesus, George and Apollinaris of Laodicea, Diodorus of Tarsus, John (Chrysostom) of Antioch, Epiphanius of Salamis, and Titus of Bostra, shows how early and ubiquitous was the danger of Manichæism in Western Asia. About A. D. 404, Julia, a lady of Antioch, tried by her riches and culture to pervert the city of Gaza to Manichæism, but without success. In Jerusalem St. Cyril had many converted Manichæans amongst his catechumens and refuted their errors at length. St. Nilus knew of secret Manichæans in Sinai before A. D. 430.

In no country did Manichæism enter more insidiously into Christian life than in Egypt. One of the governors of Alexandria under Constantine was a Manichæan, who treated the Catholic bishops with unheard-of severity. St. Athanasius says of Anthony the Hermit (330) that he forbade all intercourse with "Manichæans and other heretics".

In the Eastern Roman Empire it came to the zenith of its power about A. D. 375–400, but then rapidly declined. But in the middle of the sixth century it once more rose into prominence. The Emperor Justinian himself disputed with them; Photinus the Manichæan publicly disputed with Paul the Persian. Manichæism obtained adherents amongst the highest classes of society. Barsymes, the Nestorian prefect of Theodora, was an avowed Manichæan. But this recrudescence of Manichæism was soon suppressed.

Soon, however, under the name either of Paulicians or Bogomiles, it again invaded the Byzantine Empire, after having lain hidden for a time on Mussulman territory. The following are the imperial edicts launched against Manichæism: Diocletian (Alexandria, 31 March, 296) commands the Proconsul of Africa to persecute them, he speaks of them as a sordid and impure sect recently come from Persia, which he is determined to destroy root and branch (*stirpitus amputari*). Its leaders and propagators must be burnt, together with their books; the rank and file beheaded, people of note condemned to the mines, and their goods confiscated. This edict remained at least nominally in force under Constantine and Constantius. Under Julian the Apostate Manichæism seems to have been tolerated. Valentinian I and Gratian, though tolerant of other sects, made exception of the Manichæans. Theodosius I, by an edict of 381, declared Manichæans to be without civil rights and incapable of testamentary disposition. In the following year he condemned them to death under the name of Encratites, Saccophores, and Hydroparastates. Valentinian II confiscated their goods, annulled their wills, and sent them into exile. Honorius in 405 renewed the edicts of his predecessors, and fined all governors of cities or provinces who were remiss in carrying out his orders; he invalidated all their contracts, declared them outlaws and public criminals. In 445 Valentinian III renewed the edicts of his predecessors; Anastasius condemned all Manichæans to death; Justin and Justinian decreed the death penalty, not only against Manichæans who remained obstinate in their heresy, but even against converts from Manichæism who remained in touch with their former co-religionists, or who did not at once denounce them to the magistrates. Heavy penalties were likewise decreed against all State officials who did not denounce their colleagues, if infected with Manichæism, and against all those who retained Manichæan books. It was a war of extermination and was apparently successful, within the confines of the Byzantine Empire.

IV. History in the West.—In the West the special home of Manichæism was Proconsular Africa, where it seems to have had a second apostle inferior only to Mani, a further incarnation of the Paraclete, Adimantus. Previous to 296 Julian the Proconsul had written to the emperor that the Manichæans troubled the peace of the population and caused injury to the towns. After the edict of Diocletian we hear no more of it till the days of St. Augustine. Its most notorious champion was Faustus of Mileve. Born at Mileve of poor parents, he had gone to Rome, and being converted to Manichæism he had begun to study rhetoric somewhat late in life. He was not a man of profound erudition, but he was a suave and unctuous speaker. His fame in Manichæan circles was very great. He was a Manichæan *episcopus* and boasted of having left his wife and children and all he had for his religion. He arrived at Carthage in 383, and was arrested, but the Christians obtained the commutation of his sentence to banishment, and even that was not carried out. About A. D. 400 he wrote a work in favour of Manichæism, or rather against Christianity, in which he tried to wrest the New Testament to the support of Manichæism. St. Augustine answered him in thirty-three books embodying verbally much of his teaching. On 28 and 29 August, 392, St. Augustine had refuted a certain Fortunatus in public discussion held in the Baths of Sossius. Fortunatus acknowledged defeat and disappeared from the town. On 7 Dec., 404, St. Augustine held a dispute with Felix, a Manichæan priest. He convinced him of the error of his ways and he made him say: Anathema to Mani. St. Augustine knew how to use severity to extirpate the heresy. Victorinus, a deacon, had become an *auditor* and propagandist of the Manichæans. He was discovered, upon which he apparently repented and asked for reconciliation, but St. Augustine punished him and banished him from the town, warning all people against him. He would not hear of his repentance unless he denounced all the Manichæans he knew in the province. St. Augustine did not write against Manichæism during the last twenty-five years of his life; hence it is thought that the sect decreased in importance during that time. Yet in 420 Ursus, the imperial prefect, arrested some Manichæans in Carthage and made them recant. When the Arian Vandals conquered Africa the Manichæans thought of gaining the Arian clergy by secretly entering their ranks, but Huneric (477–484), King of the Vandals, realizing the danger, burnt many of them and transported the others. Yet at the end of the sixth century Gregory the Great looked upon Africa as the hotbed of Manichæism. The same warning was repeated by Gregory II (701), and Nicholas II (1061).

The spread of Manichæism in Spain and Gaul is involved in obscurity on account of the uncertainty concerning the real teaching of Priscillian.

It is well known how St. Augustine (383) found a home at Rome in the Manichæan community, which must have been considerable. According to the "Liber Pontificalis" Pope Miltiades (311–314) had already discovered adherents of the sect in the city. Valentinian's edict (372), addressed to the city prefect, was clearly launched mainly against Roman Manichæans. The so-called "Ambrosiaster" combated Manichæism in a great number of his writings (370–380). In the years 384–388 a special sect of Manichæans arose in Rome called Martari or Mat-squatters, who, supported by a rich man called Constantius, tried to start a sort of monastic life for the Elect in contravention of Mani's command that the Elect should wander about the world preaching the Manichæan Gospel. The new sect found the bitterest opposition among their co-religionists. In Rome they seem to have made extraordinary endeavours to conceal themselves by almost complete conformity with Christian customs. From the middle of the sixth century onward Manichæism apparently died out in the West. Though a number of secret societies and dualistic sects may have existed here and there in obscurity, there is apparently no direct and conscious connexion with the Prophet of Babylon and his doctrine. Yet when the Paulicians and Bogomili from Bulgaria came in contact with the West in the eleventh century, and Eastern missionaries driven out by the Byzantine emperors taught dualist doctrines in the North of Italy and the South of France they found the leaven of Manichæism still so deeply pervading the minds of many that they could make it ferment and rise into the formidable Catharist heresies.

V. Manichæan Writers.—Manichæism, like Gnosticism, was an intellectual religion, it despised the simplicity of the crowd. As it professed to bring salvation through knowledge, ignorance was sin. Manichæism in consequence was literary and refined, its founder was a fruitful writer, and so were many of his followers. Of all this literary output only fragments are at present extant. No Manichæan treatise has come down to us in its entirety. Mani wrote in Persian and Babylonian Aramaic, apparently using either language with equal facility. The following seven titles of works of his have come down to us: (1) "Shapurâkân", i. e. "Princely", because it was dedicated to Peroz the brother of Sapor I (written in Syrian). It was a kind of Manichæan eschatology, dealing in three chapters with the dissolution of Hearers, Elect, and Sinners. It was written about A. D. 242. (2) "The Book of Mysteries", polemical and dogmatic in character. (3) "The Book of the Giants", probably about cosmogonic figures. (4) "The Book of Precepts for Hearers", with appendix for the Elect. (5) "The Book of Life-Giving", written in Greek, probably of considerable size. (6) "The Book of the Pragmateia", contents totally unknown. (7) "The Gospel" (written in Persian), of which the chapters began with successive letters of the alphabet. Besides these more extensive works no less than seventy-six letters or brief treatises are enumerated, but it is not always clear which of these are by Mani himself, which by his immediate successors. The "Epistola Fundamenti", so well known in Latin writers, is probably the "Treatise of the Two Elements", mentio-ed as first of the seventy-six numbers in Arabic sources. Small and often unintelligible fragments in Pahlevi and in Sogdian (?) have recently been found in Chinese Turkestan by T. W. K. Mueller. The "Epistola Fundamenti" is extensively quoted in St. Augustine's refutation and also in Theodore Bar Khoni and Titus of Bostra, and the "Acta Archelai". Of Manichean writers the following names have come down to us: Agapius (Photius, Cod. 179), of Asia Minor; Aphthonius of Egypt (Philostorgium, "Hist. Eccl.", III, 15), Photinus refuted by Paul the Persian (Mercati, "Per la vita di Paolo il Persiano"), Adimantus, refuted by Augustine.

VI. Anti-Manichæan Writers.—St. Ephræm (A. D. 306–373); his treatise against the Manichæans was published in poems (59 to 73) in the Roman edition with Latin translation, and again by K. Kessler in his "Mani", I, 262–302; Hegemonius is said by Heracleon of Chalcedon to be the author of the "Acta disputationis Archelai episcopi Mesopotamiæ et Manetis hæresiarchæ". This important work on Manichæism, written originally in Greek or perhaps in Syriac, between A. D. 300 and 350, has come down to us only in a Latin translation, though small fragments exist in Greek. The most recent edition is that of M. Beeson (Berlin, 1906). It contains an imaginary dispute between Archelaus, Bishop of Charcar, and Mani himself. The dispute is but a literary device, but the work ranks as the first class authority on Manichæism. It was translated into English in the Ante-Nicene library.

Alexander of Lycopolis published a short treatise against Manichæism, last edited by A. Brinkmann (Leipzig, 1895). Serapion of Thmuis (c. 350) is credited by St. Jerome with an excellent work against the Manichæans. This work has recently been restored to its original form by A. Brinkmann, "Sitz. ber. der Preuss. Acad. Berlin" (1895), 479 sqq. Titus of Bostra (374) published four books against the Manichæans, two containing arguments from reason and two arguments from Scripture and theology against the heresy. They have come down to us complete only in a Syriac version (Lagarde, "Tit. Bost. contra Manichæos Libri IV", Berlin, 1859), but part of the original Greek is published in Pitra's "Analecta sacr. et class." (1888), I, 44–46. St. Epiphanius of Salamis devoted his great work "Adversus Hæreses" (written about 374) mainly to refutation of Manichæism. The other heresies receive but brief notices and even Arianism seems of less importance. Theodoret of Cyrus (458), "De hæreticorum fabulis", in four books (P. G., LXXXIII), gives an exposition of Manichæism. Didymus the Blind, president of the catechetical school at Alexandria (345 to 395), wrote a treatise in eighteen chapters against Manichæans. St. John Damascene (c. 750) wrote a "Dialogue against Manichæans" (P. G., XCIV), and a shorter "Discussion of John the Orthodox with a Manichæan" (P. G., XCVI); Photius (891) wrote four books against the Manichæans, and is a valuable witness of the Paulician phase of Manichæism. Paul the Persian (c. 529), "Disputation with Photinus the Manichæan" (P. G., LXXXVIII, 528). Zacharias Rhetor (c. 536), "Seven theses against Manichæans", fragments in P. G., LXXXV, 1143—. Heraclian (c. 510), wrote twenty books against Manichæans (Photius, Cod. 86). Amongst Latin writers St. Augustine is foremost, his works being "De utilitate credendi"; "De moribus Manichæorum"; "De duabus animabus"; "Contra Fortunatum"; "Contra Faustum"; "De actis cum Felice", "De Natura Boni", "Contra Secundinum", "Contra Adversarium Legis et Prophetarum" in "Opera", VIII (Paris, 1837). Some in English. "De Genesi contra Manichæos lib. II." Ambrosiaster (370–380): for his commentaries on St. Paul's Epistles and his "Quæstiones V. et N. Testamenti" see A. Souter, "A Study of Ambrosiaster" (1907); Marcus Victorinus (380), "Ad Justinum Manichæum".

Sources.—Theodore Bar Khoni, Nestorian Bishop of Cascar (c. end sixth century), wrote a book of "Scholia" or Memoirs. Book XI of this work contains a list of "sects which arose at different times"; among these he gives an account of the Manichæans and relates at length the Manichæan cosmogony. This is especially interesting and valuable as he retains the original Syriac designations of the cosmogonic figures and probably gives Mani's own account verbally from the Fundamental Epistle; in Pognon, *Inscriptions mandaites des coupes de Khouabir* (Paris, 1898), French tr. (see also M. Noldeke Wiener, *Zeitsch. Kund. Morg.*, XII, 355); Abu' Lfaradsh, usually called En Nadim ("The Shining One"), an Arab historian who in A. D. 908 wrote his *Fihrist al'ulum* or *Compendium of Sciences*. The chapters dealing with the Manichæans were published in German tr. by Flügel in his *Mani*. Al Biruni, an Arabic chronologist (A. D. 1000), in his *Chronology of Eastern Nations*, Eng. ed. Sachau, *Or. transl. Fund* (London, 1879), and *India*, Eng. ed. Sachau, *Trübn. Or. ser.* (London, 1888).

LITERATURE.—DUFOURCQ, *Etudes sur les Gesta Martyrum Romains*, IV: *Le Neo-Manichéisme et la légende chrét.* (Paris, 1910); IDEM, *De Manicheismo apud Latinos quinto sextoque sæculo*, etc. (Paris, 1910); CUMONT, *Recherches sur le Manichéisme*, I: *La Cosmogonie Manichéenne* (Brussels, 1908); In course of publication, II: *Fragments syriaques d'ouvrages manichéens;* III: *Les formules grecques d'abjuration;* DE STOOP, *La diffusion du Manichéisme dans l'empire Romain* (Ghent, 1908); KESSLER, *Mani. Forschungen über die mani-chäische Religion*, I (Berlin, 1889); II (1903); IDEM in *Acts of Internat. Congress of Hist. of Religion* (Basle, 1905); IDEM in *Realencykl. für Prot. Theol.*, s. v. *Mani, Manichäer;* FLÜGEL, *Mani, seine Lehre und seine Schriften* (Leipzig, 1862); MÜLLER, *Handschr. Reste in Estrangelo-Schrift. aus Turfan, Chin.-Turkestan* (Berlin, 1904); SALEMANN, *Ein Bruchstuck man. Schrifttums* in *Mem. Acad. S. Petersburg* (1904); BISCHOFF, *Im Reiche der Gnosis* (Leipzig, 1906), 40–104; BRUCKNER, *Faustus von Mileve, Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des abendl. Manich.* (Leipzig, 1901); BEAUSOBRE, *Hist. crit. de Manichée et du Manichéisme* (Amsterdam, 1734); BOUSSET, *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis* (Göttingen, 1907); SALEMANN, *Manichæische Studien* (Petersburg, 1908); CASARTELLI, *La Philosophie du Mardéisme*; ROCHAT, *Essai sur Mani et sa doctrine* (Geneva, 1897); NEWMANN, *Introd. Essay on Manich. Heresy* (1887); TER-MEKERTSCHIAN, *Die Paulicianer* (Leipzig, 1893); DÖLLINGER, *Geschichte der gnost-manich. Secten* (Munich, 1890); GEYLER, *System des Manichäismus* (Jena, 1875).

J. P. ARENDZEN.

Manifestation of Conscience (RATIO CONSCIENTIÆ), a practice in many religious orders and congregations, by which subjects manifest the state of their conscience to the superior, in order that the latter may know them intimately, and thus further their spiritual progress. This practice has been employed by those devoted to the ascetical life from the early centuries of the Church, and Cassian's "Conferences" make frequent mention of it as in common use among the Fathers of the Desert. It is part of the domestic and paternal government of religious institutes and of itself requires no ecclesiastical jurisdiction in the superiors, and hence such a function may be annexed to the office of a lay, or even female, superior. The knowledge of the state of soul acquired by manifestation of conscience enables the superior to determine the expediency of the frequency of communion, what spiritual reading is to be selected, what penances to be practised, what counsel to be given concerning doubts, difficulties, and temptations. Primarily, the object of this manifestation is the good of the individual subject, though, secondarily, it also affects the good of the whole religious institute. The superior cannot indeed make use of this knowledge for government in such a way as to inflict any loss or grievous inconvenience on the subject, and thus reveal the secret knowledge he has obtained, but he can dispose even external matters for the interior good of the subject, who is presumed to tacitly consent to such arrangement. The secret must, however, be kept inviolably, and hence a subject may object to any external use whatever of the revelations he has made to the superior. He can, likewise, if he wishes, amplify the right of the superior to use it. It is to be noted that this manifestation of conscience differs from sacramental confession both in end and in object, as also from judicial and paternal investigation.

Although, by the nature of things, the power of receiving manifestation of conscience is not incompatible with the state of lay, even female, superiors, yet by the decree "Quemadmodum", of 17 Dec., 1890, Pope Leo XIII considerably limited the powers of the latter. The decree says: "His Holiness annuls, abrogates, and declares of no force whatever hereafter, all regulations whatsoever in the Constitutions of pious societies and institutes of women who make either simple or solemn vows, as well as in those of men of the purely lay order (even though the said constitutions should have received from the Holy See approbation in whatsoever form, even that which is termed most special), in this one point, in which those constitutions regard the secret manifestation of conscience in whatsoever manner or under whatsoever name. He therefore seriously enjoins on all superiors, male and female, of such institutes, congregations, and societies absolutely to cancel and expunge altogether from their respective Constitutions, Directories, and Manuals all the aforesaid regulations." The pope, having thus abolished compulsory manifestation of conscience, goes on to forbid superiors, either directly or indirectly, to induce their subjects to such manifestation, and commands that such superiors be denounced to higher superiors if they violate this decree, or in case of the superior-general to the Sacred Congregation of Bishops and Regulars (now the Congregation of the Religious Orders). The decree states, however, that any voluntary manifestation on the part of subjects, for the purpose of obtaining help in doubts and difficulties, and to further their spiritual progress, is not prohibited. Neither does this decree forbid the ordinary domestic or paternal interrogation which is part of all religious government, nor the solicitude of a superior in inquiring into the manifest troubles or affliction of a subject. The pope commands that the decree "Quemadmodum" be translated into the vernacular and inserted into the Constitutions of those religious institutes which it affects, and that it be read publicly once a year.

VERMEERSCH, *De Religiosis Institutis*, I (Bruges, 1902); TAUNTON, *The Law of the Church* (St. Louis, 1906), s. v.

WILLIAM H. W. FANNING.

Manila, ARCHDIOCESE OF (DE MANILA), comprises the city of Manila, the provinces of Bataan, Bulacan, Cavite, Mindoro, Nueva Ecija, Pampanga, Rizal, Tarlac, and Zambales; and the Districts of Infanta and Marinduque in the Province of Tayabas. The area of this territory is 18,175 square miles. The population, nearly all Catholics, is estimated at 1,642,582. By the appointment (March, 1910) of the Rt. Rev. José Patrelli as first Bishop of Lipa, Batangas, the provinces of Batangas and Laguna were separated from the archdiocese of which they had until then been a part. The archidocese includes some 270 towns, or, more properly, townships or counties, since each town may include, together with the *pueblo* several *barrios* (villages) with a population of two or three thousand each. There are in the archdiocese 225 secular priests, 182 priests representing nine religious orders, 252 parishes (196 of which have resident priests), 70 lay brothers, 309 members of nine religious communities of women, a preparatory and a general seminary, one university, 52 colleges, academies, and schools, with a total attendance of about 5000, and 9 charitable institutions with approximately 2000 inmates.

I. HISTORY.—Manila was formerly occupied by the Spaniards under Legaspi on 19 May, 1571. The natives whom the missionaries found there were idolators, ancestor-worshippers, and worshippers of the sun, moon, and stars, of animals and birds. The Mohammedans (Moros) from Mindanao, however, had begun to force their creed among the natives before Legaspi arrived, and he was accompanied by Augustinian Friars, who immediately began to explain the doctrines of Christianity to the pagans. Their conversion was rapid, and in a comparatively short time churches were erected, schools opened, and a printing press established. The ease with which the Spaniards conquered these Islands was due to the zeal of the missionaries. That the Filipinos have remained loyal to their faith is attested by the Philippine Commission (Atkinson, "The Philippine Islands", p. 329).

The See of Manila, with jurisdiction over all the Philippine Islands and suffragan to Mexico, was erected in 1578. The first bishop, Domingo de Salazar (b. 1512), arrived in Sept., 1581. One of the first acts of the bishop was to publish (21 Dec., 1581) regulations for the government of the cathedral chapter. He appointed a dean, canons, and other ecclesiastical officials, and in 1582 convoked a synod at Manila, interrupting it until 1586 on account of the absence from the Philippines of the Jesuit Father Sanchez. There were ninety ecclesiastics, and six laymen, at the council.

After ten years of energetic work Salazar went to Spain to plead the cause of the Filipinos before the King. He was nominated Archbishop of Manila, with suffragan sees at Cebu, Nueva Caceres, and Nueva Segovia (Vigan). To these were added the Diocese of Jaro, in 1865, and four other dioceses, in 1902. Salazar died at Madrid, 4 Dec., 1594, before receiving the Bulls of his appointment from the pope. The first archbishop to reach Manila was the Franciscan, Ignacio de Santibañez. He took possession of his see in 1798, but died three months later. Five years passed before a successor was appointed, in the person of Miguel de Benavides, a Dominican and first Bishop of Nueva Segovia in Northern Luzon. The new archbishop had come to the Philippines in 1587. He had laboured among the Chinese of Manila and built the hospital of San Gabriel for them. He was the founder of the celebrated University of Santo Tomás at Manila, which exists to this day. During the archiepiscopacy of his successor, Diego Vasquez de Mercado, there arrived in Manila a large band of confessors exiled from Japan. Colin's "Labor Evangelica", pp. 434–562.

Among the other archbishops who filled the See of Manila were: Miguel Garcia Serrano, an Augustinian, noted for his great sanctity of life; Hernando Guerrero, a Franciscan, who had laboured for more than thirty years among the Tagalos and Pampangans; Fernando Montero de Espinosa; Miguel Poblete, who rebuilt the cathedral and himself went about the city soliciting alms for that purpose; Felipe Pardo, a Dominican, who was banished from the city by the Audiencia, but was later restored; Francisco de la Cuesta, a Hieronymite, who, together with a large number of prominent laymen and ecclesiastics, was imprisoned by the tyrannical governor Bustamente, in Fort Santiago, whence he was afterwards taken and forced by the populace to accept the governorship of the islands *ad interim*, in place of Bustamente. Manuel Rojo, who took possession of the see 22 July, 1759, had been also appointed governor-general of the islands. During his rule the English, under Draper, besieged and captured Manila and then pillaged the city so wantonly that Draper himself was obliged to interfere. In order to raise the money demanded by the English, the archbishop was obliged to surrender all his church property, even to his own pastoral ring. Archbishop Pedro Payo, a Dominican, built the present cathedral at a cost of about $500,000. Bernardino Nozaleda, also a Dominican, was the last archbishop under the Spanish domination, resigning his see in 1901. The archdiocese was then administered by the Rt. Rev. Martin García y Alcocer, Bishop of Cebu, until the appointment of the first American archbishop, the Most Rev. Jeremiah J. Harty. Archbishop Harty was born at St. Louis, Missouri, 1 Nov., 1853, made his early studies under the Christian Brothers and in the Jesuit University of St. Louis, entered the seminary at Cape Girardeau in 1873, and was ordained priest 28 April, 1878. He had held various cures of souls in the Archdiocese of St. Louis, and had founded the Parish of St. Leo in that city, when Pius X appointed him to the See of Manila by a Brief dated 8 August, 1903. He was consecrated at Rome, 15 August, of the same year, preconized on 9 Nov., and took possession of the see on 16 Jan., 1904. An Apostolic delegation to the Philippine Islands was inaugurated in 1902 with the Most Rev. John Baptist Guidi, who died at Manila, 26 June, 1904, and was replaced two months later by the Most Rev. Ambrose Agius, a Benedictine. Monsignor Agius convoked the first Provincial Council of the Philippine Islands, which was solemnly opened in the cathedral of Manila on the Feast of the Immaculate Conception, 1907.



THE CATHEDRAL, MANILA

II. RELIGIOUS ORDERS.—Sawyer, a Protestant writer, speaking of the religious orders in the Philippines, says: "The friars have fared badly at the hands of several writers on the Philippines; but it will be noticed that those who know the least about them speak the worst of them" ("The Inhabitants of the Philippines", p. 65). "The religious orders . . . were hardy and adventurous pioneers of Christianity and in the evangelization of the Philippines, by persuasion and teaching, they did more for Christianity and civilization than any other missionaries of modern times. Of undaunted courage, they have ever been to the front when calamities threatened their flocks. . . . In epidemics of plague and cholera they have not been dismayed, nor have they ever in such cases abandoned their flocks. . . . They have done much for education, having founded schools for both sexes, training colleges for teachers, the University of St. Thomas in Manila and other institutions. Hospitals and asylums attest their charity. They were formerly, and even lately, the protectors of the poor against the rich, and of the native against the Spaniard. They have consistently resisted the enslavement of the natives. They restrained the constant inclination of the natives to wander away into the woods and return to primitive savagery by keeping them in the towns, or, as they said, 'under the bells'" (ibid., p. 75).

The first missionaries in the Archdiocese of Manila were Augustinians. They arrived in Cebu, with Legaspi, in 1565, and six years later opened a house at Manila which became the central house of their order in the Philippines. They founded the parishes of Tondo (Manila), Tambobong, and Pasig. In the Province of Bulacan they established the parishes of Dapdap, Guiguinto, Bigaa, Angat, Baliuag, Quingua, Malolos, Paombong, Calumpit, and Hagonoy. In the Province of Pampanga they founded parishes at Bacolor, Macabebe, Porac, Mexico, Arayat, and Apalit. They had their churches also at Tarlac, San Miguel de Mayumo, and Candaba. In the Province of Batangas they founded the towns (now numbering from 20,000 to 40,000 inhabitants) of Taal, Balayan, Bauan, Batangas, Tanauan, and Lipa. They became masters of the dialects of the tribes among whom they laboured, reduced the languages to a system, and published grammars, dictionaries, and books of devotion for the natives. In all their parishes (and this may be said equally of the other religious orders) they erected magnificent stone churches which remain to this day as a lasting memorial to their zeal. Their monastery

and church at Guadalupe (near Manila) and their church at Malolos, one of the largest in the islands, were destroyed during the Filipino insurrection; but even the ruins bear splendid testimony to the Apostolic zeal of these fervent missionaries.

The Franciscans arrived at Manila 24 June, 1577. They were the first missionaries in the districts of Sampaloc and Santa Ana, Manila, and in the towns of Meycauayan, Bocaue, Morong, Baraa, Pagsanjan, Santa Cruz de la Laguna, and Mainit. They also established numerous parishes in the Provinces of Tayabas and Camarines. A lay brother, porter in the Convent of San Francisco, Manila, was the founder of the San Lazaro hospital for lepers in 1598. Five years later the hospital was removed outside the city; since the American occupation it has been in the possession of the American Government, though the archiepiscopal cross still remains over the entrance. The Emperor of Japan was responsible in a great measure for the increase of leprosy in the Islands, as he sent a shipload of the unfortunates to Manila with the double purpose of ridding his country of them and of manifesting his displeasure at the spread of Christianity in his empire. He is reported to have sent a message with the convoy to the effect that, as the Spaniards were so fond of caring for the sick, he desired to gratify their wishes by presenting them with the lepers. To the Franciscans is probably due, in great measure, the striking devotion to the Passion of Our Lord which exists to-day among the Filipino people.



CHURCH OF THE HOLY ROSARY, MANILA
(Commonly known as Binondo Church)

The first Jesuits to arrive in the islands came with Bishop Salazar in 1581. One of them, Father Sedeno, had been a missionary in Florida. He opened the first school in the Philippines and founded colleges at Manila and Cebu. He taught the Filipinos to cut stone, to make mortar, to weave, and to sew. He brought artists from China to teach them to draw and paint, and erected the first stone building in the Philippines, the cathedral, dedicated to the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary, the patroness of the whole group of islands. His companion, Father Sanchez, was one of the most remarkable men of the society in his day, and by a unanimous vote of all the Spaniards of the colony, was sent to Europe to treat with Philip II and with the pope on the affairs of the colony. He was accompanied by a Filipino boy, a Pampangan youth named Martin, who later returned to his native land as the first Filipino Jesuit. The college and seminary of San José was established by the Jesuits of Manila in 1595. Though no longer under the control of the Jesuits, it still exists, and is therefore the oldest of the colleges of the archipelago. By royal decree of 12 March, 1653, it took precedence of all centres of learning in the islands. During the first hundred years of its existence it counted among its *alumni* 8 bishops, 39 Jesuits (4 of whom became provincials), 11 Augustinians, 18 Franciscans of various branches of the order, 3 Dominicans, and 39 secular clergy. The Jesuit University of St. Ignatius, which opened its first classes in 1587, was confirmed as a pontifical university in 1621, and as a royal university in 1653. Besides their college and university, the Jesuits had a novitiate for the training of members of their order at San Pedro Macati, near Manila. The solid stone church still exists, but to-day only massive ruins remain of the seventeenth-century novitiate. The Jesuits also possessed a college at Cavite. They built the famous sanctuary of Antipolo, at present the most frequented place of pilgrimage in the islands. They established the Parishes of Santa Cruz and of San Miguel, Manila. They published numerous works in the Tagalog dialect, and some of their great folio dictionaries of that tongue exist to-day. Expelled from the Philippines in 1768, it was not until 1859 that they were permitted to continue the work they had begun 278 years before. They opened the college of the Ateneo, which, from humble beginnings became a school of secondary instruction in 1865, and now numbers about 1500 students, and they established a normal school which, since the American occupation, has become a combined preparatory seminary and college under the title of San Xavier. (See also MANILA OBSERVATORY.)

The first band of Dominican missionaries to reach the islands arrived in Manila in 1587. A full account of the immense good accomplished by these fathers will be found in Fonseca's "Historia de la Provincia del Santisimo Rosario". In 1611 they founded the University of Santo Tomás which was confirmed as a pontifical university in 1645 and as a royal university in 1680. In 1836 the university petitioned Spain for authority to establish a chair of Spanish and Insular Law. The petition was granted, and the law department of the university was begun. In 1871 departments of medicine and pharmacy were opened. As these drew revenue from the estate of the old San José College, they are now known as the San José College. The College of San Juan de Letrán was begun by the Dominican Fathers in 1640; it was elevated to the rank of a school of secondary instruction in 1867. The students, who number about 1000, follow the usual college course leading to the degree of Bachelor of Arts. Of the professors of Santo Tomás about thirty have been raised to the episcopal dignity, and one student, a native Chinese named Gregorio Lopez, was Bishop of Nanking, where he died in 1670. What is now the University Press was established at the end of the sixteenth century, before the foundation of the university itself. It was first established in the Hospital of San Gabriel, later transferred to Bataan, and in 1623 it was removed to the university, where it has continued until the present day. During its long career the University Press has issued countless works of a religious and educational character, not only in the modern and classical languages, but in various native dialects of the Islands. Greek, Hebrew, and Sanskrit are included in its rich assortment of type. The Church of San Domingo at Manila, which was rebuilt for the fifth time in 1868, contains the famous statue of Our Lady of the Rosary which is carried in solemn procession every year through the streets of Manila attended by a vast multitude of people from every part of the islands. That the devotion to the Holy Rosary is so deeply implanted in the hearts of the Filipino people, is due mainly to the zeal of the

Dominican Fathers. Like their companions in missionary labours, the Dominicans extended their zealous work in numerous provinces of the islands, founding towns, establishing parishes, building magnificent churches, opening schools, and publishing books in the native dialects.

The Recollect Fathers were first established in the archdiocese in 1600. Besides their work in Manila, where they have two large churches, the Recollects have converted the tribes in Mariveles and Zambales. Their apostolic labours have been extended to the islands of Mindoro, Tablas, Masbate, Burias, Ticao, Paragua, the Calamianes, Negros, and Mindanao. The Lazarist fathers came to Manila in 1862 to care for the diocesan seminaries in the Philippines. Since the American occupation the seminaries of the archdiocese have been under the direction of the Jesuit fathers, but the Lazarists continue in charge of the diocesan seminaries of Cebu, Jaro (Iloilo), and Nueva Caceres. The Capuchin fathers are in charge of two churches at Manila. They came to the Philippines in 1886 to assume charge of the missions in the Caroline and Palaos Islands. The fathers of the Order of St. Benedict were first established in Manila in 1895. In 1901 they founded the college of San Beda, which has an attendance of about 400 students.

A community of cloistered Franciscan nuns was established at Manila in 1621. The sisters, Spaniards, mestizas, and natives, occupy the convent of Santa Clara, Manila. In 1694 Ignacia del Espiritu Santo founded the Congregation of the Sisters of the Blessed Virgin. The members are all natives. They conduct a school, to which is attached a home for aged women. A large number of them are engaged in teaching in various mission stations of Mindanao. The sisters of St. Dominic opened their convent at Manila in 1698. They conduct the College of Santa Catalina. The Sisters of Santa Rita date their origin from 1730. They have charge of the Santa Rita Academy. The Sisters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul are in charge of the Colleges of Santa Isabel, of Concordia, and of Santa Rosa; of the Hospicio de San José, of the Hospital of San Juan de Dios, of the School and Orphan Asylum of St. Vincent de Paul (Looban), all at Manila. They entered the archdiocese in 1862. The establishment of the Sisters of the Assumption at Manila was made in 1892. The sisters are in charge of a college for young ladies and a free school for the poor. The Augustinian Sisters are native nuns who conduct the Academy of Our Lady of Consolation. The Sisters of St. Paul de Chartres were established at Manila in 1904. Besides their hospital work and a large school of native nurses in the city, they have charge of several academies in the provinces. The Benedictine Sisters came to the islands from Germany in 1906. They established the college of St. Scholastica, and have organized in their chapel the devotion of the Perpetual Adoration.

LEGASPI-URDANETA MONUMENT, MANILA
Legaspi was the founder of the city, and Urdaneta the missionary who accompanied him

CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS.—The Hospital of San Juan de Dios, situated in the Walled City of Manila, was founded in 1596 by the Confraternity of Santa Misericordia. In 1656 it passed into the hands of the Order of St. John of God, and in 1886 it was put under the care of the Sisters of Charity, who still conduct the institution. The hospital was twice destroyed by earthquakes, and was severely damaged by the storm of 1882. The generosity of the pious people, especially of the governor-general and of the archbishops, restored it; the building was enlarged and now occupies a large city square. The patients, the majority of whom are Filipinos, number between four hundred and five hundred, a fourth of whom are charity patients, supported by the hospital. St. Paul's Hospital, at present the best equipped hospital in the Far East, was founded by Archbishop Harty in 1905. It is under the care of the Sisters of St. Paul de Chartres. There are about 200 patients. The Hospicio de San José is situated on an island in the Pasig River, adjacent to the Ayala Bridge, Manila. It was founded in 1806, and is under the care of the Sisters of Charity. It contains an orphan asylum for boys and girls, a home for the aged, a foundling asylum, an insane asylum for men and women, a reform school for youthful prisoners sentenced by the courts, and a department for female prisoners with children under two years of age. There are about 600 inmates in this institution, which is supported by government appropriation and by donations of the charitable. A native woman who became a Sister of Charity, gave her home and property for the founding of the Asylum of St. Vincent de Paul, which is conducted by that congregation. It contains an orphan asylum for girls and an academy for extern students. The asylum is supported by charitable donations and by the sale of embroidery made by the inmates. The College of Santa Isabel was founded in 1632 for the education of Spanish orphan girls. It was supported until 1640 by the Confraternity of Mercy. In 1861 the College of Santa Potenciana was combined with that of Santa Isabel. At present the institution, besides providing for orphans, conducts a boarding- and day-school. The Monte de Piedad is a charitable pawnbroking establishment which was opened in 1880. Money is loaned to the poor at the rate of 6 per cent per annum. (The rate in Manila for small loans is commonly 5 per cent per month, and a much higher rate is not uncommon.) Interest at 4 per cent per annum is allowed on all deposits. The Archbishop of Manila is the President of the Board of Directors of the Monte de Piedad. There are about 2000 students in Manila who have come from the provinces to attend the advanced classes of the government schools. To protect these boys and girls from the dangers to which they would be exposed in a large city, far removed from the salutary influence of home, to provide them, also, with the religious instruction of which they are deprived in the government schools, Archbishop Harty established in 1906 a dormitory for boys, and in 1909 one for girls. Board and lodging are furnished in these establishments at from $7.50 to $9.00 a month.

U. S. BUREAU OF INSULAR AFFAIRS, *Official Handbook: De-*

scription of the Philippines, part I (Manila, 1903); *Report of the Philippine Commission to the President, 1900* (Washington, 1901); COMYN, *State of the Philippines* (Madrid, 1820), tr. WALTON (London, 1821); ATKINSON, *The Philippine Islands* (Boston, 1905); SAWYER, *The Inhabitants of the Philippines* (New York, 1900); *General Bulletin of the Manila University of Santo Tomás, 1908–1909* (Manila, 1909); BARANERA, *Compendio de la Historia de Filipinas* (Manila, 1884); ARENAS, *Memorias Históricas y Estadísticas de Filipinas* (Manila, 1850); DELGADO, *Historia General de las Islas Filipinas* (Manila, 1894); MORENO, *Historia de la Santa Iglesia Metropolitana de Filipinas* (Manila, 1877); COLIN, *Labor Evangélica*, vols. I, II, III (Barcelona, 1902); ALCAZAR, *Historia de los dominios Españoles en Oceania: Filipinas* (Manila, 1895); MURILLO, *Historia de Filipinas* (Manila, 1747).

PHILIP M. FINEGAN.

Manila Observatory, founded by Father Frederic Faura, S.J., in 1865; constituted officially "The Philippine Weather Bureau" by decree of the American governor, May, 1901.

The typhoon, known in the Philippines as a *baguío*, is one of the worst enemies with which the islands have to contend. Father Faura, a Jesuit professor at the Ateneo College, spent many years in the study of these dreaded storms, in the hope of one day being able to foretell their coming and thereby avert much of the damage which they would otherwise cause. On 7 July, 1879, he predicted that a *baguío* would pass over Northern Luzon; the event justified his warning. It was the first time that the existence, duration, and course of a typhoon had been predicted in the Far East. On 18 November of the same year, Father Faura predicted a second typhoon, which he said would pass through Manila. The announcement caused great consternation in the city. Proper precautions were taken, and the captain of the port forbade vessels to leave the harbour. Thanks to the warning of Father Faura, comparatively little damage was done in Manila when, two days later, the storm broke in all its fury on the city. At other ports, to which notice of the approaching storm could not be sent for lack of telegraphic communication, the destruction was enormous. Forty-two vessels were wrecked in Southern Luzon alone, and many lives were lost.

These successful predictions aroused the interest of a number of merchants of the city, who subscribed money to enable him to continue his valuable work on a larger scale. In 1880, when cable connexions between Hong-Kong and Manila were established, the merchants of the former colony requested that Father Faura's predictions be sent them, and their request was cheerfully granted. For some time the Jesuit meteorologist had been working on a barometer of his own invention, specially designed to foretell the approach of *baguíos*. In 1886 the "Faura barometer" was offered to the public, and it passed immediately into general use among the navigators of the Philippine waters and the China Sea. In 1884 the Government at Madrid declared Father Faura's weather bureau an official institution, to be known as the Manila Observatory. It was then removed from the Ateneo to its present location in the District of Ermita, Manila. Fourteen sub-stations, each equipped with suitable meteorological instruments, were now opened in Luzon, and their daily observations were published in a monthly bulletin. In 1890, at the request of the Japanese Government, observations began to be exchanged with that country. In 1895 the Manila Observatory was invited to be one of sixteen observatories of the world to co-operate in the work of cloud-measurement, and it succeeded in making the highest of these measurements. The photographic observations were carried on by the Rev. José Algué, S.J., who is now director of the Philippine Weather Bureau. Father Algué published a valuable work, "The Clouds in the Philippine Archipelago", as the result of his observations. His "Philippine Cyclones", a volume much prized by navigators, and which has been translated into several languages, was published in 1897. In the same year he gave the public his "barocyclonometer", an improvement on Father Faura's invention, by which storms may be foretold, not only in the Philippines, but throughout the entire Orient.

The meteorological service of the Philippines was reorganized by Father Algué. The observatory at Manila receives observations by telegraph three times a day from eight first-class and nine second-class stations throughout the islands. Eighteen stations of the third class telegraph their observations twice a day, while ten fourth-class stations record observations and telegraph on request. The observatory has a branch at Mt. Mirador, about 5000 feet above sea level, which telegraphs its observations three times a day. Reports are also received twice each day by cable, from ten stations in Japan, from six in Formosa, from four on the Chinese coast, and from three in Indo-China. Whenever there are indications of a typhoon, cablegrams are exchanged with the stations in Guam and Yap, and on such occasions as many as half a dozen or more messages may be cabled on a single day to all the foreign stations. The observatory, besides a rich equipment of the latest meteorological instruments and seismographs, possesses a 19-inch refracting telescope, by far the largest in the Orient. It has also its own private telegraph and cable office. The staff of the observatory at Manila includes five Jesuit fathers and twenty-five well-trained native assistants.

PHILIP M. FINEGAN.

Maniple.—*Form, Material, and Use.*—The maniple is an ornamental vestment in the form of a band, a little over a yard long and from somewhat over two to almost four inches wide, which is placed on the left arm in such manner that it falls in equal length on both sides of the arm. It is worn only during Mass, not at the administration of the sacraments, during processions, nor at Benediction, etc. In order to fasten the maniple on the arm either two strings are placed on the inner side near the middle, or else an elastic band is used, or a loop is formed in the maniple itself by sewing together the two halves which have been laid over each other, at a distance of about six inches from the middle. Another device for securing the maniple is to set a small band a little to one side of the middle and to secure this band with a pin to the alb. The maniple is made of silk or half-silk material. The colour is in accordance with the liturgical rules. The ends of the maniple are often broader than the upper part, but too great a breadth at the ends, as in the so-called pocket or spade-shaped maniple, is ugly. In the middle and at each end the maniple is ornamented with a small cross; of these crosses that in the middle is always necessary as it is prescribed by the rubrics of the Missal. The maniple is worn by the subdeacon, deacon, priest, and bishop, but not by those who have only received minor orders. For the subdeacon the maniple is the liturgical sign of his rank, and at ordination is placed on his left arm by the bishop himself. A bishop puts on the maniple at the altar after the Confiteor, other ecclesiastics put it on in the sacristy before the service.

Name and Origin.—In earlier ages the maniple was called by various names: *mappula, sudarium, mantile, fano, manuale, sestace,* and *manipulus,* appellations which indicate to some extent its original purpose. Originally it was a cloth of fine quality to wipe away perspiration, or an ornamental handkerchief, which was seldom put into actual use, but was generally carried in the hand as an ornament. Ornamental handkerchiefs or cloths of this kind were carried by people of rank in ordinary life. Ancient remains show many proofs of this: for instance, the *mappa* with which the consul or prætor gave the signal for the commencement of the games was a similar cloth. The name *manipulus* was given because it was folded together

and carried in the left hand like a small bundle (*manipulus*).

Antiquity.—Without doubt the maniple was first used at Rome. At least it was worn at Rome early in the sixth century, even though not by all those ecclesiastics who later used it. The *pallialinostima* spoken of in the lives of Popes Sylvester and Zosimus, which appeared at this date in the "Liber Pontificalis", can be explained with most probability as references to the ornamental vestment called later *mappula* and *manipulus*. About the close of the sixth century under the name of *mappula* it was also worn by the priests and deacons of Ravenna (cf. the letters which passed between Gregory the Great and Archbishop John of Ravenna). By the beginning of the ninth century the use of the maniple was almost universal in Western Europe, being customary even at Milan which had otherwise its own peculiar rite. This is shown by the relief work on the celebrated *pallioto* (antependium) in the Basilica of St. Ambrose at Milan, a fine piece of goldsmith's work of the middle of the ninth century. The use of the maniple in Gaul and Germany is proved by the statements of Amalar of Metz, Rabanus Maurus, Walafried Strabo, by the "Admonitio synodalis" and by other writings, as well as by various miniature paintings. That it was also worn in England is evident from the elaborately worked maniple now in the Museum of Durham cathedral which, according to the inscription embroidered on it, was made by order of Queen Æthelflæd (d. before 916), wife of Edward the Elder, for Bishop Frithestan of Winchester. At Rome in the ninth century even the acolytes wore the maniple. In the eleventh and twelfth centuries the singular custom prevailed at Cluny and other monasteries that on the chief feast days all, even the lay brothers, appeared at Mass in alb and maniple; this practice, however, was forbidden in 1100 by the Synod of Poitiers. When in the eleventh and twelfth centuries the subdiaconate developed into a higher order, the maniple became its distinctive vestment.

Nature and Mode of Wearing.—The maniple was originally a folded piece of cloth. It cannot be positively decided when it became a plain band. Probably the change did not occur everywhere at the same time. Maniples made of a fold of material existed at least as early as the beginning of the tenth century; this is proved by the maniple at Durham made for Bishop Frithestan. About the end of the first millenium it was hardly more than an ornamental band. In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries these bands were, as a rule, very long and narrow and had laid on at the ends for ornament squares or rectangular pieces of material; after a while, however, this form of maniple went out of use. In the sixteenth century it began to be customary to broaden the ends, giving them something of the form of a spade, until in the eighteenth century the shape of the ends became completely that of a spade or pocket. For the period up to the twelfth century almost nothing is known as to the material of which the maniple was made. In the later Middle Ages it was generally of silk. As early as the tenth century much importance was attached to its ornamentation. The inventories of this time repeatedly mention costly maniples adorned with gold or silver. In the succeeding centuries even more importance was attached to the rich ornamentation of the maniple. It was enriched, so the inventories inform us, with embroidery, small ornaments of precious metals, precious stones, and pearls. Maniples of this period with costly embroidery are to be found in the cathedral of Sens, in the convent of the Sisters of Notre-Dame at Namur, at Pontigny, in the cathedral of Bayeux, in the Museum of Industrial Art at Berlin, etc. A favourite way to finish the ends was with fringe, tassels, or little bells. The maniple had generally no crosses at the ends or in the middle. Originally it was held in the left hand; from the eleventh century, however, it became customary to carry it on the lower part of the left arm and the usage has remained the same up to the present day. Even in medieval times it was seldom worn except at Mass. The ceremony of giving the maniple to the subdeacon at ordination developed in the tenth to the eleventh century, but it was not until the thirteenth century that the custom became universal.

Symbolism.—In the Middle Ages the maniple received various symbolical interpretations. At a later period it was common to connect this vestment with the bonds which held the hands of the Saviour. In the prayer offered by the priest when putting on the maniple are symbolized the cares and sorrows of this earthly life which should be borne with patience in view of the heavenly reward.

EPIGONATION.—In the Greek Rite the vestment that corresponds to the maniple is the *epigonation*. It is a square piece of material often embroidered with a sword and intended as an ornament; it is hung at the right side on the cincture and falls to the knee. The epigonation does not belong to all the clergy but only to the bishop. Originally also an ornamental handkerchief and called at that date *encheirion* (ἐγχείριον) it received its present form in the twelfth century.

SUBCINCTORIUM.—Very similar to the maniple in form and nature is the subcinctorium, an ornamental vestment reserved to the pope. It is worn on the cincture; on one end is embroidered a small Agnus Dei and on the other a cross. The pope wears it only at a solemn pontifical Mass. The subcinctorium is mentioned under the name of *balteus* as early as the end of the tenth century in a "Sacramentarium" of this date preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris (f. lat. 12052). It is mentioned under the name *præcinctorium* about 1030 in what is known as the "Missa Illyrica". Later it was generally called subcinctorium. In the Middle Ages it was worn not only by the pope but also by bishops, and even in a few places by priests. However, it gradually ceased to be a customary vestment of bishops and priests, and in the sixteenth century only the popes and the bishops of the ecclesiastical province of Milan wore it. The original object of the subcinctorium was, as St. Thomas explicitly says, to secure the stole to the cincture. But as early as about the close of the thirteenth century, it was merely an ornamental vestment. According to the inventories, even in the eleventh century much thought was given to its ornamentation. Most probably the subcinctorium was first used in France, whence the custom may possibly have spread to Italy about the close of the first millennium.

BOCK, *Geschichte der liturgischen Gewänder*, II (Bonn, 1866); DUCHESNE, *Origines du culte chrétien* (Paris, 1903); ROHAULT DE FLEURY, *La messe*, VII (Paris, 1888); WILPERT, *Die Gewandung der Christen in den ersten Jahr.* (Cologne, 1898); THURSTON, *The Vestments of Low Mass* in *The Month* (Sept., Oct., Nov., Dec., 1898); KLEINSCHMIDT, *Die priesterl. Gewänder* in *Linzer Quartalschrift*, LII (Linz, 1899); BRAUN, *Die priesterlichen Gewänder des Abendlandes* (Freiburg, 1897); IDEM, *Die liturgische Gewandung im Occident und Orient* (Freiburg, 1907).

JOSEPH BRAUN.

Manitoba, one of the smallest, but economically and historically one of the most important, of the Canadian provinces. Its name is derived from two Sauteux words meaning "Manitou Narrows", first applied to the lake of the same name which lies within the present boundaries of that commonwealth. These are: 52° 50′ N. lat; 95° W. long.; 101° 20′ W. long. and in the south, the American States of North Dakota and Minnesota. From its square and relatively small area, it is sometimes jocularly called the postage-stamp province; yet it is not less than 74,000 square miles in extent, or only 8782 less than England and Scotland combined. Physically it is remarkable for its level plains and the fine, shallow sheets of water it contains: Lake Winnipeg, 270 miles long, with an

average width of 30; Lake Winnipegosis, 150 miles by 18; and Lake Manitoba, 130 miles by about 10. The first named is the only lake entirely within the present limits of the province. These and other more or less considerable sheets of water, by the immense shoals of white fish they contain, give rise to a remunerative industry. The only rivers worth mentioning are the Red, the Assiniboine, and the Winnipeg. But the principal wealth of the country consists in its fertile plains, which are yearly covered with endless fields of the famous hard Canadian wheat and other cereals. The area under crop in 1909 was somewhat smaller than in preceding years. We give it here, together with the yields of the various grains and roots:

Crop	Area Tilled in Acres	Average Yield in Bushels	Total Yield in Bushels
Wheat	2,642,111	17·33	45,774,707
Oats	1,373,683	31·1	50,983,005
Barley	601,008	27·31	16,416,634
Flax, Rye, and Peas	25,096	15·	330,056
Potatoes	28,265	192·8	5,450,200
Roots	9,876	269·3	2,659,928

The climate of Manitoba is bracing and healthy. Its winters are somewhat long and severe; but the constant dryness of the atmosphere makes them bearable. The total population of the province in Feb., 1910, was computed at 466,368 inhabitants, of whom 8327 were Indians. Among the whites there were in May, 1909, 51,794 Catholics, with, officially, 1734 Indians. Some 25,000 of the Catholics follow the Græco-Ruthenian rite. The capital, Winnipeg, contains an estimated population of 142,000. Its chief cities are Brandon, pop. 14,000 inhabitants; St. Boniface (the cathedral town), pop. 6700, and Portage la Prairie, pop. 6500. The region which has become the province of Manitoba was discovered and settled in a way by the Sieur de Lavérendrye, between 1732 and 1739. Shortly prior to the cession of Canada to Great Britain, the trading posts he had established were abandoned, and English-speaking adventurers from the East for the first time tried their fortunes on the Western plains. These, with their purveyors in Montreal, founded the famous North-west Company, which soon became a formidable rival to the long established Hudson Bay Company, the representative of the English interests. Then Lord Selkirk, a Scottish nobleman, and an important shareholder in the latter corporation, who had secured a vast tract of land at the confluence of the Red and Assiniboine Rivers, planted there (1812) a colony of Scotch and Irish settlers, whose presence excited the hostility of the North-west Company and the numerous French Canadians and half-breeds in its employ. This culminated (19 June, 1816) in the Battle of Seven Oaks, wherein Robert Semple, governor for the Hudson Bay Company and twenty of his men fell. The immediate result was the disbanding of the colonists, who, however, were soon after recalled by Lord Selkirk at the head of a strong force of hired soldiers (1817). The following year (16 June, 1818) there arrived in the colony the first two resident Catholic priests (see Provencher), and in the fall of 1820 the first Protestant minister, Rev. John West, similarly reached the Red River Settlement, as the country was long called.

In March, 1821, the two contending companies were united under the name already borne by the English body. Twelve years later, the increase in the population led to the formation of a sort of home government, with a deliberative assembly termed the Council of Assiniboia, the name then assumed by the settlement. Meantime the country was seriously dissatisfied at the severity with which the Hudson Bay Company—still practically the governing body—was asserting its monopoly in the fur trade. In the spring of 1849 the French half-breeds, or Metis, took advantage of the arrest of a few of their number, accused of having infringed on said vested rights, to rise for the purpose of forcibly establishing freedom of commerce. Ten years later whites from Ontario began to arrive in the settlement, established a newspaper, and waged war on the Hudson Bay Company. Immediately on the formation (1867) of the Dominion of Canada steps were taken to acquire the colony and the entire country tributary to Hudson Bay. Without consulting the inhabitants, now numbering 12,000, those immense regions were sold to Canada for the sum of £300,000, and, even before their transfer to the new confederation, surveyors and prospective settlers were dispatched who, by their arrogance, greed, and lack of respect for acquired rights, gave rise to the Red River Insurrection under Louis Riel. The outcome of this was a list of demands from the federal authorities, practically all of which were granted, the concessions being embodied in the Manitoba Act. This Act created a province with, at first (1870), an area of only 14,340 square miles. In 1881 its limits were enlarged.

When, however, settlers from Ontario and English-speaking provinces had outnumbered the Catholics, who were chiefly of the French race, both rights were ignored by the Provincial Legislature in the spring of 1890, despite the unequivocal declarations of the Constitution. The Catholics immediately protested, especially on behalf of their schools, and had recourse to various tribunals in the dominion and even to the Crown. In 1895 the Privy Council admitted that they had a real grievance and that they were entitled to redress at the hands of the Federal Parliament. A sort of compromise was effected which fell short of Catholic aspirations, and at present, as a result of a kindly interpretation of the law by the Conservative Government of Manitoba, and thanks to a tacit understanding, which is liable to be ignored by a Liberal administration of the province, the schools in the town of St. Boniface and in the French country districts enjoy some measure of religious autonomy, due chiefly to the fact that the teachers are mostly French Canadians who are allowed to teach partly in French and who are Catholics. These schools receive a government grant. But in cities, such as Winnipeg, Brandon, and Portage la Prairie, those Catholics who have made the greatest pecuniary sacrifices for the education of their children have received absolutely no redress from the unjust burden of taxation for non-Catholic schools and from the refusal of government or municipal grants for the schools which they maintain at great expense.

Ross, *The Red River Settlement* (London, 1856); Hargrave, *Red River* (Montreal, 1871); Hamilton, *The Prairie Province* (Toronto, 1876); Gunn, *History of Manitoba* (Ottawa, 1880); Bryce, *Manitoba; its infancy, growth and present condition* (London, 1882); *The Romantic Settlement of Lord Selkirk's Colonists* (Toronto, 1909); Hill, *Manitoba* (Toronto, 1890); Begg, *History of the North-West* (Toronto, 1894); Dugas, *L'Ouest Canadien* (Montreal, 1896); Morice, *Aux Sources de l'Histoire Manitobaine* (Quebec, 1907); *Dictionnaire historique des Canadiens et des Métis Français de l'Ouest* (Quebec, 1908); *History of the Catholic Church in Western Canada* (Toronto, 1910); Anglin, *Catholic Education in Canada in its Relation to the Civil Authority* in *The Catholic Educational Association Bulletin* (Columbus, Ohio, August, 1910).

A. G. Morice.

Manizales, Diocese of. See Medellin, Archdiocese of.

Mann, Theodore Augustine, English naturalist and historian, b. in Yorkshire, 22 June, 1735; d. at Prague in Bohemia, 23 Feb., 1809. Little is known of his education except that he seems to have imbibed deistic ideas in his youth. He left England about 1754 and went to Paris. Here the study of Bossuet's "Discours sur l'histoire universelle" exerted a profound influence upon him, and in 1756 he was received into the Catholic Church by the Archbishop of Paris. Upon the outbreak of the war between France and England in the same year, he went to Spain, where he enlisted in a regiment of dragoons,

and afterwards became a student at the military academy of Barcelona. He soon abandoned, however, the idea of a military career, and went to Belgium, where he entered the Chartreuse monastery at Nieuport, the sole English house of the order. After his profession his leisure was devoted to scientific study, and his memoir "Théorie des causes physiques des mouvements des corps célestes d'après les principes de Newton", won for him membership in the Imperial Academy of Brussels. He became prior of his monastery in 1764, but left the order thirteen years later, after having obtained a Bull of secularization and also the privilege of possessing a benefice. He took up his residence at Brussels, and received a prebend in the Chapter of Notre-Dame de Courtrai. In 1787 he was chosen perpetual secretary of the Brussels Academy, and carried on numerous meteorological observations under its auspices. The invasion of the French in 1794 forced him to leave Belgium, and, after travelling in Germany and England, he finally settled at Prague, where he continued his literary labours until his death. Mann was a laborious student and a versatile writer. He is said to have refused the Bishopric of Antwerp, offered him by Emperor Joseph II, rather than abandon his favourite studies.

His principal literary works, conspicuous for their erudition, were: "Mémoire et lettres sur l'étude de la langue grecque" (Brussels, 1781); "Mémoire sur la conservation et le commerce des grains" (Mechlin, 1764); "Abrégé de l'histoire ecclésiastique, civile, et naturelle de la ville de Bruxelles et de ses environs" (Brussels, 1785), in collaboration with Foppens; "Histoire du règne de Marie Thérèse" (Brussels, 1781; 2nd ed., 1786); "Recueil de mémoires sur les grandes gelées et leurs effets" (Ghent, 1792); "Principes métaphysiques des êtres et des connaissances" (Vienna, 1807), and numerous papers in the "Mémoires" of the Brussels Academy. He was also the translator of an English work, which was published under the title "Dictionnaire des Jardiniers et des Cultivateurs" (Brussels, 1786–9).

REIFFENBERG, *Eloge de l'Abbé Mann* in *Annuaire de la Biblioth. royale de Belgique* (Brussels, 1850), 77; SECCOMBE in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, s. v.; REGNARD in *Nouvelle Biogr. Gén.*, s. v.

HENRY M. BROCK.

Manna (Heb. מן, Gr. *μάν, μάννα*; Lat. *man, manna*), the food miraculously sent to the Israelites during their forty years' sojourn in the desert (Ex., xvi; Num., xi, 6–9). It fell during the night in small white flakes or grains which covered the ground and presented the appearance of hoar frost. These grains are described as resembling coriander seed and bdellium, with a taste like "flour with honey", or "bread tempered with oil" (Ex., xvi, 31; Num., xi, 7–8).

The manna fell for the first time while the Israelites were in the desert of Sin, six weeks after their departure from Egypt, in answer to their murmurs over the privations of desert life (Ex., xvi, 1 sq.) and thenceforth fell daily, except on the Sabbath, till they arrived at Galgal in the plain of Jericho (Jos., v, 12). During these years the manna was their chief but not their only article of diet. Their herds furnished them some milk and meat; they had oil and flour, at least in small quantities, and at times purchased provisions from neighbouring peoples (Lev., ii, sq.; xvii, 1 sq.; Deut., ii, 6, 28). The manna had to be gathered in the morning, as the heat of the sun melted it. The quantity to be collected was limited to a gomor ('*ōmer*, between six and seven pints) per person; but on the eve of the Sabbath a double portion was gathered. When kept over night it putrefied and bred worms, except the portion which was reserved for the Sabbath. Though it was probably eatable in the natural state, it was usually ground in a mill or beaten in a mortar and then boiled and made into cakes. As a reminder to future generations, a vessel filled with manna was placed near the Ark of the Covenant. The name is connected with the exclamation "Mān hû", which the Israelites uttered on first seeing it. This expression since the time of the Septuagint is generally translated "What is this?", though it should more probably be translated "Is this manna?", or "It is manna". A substance named *mannu* was known in Egypt at that time, and the resemblance of the newly fallen food to this substance would naturally call forth the exclamation and suggest the name.

Many scholars have identified the Biblical manna with the juice exuded by a variety of *Tamarix gallica* (*Tamarix mannifera*) when it is pricked by an insect (*Coccus manniparus*), and known to the Arabs as *mannes-sama*, "gift of heaven" or "heavenly manna". But although manna in several respects answers the description of the manna of the Bible, it lacks some of its distinctive qualities. It cannot be ground or beaten in a mortar, nor can it be boiled and made into cakes. It does not decay and breed worms, but keeps indefinitely after it is collected. Besides, being almost pure sugar, it could hardly form the chief nourishment of a people for forty years. But even if the identity were certain, the phenomenon of its fall, as recorded in Exodus, could not be explained except by a miracle. For, although the tamarisk was probably more plentiful in the days of the Exodus than it is now, it could not have furnished the large quantity of manna daily required by the Israelites. Moreover, the tamarisk manna exudes only at a certain season, whereas the Biblical manna fell throughout the year; it exudes every day during its season, while the Biblical manna did not fall on the Sabbath. Most of these objections apply also to the juice exuded by the Camel's Thorn (*Alhagi Camelorum*), which is sometimes considered identical with Biblical manna.

Others think they have found the true manna in a lichen, *Lenora esculenta* (also known as *Sphærothallia esculenta*), met with in Western Asia and North Africa. It easily scales off, and being carried away by the wind sometimes falls in the form of a rain. In times of famine it is ground and mixed with other substances to make a kind of bread. But this lichen is dry and insipid, and possesses little nutritive value. The regular fall in this case, too, would be miraculous. The manna may, indeed, have been a natural substance, but we must admit a miracle at least in the manner in which it was supplied. For not only does the phenomenon resist all natural explanation, but the account of Exodus, as well as the designation "bread from heaven", "bread of angels", i. e. sent by the ministry of angels (Ps. lxxvii, 24, 25; Wisd., xvi, 20), plainly represents it as miraculous.

Christ uses the manna as the type and symbol of the Eucharistic food, which is true "bread from heaven", and "bread of life", i. e. life-giving bread, in a far higher sense than the manna of old (John, vi). St. Paul in calling the manna "spiritual food" (I Cor., x, 3), alludes to its symbolical significance with regard to the Eucharist as much as to its miraculous character. Hence the manna has always been a common Eucharistic symbol in Christian art and liturgy. In Apoc., ii, 17, the manna stands as the symbol of the happiness of heaven.

HUMMELAUER, *Com. in Exod.* (Paris, 1897), 168 sq.; EBERS, *Durch Gosen zum Sinai* (Leipzig, 1872), 236; RITTER, *Die Erdkunde* (Berlin, 1848), xiv, 665 sq.; BURCKHARDT, *Travels in Syria* (London, 1822), 600 sq.; LESÊTRE in VIG., *Dict. de la Bible*, s. v.; ZENNER, *Man hu* in *Zeitschr. der Kath. Theol.*, xxiii (1899), 164; PETERS, *Zu Man hu*, ibid., 371.

F. BECHTEL.

Manning, HENRY EDWARD, Cardinal Priest of Sts. Andrew and Gregory on the Cœlian Hill and second Archbishop of Westminster, b. 15 July, 1808; d. 14 January, 1892.

Henry Edward Manning, who was born at his grand-

father's home, Copped Hall, Totteridge, Herts, England, was the son of William Manning, M. P. for Evesham and Lymington and sometime governor of the Bank of England. His father's family was of an old Kentish stock, and though born in Hertfordshire, the future cardinal spent some years of his boyhood at Combe Bank, near Sevenoaks in Kent, whither his father had moved when his son was but seven years old. His mother, William Manning's second wife, was a daughter of Henry Lannoy Hunter, who was of a French Huguenot family originally known by the name of Veneur. His father's mother was a Miss Ryan, whose name betrays her Irish origin, and from some old diaries which have only lately come to life it appears that she was a Catholic and faithfully practised the duties of her religion. This fact, it would seem, was never known to Cardinal Manning himself, as the diaries have only been discovered since his death. After learning his first rudiments at home and at a private school at Totteridge, Henry Manning went to Harrow, in 1822, and on leaving school continued his studies for a time under a private tutor. It had at first been his purpose to follow his father in the banking business and to enter Parliament. But the banker having suffered a reverse of fortune, he was fain to take a different course. In 1827 he went up to Oxford and entered at Balliol College. Although he no longer had a parliamentary career in view, he continued to take an interest in political questions, and his natural powers of oratory soon made him conspicuous in the debating of the Union, where he was succeeded by Gladstone in the presidency. In later life he still cherished pleasing recollections of the memorable debate of 1829, when Monckton Milnes and Hallam and Sunderland came from Cambridge to prove the poetical superiority of Shelley to Byron.

These rhetorical distractions, however, did not interfere with his studies, and in 1830 he took a first class in classics. On leaving Oxford, he accepted a subordinate post in the Colonial Office, and devoted his attention to questions of political economy, a study which stood him in good stead when in later years he took a prominent part in the practical discussion of social problems. But though this time was in no wise wasted, he had not yet found his rightful place and his real work in life. He had scarcely relinquished his dreams of political ambition, when he felt himself called to the service of God and his brethren. For this reason he once more went back to Oxford, where, in 1832, he was elected a Fellow of Merton College. After completing the course of reading required for orders, he was ordained to the Anglican ministry later in the same year and preached his first sermon in Cuddesdon Church on Christmas Day. Soon after his ordination he went to act as curate to the Rev. John Sargent, Rector of Lavington-with-Graffham, Sussex, who was stricken with illness, and in taking what seemed to be a temporary work he found what was to be his home for the next seventeen years. On the death of the rector, he was presented to the living in May, 1833, by the patroness, Mrs. Sargent of Lavington, the mother of the Rev. John Sargent. In November of the same year he married Caroline Sargent, the third daughter of his predecessor in the incumbency. His marriage may be said to have had some part, however indirectly, in leading him into the Catholic Church, for it brought him into a family circle that was destined to be strongly affected by the rising Romeward movement. Of the four famous Sargent sisters, Mrs. Henry Wilberforce and Mrs. George Ryder were received into the Church with their husbands and their children; the other two, Caroline Manning, who died in July, 1837, and her eldest sister, the wife of Samuel Wilberforce afterwards Bishop of Winchester, were already dead when the movement had scarce begun; yet one of them eventually gave her husband and the other her daughter to the Church.

In his country parish at Lavington, though Henry Manning had not yet attained to the fullness of the Faith, nor as yet received the sacramental grace and the spiritual powers of the Catholic pastor, he was already, according to the light so far vouchsafed him, serving his Divine master and labouring for the salvation of souls in a true spirit of zeal and generous self-sacrifice, in the spirit that speaks in later days from the pages of his "Eternal Priesthood" and his "Pastoral Office". In 1841, after some years of simple parish work, a wider field was opened to him by his appointment to the office of Archdeacon of Chichester. The office in his case was assuredly no sinecure. The volume of charges delivered on the periodical visitations of the archdeaconry remains to show the intelligent and tireless zeal with which he entered into these new duties. Here also we may find some things that seem to foreshadow his larger work in later years, notably the pages that bear witness to his love for God's poor, his resolute resistance to wrong, and his zeal for reforming abuses. Meanwhile, all this active work was accompanied by a corresponding growth in the knowledge of Catholic truth.

The Oxford Movement was now in full swing, and some of its leaders were already, however unconsciously, well on their way to Rome. Newman had begun to see the light in 1839 (two years before Manning's appointment as archdeacon), but six more years had to elapse before his final submission to the Holy See in 1845. This fact is worth recalling here, for it reminds us that a conversion is often a matter of some time. Between the beginning of difficulties, misgivings, and fears that may prove illusory, and the period when the misgivings become convictions, and duty becomes clear, a considerable time may often elapse. It is difficult to lay down any general rule; some may see their way clear more speedily than others and may have little need to seek for outward help in coming to a decision, but where, as so often happens, the process of conviction is slow, and some wise counsel is needed, it may be a duty to confide to some competent adviser fears and misgivings which it would be a crime to proclaim in public. In such a position the most candid and consistent writer must needs speak in a different strain in his confidential letters setting forth his difficulties, and in letters addressed to others to whom it would be wrong to make them known. And the reader who can appreciate this position will readily understand the seeming inconsistency between the language of Manning's private correspondence unfolding conscientious perplexities and that of his public utterances at this time, wherein all doubt is silenced. He has been accused of remaining an Anglican after losing faith in Anglican teachings; and it has been alleged that he became a Catholic for motives of worldly ambition. A change of religion for such unworthy motives is quite out of keeping with the character of the man as revealed in his letters and journals of that date, and is unintelligible if Manning had been the astute and ambitious man imagined by his accusers. When he first began to break away from the Church of England there was no Catholic hierarchy or cardinal archbishop in England, and the position of a vicar Apostolic could not offer any great temptation to an ambitious Anglican archdeacon. And if we once suppose him to be so unprincipled as to change his belief or profession for the sake of preferment, why should he go so far and get so little? There would certainly be less trouble and greater prospect of success in a change of course within the Church of England. An astute and ambitious Archdeacon of Chichester would have broken with the High Church party and taken a line agreeable to the men in high places. The real cause and motive of his conversion to the Church may be plainly seen in the whole history of the Oxford Movement, as well as in his own published writings and his

private letters and journals. In common with the Tractarian leaders he had from the first taken hold of great Catholic principles which he found in the writings of the early Fathers. And in his case the truth that came home to him with special force, and dominated and moulded his whole life and character was the abiding presence of the Holy Ghost in the Church of God. This, it may be said, is at once his leading idea in his Anglican sermons, his main motive at the time of his conversion and in the course he took in the Vatican Council, and it forms the favourite theme in his later spiritual and theological writings. At first, like other Anglican divines, he was able to satisfy himself that the Church of England was a part of the one Holy Catholic Apostolic Church of the Creed, and as such was guided and quickened by the presence of the Holy Spirit. For this reason he looked to the Church to guard and cherish the revealed doctrines committed, as he supposed, to her care.

His faith in Anglicanism had already been somewhat shaken by other doctrinal or historical difficulties. It was finally shattered by the Gorham Judgment of 1850, when the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council directed the Dean of Arches to institute a clergyman who was accused of holding unorthodox views on the subject of Baptismal Regeneration. As Newman had said of the Jerusalem Bishopric, this act of the state Church was for Manning "the beginning of the end". Even then he did not act with any undue haste, and joined in an attempt to free the Church of England from a compromising association with heresy. His zeal and devotion to the Establishment caused him at this time to be looked up to as the leader of the High Church party as distinguished from the Tractarians in the Anglican body. On 23 January, 1847, in reply to Dr. Pusey's lament over Canon MacMullen's conversion he had written to him: "You know how long I have to you expressed my conviction that a false position has been taken up by the Church of England. The direct and certain tendency of what remains of the original movement is to the Roman Church. You know the minds of men about us better than I do, and will therefore know how strong an impression the claims of Rome have upon them. . . . It is also clear that they are revising the Reformation; that the doctrine, ritual, and practice of the Church of England taken at its best does not suffice them. . . . I say all this not in fault-finding but in sorrow. How to help to heal it I do not presume to say." Within a few days after the Gorham Judgment (March, 1850) he still clung to the Church of England as a living branch of the Church of Christ, and he was the first to sign a protest calling on the Church to free itself from a heresy imposed on it by the civil power. A bill was introduced in the House of Lords to provide that the ultimate decision as to questions of doctrine should be transferred to the Upper House of Convocation, but was lost by 84 votes to 31, and Manning was driven to consider whether the Church of England could claim to be an unerring guide and teacher of the Faith. He took pains to inform his friends that he was acting with calmness and deliberation. In June, 1850, he wrote from Lavington to his sister, Mrs. Austen: "Let me tell you to believe nothing of me but what comes from me. The world has sent me long ago to Pius IX, but I am still here, and if I may lay my bones under the sod in Lavington Churchyard with a soul clear before God, all the world could not move me." With Wilberforce and Mill he circulated a declaration that the oath of supremacy only obliged the conscience in matters of a civil not of a spiritual kind; it was sent to 17,000 clergymen, but only about 1800 signed it. When these efforts failed, and the truth was borne in upon him with irresistible force, his own course was at length clear before him. At Michaelmas in the same year he took steps to resign his living, and on Passion Sunday, 6 April, 1851, together with his friend J. R. Hope-Scott, Q.C., he was received into the Catholic Church, by Father Brownbill, S.J.

To those who knew the archdeacon's zeal in the pastoral office for the salvation of souls, there was no doubt of his call to the sacred ministry. It seemed only a matter of course that his submission to the Church should be followed, after the necessary interval of preparation, by his ordination to the Catholic priesthood. Few could have expected that this ordination would come as speedily as it did. Cardinal Wiseman, recognizing that the circumstances of the case were exceptional, decided to let no time be lost, and Henry Edward Manning was ordained priest by his predecessor in the See of Westminster on Trinity Sunday, 14 June, 1851, little more than two months after his reception into the Church. There may seem to be a strange irony of fate in this hurried promotion of one who was to lay so much stress on the importance of due preparation for the priesthood. But the want of preparation in this case was apparent rather than real. Whether we regard the theological learning or the spiritual holiness of life required of candidates for the priesthood, Manning had already made no little progress in preparation. In his final years at Lavington he had made good way in the study of Catholic theology and spiritual literature, and, as his journal with its searching self-examination and generous resolutions bears witness, the other side of that preparation was in no wise wanting. At the same time, it was certainly desirable that some more systematic training should be added to this self-education. For this reason his ordination was followed by a course of studies in Rome. These studies, however, were not allowed to prevent that immediate missionary work which had doubtless been one of Cardinal Wiseman's main motives in hastening the ordination of the neophyte. During these years of Roman study, Manning took advantage of the summer vacation to exercise his pastoral office in London, preaching, receiving converts into the Church, and hearing confessions at the Jesuit church in Farm Street. In this church he had said his first Mass on 16 June, 1851, assisted by Père de Ravignan.

By a significant coincidence his ordination took place on 14 June, the feast of St. Basil, one of the Fathers who was in a special manner his pattern, and who has left us a great work on the Holy Ghost, and, as he noticed at the time with delight, the Introit of his first Mass (on the feast of St. Francis Regis) was the text: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me; wherefore he hath anointed me, to preach the Gospel to the poor he hath sent me" (Luke, iv, 18; Isaias, lxi, 1), words that bring before us both his active work for the poor and the devotion to the Holy Ghost, which was, so to say, the soul of all his life and labour. The priestly labours which thus began were continued on a large field and with fresh advantages when, in 1857, he founded at St. Mary of the Angels, Bayswater, the Congregation of the Oblates of St. Charles. This new community of secular priests was in some sort the joint work of Cardinal Wiseman and Manning, for both had independently conceived the idea of a community of this kind, and Manning had studied the life and work of St. Charles in his Anglican days at Lavington and had, moreover, visited the Oblates at Milan, in 1856, to satisfy himself that their rule could be adapted to the needs of Westminster. In the same year that he became superior of this congregation another office was laid upon him. At the instigation of Dr. Whitty, who was about to enter the Society of Jesus, he was appointed, by Pius IX, provost of the Westminster Metropolitan Chapter. During the eight years of his tenure of these two offices, the provost and superior accomplished a great amount of work both for the diocese and for his own community, and the eloquence which had made him one of the foremost Anglican preachers of the time now helped to

HENRY EDWARD CARDINAL MANNING

PAINTING BY EDWIN LONG, R.A.

spread and strengthen the Catholic Faith in England. His pastoral labour was now no longer hampered by inward struggles or by the uncertainties of doctrinal differences that troubled the Anglican archdeacon.

Though the old time of storm and stress was ended, he was now to have trouble of another kind; and through no fault of his own he found himself involved in a domestic controversy which became the cause of considerable misunderstanding. In the circumstances of the time it was almost inevitable that the new community, partly composed of converts and apparently aiming at a revival in English Catholic ecclesiastical life, should be a subject of some difference of opinion. Men of the old school, who looked with suspicion on any novelties, may be pardoned for feeling alarm at the participation of the new community in the work of the diocesan seminary. Likely enough, neither side quite understood the ideas and motives of the other. Be this as it may, the majority of the Metropolitan Chapter adopted views at variance with those of Wiseman and Manning, and in the controversy that ensued the canons were supported by Archbishop Errington, at that time Cardinal Wiseman's coadjutor "with right of succession" to the see. In the event the Oblates had to retire from St. Edmund's College (1861), where their presence had given offence to the chapter. But the most important outcome of the struggle was the removal of Archbishop Errington from his office of coadjutor *cum jure successionis*. And as this decision of the Holy See followed upon a controversy in which Manning took a conspicuous part, some critics, imperfectly acquainted with the facts, have regarded him as an ambitious aspirant for office removing a rival from his path. But in this they strangely mistake the situation, and forget or overlook the fact that Manning's part in the controversy was strictly defensive. This can hardly be disputed by any careful and candid student of the documents. For even a reader who shared Archbishop Errington's unfavourable view of the Oblate Community and its position and influence in the diocese could hardly blame the superior of the Oblates for writing a vigorous vindication of himself and his community.

Though this struggle was certainly not of his seeking, and though he clearly had no thought of securing the succession for himself; it is none the less true that this controversy with the chapter and the coadjutor did lead in the event to his own elevation. If the rupture had never come to pass there would have been no vacancy on Cardinal Wiseman's death, since the coadjutor would have succeeded in due course. At the same time, the attack and the vindication had the effect of making Manning's merits and labours better known in Rome, and marked him out as the man most in sympathy with Wiseman's policy, and thus suggested him as a suitable successor. Hence, when the vacancy occurred on Wiseman's death in February, 1865, the natural result followed. This was made more certain when the chapter sent up Archbishop Errington's name at the head of the *terna*, and the other candidates did their best to secure his appointment. As the Holy See could hardly accept such a reversal of the decision made a few years before, it was inevitable that the names should be set aside; and the pope himself decided to appoint Mgr. Manning. While the matter still hung in the balance, Manning endeavoured to secure the appointment of another, and, in a confidential letter to Mgr. George Talbot in Rome, urged the claims of Bishop Ullathorne and Bishop Cornthwaite. From resolutions which he made as to his future conduct towards the coming archbishop it is clear that he did not anticipate his own appointment.

The new archbishop was consecrated at St. Mary Moorfields, on 8 June, 1865, by Bishop Ullathorne of Birmingham. Later in the year he went to Rome to receive the pallium, returning to England by November, when he was solemnly enthroned, and set himself to the great work that lay before him. If the choice made by the Holy See was naturally received with satisfaction by all who really knew him, others who had not that advantage regarded it with some misgiving. Yet some who had hitherto misunderstood him may possibly have gained a new sense of his power, and of his fitness for the post, from the sermon that he preached at the funeral of Cardinal Wiseman. In that graphic sketch of his predecessor's career, wherein he showed how the man had been fashioned and prepared for the work he was destined to do in England, the discerning reader may see how well the preacher had grasped the needs and hopes of the country, and may moreover be led to reflect how he, too, though in other ways than Wiseman's, had been made ready to carry the Catholic standard forward to further victories. While those who rightly understood Manning's merits may well have had high hopes for the future, few if any can have anticipated anything like the actual accomplishment. For one thing, his age and his apparently frail health gave little promise of such a long lease of active and laborious life. He said himself that he thought he had twelve years of work in him; and some may have considered this over sanguine. Yet he was to have a life full of strenuous and varied labour for more than a quarter of a century.

He inaugurated a memorial to his predecessor Cardinal Wiseman and determined that it should take the form of a cathedral for Westminster. In 1868 he was able to secure a site, but in after years a more favourable one was determined on. His efforts to procure education for the poor Catholic children of London were unceasing; and in his Lenten Pastoral of 1890 he was able to say that the names of 23,599 Catholic children were on the books of his parochial schools, and that during the previous quarter of a century 4542 children had been provided for in the homes of the archdiocese. He was one of the 500 bishops assembled in Rome to take part in the eighteenth centenary of Sts. Peter and Paul, and he was, therefore, present when Pius IX announced his intention of convoking a General Council. He returned to Rome in 1869, arriving for the opening of the Vatican Council, 8 December, and was put on the Committee "De Fide". To this Committee, in March, 1870, was referred the question of Papal Infallibility, and on 18 July the Decree was passed.

On his return to England, Manning protested in the press against the charges made by Mr. Gladstone against Catholics who accepted the Vatican Decrees, and his three pastoral letters published under the title "Petri Privilegium" did much to remove prejudice and misconception even among Catholics. In 1878 his "True Story of the Vatican Council" appeared in "The Nineteenth Century" in reply to incorrect statements that had obtained credence. In 1875 he was summoned to Rome to receive the cardinalate and the title of Sts. Andrew and Gregory, the church on the Cœlian, once the home of St. Gregory the Great, whence St. Augustine and his companions had been sent to convert England. In 1878 Cardinal Manning took part in the conclave that elected Leo XIII, receiving a vote or two himself in the scrutiny; and Pope Leo's encyclical "On the condition of labour", to use the words of Bishop Hedley, "owes something to the counsels of Cardinal Manning."

A matter of importance which took up not a little of his time and caused him some anxiety arose at the Low Week meeting of the bishops in 1877, when he proposed that they should prepare a petition to be sent to Rome asking that the pope should determine the relations which ought to exist between the regulars and the episcopate. The main questions at issue affected the right of the bishops to divide missions already in

the hands of regulars and the control bishops had over missions served by regulars in matters concerning visitation and the auditing of funds collected *intuitu missionis*. After some necessary delay the famous Constitution "Romanos Pontifices" was issued in 1881, and in course of time its provisions have been extended to nearly all English-speaking countries. It deals mainly with matters of jurisdiction and discipline, and treats of many subjects involving nice and complicated points of prudence and equity. To his zeal in the cause of elementary religious education, Cardinal Manning's later years saw added his efforts on behalf of the poor and outcast. He was invited to join the commission for the better housing of the working classes, he founded his League of the Cross for the promotion of temperance, and the "Cardinal's Peace" recalls the success of his efforts at mediation between the strikers and their employers at the time of the great London Dock Strike in 1889. Such are some of the salient works of Manning's life. And it may be remarked that while any one of these various lines of activity might have been enough, or more than enough for any ordinary man, all of them together by no means make up the whole life work of Cardinal Manning. Besides these special theological, literary, or social labours, there remain his ordinary pastoral activities. If he had done none of those things that seem at first sight most striking and characteristic, his life would still have been sufficiently full with the administration of the affairs of his diocese, with his care in training the clergy, his daily "solicitude for all the Churches", with holding ordinations and presiding at diocesan synods, with the building and blessing of new churches. And nothing in the way of special work could make him neglect those primary episcopal duties or perform them in a perfunctory fashion. These, it may be safely said, came first and foremost. For him the Catholic bishop was the father of the flock, solicitous in every way for the welfare of his children. It was, therefore, as a bishop sent by the Holy Ghost, the "Pater pauperum", to rule the Church of God, that he spent himself in works of charity or social reform, or defended the truth against attack from all forms of error, or from the corruptions of an evil life, and spoke in the same spirit, whether addressing dockers in the East End, or agnostics in the Metaphysical Society or bishops and theologians in the Vatican Council.

Theological controversy may be said to hold the first place in the earlier part of his episcopate, culminating in the Vatican Council, and continuing with somewhat abated vigour for a few years longer. Social work gradually becomes more conspicuous in the years after 1876, and reaches its climax in the Dock Strike in 1889. And most of his active work in the League of the Cross and among working men comes after his elevation to the cardinalate in 1875. For the last two years of his life, his failing health made him for the most part a prisoner. At length the end came, after a few days of illness, and he went to his rest on 14 January, 1892. A striking proof of the hold he had on the hearts of the poor and the working people of London was given when thousands thronged to get a last glimpse of him as he lay in state in his house at Westminster, and to follow his funeral to Kensal Green Cemetery. After some years in that field of the dead which he had described so well in his words on Wiseman, he was once more brought back to Westminster and given his last earthly resting place in the crypt of the cathedral.

The chief sources for the history of Cardinal Manning are his own published works and manuscript notes, reminiscences, letters, and journals, which exist in great abundance. Apart from their literary value, which is higher than some hasty critics are disposed to allow, his numerous works, both Anglican and Catholic, throw no little light on the growth of his opinions and the motives of his active labours, for from first to last there is a close correspondence between his words and actions. For his doctrinal development in Anglican days *The Rule of Faith* (1839) and the *Unity of the Church* are noteworthy; but his best work is seen in the four vols. of *Sermons* (1845–50) and *University Sermons* (1844), and these should be compared with such Catholic works as *The Grounds of Faith* (1852), *The Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost* (1865), and *The Eternal Priesthood* (1883). This last book has been translated into many languages and may be regarded as his masterpiece; apart from its intrinsic merit, it expresses the thoughts that dominated all his active life. The greater part of his private papers are still unpublished; but a great number of letters and autobiographical notes were printed in the *Life of Cardinal Manning, Archbishop of Westminster*, by EDWARD SHERIDAN PURCELL (London, 1895), 2 vols., a work which contained much valuable matter, though the author's information on some points was very imperfect, and he strangely misunderstood some important episodes, notably the state of Manning's mind before his conversion, his part in the Errington case, and his relations with Cardinal Newman. On these points see the *Appendix* to *Cardinal Manning* (2nd ed., London, 1896) by DR. J. R. GASQUET, the cardinal's nephew by marriage, who had the advantage of private papers and family memories unknown to Purcell. The true story of the Errington case is told, with the help of authentic documents, by WILFRID WARD in his *Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman*, And the relation of Newman and Manning, as well as the other two points, are treated in the review of Purcell's book by W. H. KENT in *Dublin Review* (April, 1896). All those matters will be more fully dealt with in the *Life of Cardinal Manning* now being prepared by W. H. KENT, a work which will contain many important documents hitherto unpublished, including the letters to Mr. Gladstone which Mr. Purcell wrongly supposed to be destroyed. HEMENER'S *Vie du Cardinal Manning* (1897) may also be mentioned, as well as the life by a well known French Protestant, DE PRESSENSÉ (1896: tr., 1897). This book, like a more recent non-Catholic biography, *The Cardinal Democrat*, by MISS I. TAYLOR, pays special attention to the cardinal's social work, a topic also treated by a French Catholic authority, ABBÉ LEMIRE, in *Cardinal Manning et son œuvre sociale*. On this point the article of SYDNEY BUXTON, M. P., in the *Contemporary Review* (1896) on *Cardinal Manning and the Dock Strike* is valuable for its first-hand information from one who took part in the fray. Yet another non-Catholic work, the *Life of Cardinal Manning* by A. W. HUTTON (1892) is worthy of note if only for its excellent bibliography. See also SNEAD-COX, *Life of Cardinal Vaughan* (London, 1910).

W. H. KENT.

Mannyng, ROBERT, OF BRUNNE, poet. He came from Bourne in Lincolnshire, England. From his own account he entered the house of the Gilbertine Canons at Sempringham in 1288 and at some period in his life he was with Robert Bruce at Cambridge. In 1338 he was living in another priory of his order, but still in Lincolnshire. The date of his death is unknown. He was the author of two poems, both free translations from the French: (1) "Handlyng Synne", a very free rendering of the "Manuel des Peschiez", which had been written in poor French verse by an Englishman, William of Waddington, in the reign of Edward I. It consists chiefly of a series of stories illustrating the Commandments, the seven deadly sins, the sin of sacrilege and the Sacraments. Mannyng is much more of a story-teller than a poet, he interpolates tales of his own and illustrates those of his original from the English life of his day. He is severe on all classes of society, but is yet sympathetic towards the poor. (2) A "Chronicle of England", the first part of which is a translation, with some additions, of Wace's version of Geoffrey of Monmouth, and the second is based on Peter de Langtoft's Anglo-Norman poem. When Mannyng comes to the reign of Edward I he inserts a good deal of matter which has some independent historical value. These poems are important because they illustrate a growing interest in "ignorant men who delight in listening to tales" but who cannot read French, because they foreshadow the love of story-telling which is to produce the "Canterbury Tales" at the end of the century and because they helped to make East-Midland English the literary dialect of English. F. J. Furnivall has edited the "Handlyng Synne" and the "Chronicle" with prefaces. The authorship of "Meditacyuns of the Soper of our Lord Jhesus" (edited for the Early English Text Society in 1875), has also been ascribed to Mannyng, but this is by no means ascertained beyond doubt.

Cf. *Cambridge History of English Literature*, vol. I, pp. 344–52; *Dict. of Nat. Biography*, s. v.

F. URQUHART.

Mans, Le. See Le Mans, Diocese of.

Mansard (Mansart), the name of two French architects.—I. François, b. in Paris, probably of Italian stock, in 1598; d. there, 1666. During at least the last thirty years of his life he exercised the greatest influence on the development of architecture. Among his contemporaries only Salomon de Brosse approached him in ability. Defects and oddities, so glaring as even to provoke published satires, for some time prevented him from obtaining commissions. He had so high a sense of true architecture that he hardly ever decided on a plan definitely at the outset, anticipating that improvements on the first conception would be sure to suggest themselves later on. Thus he lost the commission for building the Louvre, because nothing could induce him to submit detailed plans. Having built one wing of the château Maison-Lafitte (1642), he destroyed what had been built so as to rebuild it on what he thought a better plan, the ultimate result being the finest of all his non-ecclesiastical works. After beginning the finely planned abbey church of Val-de-Grâce (1645), his fastidious self-criticism made him leave the work, carried only as far as the ground plan, for others to finish. He is said, however, to have elsewhere executed what had been his design for this church. These two are regarded as his best works. To him are due, also, the design and construction of several châteaux—Fresnes, Berny, Bercy, and others. At Paris he built, wholly or in part, the Hôtels Carnavalet, de La Vrillière, Mazarin, de Conti, and others, and the façades of the Feuillants, Dames de Ste-Marie, and Minimes. His work is characterized rather by the essential beauty of construction than by the adventitious charm of ornamentation, which, indeed, he employed sparingly. His style was influenced by Salomon de Brosse, but he also strove to follow the older Italian masters.

II. Jules, grand-nephew of François, was originally Jules Hardouin, but took the name of Mansard; was b. in Paris, 1646; d. at Marly 1708. He had more apparent success than François, if less ability. He enjoyed in a high degree the favour of Louis XIV, who bestowed on him numerous titles and offices, as well as the dignity of Count and the inspectorship of buildings. Nearly all the architectural undertakings of this king are linked with the name of Jules Mansard, who, indeed, has been blamed, rightly or wrongly, for some of Louis's extravagant expenditures. Few architects have ever received such remunerative, or so many, commissions. He sought to combine the style of his grand-uncle, and of Le Brun, with the extreme classical style so much affected at that time, and thus became in some degree an exponent of the Baroque style. His best work is the church of the Invalides, with its dome and cupola similar to St Paul's in London, which is of the same period, and designed after the plan of St Peter's at Rome. Mansard generally laid more stress on elegance of effect than on monumental grandeur, so that some of his effects tend to triviality. The nave of the Invalides is merely a cubical base for the great dome, and its double row of columns, though graceful, has little of imposing grandeur in its effect. The outer shell of the dome is of wood, a feature which this building shares with other French structures of similar character. The decoration between the ribs of the cupola, the pierced tapering lantern, encircled with corbels, and the pointed tip, all contributed to its elegance, so that the cap of the dome seems rather to soar than to rest on its supports. This graceful dome, with its high drum and attic, forms a striking point in the panorama of Paris. In the interior, Mansard made use of a happy artifice in order to secure the illuminating effect of the dome to the full without exposing the painting to the direct glare of day: he built two domes the one over the other, the one above with attic windows so placed as not to be visible from the interior; through an opening in the inner dome one sees the paintings in the outer, but not the windows. In spite of certain faults of detail, this structure is, on the whole, one of the finest Baroque buildings in existence. With Leveau, Mansard finished the château of Versailles, which exercised so wide and powerful an influence on the architecture of the Baroque period. In the exterior, an effect of space and sweep was sought rather than pure beauty. The interior more than satisfies the anticipations raised by the exterior. The Grand Trianon and the Colonnades are also Jules Mansard's, as well as many other buildings in and near Versailles. His work, in domestic architecture and public buildings is, indeed, scattered all over France, and what is known as the "Mansard roof" takes its name from him.

Lance, *Dict. des architectes français* (Paris, 1873); *Archives de l'art français*, 2nd series, II; *Nouvelles Archives de l'art français*; Dussieux, *Le Château de Versailles* (Versailles, 1881); Gurlitt, *Geschichte des Barockstils* (Stuttgart, 1887–89).

G. Gietmann.

Mansi, Gian Domenico, Italian prelate and scholar, b. at Lucca, of a patrician family, 16 Feb., 1692; d. archbishop of that city, 27 Sept., 1769. At the age of sixteen he entered the Congregation of Clerks Regular of the Mother of God and made his profession in 1710. Except for some journeys made for purposes of study, his whole life, until his appointment as Archbishop of Lucca (1765), was spent in his religious home. In 1758, after a sojourn at Rome, where he had been excellently received by Cardinal Passionei, there was question of elevating him to the Sacred College, but his unwise collaboration in an annotated edition of the famous "Encyclopédie" (see Encyclopedists) displeased Clement XIII. It should be remarked that the notes in this edition were intended to correct the text. Three years after his elevation to the episcopate he was smitten with an attack of apoplexy which left him suffering, deprived of the power of motion, until his death. Pious, simple, very kindly, very helpful, and extremely charitable to the poor, he made an excellent bishop, and his death caused general regret. His long career was filled chiefly with the re-editing of erudite ecclesiastical works with notes and complementary matter. His name appears on the title-pages of ninety folio volumes and numerous quartos. An indefatigable worker, widely read and thoroughly trained, his output was chiefly of a mechanical order, and unoriginal because hurried. His task was most often limited to inserting notes and documents in the work to be reproduced and sending the whole result to the printer. This left room for numberless shortcomings; Mansi's publications cannot satisfy the critical judgment; he himself, indeed, was a savant rather than a critic; he went too fast, and did too many things, to keep his aim fixed on perfection.

The only work worth mentioning that is all Mansi's own is a "Tractatus de casibus et censuris reservatis", published in 1724, which brought him into difficulties with the Index. The rest are all annotated editions. In 1726 there was "Jo. Burch. Menckenii De Charlataneria eruditorum declamationes duæ cum notis variorum"; from 1725 to 1738, an annotated Latin translation of the three works of Dom Calmet—the "Dictionnaire de la Bible", "Prolégomènes et Dissertations", and "Commentaire littéral". In 1728 he reprinted the "Vetus et nova Disciplina" of Thomassin; from 1738 to 1756 he issued in twenty-eight folio volumes the "Annales" of Baronius and those of Raynald, printed with the "Critica" of Pagi; in 1742 he re-edited the Chronicle of Castruccio (1314–28); in 1749 Natalis Alexander's "Historia ecclesiastica"; in 1753 a "Diario antico e moderno delle Chiese di Lucca", considerably enlarged by himself; in 1754, "Jo. Alberti Fabricii Lipsiensis inter suos S. Th. D. et professoris publici Bibliotheca Latina mediæ et infimæ ætatis, cum supplemento Christiani Schottgenii," with his own notes also, in three quarto volumes (the work

is dated 1734; Mansi's publication was re-edited at Florence in 1858); in 1755, the works of Æneas Silvius Piccolomini (Pius II); in 1758, the "Theologia moralis" of Anacletus Reiffenstuel, with an epitome published separately; in 1760, the "Theologia moralis" of Laymann; in 1761, the "Miscellanea" of Baluze; in 1762, the "Historia ecclesiastica" of Père Amat de Graveson; lastly, in 1765, the "Memorie della gran Contessa Matilde" (Fiorentini).

The best-know publication of Mansi is his vast—too vast, indeed—edition of the Councils, "Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio" (31 vols., folio, Florence and Venice, 1758–98), which was stopped by lack of resources in the middle of the Council of Florence of 1438. The absence of an index renders it inconvenient, and in a critical point of view it leaves an immensity to be desired. Mansi saw only fourteen volumes of it published, the others were finished from his notes. In 1748 the savant began to publish the first volume of a collection which was presented as a supplement to that of Coleti; the sixth and last volume of it appeared in 1752. This supplement contains, together with various dissertations, many recently published documents, and many unpublished, which were lacking in the previous collections—330 letters of popes, 200 new councils, mention of 380 others—besides notes. The success of this publication induced Mansi to undertake a recasting of Coleti, with his supplement, adding to it documents discovered since his time. Such was the origin of the "Amplissima". The Paris publishing-house of Welter undertook, in 1900, a heliogravure reproduction of it with a continuation and supplement by the Abbé J. B. Martin.

Franceschini, *Biographical Notice of Mansi*, prefixed to the *Amplissima*, XIX; Pacchius, *J. D. Mansi Vita*, prefixed to *Fabricius, Bibliotheca latina* (Florence, 1858); Quentin, *J. D. Mansi et les grandes collections conciliaires* (Paris, 1900); Hefele, *Histoire des Conciles*, I (new Fr. tr., Paris, 1907), 110.

A. Boudinhon.

Mantegna, Andrea, Italian painter; b. according to some authorities, at Vicenza, according to others at Padua, in 1431; d. at Mantua, 13 September, 1506. Little is known of his origin save that he came of honourable parentage and was adopted at an early age by Francesco Squarcione who reared him as his son. Everything tends to show that his artistic education began very early, for he was at work upon masterpieces at an age when most artists are still under tuition. He owed little of what he knew to his foster-father, who, although the founder of the Paduan school of painting, possessed but mediocre ability. Mantegna's earliest known work, a "Madonna in Glory", was painted when he was seventeen for the church of S. Sofia at Padua. This picture is no longer in existence, but to judge from his next dated work, a fresco (1452) in the church of the Santo, Padua, this first achievement must have exhibited almost incredible maturity of talent. In 1454 he was employed in the church of S. Giustina, Padua, where he painted the Ancona, which is now in the Brera, at Milan. Squarcione had been commissioned by the Ovetari family to decorate the Church of the Eremitani, Padua, and he had deputed a portion of the task to Mantegna. By these frescoes, which attest a steady development in his manner, he is doubtless best known. The probable dates are 1448–55 and the frescoes due to him are: on the left wall, "Baptism of Hermogenes", "St. James before Cæsar", "St. James led to execution", and "The Martyrdom of St. James"; on the right wall, "The Martyrdom of St. Christopher", and "The Removal of his Body". These works established his fame as the foremost painter of the Paduan school, and among those who recognized and applauded his genius was Jacopo Bellini, whose daughter, Nicolosia, Mantegna married in 1454. This brought about a rupture with Squarcione which was final.

St. George
Accademia Reale, Venice

Bronze Bust by Cavalli
Church of S. Andrea, Mantua

Baptism of Hermogenes
Church of the Eremitani, Padua

Andrea Mantegna

At the height of his fame he painted the portrait of Cardinal Scarampi (1459), the altar-piece of the Church of San Zeno, Venice, and the "Agony in the Garden". In 1457 Lodovico Gonzaga, Marquess of Mantua, invited Mantegna to enter his service, but it was two years before the successful artist could be persuaded to accept. In 1459 he went to Mantua, and here, save for the interval of his stay in Rome, whither he went at the request of Innocent VIII to decorate the new chapel in the Vatican, he spent the remainder of his life. He was held in great honour but treated with only spasmodic liberality, his salary being irregularly paid. Lodovico was succeeded in 1478 by his son Federigo, who died in 1484, and Francesco Gonzaga succeeded him at the age of eighteen. Francesco was betrothed to the beautiful and accomplished Isabella d'Este, one of the women whose appreciation and encouragement of art and letters did so much to make the Renaissance what it was. In 1485 Mantegna was ordered by Gonzaga to paint a Madonna for Isabella's mother, the Duchess of Ferrara, to do which he interrupted a series of paintings, "The Triumph of Cæsar",

THE HOLY WOMEN AT THE SEPULCHRE

MANTEGNA, NATIONAL GALLERY, LONDON

now at Hampton Court, which he had begun soon after his arrival in Mantua. His work in the Vatican was another interruption, but on his return to Mantua in 1490 he continued this, the greatest of his works, which was completed in 1494.

In 1495 he painted an altar-piece in commemoration of the marquess's victory at Fornovo. This picture, the "Madonna della Vittoria", is now at the Louvre. The "Madonna and Saints", painted for the church of Santa Maria in Organo, Verona, was finished in 1497. Another series of paintings was that executed for the Marchioness Isabella as decorations for her study. These were "The Triumph of Wisdom", "Parnassus", and "The Masque of Comus", the last-named being finished by Lorenzo Costa. To the last period of his life belong the "Madonna and Saints", now in the National Gallery, the "Dead Christ", in the Brera, Milan, and "The Triumph of Scipio", in the National Gallery. Mantegna's work is grandly conceived and severely beautiful. His manner has been called dry and hard, but he exhibits marvellous art in his modelling of form and disposing of drapery, as well as great knowledge of design. He was one of the earliest Italian engravers on copper, but few of the plates attributed to him are his.

VASARI, *Andrea Mantegna*, ed. SANSONI (Florence, 1878); CROWE AND CAVALCASELLE, *Hist. of Painting in N. Italy*, I (London, 1871); CRUTWELL, *Mantegna* (London, 1901); WAAGEN, *Uber Leben und Wirken des Malers Mantegna* (Leipzig, 1850); YRIARTE, *Mantegna* (Paris, 1901).

B. M. KELLY.

THE CATHEDRAL, MANTUA
Façade, XVIII century; Campanile, XII century

Mantelletta, an outer vestment reaching to the knees, open in front, with slits instead of sleeves on the sides. It is worn by cardinals, bishops, and prelates *di mantelletta*. For cardinals the colour is ordinarily red, in penitential seasons and for times of mourning it is violet, on Gaudete and Lætare Sundays rose-colour; for the other dignitaries, the same distinctions being made, the colour is violet or black with a violet border. Cardinals and bishops belonging to orders which have a distinctive dress, also abbots who are entitled to wear the mantelletta, retain for it the colour of the habit of the order. The vestment is made of silk only when it is worn by cardinals or by bishops or prelates belonging to the papal court. The mantelletta is probably connected with the *mantellum* of the cardinals in the "Ordo" of Gregory X (1271–1276) and with the *mantellum* of the prelates in the "Ordo" of Petrus Amelius (d. 1401), which was a vestment similar to a scapular.

The *mantellone*, the outer vestment of the prelates, differs from the mantelletta by being longer and having wing-like sleeves.

BARBIER DE MONTAULT, *Traité pratique de la construction des églises*, II, 517 sq.

JOSEPH BRAUN.

Mantua, DIOCESE OF (MANTUANA), in Lombardy. The city is situated on the Mincio River, which surrounds it entirely, and forms the swampy lowlands that help to make Mantua the strongest fortress in Italy, but infect its atmosphere. Mantua is of Etruscan origin, and preserved its Etruscan character as late as the time of Pliny; even now some ruins of that period are found. The possession of Mantua was contested for a long time by the Byzantines and the Lombards; in 601 the latter, having obtained definite success in that struggle, established the capital of one of their counties at Mantua. From the ninth century, as elsewhere in Northern Italy, the authority of the bishop eclipsed that of the count, and the emperors gave to the bishops many sovereign rights, especially that of coining money. In the eleventh century Mantua was under the Counts of Canossa, and became involved in the wars between the popes and the empire; in 1091 Henry IV took possession of the city, after a siege of seven months. At the death of Countess Matilda (1115), Mantua became a commune, "salva imperiali justitia". In the wars of the Lombard cities against Frederick Barbarossa, Mantua was at first on the side of the empire, led by Bishop Garsendonio, who in consequence was driven from the city and deposed by Alexander III, after which (1161) Mantua formed part of the Lombard League. After the peace of Venice, Garsendonio was allowed to return, and then began a period of economical progress, manifested more especially in the changing of the course of the Mincio, the building of the Palazzo della Ragione (1198), and the construction of the covered bridge (1188). Mantua took part in the second Lombard League against Frederick II, was besieged by him in 1236, and surrendered in the following year. Ezzelino da Romano also besieged the city in 1256, and the Mantuans had a considerable part in the war that overthrew that tyrant in 1259. There followed a period of internal struggle for predominance among the families of Casaloldi, Arlotti, Bonaccorsi, and Zanecalli. In 1275, two captains of the people were created for the administration of justice, but one of them, Pinamonte Bonaccolsi, put to death his colleague, Ottonello Zanecalli, and thereby remained sole master of the city, the government of which he left to his son; the latter, however, was obliged to resign in favour of his cousin Guido, thenceforth known as *Signore* (lord). Guido was succeeded by his brother Rinaldo, who conquered Modena, but he made himself odious, and was murdered, while the lordship passed to Lodovico Luigi Gonzaga (1328), in whose family it remained until 1708. Luigi became imperial vicar in 1329; he was a protector of letters, especially of Petrarch; like his successors, Luigi II (1360–82), and Gianfrancesco I (1382–1407), he had to contend with the Visconti of Milan. Gianfrancesco II (1407–44), on the other hand, after having commanded the Venetian troops against the Visconti, entered the service of the latter, thereby becoming arbiter of the situation, and assuring great tranquillity to his state, which consequently began to flourish. He was also a friend of letters. In 1423 Vittorino da Feltre established at Mantua the famous school known as "Casa Giocosa". In 1432, Gianfrancesco received the title of marquess from Em-

peror Sigismund. His son Ludovico III, "il Turco", who reigned from 1444 to 1478, divided the marquessate between his two sons, leaving Mantua to Federigo I (1478–84), and creating the marquessate of Sabbioneta, which became a duchy, and the Principality of Borzolo for Gianfrancesco, whose line became extinct in 1591. The third son Rodolfo was made Prince of Castiglione. Under Ludovico III, in 1459, was held the famous "congress of princes", to consider a common action against the Turks, proposed by Pius II. Francesco Gonzaga (1484–1519) was a captain of the league against Charles VIII (1495), and commanded at the battle of Fornovo. Federigo II (1519–1540) was made Duke of Mantua by Charles V, and received the Marquessate of Casale Monferrato. He was succeeded by his two sons Francesco III

Statue of St. Longinus
The soldier who pierced the side of Christ and who is said to have preached the Gospel in Mantua

(1540–50), and Guglielmo (1550–87); the second sheltered Torquato Tasso. Vincenzo I (1587–1612), in his turn also left the duchy divided between two sons, Francesco III (1612) and Ferdinando (1612–1626), the latter of whom resigned the cardinalate, and was succeeded by his brother Vincenzo II (1626–27), who also was a cardinal, and by whose death the direct line of the Gonzaga of Mantua became extinct; its rights were inherited by Carlo Gonzaga (1627–1637), who was a son of Luigi the brother of Francesco III, and who, having married the heiress of the Duchy of Nevers, was acceptable to the French; but Carlo Emanuele of Savoy was a pretendant to the Marquessate of Casale, while Cesare Gonzaga, Duke of Guastalla, wished to possess the entire duchy; and this situation gave rise to the war of the succession of Monferrato, in which Savoy received the support of Spain and of Austria, and Carlo Gonzaga that of France. The Austrians sacked Mantua in 1629, but the treaty of Cherasco (1630) put an end to the war, and secured the possession of Mantua and of Casale to Carlo of Nevers. The latter was succeeded by his nephew Carlo III (1637–65), who was a son of Carlo II, deceased in 1631; Carlo III sold the Duchy of Nevers to Cardinal Mazarin. Carlo IV (1665–1708) was a libertine; he united the Lordship of Guastalla to Mantua, but sold the marquessate of Casale to France (1681); on account of this transaction, and because Carlo had given assistance to France in the War of the Spanish Succession, Joseph I in 1708 took the Duchy of Mantua and annexed it, together with Milan, to the Austrian states, while Monferrato was given to Piedmont. In the same year Carlo IV died at Padua. In 1735, Carlo Emanuele of Savoy besieged Mantua unsuccessfully. Empress Maria Theresa did much for its prosperity. Napoleon took the city on 2 February, 1796, after a siege of eight months, but it was retaken by Kray for Austria in 1799; at the Peace of Lunéville, however, it was annexed to the Italian Republic (1801). From 1814 to 1866, it belonged to Austria, and was besieged in 1848 by the Piedmontese.

The cathedral of Mantua is the ancient church of SS. Peter and Paul transformed, and was begun by Pietro Romano in 1544 by order of Cardinal Ercole Gonzaga, it remained unfinished, but its stucco work by Primaticcio is famous, as are also a statue of Moses and one of Aaron by Bernero and several beautiful pictures, among them a Madonna by Mantegna, whose art is abundantly represented in the other churches and in the palaces of the city. The chapel of the Incoronata is by Leon Battista Alberti; its belfry is Romanesque. The church of Sant' Andrea is by the same architect; it has a single nave over 300 feet in length, while its cupola, by Juvara, is about 250 feet high. The tomb of Mantegna is in this church. Outside the city is the sanctuary of the Madonna delle Grazie, founded by Francesco Gonzaga in 1399. Other fine churches are that of Ognissanti, that of San Barnaba, which contains the tomb of Giulio Romano, the church of San Maurizio, where there are paintings by Ludovico and Annibale Caracci; lastly, the church of San Sebastian.

The secular buildings are the Palazzo della Ragione, which houses the communal government (1198 and 1250); the Ducal Palace, begun in 1302 by the Bonaccolsi, and enlarged at different times by the Gonzaga (ducal apartments, the tapestries of Paradise, of Troy; paintings by Mantegna, Giulio Romano, and others); the Castello, built for the defence of the Ducal Palace, containing archives that date from 1014; the Accademia delle Scienze ed Arti, founded by Maria Theresa; the Palazzo degli Studi, formerly a Jesuit college; the "T" palace, a *villeggiatura* of the dukes, the work of Giulio Romano; the episcopal palace, and several private ones; the ancient synagogue in the ghetto, etc.

Among the famous men of Mantua are: the poets Virgil, Sordello (thirteenth century), G. Pietro Arrivabene, author of the "Gonzagis", Vittorio Vettori (d. 1763), and Folengo, the first of the so-called macaronic writers; the jurist Piacentino (twelfth century), Baldassare Castiglione (il Cortigiano); the philosopher Pomponazzi, the Jesuits Antonio Possevino and Ognibene, the physician Matteo Selvatico (thirteenth century), etc. Among women of letters are Camilla Valenti, Ippolita, Giulia, and Lucrezia Gonzaga.

The Gospel is said to have been brought to Mantua by St. Longinus, the soldier who pierced the side of Our Lord; tradition also says that he brought with him the relic of the Precious Blood, preserved in a beautiful reliquary in the crypt of the church of Sant' Andrea. Originally Mantua formed part of the Diocese of Milan; later it belonged to that of Ravenna (about 585), and in 729 it was attached to the Diocese of Aquileia. In 804 Leo III made Mantua a diocese, of which a certain Gregory was the first known bishop. The relic of the Precious Blood, which had been lost, was found in 1048, and was recognized as authentic by Leo IX in 1053. The Bishops Garsendonio (1165) and Enrico (1193–1225) had the title of imperial vicar in Italy; Guidotto da Corregio (1231) was assassinated by the Avvocati faction in 1235; other bishops of this diocese were Cardinal Martino de Puzolerio (1252); the Blessed Jacopo de' Benfatti, O. P. (1304); Guido d'Arezzo (1366), who died of the plague, which

he contracted through his care of the sick. From 1466 to 1584, the See of Mantua was occupied by bishops of the House of Gonzaga: Cardinals Francesco, Ludovico, Sigismondo, Ercole, Federigo, Francesco II, Marco Fedele; only in 1566 was this series interrupted, by the Dominican Gregorio Boldrino. After Alessandro Andreasi (1584–87), who founded a house for Jewish converts and a hospital for sick pilgrims, the diocese was once more governed by a Gonzaga, Cardinal Francesco III (1587–1620), a Franciscan whose secular name was Annibale. Mention should be made also of Mgr Pietro Rota (1871–79), who was the object of much persecution at the hands of the government, and of Giuseppe Sarto (1884–95), now Pius X.

A synod was held at Mantua in 827, to settle a controversy between the metropolitan bishops of Aquileia and of Grado, one in 1053 for disciplinary reform, another in 1064, in relation to the controversy between Alexander II and the antipope Honorius II. At first (1537) it was proposed to hold the Council of Trent at Mantua.

The diocese was once suffragan of Aquileia, but in 1452 it became immediately dependent on the Holy See; in 1803, however, it was made a suffragan of Ferrara, and in 1819 of Milan. It has 153 parishes, and 257,500 inhabitants; there are 3 religious houses of men, and 21 of women; 4 educational establishments for boys, and 10 for girls, and one Catholic daily paper.

Donesmondi, *Della istoria eccles. di Mantova* (Mantua, 1612–15); Cappelletti, *Le Chiese d'Italia*, vol. XII; D'Arco, *Delle arti e degli artifici di Mantova* (Mantua, 1867); *Studi intorno al municipio di Mantova* (Mantua, 1871–74); Volta, *Compendio della storia di Mantova* (Mantua, 1807–38), 5 vols.; Davari, *Notizie topografiche della città di Mantova nei secoli 13–15* (Mantua, 1903).

U. Benigni.

Manu, The Laws of.—"The Laws of Manu" is the English designation commonly applied to the "Mānava Dharma-sāstra", a metrical Sanskrit compendium of ancient sacred laws and customs held in the highest reverence by the orthodox adherents of Brahminism. The Brahmins themselves credit the work with a divine origin and a remote antiquity. Its reputed author is Manu, the mythical survivor of the Flood and father of the human race, the primitive teacher of sacred rites and laws, now enjoying in heaven the dignity of an omniscient deity. The opening verses of the work tell how Manu was reverently approached in ancient times by the ten great sages and asked to declare to them the sacred laws of the castes, and how he graciously acceded to their request by having the learned sage Bhrigu, whom he had carefully taught the metrical institutes of the sacred law, deliver to them this precious instruction. The work thus pretends to be the dictation of Manu through the agency of Bhrigu; and as Manu learned it himself from the self-existent Brahma, its authorship purports to be divine. This pious Brahmin belief regarding the divine origin of the "Laws of Manu" is naturally not shared by the Oriental scholars of the western world. Even the rather remote date assigned to the work by Sir William Jones, 1200–500 B. C., has been very generally abandoned. The weight of authority to-day is in favour of the view that the work in its present metrical form dates probably from the first or second century of the Christian era, though it may possibly be a century or two older. Most of its contents, however, may be safely given a much greater antiquity. Scholars are now pretty well agreed that the work is an amplified recast in verse of a "Dharma-sūtra", no longer extant, that may have been in existence as early as 500 B. C.

The *sūtras* were manuals composed by the teachers of the Vedic schools for the guidance of their pupils. They summed up in aphorisms, more or less methodically arranged, the enormously complicated mass of rules, laws, customs, rites, that the Brahmin student had to know by heart. Every Vedic school of importance had its appropriate *sūtras*, among which were the "Grihya-sūtras", dealing with domestic ceremonies, and the "Dharma-sūtras", treating of the sacred customs and laws. A fair number of these have been preserved, and form part of the sacred Brahmin literature. In course of time, some of the more ancient and popular "Dharma-sūtras" were enlarged in their scope and thrown into metrical form, constituting the so-called "Dharma-sāstras". Of these the most ancient and most famous is the "Laws of Manu", the "Mānava Dharma-sāstra", so called, as scholars think, because based on a "Dharma-sūtra" of the ancient Mānava school. The association of the original *sūtra* with the name Mānava seems to have suggested the myth that Manu was its author, and this myth, incorporated in the metrical "Dharma-sāstra", probably availed to secure the new work universal acceptance as a divinely revealed book.

The "Laws of Manu" consists of 2684 verses, divided into twelve chapters. In the first chapter is related the creation of the world by a series of emanations from the self-existent deity, the mythical origin of the book itself, and the great spiritual advantage to be gained by the devout study of its contents. Chapters two to six inclusive set forth the manner of life and regulation of conduct proper to the members of the three upper castes, who have been initiated into the Brahmin religion by the sin-removing ceremony known as the investiture with the sacred cord. First is described the period of studentship, a time of ascetic discipline devoted to the study of the Vedas under a Brahmin teacher. Then the chief duties of the householder are rehearsed, his choice of a wife, marriage, maintenance of the sacred hearth-fire, sacrifices to the gods, feasts to his departed relatives, exercise of hospitality. The numerous restrictions, also, regulating his daily conduct, are discussed in detail, especially in regard to his dress, food, conjugal relations, and ceremonial cleanness. After this comes the description of the kind of life exacted of those who choose to spend their declining years as hermits and ascetics. The seventh chapter sets forth the divine dignity and the manifold duties and responsibilities of kings, offering on the whole a high ideal of the kingly office. The eighth chapter treats of procedure in civil and criminal lawsuits, and of the proper punishments to be meted out to different classes of criminals. The next two chapters make known the customs and laws governing divorce, inheritance, the rights of property, the occupations lawful for each caste. Chapter eleven is chiefly occupied with the various kinds of penance to be undergone by those who would rid themselves of the evil consequences of their misdeeds. The last chapter expounds the doctrine of *karma*, involving rebirths in the ascending or descending scale, according to the merits or demerits of the present life. The closing verses are devoted to the pantheistic scheme of salvation leading to absorption into the all-embracing, impersonal deity.

The "Laws of Manu" thus offers an interesting ideal picture of domestic, social, and religious life in India under ancient Brahmin influence. The picture has its shadows. The dignity of the Brahmin caste was greatly exaggerated, while the Sudra caste was so far despised as to be excluded under pain of death from participation in the Brahmin religion. Punishments for crimes and misdemeanours were lightest when applied to offenders of the Brahmin caste, and increased in severity for the guilty members of the warrior, farmer, and serf caste respectively. Most forms of industry and the practice of medicine were held in contempt, and were forbidden to both Brahmins and warriors. The mind of woman was held to be fickle, sensual, and incapable of proper self-direction. Hence it was laid down that women were to be

held in strict subjection to the end of their lives. They were not allowed to learn any of the Vedic texts, and their participation in religious rites was limited to a few insignificant acts. Guilt involving penances was attributed to unintentional transgressions of law, and there was a hopeless confusion of duties of conscience with traditional customs and restrictions in large part superstitious and absurd. Yet, with all this, the ethical teachings of the "Laws of Manu" is very high, embracing almost every form of moral obligation recognized in the Christian religion.

The "Laws of Manu" is accessible to modern readers in a number of good translations. It was published in English dress under the title, "The Institutes of Manu", by Sir William Jones in 1794, being the first Sanskrit work to be translated into a European tongue. This version is still recognized as a work of great merit. In 1884 a very excellent translation, begun by A. C. Burnell and completed by Professor E. W. Hopkins, was published in London, with the title, "The Ordinances of Manu". Two years later appeared Professor George Buhler's able version with a lengthy introduction, constituting volume XXV of the "Sacred Books of the East". In 1893 Professor G. Strehly published in Paris a very elegant French translation, "Les Lois de Manou", forming one of the volumes of the "Annales du Musée Guimet".

Macdonell, *Sanskrit Literature* (New York, 1900); Frazer, *A Literary History of India* (New York, 1898); Monier Williams, *Indian Wisdom* (4th ed., London, 1893); Johäntgen, *Ueber das Gesetzbuch des Manu* (Leipzig, 1863).

Charles F. Aiken.

Manual Masses. See Mass.

Manuel Chysoloras, first teacher of Greek in Italy, born at Constantinople about the middle of the fourteenth century; died at Constance, Germany, and was buried there, 15 April, 1415. His first visit to Italy was at the time of the siege of Constantinople, when he was sent to Venice by Emperor Palæologus to implore the aid of the Christian princes. He returned to Constantinople. In 1396 he went to Florence at the invitation of the humanists of that city, Salutato, Niccolo de Niccoli, and their friends, as professor of Greek literature. He severed his connexion with the Florentine government, however, before the time for the end of the agreement had expired, owing either to intrigues which Bruno and Filelfo attributed to Niccoli, or perhaps to his own moody temperament. He was then engaged in teaching at Milan and afterwards at Pavia. In 1404 he was Manuel Palæologus's ambassador in Venice and visited Rome and England in the same capacity. He was also actively employed in promoting a union of the Greek with the Latin Church, and with that object in view returned once more to Constantinople. In 1413 John XXIII chose him to accompany the cardinals sent as delegates to the emperor Sigismund to fix a place for the assembling of a general council. Constance was chosen. He is mentioned in the Bull of convocation. He probably accompanied John XXIII to Constance (1414) and died there the following year. His death gave rise to commemorative essays of which Guarino of Verona made a collection in "Chrysolorina".

Chrysoloras's works include opuscules on the Procession of the Holy Ghost; "Epistolæ tres de comparatione veteris et novæ Romæ"; letters to his brothers, to L. Bruni, to Guauni, to Traversari, to Pallas Strozzi. He also translated Plato's "Republic" into Latin. Finally he is the author of the first modern Greek grammar, the "Erotemeta" printed for the first time at Florence in 1484, and immediately studied by Linacre at Oxford and by Erasmus at Cambridge. He was chiefly influential through his teaching in familiarizing men such as Bruni, Salutato, Giacomo da Scarparia, Roberto de' Rossi, Carlo Marsuppini, Vergerio, Decembrie, Guauni, Poggio, with the masterpieces of Greek literature. As an oral teacher he was too verbose and diffuse. As a man, however, such nobility of character and integrity was rarely met with in the Greek teachers who succeeded him in Italy.

Legrand, *Bibliographie hellénique* (Paris, 1884), I, XIX and 5; Sandys, *A history of classical scholarship*, II (Cambridge, 1908), 19.

Paul Lejay.

Manumission of Christian Slaves. See Slavery.

Manuscripts.—Every book written by hand on flexible material and intended to be placed in a library is called a manuscript. We must therefore set aside from the study of manuscripts (1) books graven on stone or brick (Library of Assurbanipal at Ninive; graven documents discovered at Cnossus or Phæstos in Crete); (2) all public acts (diplomas, charters, etc.), the study of which constitutes the object of diplomatics. Manuscripts have been composed from the most remote antiquity (Egyptian papyri of the Memphite epoch) down to the period of the invention of printing. However, Greek manuscripts were still copied until the end of the sixteenth century, and in the monasteries of the East (Mount Athos, Syria, Mesopotamia, etc.), the copying of manuscripts continued well into the nineteenth century. On the other hand the most recent Western manuscripts date from the last years of the fifteenth century.

I. Materials and Form of Manuscripts.—The principal materials employed in the making of manuscripts have been papyrus, parchment, and paper. In exceptional cases other materials have been used (e. g. the linen books of Etruria and Rome, a specimen of which was found on an Egyptian mummy in the museum of Agram; the silken books of China, etc.). Besides, in ancient times and during the Middle Ages tablets dipped in wax on which characters were traced with a stylus were made use of for fugitive writings, accounts, etc.; these might be folded in two (diptychs), or in three (triptychs), etc. Papyrus (*charta œgyptica*) was obtained from a long-stemmed plant terminating in a large and elegant umbrella; this was the Cyperus Papyrus, which grew in the marshes of Egypt and Abyssinia. The stem was cut in long strips which were placed one beside the other. On the vertical strips others were placed horizontally; then after they had been wet with the water of the Nile they were submitted to strong pressure, dried in the sun, and rubbed with shells to render them solid. To make a book the separate pages (σελίδες, *paginæ*) were first written on, then they were put end to end, the left margin of each page being made to adhere to the right margin of the preceding page. A roll (*volumen*) was thus secured, of which the dimensions were sometimes considerable. Some Egyptian rolls are forty-six feet long by nine or ten inches wide, and the great Harris papyrus (British Museum) is one hundred and forty-one feet long. The end of the last page was fastened to a cylinder of wood or bone (ὀμφαλός, *umbilicus*), which gave more consistency to the roll. The page having been ruled, the writing was done with a sharpened reed on the horizontal portion of the fibres. From being almost exclusively used in Egypt, the use of papyrus spread to Greece about the fifth century, then to Rome and throughout the West. Its price remained very high; in 407 B. C. a roll of twenty leaves was worth twenty-six drachmas, or about five dollars (Corp. Insc. Attic., I, 324). Pliny the Elder (Hist. Nat., XIII, 11–13) gives a list of its various grades (*charta Augusta, Liviana*, etc.). Egypt retained the monopoly of the manufacture, which furthermore belonged to the State. Alexandria was the principal market. In the first centuries of the Middle Ages it was exported to the West by the "Syrians", but the conquest of Egypt by the Arabs (640) stopped the trade. However it still continued to be used for diplomas (at Ravenna until the tenth century; in the papal chancery until 1057). The Arabs had attempted to cultivate the plant in Sicily.

Parchment (*charta pergamena*), made of the skin of sheep, goats, calves (*vellum*), asses, etc., was used by the Ionians and the Asiatics as early as the sixth century B. C. (Herodotus, V, 58); the anecdote related by Pliny (Hist. Nat., XIII, 11), according to which it was invented at Pergamus, seems legendary; it would seem that its manufacture was simply perfected there. Imported to Rome in ancient times, parchment supplanted papyrus but slowly. It was only at the end of the third century A. D. that it was preferred to papyrus for the making of books. Once prepared, the parchment (*membrana*) was cut into leaves which were folded in two; four leaves together formed a book of eight folios (*quaternio*); all the books formed a *codex*. There was no paging before the fifteenth century; writers merely numbered first the books (signature), then the folios. The dimensions of the leaves varied; that most in use for literary texts was the large quarto. An Urbino catalogue (fifteenth century) mentions a manuscript so large that it required three men to carry it (Reusens, "Paléographie", 457); and there is preserved at Stockholm a gigantic Bible written on ass-skin, the dimensions of which have won for it the name of "Gigas librorum". The page was ruled in dry point so deeply that the mark was visible on the other side. Parchments were written on both sides (opistographs). As parchment became very rare and costly during the Middle Ages, it became the custom in some monasteries to scratch or wash out the old text in order to replace it with new writing. These erased manuscripts are called palimpsests. With the aid of reacting chemicals the old writing has been made to reappear and lost texts have been thus discovered (the Codex Vaticanus 5757 contains under a text of St. Augustine the "De Republica" of Cicero, recovered by Cardinal Mai). Manuscripts thus treated have been nearly always incomplete or mutilated; a complete work has never been recovered on a palimpsest. Finally, by sewing strips of parchment together, rolls (*rotuli*) were made similar to those formed of papyrus (e. g. Hebrew Pentateuch of Brussels, ninth century, on fifty-seven sewn skins, forty yards in length; "rolls of the dead", used by the associations of prayer for the dead in the abbeys; administrative and financial rolls used especially in England to transcribe the decrees of Parliament, etc.).

Paper is said to have been invented in China in A. D. 105 by a certain Tsai-Louen (Chavannes, "Journ. Asiatique", 1905, 1). Specimens of paper of the fourth century A. D. have been found in Eastern Turkestan (expeditions of Stein and Sven Hedin). It was after the taking of Samarkand (704) that the Arabs learned to make paper, and introduced it to Bagdad (795), and to Damascus (*charta damascena*). It was known in Europe as early as the end of the eleventh century, and at this early date it was used in the Norman chancery of Sicily; in the twelfth century it began to be used for manuscripts. It was sold even then in quires and reams (Arabic, *razmah*) and in the thirteenth century appeared the filigranes or watermarks. According to chemical analyses, the paper of the Middle Ages was made of hempen or linen rags. The expression "charta Bombycina" comes from the Arab manufactory of Bombyce, between Antioch and Aleppo. The copyist of the Middle Ages used chiefly black ink, *incaustum*, composed of a mixture of gall nuts and vitriol. Red ink was reserved from ancient times for titles. Gold and silver ink were used for manuscripts de luxe (see EVANGELIARIA). The method of binding codices has varied little since ancient times. The books were sewn on ox sinews placed in rows of five or six on the back. These sinews (*chordæ*) served to attach to the volume wooden covers, which were covered with parchment or dyed skin. Covers of the manuscripts de luxe were made of ivory or brass, ornamented with carvings, precious stones, cut and uncut.

II. PAPYRI.—Montfaucon (Palæographia græca, 15) confesses that he never saw a papyrus MS. There were such, nevertheless, in some archives, but it was only in the eighteenth century, after the discovery of the papyri of Herculaneum (1752) that attention was devoted to this class of documents. The first discovery took place in Egypt at Gizeh in 1778, then from 1815 the discoveries in the tombs have succeeded one another without interruption, especially since 1880. The hieroglyphic, demotic, Greek, and Latin papyri are at present scattered among the great libraries (Turin, Rome, Paris, Leyden, Strasburg, Berlin, London, etc.). The publication of the principal collections has been begun (see below), and the



ST. AUGUSTINE, "DE CIVITATE DEI" (A. D. 841–52)
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud Misc., 120

edition of a "Corpus papyrorum" is projected, which may be one of the greatest undertakings of erudition of the twentieth century. The importance of these discoveries may be estimated from the consideration of the chief kinds of papyrus published to-day.

(1) *Egyptian Papyri.*—The greater number are religious documents relating to the veneration of the dead and the future life. The most ancient date from the epoch of Memphis (2500–2000 B. C.), the most recent belong to the Roman period. One of the most celebrated is the "Book of the Dead", of which several copies have been recovered. Moral and philosophical treatises have also been found (the Prisse Papyrus, in the Bibliothèque Nat., Paris) as well as scientific treatises, romances and tales, and popular songs.

(2) *Greek Papyri.*—They are distributed over ten centuries (third century B. C.–seventh century A. D.) and contain registers from archives (giving a very exact idea of the administration of Egypt under the Ptolemies and the Roman and Byzantine emperors; their study has given rise to a new diplomatic science),

literary works (the finest discovered are the orations of Hyperides found on papyri in the British Museum in 1847, 1858, 1891, and in the Louvre in 1889; Aristotle's "Republic of Athens" on a papyrus of the British Museum in 1891; the "Mimes" of Herondas, lyric poems of Bacchylides and Timotheus; and lastly, in 1905, 1300 verses by Menander at Kom Ishkaou by G. Lefebvre), and religious documents (fragments of Gospels, of which some remain unidentified, religious poems, hymns, edifying treatises, etc., e. g.: the Greek Psalter of the British Museum, of the third century A. D., which is one of the most ancient Biblical manuscripts we possess; the "Logia" of Jesus, published by Grenfell and Hunt; a hymn in honour of the Holy Trinity similar to the "Te Deum", discovered on a papyrus of the sixth century; etc.).

(3) *Latin Papyri.*—These are rare, at Herculaneum as well as in Egypt, and we possess only fragments. A papyrus of Ravenna dated 551 (Library of Naples) is in Ostrogothic writing (Catal. of Latin papyri in Traube, "Biblioth. Ecole des Chartes", LXIV, 455).

Chief Collections.—Louvre (Brunet de Presle, "Not. et ext. des MSS.", XVIII); Turin (ed. Peyron, 1826–27); Leyden (ed. Leemans, 1843); British Museum (ed. Kenyon, 1898); Flinders Petrie (ed. Mahaffy, Dublin, 1893–94); University of California (Tebtunis Papyrus, ed. Grenfell and Hunt, London and New York, 1902); Berlin (Berlin, 1895–98); Archduke Renier (ed. Wessely, Vienna, 1895); Strasburg (ed. Keil, 1902); Oxyrhyncos excavations (Grenfell and Hunt, London, since 1898); Th. Reinach (Paris, 1905).

III. The Making of Manuscripts.—In ancient times the copyists of manuscripts were free workmen or slaves. Athens, which was before Alexandria a great library centre, had its Βιβλιογράφοι, copyists, who were at the same time librarians. At Rome Pomponius Atticus thought of competing with booksellers by training slaves, for the most part Greeks, to copy manuscripts, their work to be afterwards sold. Some booksellers were at once copyists, calligraphers, and even painters. To the great libraries founded by the emperors were attached rooms for copyists; in 372 Valens attached to that of Constantinople four Greek and three Latin copyists (Theod. code, XIV, ix, 2). The edict of Diocletian fixing the maxima of prices sets down the monthly salary of the *librarius* at fifty *denarii* (Corp. Inscript. Latin, III² 831). Unfortunately, except for the Egyptian papyri, none of the works copied in ancient times has come down to us, and our oldest manuscripts date only from the beginning of the fourth century. The copyists of this century, several of whom were Christian priests, seem to have displayed great activity. It was by transcribing on parchment the works hitherto written on papyrus and in danger of being destroyed (Acacius and Euzoïus at Cæsarea; cf. St. Jerome, "Epist.", cxli), that they assured the preservation of ancient literature and prepared the work of the copyists of the Middle Ages. The most ancient and the most precious manuscripts of our collections date from this period; Biblical MSS.: Codex Sinaiticus, a Greek fourth century MS. discovered by Tischendorf at the monastery of St. Catherine of Sinai (1844–59), now at St. Petersburg; Codex Alexandrinus, a Greek Bible executed at Alexandria in the beginning of the fifth century, now in the British Museum; Codex Ephræmi Rescriptus, a palimpsest of the Bibliothèque Nationale of Paris, containing fragments of a New Testament written in the fifth century; Latin Bible of Quedlinburg, fourth century, in the Library of Berlin; Fragments of the Cotton Latin Bible (Brit. Mus.), fifth century. Profane authors: The seven manuscripts of Virgil in capitals [the most famous is that of the Vatican (Lat. 3225), fourth century]; the "Iliad" of the Ambrosian Library, fifth century; the Terence of the Vatican (Lat. 3226) in capitals, fifth century; the "Calendar" of Philocalus written in 354, known only by modern copies (Brussels, Vienna, etc.).

The barbarian invasions of the fifth and sixth centuries brought about the destruction of the libraries and the scattering of the books. However, in the midst of barbarism, there were a certain number of privileged refuges, in which the copying of books went on. It is to these copyists of the Middle Ages that moderns owe the preservation of the Sacred Books as well as the treasures of classical antiquity; they veritably saved civilization. The chief of these copying centres were: Constantinople, where the library and schools continued to exist; the monasteries of the East and West, where the copying of books was regarded as one of the essential labours of monastic life; the synagogues and schools of the Jews, to which we owe the Hebrew MSS. of the Bible, the most ancient of which date only from the ninth century (British Museum, MSS. Orient, 4445, ninth century; Codex Babylonicus of St. Petersburg, copied in 916); the Mussulman schools (*Medressehs*), provided with large libraries (that at Cordova had 400,000 vols.) and copying rooms, in which were transcribed not only the Koran but also theological works and Arabic translations of Greek authors (Aristotle, Ptolemy, Hippocrates, etc.). The most important work undoubtedly was done by the monasteries; its history is identical with the history of the transmission of sacred and profane texts of antiquity.

(1) *Oriental Christendom.*—From the very beginning of Egyptian monasticism copying rooms were installed in the monasteries, as is shown by the Coptic chronicle on papyrus studied by Strzygowski ("Eine Alexandrinische Weltchronik", Vienna, 1905). In Palestine, Syria, Ethiopia, and Armenia, in Melchite, Jacobite, or Nestorian monasteries, the copying of manuscripts was held in esteem. We know the name of one scribe, Emmanuel, of the monastery of Qartamin on the Tigris, who copied with his own hand seventy manuscripts (one of them the Berlin Nestorian Evangeliarium; Sachau, 304, tenth century). At the Nestorian school of Nisibis the students copied the Holy Scriptures, the text of which was afterwards explained to them. Indeed the Bible was copied by preference, hence the numerous Biblical MSS., whether Syriac (text of the "Peshitto" preserved at Milan; end of the fifth century), Coptic (fragments discovered by Maspero at Akhmin; see "Journal Asiatique", 1892, 126), Armenian (Gospel in capitals, Institute Lazarev of Moscow, dated 887; the most ancient complete Bible belongs to the twelfth century), Ethiopian, etc. Commentaries on Holy Scripture, liturgical books, translations from the Greek Fathers, theological or ascetical treatises, and some universal chronicles constitute the greater number of these MSS., from which the classic writers are excluded.

(2) *Greek Church.*—In the Greek monasteries St. Basil also recommended the copying of manuscripts, and his treatise "On the usefulness of reading profane authors" bears sufficient witness that side by side with the religious texts the Basilian monks assigned an important place to the copying of classical authors. That a large number of texts have perished is not the fault of the monks, but is due to the custom of Byzantine scholars of composing "Excerpta" from the principal authors, and afterwards neglecting the originals (e. g. Encyclopedia of Constantine Porphyrogenitus, in the library of Photius. See Krumbacher, "Gesch. der Byzant. Litter.", p. 505). Wars, and especially the taking of Constantinople in 1204, also brought about the destruction of a great number of libraries. The work of the Byzantine copyists from the sixth to the fifteenth centuries was considerable; and to convince ourselves it is enough to peruse the list of three thousand names of known copyists recovered by Maria Vogel and Gardthausen from Greek manuscripts

PAGE OF THE CODEX ARGENTEUS OF ULFILA (Mark III. 27–32)

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY, UPSALA

("Beihefte zum Zentralblatt für Bibliothekwesen", XXXIII, Leipzig, 1909). It will be seen that the greater number of copyists are monks; at the end of the manuscript they often place their signature and the name of their monastery. Some of them through humility preserve anonymity: Γράψε τίς; οἶδε θεός "Who wrote this? God knows." Others on the contrary inform posterity concerning the rapidity with which they have completed their task. The scribe Theophilus wrote in thirty days the Gospel of St. John (985). A manuscript of St. Basil begun on Pentecost (28 May) of 1105 was ended 8 August of the same year. With the monks there were some secular copyists known as *notarii*, *tabularii*, among them a tax collector of the eleventh century (Montfaucon, "Palæog. gr.", 511), a judge of the Morea (Cod. Paris. gr. 2005, written at Mistra in 1447), and even emperors. Theodosius II (408–450) had earned the surname of "Calligrapher" (Codinus ed. of Bonn, 151) and John V Cantacuzenus, having in 1355 retired to a monastery, copied manuscripts. Among copyists is also mentioned the Patriarch Methodius (843–847), who in one week copied seven psalters for the seven weeks of Lent (Pat. Gr. G. 1253).

The monasteries of Constantinople remain the chief centres for the copying of manuscripts. From them perhaps proceeded in the sixth century the beautiful Gospels on purple parchment in letters of gold (see MANUSCRIPTS, ILLUMINATED). In the ninth century the reform of the Studites was accompanied by a veritable renascence of calligraphy. St. Plato, uncle and master of Theodore of Studion, and Theodore himself copied many books, and their biographies extol the beauty of their writing. Theodore installed at Studion a scriptorium, at the head of which was a "protocalligrapher" charged with preparing the parchment and distributing to each one his task. In Lent the copyists were dispensed from the recitation of the Psalter, but rigorous discipline reigned in the workroom. A stain on a manuscript, an inexactness in copy was severely punished. All the monasteries which came under the influence of Studion also adopted its method of copying; all had their libraries and their copying rooms. In the eleventh century St. Christodoulos, another monastic reformer, founder of the convent of St. John of Patmos, ordained that all monks "skillful in the art of writing should with the authorization of the *hegoumenos* make use of the talents with which they had been endowed by nature". There has been preserved a catalogue of the library of Patmos, dated 1201; it comprises two hundred and sixty-seven manuscripts on parchment, and sixty-three on paper. The majority are religious works, among them twelve Evangeliaries, nine Psalters, and many Lives of the saints. Among the seventeen profane manuscripts are works on medicine and grammar, the "Antiquities" of Josephus, the "Categories" of Aristotle, etc.

In the monasteries located at the extremities of the Hellenic world are found the same occupations. The monastic colony of Sinai, which has existed since the fourth century, formed an admirable library, of which the present remains (1220 MSS.) afford but a faint idea. In Byzantine Italy from the tenth to the twelfth century, the Basilian monks also cultivated calligraphy at Grottaferrata, at St. Salvatore at Messina, at Stilo in Calabria, at the monastery of Cassola, near Otranto, at St. Elias at Carbone, and especially at the Patir of Rossano, founded in the eleventh century by St. Bartholomew, who bought books at Constantinople and copied several MSS. The library of Rossano became one of the sources from which the manuscripts of the Vatican library were drawn. Besides, from the end of the tenth century the great monasteries of Mt. Athos, the great *laura* of St. Athanasius, Vatopedi, Esphigmenou, etc., became most important centres for the copying of MSS. Without speaking of the treasures of sacred and profane literature which are still preserved there, there is not a library of Greek MSS. which does not possess some examples of their work. Finally the monasteries founded in the Slav countries, in Russia, Bulgaria, Servia, on the model of the Greek convents, also had their copying rooms, in which were translated into the Slavonic language, with the help of the alphabet invented in the ninth century by St. Cyril, the Holy Scripture and the most important works of the ecclesiastical literature of the Greeks. It was also in these monastic study halls that the first monuments of the national literature of the Slavs were



ANGLO-SAXON CHRONICLE (A. D. 1045)
British Museum, Cotton MS. (Tiberius B. I.)

copied, such as the "Chronicle of Nestor", the "Song of Igor", etc.

(3) *The West.*—The work of the Western copyists begins with St. Jerome (340–420), who, in his solitude of Chalcis and later in his monastery of Bethlehem, copied books and commended this exercise as one most becoming to monastic life (Ep. cxxiii). At the same time St. Martin of Tours introduced this rule into his monastery. The copying of MSS. appears as one of the occupations of all the founders of monastic institutions, of St. Honoratus and St. Capresius at Lérins, of Cassian at St. Victor's at Marseilles, of St. Patrick in the monasteries of Ireland, of Cassiodorus in his monasteries of Scyllacium (Squillace). In his treatise "De Institutione divinarum litterarum" (543–545) Cassiodorus has left a description of his library with its nine *armaria* for MSS. of the Bible; he also describes the copying room, the scriptorium, directed by the *antiquarius*. He himself set the example by copying the Scriptures and he believed that "each word of the Saviour written by the copyist is a defeat inflicted on Satan" ("De Institut.", I, 30). The work of the copyists was also considered meritorious by St. Benedict. In the sixth century copying rooms existed in all the monasteries of the West.

Since the time of Damasus, the popes had a library which was probably provided with a copying room.

The missionaries who left Rome to evangelize the Germanic peoples, such as Augustine in 597, brought with them manuscripts which they were to reproduce in the monasteries founded by them. In the seventh century Benedict Biscop made four journeys to Rome and brought thence numerous MSS.; in 682 he founded the monastery of Jarrow which became one of the chief intellectual centres of England. Theodore of Tarsus (668–680) accomplished a similar work when he reorganized the Anglo-Saxon Church. The first period of monastic activity (sixth–seventh centuries) is represented in our libraries by a large number of Biblical MSS., many of which come from Ireland ("Liber Armachanus" of Dublin), England ("Codex Amiatinus" of Florence, copied at Wearmouth under Wilfrid, and offered to the pope in 716; "Harley Evangeliary", Brit. Mus., seventh century), some from Spain ("Palimpsest of Leon", cathedral archives, seventh century). Finally the library of the University of Upsala possesses the "Codex Argenteus", on purple parchment, written in the fifth century, which contains the Bible of Ulphilas, the first translation into a Germanic language of the Holy Scriptures.

At the end of the seventh and during the eighth century Gaul became more and more barbarous; monasteries were destroyed or ravaged, culture disappeared, and when Charlemagne undertook the reorganization of Europe he addressed himself to the countries in which culture was still flourishing in the monasteries, to England, Ireland, Lombardy. The Carolingian renaissance, as the movement has been called, had as its principle the establishment of copying rooms at the imperial court itself and in the monasteries. One of the most active promoters of the movement was Alcuin (735–804), who after having directed the library and school of York, became in 793 Abbot of St. Martin of Tours. Here he founded a school of calligraphy which produced the most beautiful MSS. of the Carolingian epoch. Several specimens distributed by Charlemagne among the various monasteries of the empire became the models which were imitated everywhere, even in Saxony, where the new monasteries founded by Charlemagne became the foremost centres of Germanic culture. M. L. Delisle (Mém. de l'Acad. des Inscript., XXXII, 1) has compiled a list of twenty-five MSS. which proceeded from this school of Tours (Bible of Charles the Bald, Paris, Bib. Nat., Lat. No. 1; Bible of Alcuin, Brit. Mus., 10546; manuscripts at Quedlinburg relating to the life of St. Martin; Sacramentaries of Metz and Tours of the Paris Bibliothèque Nationale, etc.).

Among the works proceeding from the imperial scriptorium attached to the Palatine School is mentioned the Evangeliary copied for Charlemagne by the monk Godescalc in 781 (now at the Bibliothèque Nationale), and the Psalter of Dagulf presented to Adrian I (now at the Imperial Library of Vienna). Other important scriptoria were established at Orléans by Bishop Theodulfe (whence issued the two beautiful Bibles now kept in the treasury of the cathedral of Puy and of the Bibliothèque Nationale, Lat. 9380), at St. Amand (where the copyist Hucbald contributed eighteen volumes to the library), at St. Gall, under the Abbots Grimaldus (841–872) and Hardmut (872–883), who caused the making of a complete Bible in nine volumes; there are extant ten Biblical MSS. written or corrected by Hardmut. At St. Gall and in many other monasteries the influence of Irish monks is very marked (MSS. of Tours, Würzburg, Berne, Bobbio, etc.). Besides numerous Biblical MSS. there are found among the works of the Carolingian epoch many MSS. of the classical authors. Hardmut had had copied Josephus, Justin, Martianus Capella, Orosius, Isidore of Seville; one of the most beautiful MSS. of the school of Tours is the Virgil of the library of Berne, copied by the deacon Bernon. Many of these works were even translated into the vulgar tongue: at St. Gall there were Irish translations of Galen and Hippocrates, and at the end of the ninth century King Alfred (849–900) translated into English the works of Boethius, Orosius, Bede, etc. At this epoch many monasteries possessed libraries of considerable size; when in 906 the monks of Novalaise (near Susa) fled before the Saracens they carried to Turin a library of six thousand MSS.

The period of the eleventh and twelfth centuries may be considered as the golden age of monastic manuscript writing. In each monastery there was a special hall, called the "scriptorium", reserved for the labours of the copyists. On the ancient plan of St. Gall it is shown beside the church. In the Benedictine monasteries there was a special benediction formula for this hall (Ducange, "Glossar. mediæ et inf. latin.", s. v. Scriptorium). Absolute silence reigned there. At the head of the scriptorium the *bibliothecarius* distributed the tasks, and, once copied, the MSS. were carefully revised by the *correctores*. In the schools the pupils were often allowed as an honour to copy MSS. (for instance at Fleury-sur-Loire). Everywhere the monks seem to have given themselves with great ardour to the labour which was considered one of the most edifying works of the monastic life. At St. Evroult (Normandy) was a monk who was saved because the number of letters copied by him equalled the number of his sins (Ordericus Vitalis, III, 3). In the "explicit" which concluded the book the scribe often gave his name and the date on which his work ended; he sometimes declared that he wrote "for the salvation of his soul" and commended himself to the prayers of the reader. Division of labour seems as yet not to have been fully established, and there were monks who were both scribes and illuminators (Ord. Vital., III, 7). The Bible remained the book which was copied by preference. The Bible was copied either entire (*bibliotheca*) or in part (Pentateuch, the Psalter, Gospels and Epistles, Evangeliaria, in which the Gospels followed the order of the feasts). Then came the commentaries on the Scriptures, the liturgical books, the Fathers of the Church, works of dogmatic or moral theology, chronicles, annals, lives of the saints, histories of churches or monasteries, and lastly profane authors, the study of which never ceased entirely. Rather a large number of them are found among the one thousand MSS. in the library of Cluny. At St. Denis even Greek MSS. were copied (Paris, Bib. Nation., gr. 375, copied in 1022). The newer religious orders, Cistercians, Carthusians, etc., manifested the same zeal as the Benedictines in the copying of MSS.

Then beginning with the thirteenth century the labour of copyists began to be secularized. About the universities such as that of Paris were a large number of laymen who gained a livelihood by copying; in 1275 those of Paris were admitted as agents of the university; in 1292 we find at Paris twenty-four booksellers who copied MSS. or caused them to be copied. Colleges such as the Sorbonne also had their copying rooms. On the other hand at the end of the thirteenth century in the greater number of monasteries the copying of MSS. ceased. Although there were still monks who were copyists, such as Giles of Mauleon, who copied the "Hours" of Queen Jeanne of Burgundy (1317) at St. Denis, the copying and the illumination of MSS. became a lucrative craft. At this juncture kings and princes began to develop a taste for books and to form libraries; that of St. Louis was one of the earliest. In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries these amateurs had in their pay veritable armies of copyists. Thenceforth it was they who directed the movement of the production of MSS. The most famous were Popes John XXII (1316–34), Benedict XII (1334–42); the poet Petrarch (1304–74), who was not satisfied with purchasing the MSS. in convents but himself formed a school of copyists in order to have

accurate texts, the King of France, Charles V (1364–1380), who collected in the Louvre a library of twelve hundred volumes, the French princes Jean, Duke of Berry, a forerunner of modern bibliophiles (1340–1416), Louis Duke of Orléans (1371–1407) and his son Charles of Orléans (d. 1467), the dukes of Burgundy, the kings of Naples, and Matthias Corvinus. Also worthy of mention are Richard of Bury, Chancellor of England, Louis of Bruges (d. 1492), and Cardinal Georges d'Amboise (1460–1510).

The copying rooms were made more perfect, and Trithemius, Abbot of Spanheim (1462–1513), author of "De laude scriptorum manualium", shows the well-established division of labour in a studio (preparation and polishing of parchment, ordinary writing, red ink titles, illumination, corrections, revision, each task pleted their tasks in bequeathing to the modern world the sacred and profane works of antiquity.

IV. Present Location of MSS.—Save for some exceptions, which are becoming more and more rare, the MSS. copied during the Middle Ages are at present stored in the great public libraries. The private collections which have been formed since the sixteenth century (Cotton, Bodley, Christina of Sweden, Peiresc, Gaignières, Colbert, etc.) have eventually been fused with the great repositories. The suppression of a great number of monasteries (England and Germany in the sixteenth century, France in 1790) has also augmented the importance of storehouses of MSS., the chief of which are, *Italy:* Rome, Vatican Library, founded by Nicholas V (1447–55), which has acquired successively the MSS. of the Elector Palatine (given



Section page of Petrarch's Sonnets
From the MSS. written in part by the poet himself, begun between 1366 and 1368, Vatican Library, Rome

was given to a specialist). Among these copies religious MSS., Bibles, Psalters, Hours, lives of the saints, were always represented, but an increasingly important place was accorded the ancient authors and the works of national literature. In the fifteenth century a great many Greek refugees fleeing before the Turks came to Italy and copied the MSS. they brought with them to enrich the libraries of the collectors. A number of them were in the service of Cardinal Bessarion (d. 1472), who after collecting five hundred Greek MSS., bequeathed them to the Republic of Venice. Even after the invention of printing, Greek copyists continued to work, and their names are found on the most beautiful Greek manuscripts of our libraries, for instance Constantine Lascaris (1434–1501), who lived a long time at Messina; John Lascaris (1445–1535), who came to France under Charles VIII; Constantine Palæocappa, a former monk of Athos, who entered the service of Cardinal de Lorraine; John of Otranto, the most skilful copyist of the sixteenth century.

But the copying of manuscripts had ceased long before in consequence of the invention of printing. The copyists who had toiled for long centuries had com-

by Tilly to Gregory XV), of the Duke of Urbino (1655), of Christina of Sweden, of the Houses of Capponi and Ottoboni, in 1856 the collections of Cardinal Mai, and in 1891 of the Borghese library: 45,000 MSS. (codices Vaticani, and according to their particular foundation, Palatini, Urbinates, etc.); Florence: Laurentian Library, ancient collection of the Medici; 9693 MSS. largely of the Greek and Latin classical authors (Codices Laurentiani); National Library (formerly the Uffizi), founded in 1860, 20,028 MSS.; Venice, Marcian Library (collection of Petrarch, 1362, of Bessarion, 1468, etc.), 12,096 MSS. (Codices Marciani); Verona: Chapter Library, 1114 MSS.; Milan, Ambrosian Library, founded 1609 by Cardinal Federigo Borromeo, 8400 MSS. (Codices Ambrosiani); Turin, National Library, founded in 1720, collection of the Dukes of Savoy. In Jan., 1904 a fire destroyed most of its 3979 MSS., nearly all of them of the first rank (Codices Taurinenses); Naples, National Library (ancient collection of the Bourbon family), 7990 MSS.

Spain: Library of the Escorial, founded in 1575 (one of the principal constituents is the collection of Hurtado de Mendoza, formed at Venice by the ambassa-

dor of Philip II), 4927 MSS. (Codices Escorialenses). *France:* National Library (had its origin in the royal collections gathered at Fontainebleau as early as Francis I, and contains the libraries of Mazarin, Colbert, etc., and those of the monasteries confiscated in 1790), 102,000 MSS. (Codices Parisini). *England:* British Museum (contains the collections of Cotton, Sloane, Harley, etc.), founded in 1753, 55,000 MSS.; Oxford, Bodleian Library, founded in 1597 by Sir Thomas Bodley, 30,000 MSS. *Belgium:* Brussels, Royal Library, founded in 1838 (the principal basis is the library of the Dukes of Burgundy), 28,000 MSS. *Holland:* Leyden, Library of the University, founded in 1575, 6400 MSS. *Germany:* Berlin Royal Library, 30,000 MSS.; Göttingen University, 6000 MSS.; Leipzig, Albertina Library, founded in 1543, 4000 MSS.; Dresden, Royal Library, 60,000 MSS. *Austria:* Vienna, Imperial Library, founded in 1440 (collections of Matthias Corvinus and of Prince Eugene), 27,000 MSS. *Scandinavian countries:* Stockholm, royal Library, 10,435 MSS.; Upsala, University, 13,637 MSS.; Copenhagen, Royal Library, 20,000 MSS. *Russia:* St. Petersburg, Imperial Library, 35,350 MSS.; Moscow, Library of the Holy Synod, 513 Greek MSS., 1819 Slavic MSS. *United States:* New York Public Library, founded 1850 (Astor collection, 40 MSS.; Lenox collection, 500 MSS.); Pierpont Morgan collection, 115 MSS., illuminated miniatures. *Orient:* Constantinople, Library of the Seraglio (cf. Ouspensky, Bulletin of the Russian Archeological Institute, XII, 1907); Monasteries of Athos (13,000 MSS.), of Smyrna, of St. John of Patmos at Athens, the Library of the Senate—at Cairo, the Library of the Khedive (founded in 1870, 14,000 Arabic MSS.) and the Patriarchal Library (Greek and Coptic. MSS.). The Library of the Monastery of St. Catherine of Sinai, the patriarchal libraries of Etschmiadzin (Armenian MSS.) and of Mossoul (Syriac MSS.).

FROM THE VATICAN "VIRGIL"

The dangers of all kinds which threaten MSS. have induced the greater number of these libraries to undertake the reproduction in facsimile of their most precious MSS. In 1905 an international congress assembled at Brussels to study the best practical means of reproduction. This is a great undertaking, the accomplishment of which depends on the progress of photography and of colour photography. By this means will the works of the copyists of the Middle Ages be preserved. (See LIBRARIES.)

Revue des bibliothèques (Paris, since 1890), a periodical devoted to bibliography, contains numerous unedited catalogues, and critical studies of MSS.; *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekwesen* (Leipzig, since 1884), treats of periodical bibliography in the supplement; GRAESEL, Fr. tr. LAUDE, *Manuel de Bibliothéconomie* (Paris, 1897), deals with the material arrangements of manuscript cabinets; EHRLE (prefect of the Vatican), *Sur la conservation et restauration des anciens MSS.* in *Rev. des Biblioth.* (1898), 152; OMONT, *Liste des recueils de fac-similes conservés à la Bibliothèque nationale* (Paris, 1903); GILBERT, *The National MSS. of Ireland* (Southampton, 1874), 3 vols.; IDEM, *Fac-similes of national manuscripts* (London, 1865–68), 4 vols.; KOENNECKE, *Bilderatlas der deutschen Nationalliteratur* (Marburg, 1894).

On the history of copyists and the production of MSS.: *Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes* (Paris, since 1839), contains numerous bibliographical articles; LECOY DE LA MARCHE, *L'art d'écrire et les calligraphes* in *Revue des questions historiques* (1884); DELISLE, *Le Cabinet des manuscrits de la Bib. Nat.* (Paris, 1868–81), 3 vols. and *album*, a fundamental work for the history of medieval libraries; GARDTHAUSEN, *Griechischen Schreiber des Mittelalters und der Renaissance* (Leïpzig, 1909); BERGER, *Histoire de la Vulgate pendant les premiers siècles du moyen âge* (Nancy, 1893); FAUCON, *La librairie des papes d'Avignon* (Biblioth. Ecole Franc. de Rome, XLIII and L); MÜNTZ, *La bibliothèque du Vatican au XV^e siècle* (ibid., XLVIII). A large amount of information concerning papyri will be found in *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* (Leipzig, since 1900). See also HOHLWEIN, *La papyrologie grèque* (Louvain, 1905); *Studien zur Palaeographie und papyrusurkunde* (Leipzig, since 1901, edited by WESSELY).

LOUIS BRÉHIER.

Manuscripts, ILLUMINATED. I. ORIGIN.—A large number of MSS. are covered with painted ornaments which may be presented under several forms: (1) initials of chapters or paragraphs, ornamented sometimes very simply, sometimes on the other hand with a great profusion of interlacings, foliage, and flowers; these are developed along the whole length of the page and within are sometimes depicted persons or scenes from everyday life; (2) paintings on the margin, in which some scene is carried over several pages; (3) borders around the text (interlacing colonnades, etc.), the most remarkable example is that of the evangelistic canons of the Middle Ages; (4) full-page paintings (or such as cover only a part of the page), but forming real pictures, similar to frescoes or easel pictures; these are chiefly found on very ancient or very recent MSS. (fourteenth and fifteenth centuries); (5) finally, there exist rolls of parchment wholly covered with paintings (Roll of Josue in the Vatican; Exultet Roll of S. Italy; see below). All these ornaments are called "enluminures", illuminations, or miniatures, a word used since the end of the sixteenth century. At first the "miniator" was charged with tracing in red minium the titles and initials. Despite its limitations, the art of illumination is one of the most charming ever invented; it exacts the same qualifications and produces almost as powerful effects as painting; it even calls for a delicacy of touch all its own. And whereas most of the paintings of the Middle Ages have perished, these little works form an almost uninterrupted series which afford us a clear idea of the chief schools of painting of each epoch and each region. Finally, in the history of art the rôle of illuminated MSS. was considerable; by treating in their works scenes of sacred history the MSS. painters inspired other artists, painters, sculptors, goldsmiths, ivory workers, etc.; it is especially in miniature that the ebb and flow of artistic styles during the Middle Ages may be detected.

In the Orient must be sought the origin of this art, as well as that of the MSS. themselves. The most ancient examples are found on Egyptian papyri, where in the midst of the text, and not separated from it, portraits are painted, most frequently in profile, according to the Egyptian method. After having drawn the outline in black ink the artist filled in the drawing in colours. The art seems to have been also cultivated by the Greek artists of Alexandria. The papyrus containing the poems of Timotheus (fourth century B. C.) found at Abousir, has a long-legged bird in the body of the text as a mark of division. A fragment of a romance on a papyrus (Paris, Bib. Nat., supp. Gr. 1294; first century A. D.) displays a text broken by groups of miniatures: men and women in bluish-gray or pink costumes stand out in relief from the background of the papyrus itself. Latin writers show us that the miniature was introduced into Rome as early as the first century B. C. (Pliny, "Hist. Nat.", XXV, 8). Martial (XIV, 1865) mentions a portrait of Virgil

painted on a parchment MS., and Varro collected seven hundred such portraits of illustrious men. (The portraits of the Evangelists in medieval MSS. result from this tradition.) None of these works remains and the only traces of the illuminations of antiquity are found in the following MSS. of the fourth and fifth centuries: (1) the "Virgil" of the Vatican (Lat. 3225), written by a single hand, has fifty miniatures which appear to be the work of at least three different painters. These are small pictures bordered by coloured bands (six of them fill a whole page); some of them, especially in the "Georgics", represent country landscapes the freshness of which is worthy of the text they illustrate. The background of buildings and temples recalls the paintings at Pompeii; (2) the "Iliad" of Milan (similar technic); (3) the Bible of Quedlinburg (Berlin), containing the most ancient Christian miniatures known; (4) the "Calendar" of Philocalus, composed in 354, the original of which, acquired by Peiresc, has disappeared, but the copies at Brussels, Vienna and the Barberini Library evidence a work of a purity thoroughly antique; the most curious portion is an illustrated calendar in which each month is symbolized by a scene of country life; this is a species of illustration of ancient origin which recurs very frequently in the miniatures of the Middle Ages.

II. Eastern Miniatures.—*Egypt.*—The tradition of miniatures on papyrus was preserved till the Christian era. On a Berlin papyrus (Emperor Frederick Museum) we find a picture of Christ curing a demoniac. In the Goleniscev collection there are sixteen leaves of a universal Coptic chronicle on papyrus, dated 392 and decorated with miniatures in a very barbarous style, intended as illustrations of the text. In the margin are seen successively the months (women crowned with flowers), the provinces of Asia (fortified gateways), the prophets, the kings of Rome, Lydia, Macedonia, Roman emperors, and perhaps the Patriarch Theophilus presiding at the destruction of the Serapeum. The author was a native monk and a complete stranger to Hellenic art. *Syria and Mesopotamia.*—The existence of Persian MSS. on parchment very rich in miniatures, is proved by allusions of St. Augustine (Adv. Faustum, XIII, 6, 18). As early as the fifth century schools of miniaturists were formed in the Christian convents of Syria and Mesopotamia which

Miniature
From the "Mâquamât" of Hariri

drew some of their inspiration from Greek art (draped figures), but relied mainly on the ornamental traditions of the ancient Orient. The masterpiece of this school is the Syriac Evangeliary written in 586 at the Monastery of Zagba (Mesopotamia) by the monk Rabula (since the fifteenth century in the Laurentian Library, Florence). The miniatures are real pictures with a decorative frame formed of zigzags, curves, rainbows, etc. The Gospel canons are set in arcades ornamented with flowers and birds. The scene of the Crucifixion is treated with an abundance of detail which is very rare at this period. The works of the Syro-Mesopotamian School seem to have missed the meaning of the Hellenic figures (figures in flowing

Parable of the Wise and Foolish Virgins
From the Evangeliarium of Rossano

draperies) of which they retained the tradition. On a Syriac evangeliary in the Borgian Museum (MSS. Syr., 14, f. k.) men and animals are painted in unreal colours and are bordered with black lines which give to the illuminations the appearance of cloisonné enamels. The work, which is dated 1546, seems to have been inspired by an older model.

Armenia.—The Armenian School of illuminating also belongs to Syria. It is represented by the evangeliary of Etschmiadzin (tenth century), the miniatures of which are derived from a sixth-century model; the evangeliary of Queen Mlke (Venice, Monastery of the Mechitarists, dated 902), and the evangeliary of Tübingen, dated 1113. In all these works the richness of the framework and the hieratic character of the human face are noteworthy. *Mussulman Art.*—All the above characteristics carried to extremes are found in the Mussulman schools of miniatures (Arabic, Turkish, and Persian MSS.); the oldest date only from the thirteenth century. Together with copies of the Koran, admirably illuminated with purely geometrical figures radiating symmetrically around a central *motif* like the design of a carpet, there is found especially in Persia, a fruitful school of painters which did not fear to depict the human face. Nothing is more picturesque than the varied scenes intended to illustrate the books of chronicles, legends, etc. Besides fantastic scenes ("Apocalypse of Mahomet", Paris, Bib. Nat., supp. Turk., 190) are found contemporary reproductions of scenes from real life which take us into the streets of Bagdad in the thirteenth century or permit us to follow an army or a caravan on the march ("Maqâmât" of Hariri, Bib. Nat., Paris, supp. Arab., 1618). Eastern artists, whether Christian or Mussulman, frequently portray their subjects on backgrounds of gold; in Persian MSS., however, are found attempts at landscape backgrounds, several of which betray a Chinese influence.

III. Byzantine Miniatures.—The history of Byzantine miniatures is yet to be written; it is impossible at present to determine its origin or to study its development. It seems more and more evident that Byzantine art, far from being an original creation, is no more than a prolonged survival of the Hellenic-oriental art of the fourth to the sixth centuries. The Greek monks charged with the illumination of MSS. never ceased to copy models, but, following the fashion and the occu-

pation of the time, these models sometimes varied; hence Byzantine art has undergone a development more apparent than real. Under present conditions, without seeking to determine the schools, we must be content to indicate the principal groups of MSS. *Fifth and Sixth Centuries.*—Several of the Biblical MSS. in gold letters on purple parchment have been rightly compared with one another, viz. the Genesis of the Imperial Library of Vienna, the Evangeliarium of Rossano, and the fragment of the Gospel of St. Matthew discovered at Sinope (since 1900 in the Bib. Nat., Paris). In these three MSS. the painting has an anecdotic character; it is intended to illustrate the text, and sometimes two periods of a scene are represented in a picture. Both the evangeliaries show a bearded face of Christ, majestic and severe, which already suggests the "Pantocrator" of church cupolas. From the same period date two works which appear to be the transcription on parchment of an original on papyrus; one is the Roll of Josue in the Vatican Library, which displays a series of miniatures, eleven yards long, relating to the history of Josue; the other is the MS. of the voyage of Cosmas Indicopleustes (Vatican), a monk of Sinai; in this, together with symbolic representations of various parts of the world, are many scenes and personages of the Bible, painted opposite the text, with the MS. itself as background. Very different is the illustration of medical MSS., such as the "Dioscorides" of Vienna, executed about the year 500, for Juliana, daughter of Placidia. Hereon are found real pictures copied from ancient originals (portraits of physicians and of Juliana).

From the Roll of Josue (Vatican Library)

Eighth to Eleventh Century.—The Iconoclastic crisis was fatal to illumination, and painted MSS. were either mutilated or destroyed. An attempt was made to substitute for religious representations a purely ornamental art. Probably to this school belongs an evangeliary of Paris (Bib. Nat., Gr. 63), in which the *motifs* of decoration are borrowed from flora and fauna. The triumph of images in the eleventh century was also the triumph of religious miniature painting, which together with calligraphy underwent great development in the scriptorium of Studion. One of the books illustrated by preference by the monks was the Psalter, of which the paintings comprise two elements: the scenes of the history of David, and the symbolic allusions to the life of Christ contained in the Psalms. There are to be distinguished (1) the aristocratic psalter, represented by the Psalter of Paris (Gr. 139); the miniatures extend over the whole page within a rich border, and appear to be the reproduction from an ancient original of the third-fourth century; some pictures, such as that of David tending his flocks, have a quite Pompeian freshness. Antique influence makes itself felt by a large number of allegories personified and draped in Hellenic costumes· (2) the monastic and theological psalter in which the miniatures placed in the margin follow the text step by step. The Chloudov Psalter of Moscow (ninth cent.), those of Vatopedi (tenth cent.), the Vatican (Barberini Library: dated 1059), etc. are the principal specimens of this class. Some miniatures of the Chloudov Psalter represent episodes of the Iconoclastic conflict. Another MS. often illustrated at this period was the "Menologion", which contained sometimes besides the liturgical calendar, an abbreviation of the lives of the saints for each day. The most celebrated is that of the Vatican, decorated for Basil II (976–1025) by seven artists who left their names attached to each miniature. A great variety of colours relieved a rather extreme monotony of inspiration; everywhere are found the same architectural backgrounds, the same sufferings in the midst of the same landscapes. The beautiful MS. of the "Homilies" of Gregory of Nazienzus (Paris, Bib. Nat., Gr. 510: end of ninth century) was composed for Basil II; it is unfortunately damaged but it presents a remarkable series of the most varied pictures (portraits of St. Gregory of Nazienzus and of Basil I; sessions of Councils; Biblical scenes, etc.). This period was decidedly the golden age of Byzantine illumination. The MSS., even those which lack pictures, have at least ornamented initial letters, which in the earlier examples are very simple, but in course of time became surrounded with foliage, in the midst of which animals or small figures disported themselves. (These initials, however, never attained the same dimensions as in Western MSS.)

David and Goliath
From Psalter 139, in Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris

Twelfth Century.—The lofty traditions of Byzantine miniature painting were upheld until the fall of Constantinople in 1204. A group of the Octateuch (Smyrna, Athos, Vatican, and Seraglio libraries) seems to have the same origin. The artists were chiefly concerned with illustrating the text, following it step by step; some of the scenes are spirited and picturesque, but the inspiration seems derived from ancient models (such as the Roll of Josue). The specimen at the Seraglio was composed for Prince Isaac, son of Alexius I Comnenus. A MS. whose pictures exercised great influence on Byzantine art is that of the "Homilies on the Virgin", by James, a monk of Coxynobaphos (Vatican, 1162; Paris, 1208). The initials are remarkable for richness, and the paintings

develop all the events of the life of the Blessed Virgin until the birth of Christ (cf. the mosaics in the narthex of the Kahrié-Djami at Constantinople). *Thirteenth to Fifteenth Century.*—The studios of miniature paintings for a long time felt the effects of the catastrophe of 1204, and after the thirteenth century the monks ceased to illuminate luxuriously liturgical MSS. One of the MSS. most characteristic of this period is that of the "Chronicle" of Skylitzes (Madrid, National Library, thirteenth century). The colours are clear in tone and very fresh, but the artist having no ancient model before him and left to his own resources, has executed veritable *bons-hommes*, which nevertheless charm by the vivacity of their movements and their picturesque attitudes. The imitation of antiquity however was not abandoned, as is shown by the portraits of Dosiades and of Theocritus (Cod. Paris, Gr. 28–32) composed in the fourteenth century, but probably copied from Alexandrian originals of the third and fourth centuries. Lastly attention is called to certain fourteenth-century MSS. of Western or even Italian inspiration (Cod. Paris, Gr. 135: dated 1362; on this MS., written by a scribe of John V Cantacuzenus, there is a Gothic monster, a knight with buckler ornamented with fleur-de-lis, etc.). In the Slavic countries, the illuminated MSS. of the Bulgarian, Russian or Servian monasteries belong to the Byzantine school, but have also been directly influenced by the Orient,



From the Chronicle of Skylitzes (XIII century)
In the Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid

especially by Syria. Some Russian MSS. were illuminated in the sixteenth century (e. g. the Book of the Tsars, 1535–53). Scandinavian influences appear in Russian MSS. (monsters and interlacings of initials); and one of the most remarkable monuments of Slavic miniature painting is the Servian Psalter of Munich, in which the paintings are executed by an impressionistic artist, who uses contrasting colours instead of pen designs.

IV. Western Miniatures.—The evolution of miniature painting in the Occident was quite different; the imitation of ancient models was never as complete as in the Orient, and as in all other arts, the time came when the illuminator of MSS. abandoned tradition and attempted to copy nature. In the Occident even more than in the Orient, it is possible to follow a real development of illuminated books. *Sixth to Eighth Century.*—Until the Carlovingian epoch the sole original school of illumination is to be sought in the Irish monasteries, or in those founded on the Continent by Irish monks. The works of the Irish school are characterized by wonderful decorative sense, far removed from naturalism. Nothing is more graceful than the large initials formed by ribbons ornamented with interlacings, in the midst of which are sometimes human heads or animals. Some borders decorated with spirals, rose-work, and interlacings recall, by their display of fancy, pages of the illuminated Korans. Indeed there are in Irish art elements which are frankly Oriental, and the geometrical and symmetrical aspect of the human form in Irish MSS. may be compared to what we find on certain Coptic monuments, buildings, or bas-reliefs. In Ireland as in the Orient, ancient ornamentation finds little place; foliage is entirely absent from this decoration, which consists almost exclusively of geometrical elements. The kinship of these *motifs* with those found on the barbaric jewels or the stone sculptures of Ireland is evident. Among the most celebrated works of this school may be cited: the "Book of Kells" (Trinity College, Dublin), the transcription of which is ascribed to St. Columba, but which in reality belongs to the seventh century; the "Evangeliarium of Durham", belonging to the Diocese of Lindisfarne (British Museum, Cotton MSS., Nero D. IV), copied in honour of St. Cuthbert by Bishop Eadfrith (698–721), bound by Bishop Æthilwald, and ornamented with precious stones by the monk Billfrith, is also of great value. Although copied in an English monastery it possesses all the characteristics of Irish art; large initials decorated with interlacings and without foliage, the predominance of simple colours (violet, green, yellow, red) absence of gold and silver, portraits of the evangelists similar to those on Byzantine MSS. Beginning with the sixth century this art of illumination was brought by Irish monks, not only to England but also to the Continent, where the monasteries of Luxeuil, Würzburg, St. Gall, and Bobbio became centres of Irish art. As specimens of this expansion may be cited: the "Evangeliarium of St. Willibrord" (d. 730), Apostle of the Frisians (Cod. Paris, supp. Lat. 693), of which the initials resemble those of the MS. of Durham; the "Evangeliarium of Maeseyck" (Belgium) eighth century; the MS. of the Bible called Codex Bigotianus (Cod. Paris, Lat. 281 and 298), the work of the Abbey of Fécamp, eighth century; the so-called St. Cainim MS. (now with the Franciscans of Dublin, but originating in Italy), in reality of the tenth and eleventh centuries. Several MSS. of St. Gall contain miniatures of this school, but showing foreign influence.

Beginning of St. Matthew's Gospel
Showing Irish Initial and Bordering



Illuminated Initials
From Carlovingian MSS.

In the rest of Europe, among the Visigoths, the Franks, and the Burgundians, there were schools of

calligraphy similar to those of Ireland, with more marked traces of ancient art (absence of interlacings which were replaced by garlands, sturdy foliage, etc.). As an example may be mentioned the initial of the Burgundian papyri of Geneva, sixth century (Homilies of St. Avitus). A celebrated Bible, the ornamentation of which remains a problem, must be considered apart. This is the famous MS. of St. Gatien at Tours, stolen by Libri about 1846, and returned to the Paris Bibliothèque Nationale in 1888, after having figured in the Ashburnham collection. This Pentateuch, written in seventh-century uncials, is adorned with large full-page miniatures framed in red bands, and presenting a number of scenes arranged on different margins, but without symmetry. What is striking about the MS. is its aim at picturesqueness and movement, and the wholly Oriental character of the design and especially of the costumes of the personages (the women wear the tall headdress and veil of the bas-reliefs of Palmyra) and of the architectural backgrounds (bulbous cupolas alternating with pedimented buildings). The arrangement of the scenes recalls certain fourteenth-century Persian MSS. In this instance we have to do perhaps with the reproduction of a cycle of miniatures conceived in the East to illustrate the Vulgate of St. Jerome.

Symbolical Representation of The Church
From a Carlovingian MS.

Miniatures of the Evangelists
From a Carlovingian MS.

Ninth and Tenth Centuries.—The Carlovingian period was as decisive for the illumination of MSS. as for other arts. Thanks to the initiative of Charlemagne and his chief assistants, Alcuin, Theodulfus, etc., schools of miniature painting were formed in the principal monasteries of the empire, and our libraries possess a large number of their works. The elements which compose this art were most varied; the influence of Irish and Anglo-Saxon illuminations is unquestionable, and to it was due the partiality for large initials which until the fifteenth century were one of the favourite ornaments of Western MSS. Carlovingian art was not exclusively Irish, and in the MSS. of this period are found traces of ancient art and Oriental influences (evangeliary canons, symbolical *motifs* such as the fountain of life, etc.). With the assistance of these MSS. a whole iconographical cycle may be formed, encyclopedic in character, in which side by side with religious history occur figures from the profane sciences (liberal arts, calendars, zodiacs, virtues and vices, etc.). Ornamentation is more luxurious, the colours are more vigorous and decided in tone, silver and gold have not been spared and there is even a return to MSS. in gold letters on a purple ground. Many of these Bibles, Psalters, or Evangeliaries were composed for sovereigns, whose portraits were presented on the first page in all their royal apparel; they are often surrounded by allegorical figures borrowed from antiquity. Beside these full-page paintings we find above all in these MSS. beautiful initials of extraordinary variety; Irish interlacings alone or combined with antique foliage, purely zoomorphic initials, etc. The principal MSS. of this period are: the Evangeliary of Godescalc, made for Charlemagne, 781–83 (Paris), text in gold letters on purple ground with a decorative framework which is different on each page; Bibles of Theodulf, Bishop of Orléans (Paris and Le Puy); Evangeliary of Charlemagne (Vienna); Bibles of Alcuin (Zurich, Bamberg, Vallicella, Tours); Bibles of Charles the Bald (Paris); Sacramentary of Drogo (Paris); Sacramentary of Gellone (Paris), has initials uniquely formed with fishes or birds; Evangeliary of Lothaire (Paris); Bible of St. Martial of Limoges (Paris, tenth cent.); Evangeliary of Cividale (Friuli); Codex Egberti (Trier), presented to Egbert, Archbishop of Trier, by two monks of Reichenau in 980. To the same school belong the MSS. composed in the German monasteries for the Ottos. Moreover, Irish or Anglo-Saxon art also produced remarkable monuments, among which may be mentioned the Psalter of Utrecht (tenth cent.), the Psalters of Winchester (British Museum), and the Benedictionaries of Jumièges (Rouen).

Tenth to Twelfth Century.—At the beginning of the eleventh century the fictitious unity in the artistic and intellectual sphere established by Charlemagne gave way to the diversity of provincial schools, but if the boundaries of these schools may almost be traced when there is question of architecture, the task is more difficult in the study of miniatures; researches in this field have scarcely commenced. The illuminated MSS of this period were made in the monastic studios. As a general thing the writers were at once painters and calligraphers, such as Guillaume de St. Evroult, "Scriptor et librorum illuminator" (Ord. Vital., III, 7). Sometimes however the two professions were distinct; the MS. of Peter Lombard (Valenciennes, 178) bears the inscription "Segharus me scripsit" and on the frontispiece "Sawalo me fecit". Sawalo, a monk of St. Amand, is the illuminator and his name is found elsewhere. This period is marked by the extraordinary development of large initials while the full-page miniatures disappeared. Illustrations on several scales are still found in the margin. These initials of the Romanic

Frontispiece to the Bible of Charles the Bald
In the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris

period follow the traditions of Carlovingian illumination, but they are even more complex and the human figure assumes an increasingly important place. Some of them are full-length portraits of prophets or apostles; in others complete scenes (battles, besieged cities, etc.) are developed in the midst of pillars. The great difference between this and the Carlovingian period lies in the appearance of naturalism and of anachronism (prophets with pointed shoes, etc.). Lastly there are many points of resemblance between the development of miniature painting and that of other arts of design. The short and badly drawn figures were succeeded, at the end of the twelfth century, by more slender portraits which resemble the elongated statues of Chartres. Such is the character of the ornamental school which produced innumerable works in France, Germany, Northern Italy, Spain, and the Two Sicilies. (Here it is difficult to trace the boundary between Western miniature painting and the Byzantine which made its influence felt in the workrooms of Monte Cassino and especially in the beautiful paintings of the rolls containing the text of the "Exultet" of Holy Saturday.) Also worthy of mention is an attempt of the Cistercians to infuse more simplicity into illuminating. A model MS. had been composed at Cîteaux, in which gold and painting were replaced by a calligraphic decoration in perfect taste. There is an intimate relation between this severe elegance and Cistercian architecture.



ILLUMINATION FROM THE MACHABEES
Clermont-Ferrand Bible (XII century)

Thirteenth Century.—In the thirteenth century illumination, like calligraphy, ceased to be the specialty of the monasteries. In France and about the University of Paris appeared the lay illuminators. The taste for illuminated MSS. spread more and more, and important studios of illuminators arose, the heads of which often furnished sketches of miniatures to be executed. On the other hand the illuminations took a more and more important place at the expense of the text. The artists were no longer satisfied with ornamented initials, but in a series of medallions arranged like those decorating the stained glass windows they developed whole cycles of sacred or profane history. There were then composed "Picture Bibles" made up of a continuous series of miniatures (Bible of Sir Thomas Philipps), or "Sermon Bibles", veritable illustrated theological summaries, giving for each verse of Scripture the literal, symbolical, and moral interpretations. This immense work, which must have contained 5000 figures, has not reached us complete. A MS. in 3 vols. of a Sermon Bible is divided between the Bodleian Library, the Bibliothèque Nationale of Paris, and the British Museum. The Psalter of Ingeburg (Musée Condé at Chantilly) and that of Sts. Louis and Blanche of Castile (Arsenal Library) belong by their ornamentation to the monastic art of the twelfth century. On the other hand new tendencies appear in the works of the second half of the thirteenth century, e. g. the Evangeliarium of the Sainte-Chapelle (Bib. Nat.), the two Psalters of St. Louis (Paris, Bib. Nat., and collection of H. Y. Thompson), the works of profane literature (chansons de geste, etc.). Gothic ornamentation with its wealth of rose and quatrefoil decoration, gables, pinnacles, and foliage often forms the framework for these vignettes. The gold backgrounds are almost always covered with designs, sometimes in relief. Instead of foliage and fantastic animals the human figure holds the predominant place. In miniature painting as in the sculpture of the thirteenth century may be observed the progress of realism and the exact observation of the living model. These beautiful miniatures of the Books of Hours revive for us with their still admirable colours the costumes of the contemporaries of St. Louis and Philip the Fair. Such is the style which henceforth dominates French miniature painting and which speedily spread throughout Europe, especially England.



EPISTLE OF ST. JAMES
From Clermont-Ferrand Bible (XII century)

Early Fourteenth Century.—This period is represented chiefly by the Parisian illuminator Jean Pucelle, whose name has been discovered on several MSS. One of the most beautiful of his works is the Breviary of Belleville (Bib. Nat., Lat. 10483–84), executed in collaboration with Mahiet Ancelet and J. Chevrier. The new school was remarkable for its borders, formed of wonderful garlands of interlaced foliage and flowers, no longer conventional as formerly, but copied from nature. Between the border and the text were represented scenes of everyday life, sometimes of a humorous character, for example a piper playing for dancing peasants, or animals, birds, monkeys, butterflies, dragonflies intermingled with the foliage, as on the sculptured panels of the cathedrals of the same period. Traces of Italian inspiration appear in the architecture, which is of a mixed Gothic character. Among the works of this school the "Book of the Miracles of Our Lady" (Seminary of Soissons) is one of the most exquisite. During the same period the English miniaturists produced remarkable works such as "Queen Mary's Psalter" (Brit. Mus.), which belonged to Mary Tudor but which dates from the beginning of the fourteenth cen-

tury. It contains first more than two hundred scenes from the Old Testament bordered with a simple framework of foliage. The figures are graceful and elegant. Then come scenes from the life of Christ executed on gold backgrounds with much greater richness in the midst of innumerable scenes of the chase, tourneys, games, grotesque subjects. The East Anglian abbeys (Norfolk, Suffolk) produced magnificent psalters during the same period (Psalter of Peterborough at Brussels; Psalter of Robert of Ormesby at Oxford) which belong to the same school. In Germany the miniaturists had long been imitating Byzantine art; beginning with the fourteenth century they also imitate French models. In Austria at the monastery of St. Florian is found the most ancient example of the Biblia Pauperum, executed about 1300 according to the same method as the Sermon Bibles. The taste for miniatures was so keen at this period that they even went so far as to illuminate some important charters. A copy of the house rules of the kings of Majorca shows each of the officials in the exercise of his functions (reproduced in "Acta SS. Bolland.", June, I; cf. list given by Delaborde in "Centenaire de la Société des Antiquaires de France", 93).



THE ANNUNCIATION
From the Souvigny Bible
(XII century)
In the Moulins Library

Late Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Century.—It was in the second half of the fifteenth century that the art of miniature painting was most profoundly changed. It may even be said that the illuminators of this period were to a certain extent the precursors of modern painting. This new transformation seems to have been largely the work of the powerful "Ghildes" of the Flemish masters, versatile artists, many of them skilled like André Beauneveu in painting, sculpture, and architecture, and obliged by stress of competition to leave their own country in order to offer their services to the lovers of beautiful MSS. They are found scattered throughout Europe, and some went even to Italy. André Beauneveu became (1393–1397) the chief of the artists in the employ of Jean Duke of Berry. He made a Psalter (Bib. Nat., Paris) in which figures of prophets, and Apostles alternated in quiet tones. It was at this time that manuscripts began to be painted in *grisaille*. The gold backgrounds were replaced by designs in colours, then by real landscapes. In this respect the "Très Riches Heures" of the Duke of Berry (Chantilly, Musée Condé), which have been attributed to Pol de Limbourg, mark a veritable revolution (beginning of the fifteenth century). In the pictures of the different months are represented all the châteaux of the prince in the midst of surprisingly true landscapes. Long before the Van Eycks, Pol de Limbourg was acquainted with aerial perspective. In his works are found the effects of snow, of starry nights, of dazzling summer lights, the grey tones of autumn, all of which were new in art. Persons were treated with the same love of truth. Physiognomies copied from nature without disguise of any defect, intensity of look (never was religious sentiment expressed with such power), minute truthfulness as to costumes and details of furnishing, such were the characteristics of this art. Having arrived at this perfection miniature painting ceased to be a merely decorative art and was confounded with painting on a large scale. The anachronism of costumes belonging to the fifteenth century, whether they have to do with characters from Terence or scenes from the Gospels, is not one of the least charms of these beautiful works. Similar are the other MSS. of Jean de Berry, the "Grandes Heures", ascribed to Jacquemart de Hesdin, the "Très Belles Heures" (Brussels) by the same artist, the "Dukes' Terence" (Paris), which first belonged to the Duke of Guyenne. The "Heures de Turin" (destroyed by the fire of 1904), made for William IV, Count of Holland, belong to the same school. About 1450 we can distinguish the Flemish-Burgundian school (works executed for the Dukes of Burgundy) from the French school, whose chief representative is Jean Fouquet of Tours (1415–80). Flemish and Italian influence are confused in his works: "Jewish Antiquities" (Paris); "Book of Hours" of Etienne Chevalier (Chantilly); "Grandes Chroniques de France" (Paris), etc. After him Jean Bourdichon, who about 1508 decorated the "Hours" of Anne of Brittany (Paris), may be considered the last representative of the great school of miniature painting. The progress of wood-engraving was as fatal to it, as was that of printing to calligraphy. Until modern times Books of Hours, works of heraldry, etc. have continued to be illuminated, but these miniatures do not possess a single personal quality.

ILLUMINATED FIRST PAGE
From Franciscan Breviary (A. D. 1446)
University Library, Bologna

SILVESTRE, *Paléographie universelle* (Paris, 1839–41), 400; MIDDLETON, *Illuminated Manuscripts in Classical and Mediæval Times* (Cambridge, 1892); *Reproductions from illuminated manuscripts of the British Museum* (London, 1899–1908); BRADLEY, *A Dictionary of Miniaturists, Illumination, Calligraphers and Copyists* (London, 1887); LECOY DE LA MARCHE, *Les manuscrits et la miniature* (Paris, s. d.); LABITTE, *Les manuscrits et l'art de les orner* (Paris, 1893); MARTIN, *Les peintres de manuscrits et la miniature en France* (Paris, 1910); NIEDLING, *Bücher ornamentik* (Weimar, 1888); ZORNIUS, *Historia Bibliorum pictorum* (Leipzig, 1743); BEISSEL, *Geschichte der Evangelienbücher in der ersten Hälfte des Mittelalters* (Freiburg im Br., 1906); DE NOLHAC, *Le Virgile du Vatican et ses peintures* (Paris, 1897); MAI, *Iliadis fragmenta . . . cum picturis* (Milan, 1819); STRZYGOWSKI, *Eine Alexandrinische Weltchronik* (Vienna, 1905); IDEM, *Das Etschmiadzin Evangeliar* (Vienna, 1891); IDEM, *Kleinarmenische Miniaturmalerei im Veröffentlichungen der Universitatsbibliothek zu Tübingen*, I; MIGEON, *Manuel d'art Musulman*, II (Paris, 1907), 6–60; BLOCHET, *Les écoles de peinture en Perse* in *Rev. Archéolog.* (July, 1905); KONDAKOFF, *Histoire de l'art byzantin d'après les miniatures* (Fr. tr., Paris, 1886–91); OMONT, *Miniatures des manuscrits grecs de la Bibliothèque Nationale* (Paris, 1902); MILLET, *Histoire de l'art*, I, III (Paris, 1906–09); RITTER AND WICKHOFF, *Die Wiener Genesis* (Vienna, 1895); HASELOFF, *Codex purpureus Rossanensis* (Leipzig, 1898); OMONT, *Peintures de l'Evangile de St. Mathieu (de Sinope)*: *Monuments Pict.*, VII (1901); EBERSOLT, *Miniatures byzantines de Berlin* in *Revue Archéolog.* (July, 1905); *Codices e Vaticani Selecti . . . VIII, Il Menologio di Basilio*, II (Turin, 1907); OUSPENSKY, *Le manuscrit de l'Octateuque du Sérail* in *Bulletin de l'Institut Archéol. russe de Constantinople*, XII, (1907); STRZYGOWSKI, *Die miniaturen des serbischen Psalters* (Vienna, 1906); GILBERT, *Fac-similes of national manuscripts of Ireland* (London, 1874–1884); WESTWOOD, *Fac-similes of the miniatures and ornaments of Anglo-Saxon and Irish manuscripts* (London, 1868); UNGER, *La miniature irlandaise* in *Rev. Celtique* (1870); *The Lindisfarne and Rushworth Gospels* (SURTEES SOCIETY, 48, 1865); DE BASTARD, *Peintures et ornements des manuscrits* (Paris, 1868, incomplete); LEITSCHUH, *Gesch. der Karolingischen Malerei* (Berlin, 1894); MENZEL, *Die Trierer Ada-Handschrift* (Leipzig, 1889); DE BASTARD, *Peintures de la*

Typogravure Goupil of Paris (France).

ILLUMINATION IN THE GRIMANI BREVIARY

THIS CELEBRATED MANUSCRIPT WAS DISCOVERED IN 1521 IN THE HOUSE OF CARDINAL GRIMANI AT VENICE AND IS NOW PRESERVED IN THE LIBRARY OF SAN MARCO IN THAT CITY

Bible de Charles le Chauve (Paris, 1883); BRÉHIER, *La Bible historiée de Clermont* in *Etudes archéol.* (Clermont, 1910); VITZTHUM, *Die Pariser Miniaturmalerei* (Leipzig, 1907); DELISLE, *Fac-similes de livres copiés et enluminés pour le roi Charles V* (Paris, 1903); DE LASTEYRIE, *Les miniatures d'André Beauneveu et de Jacquemart de Hesdin* in *Monuments pict.*, III; DURRIEU, *Heures de Turin* (Paris, 1902); *Les Très Riches Heures du duc de Berry* (Paris, 1904); REINACH, *Miniatures des Grandes Chroniques de Philippe le Bon* in *Monuments pict.*, XI; DE LABORDE, *Les Manuscrits à peinture de la Cité de Dieu* (Paris, 1910); OMONT, *Reproduction réduite des manuscrits et miniatures de la Bibliothèque Nationale* (Paris, s. d.), contains Psalter of St. Louis, Book of Hours of Anne of Brittany, Grande Chroniques de France of Jean Fouquet, etc.

LOUIS BRÉHIER.

Manuscripts of the Bible are written, as opposed to printed, copies of the original text or of a version either of the whole Bible or of a part thereof. After introductory remarks on MSS. in general, we shall take up in detail the Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Syriac, Armenian, and Coptic MSS. of the Bible; MSS. of other versions are not important enough to come within the scope of this article.

I. IN GENERAL.—MSS. may be conveniently divided into papyrus and vellum MSS. (1) *Papyrus MSS.*—In the Roman Empire of the first three centuries of our era, papyrus was the ordinary writing material. Made out of strips of pith taken from the stem of the Egyptian water-plant of the same name, papyrus was very fragile, became brittle in air, crumbled with use, could not resist the disintegrating force of moisture, and was quite impracticable for book-form. All papyrus MSS. of every sort are lost to us save such as were buried in exceedingly dry soil, like that of Upper and Middle Egypt. Here the ignorant fellaheen at one time wantonly destroyed vast quantities of papyrus MSS. Egyptian excavators now prevent such destruction and keep on adding to our very considerable collections of papyri. It is more than likely that the New Testament sacred writers or their scribes used ink and rolls of fragile papyrus for their *autographa* (II Cor., iii, 3; II John, 12). These original MSS. probably perished towards the end of the first or opening of the second century. We find no trace of them in either the Apostolic or the apologetic Fathers,—unless we except Tertullian's words, "the authentic letters of the Apostles themselves", which are now generally set aside as rhetorical. A significant proof of the early loss of the autograph copies of the New Testament is the fact that Irenæus never appeals to the original writings but only to all the painstaking and ancient copies (*ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς σπουδαίοις καὶ ἀρχαίοις ἀντιγράφοις*), to the witness of those that saw John face to face (*καὶ μαρτυρούντων αὐτῶν ἐκείνων τῶν κατ'ὄψιν τὸν Ἰωάννην ἑορακότων*), and to the internal evidence of the written word (*καὶ τοῦ λόγου διδάσκοντος ἡμᾶς*).

(2) *Vellum MSS.*—Egypt clung to her papyrus rolls until the eighth century and even later. Vellum had been used before the time of Christ (cf. Pliny, "Historia Naturalis", xiii, 11), and during the time of the Apostles (II Tim., iv, 13). In the third century, it began, outside of Egypt, to supersede papyrus; in the early part of the fourth century vellum and the codex, or book-form, gained complete victory over papyrus and the roll-form. When Constantine founded his capital of the Byzantine Empire, he ordered Eusebius to have fifty MSS. of the Bible made on vellum (*σωμάτια ἐν διφθέραις*) for use in the churches of Byzantium (Vita Constant., IV, 36). To the fourth century belong the earliest extant Biblical MSS. of anything but fragmentary size.

(3) *Palimpsests.*—Some vellum MSS. of the greatest importance are palimpsests (from Lat. *palimpsestum*, Gr. *παλίμψηστος*, "scraped again"),—that is, they were long ago scraped a second time with pumice-stone and written upon anew. The discovery of palimpsests led to the reckless and bigoted charge of wholesale destruction of Biblical MSS. by the monks of old. That there was some such destruction is clear enough from the decree of a Greek synod of A. D. 691, which forbade the use of palimpsest manuscripts either of the Bible or of the Fathers, unless they were utterly unserviceable (see Wattenbach, "Das Schriftwesen im Mittelalter", 1896, p. 299). That such destruction was not wholesale, but had to do with only worn or damaged MSS., is in like manner clear enough from the significant fact that as yet no complete work of any kind has been found on a palimpsest. The deciphering of a palimpsest may at times be accomplished merely by soaking it in clear water; generally speaking, some chemical reagent is required, in order to bring back the original writing. Such chemical reagents are an infusion of nutgalls, Gioberti's tincture and hydrosulphuret of ammonia; all do harm to the MS. Wattenbach, a leading authority on the subject, says: "More precious manuscripts, in proportion to the existing supply, have been destroyed by the learned experimenters of our time than by the much abused monks of old."

II. HEBREW MSS.—(1) *Age.*—(a) Pre-Massoretic text.—The earliest Hebrew MS. is the Nash papyrus. There are four fragments, which, when pieced together, give twenty-four lines of a pre-Massoretic text of the Ten Commandments and the *shema'* (Ex., xx, 2–17; Deut., v, 6–19; vi, 4–5). The writing is without vowels and seems palæographically to be not later than the second century. This is the oldest extant Bible MS. (see Cook, "A Pre-Massoretic Biblical Papyrus" in "Proceed. of the Soc. of Bib. Arch.", Jan., 1903). It agrees at times with the LXX against the Massorah. Another pre-Massoretic text is the Samaritan Pentateuch. The Samaritan recension is probably pre-exilic; it has come down to us free from Massoretic influences, is written without vowels and in Samaritan characters. The earliest Samaritan MS. extant is that of Nablûs, which was formerly rated very much earlier than all Massoretic MSS., but is now assigned to the twelfth or thirteenth century A. D. Here mention should be made of the non-Massoretic Hebrew MSS. of the Book of Ecclesiasticus (q. v.). These fragments, obtained from a Cairo *genizah* (a box for wornout and cast-off MSS.), belong to the tenth or eleventh century of our era. They provide us with more than a half of Ecclesiasticus and duplicate certain portions of the book. Many scholars deem that the Cairo fragments prove Hebrew to have been the original language of Ecclesiasticus (see "Facsimiles of the Fragments hitherto recovered of the Book of Ecclesiasticus in Hebrew", Oxford and Cambridge, 1901).

(b) Massoretic text.—All other Hebrew MSS. of the Bible are Massoretic (see MASSORAH), and belong to the tenth century or later. Some of these MSS. are dated earlier. Text-critics consider these dates to be due either to intentional fraud or to uncritical transcription of dates of older MSS. For instance, a codex of the Former and Latter Prophets, now in the Karaite synagogue of Cairo, is dated A. D. 895; Neubauer assigns it to the eleventh or thirteenth century. The Cambridge MS. no. 12, dated A. D. 856, he marks as a thirteenth-century work; the date A. D. 489, attached to the St. Petersburg Pentateuch, he rejects as utterly impossible (see Studia Biblica, III, 22). Probably the earliest Massoretic MSS. are: "Prophetarum Posteriorum Codex Babylonicus Petropolitanus", dated A. D. 916; the St. Petersburg Bible, written by Samuel ben Jacob and dated A. D. 1009; and "Codex Oriental. 4445" in the British Museum, which Ginsburg (Introduction, p. 469) assigns to A. D. 820–50. The text-critics differ very widely in the dates they assign to certain Hebrew MSS. De Rossi is inclined to think that at most nine or ten Massoretic MSS. are earlier than the twelfth century (Variæ Lectiones, I, p. xv).

(2) *Number.*—Kennicott, the first critical student of the Massoretic text, either examined or had others ex-

amine 16 Samaritan MSS., some 40 printed texts and 638 Massoretic MSS. (see "Dissertatio Generalis in Vetus Testam. Hebraicum", Oxford, 1780). He numbered these MSS. in six groups: nos. 1–88, Oxford MSS.; nos. 89–144, other MSS. of English-speaking countries; nos. 145–254, MSS. of continental Europe; nos. 255–300, printed texts and various MSS.; nos. 301–694, MSS. collated by Brunsius. De Rossi (Variæ Lectiones Vet. Test.) retained the numeration of Kennicott and added a list of 479 MSS., all his own personal property, of which unfortunately 17 had already received numbers from Kennicott. De Rossi later added four supplementary lists of 110, 52, 37, and 76 MSS. He brought the number of Massoretic MSS. up to 1375. No one has since undertaken so colossal a critical study of the Hebrew MSS. A few of the chief MSS. are more exactly collated and compared in the critical editions of the Massoretic text which were done by S. Baer and Fr. Delitzsch and by Ginsburg. To the vast number of Hebrew MSS. examined by Kennicott and De Rossi must be added some 2000 MSS. of the Imperial Library of St. Petersburg, which Firkowitsch collated at Tschufut-Kale ("Jews' Rock") in the Crimea (see Strack, "Die biblischen und massoretischen Handschriften zu Tschufut-Kale" in "Zeits. für luth. Theol. und Kirche", 1875).

(3) *Worth.*—The critical study of this rich assortment of about 3400 Massoretic rolls and codices is not so promising of important results as it would at first thought seem to be. The MSS. are all of quite recent date, if compared with Greek, Latin, and Syriac codices. They are all singularly alike. Some few variants are found in copies made for private use; copies made for public service in the synagogues are so uniform as to deter the critic from comparing them. All Massoretic MSS. bring us back to one edition—that of a textual tradition which probably began in the second century and became more and more minute until every jot and tittle of the text was almost absolutely fixed and sacred. R. Aqiba seems to have been the head of this Jewish school of the second century. Unprecedented means were taken to keep the text fixed. The scholars counted the words and consonants of each book, the middle word and middle consonants, the pecularities of script, etc. Even when such peculiarities were clearly due to error or to accident, they were perpetuated and interpreted by a mystical meaning. Broken and inverted letters, consonants that were too small or too large, dots which were out of place—all these oddities were handed down as God-



Codex Babylonicus Petropolitanus
Section of Page (Reduced)—Amos, ix, 11–13, and Abdias, i, 1–3
MS. in Imperial Library, St. Petersburg

intended. In Gen., ii, 4, בהבראם ("when they were created"), all MSS. have a small ה. Jewish scholars looked upon this peculiarity as inspired; they interpreted it: "In the letter ה he created them"; and then set themselves to find out what that meant. This lack of variants in Massoretic MSS. leaves us hopeless of reaching back to the original Hebrew text save through the versions. Kittel in his splendid Hebrew text gives such variants as the versions suggest.

Strack and Harkavy, *Catalog der hebr. Bibelhandschriften der kaiserlichen Bibliothek* (Leipzig, 1875); Neubauer, *Facsimiles of Hebrew MSS. in the Bodleian Library* (Oxford, 1886); Neubauer, *Catalogue of the Hebrew Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library and in the College Libraries of Oxford* (Oxford, 1886); Kraft and Deutsch, *Die handschriftl. hebräischen Werke der K. K. Hofbibliothek* (Vienna, 1857); Steinschneider, *Die hebräisch. Handschriften der K. Hof. und Staatsbibliothek* (Munich, 1895); Schiller-Szinessy, *Catalogue of the Hebrew MSS. preserved in the University Library* (Cambridge, 1876); Assemani, *Bibliothecæ Apostolicæ Vaticanæ codices Orientales* (Rome, 1756); Mai, *Appendix to Assemani* (Rome, 1831).

III. Greek MSS.—(1) *In General.*—Greek MSS. are divided into two classes according to their style of writing—uncials and minuscules. (a) Uncials were written between the fourth and tenth centuries, with large and disconnected letters. These letters were not capitals, but had a distinctive form: epsilon, sigma, and omega were not written E, Σ, Ω, as are those capitals

in inscriptions; ρ, φ, ψ, and at times υ were prolonged above or below the line. Words were not separated; neither accents nor punctuation marks were used; paragraphs were marked off only by a very small lacuna; the letters were uniform and artistic; ligatures were used only for the most ordinary words—ΙC (Ἰησοῦς), ΚC (Κύριος), ΧC (Χρίστος), ΙCΑ (Ἰσραήλ), ΠΝΑ (πνεῦμα), ΔΑΔ (Δαυίδ), ΑΝΟC (ἄνθρωπος), ΠΗΡ (πατήρ), ΜΗΡ (μητήρ), ΥC (υἱός), CΗΡ (σωτήρ), ΟΥΝΟC (οὐρανός). In the sixth century, began a decadence of the elegant uncial writing. Twists and turns were given to certain letters. In the seventh century, more letters received flourishes; accents and breathings were introduced; the writing leaned to the right. (b) Minuscules.—While uncials held sway in Biblical MSS., minuscules were employed in other works. During the ninth century, both uncial and minuscule MSS. of the Bible were written. The latter show a form of writing so fully developed as to leave no doubt about its long standing use. The letters are small, connected, and written with a running hand. After the tenth century, minuscules were used until, in the fifteenth century, MSS. were superseded by print.

(2) *Old Testament MSS.*—(a) LXX.—There are three families of LXX MSS.,—the Hexaplaric, Hesychian, and Lucianic. MSS. of Origen's Hexapla (q. v.) and Tetrapla were preserved at Cæsarea by his disciple Pamphilus. Some extant MSS. (v. g. ℵ and Q) refer in scholia to these gigantic works of Origen. In the fourth century, Pamphilus and his disciple Eusebius of Cæsarea reproduced the fifth column of the Hexapla, i. e. Origen's Hexaplaric LXX text, with all his critical signs. This copy is the source of the Hexaplaric family of LXX MSS. In course of time, scribes omitted the critical signs in part or entirely. Passages wanting in the LXX, but present in the Hebrew, and consequently supplied by Origen from either Aquila or Theodotion, were hopelessly commingled with passages of the then extant LXX. Almost at the same time two other editions of the LXX were published—those of Hesychius at Alexandria and of Lucian at Antioch. From these three editions the extant MSS. of the LXX have descended, but by ways that have not yet been accurately traced. Very few MSS. can be assigned with more than probability to one of the three families. The Hexaplaric, Hesychian, and Lucianic MSS. acted one upon the other. Most extant MSS. of the LXX contain, as a result, readings of each and of none of the great families. The tracing of the influence of these three great MSS. is a work yet to be done by the text-critics.

(i) Papyrus.—About sixteen fragments on papyrus are extant. Of these, the most important are: (α) Oxyrhyncus Pap. 656 (early third cent.), containing parts of Gen., xiv–xxvii, wherein most of the great vellum MSS. are wanting. (β) British Museum Pap. 37, at times called U (seventh cent.), containing part of Psalms (Hebrew) x–xxxiii. (γ) A Leipzig Pap. (fourth cent.) containing Psalms xxix–liv. These two Psalters give us the text of Upper Egypt. (δ) A Heidelberg Pap. (seventh cent.) containing Zach., iv, 6–Mal., iv, 5. (ε) A Berlin Pap. (fourth or fifth cent.) containing about thirty chapters of Genesis.

(ii) Vellum Uncial.—Parsons collated 13 uncial and 298 minuscule MSS. of the LXX; the former he designated with Roman numerals, I–XIII, the latter with Arabic numbers, 14–311 (cf., "V. T. Græcum cum Variis Lectionibus", Oxford, 1798). Lagarde designated the uncials by Roman and Greek capitals. This designation is now generally accepted (cf. Swete, "Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek", Cambridge, 1902, 148).

ℵ—S, *Cod. Sinaiticus* (q. v.) (fourth century; 43 leaves at Leipzig, 156 together with N. T. at St. Petersburg) contains fragments of Gen. and Num.; I Par., ix, 27–xix, 17; Esd., ix, 9–end; Esth.; Tob.; Judith; I and IV Mach.; Isa.; Jer.; Lam., i, 1–ii, 20; Joel; Abd.–Mal.; the Poetical Books; the entire New Testament; the Epistle of Barnabas and part of the "Shepherd" of Hermas. The text is mixed. In Tobias it differs much from A and B. Its origin is doubtful. Two correctors (C^a and C^b) are of the seventh century. C^a tells us at the end of Esth. that he compared this MS. with a very early copy, which Pamphilus testified had been taken from and corrected according to the Hexapla of Origen.

A, or *Cod. Alexandrinus* (q. v.) (fifth century; in British Museum) contains complete Bible (excepting Ps. l, 20–lxxx, 11, and smaller lacunæ) and includes deuterocanonical books and fragments, the apocryphal III and IV Mach., also I and II Clem. Its origin is Egyptian and may be Hesychian. It differs much from B, especially in Judges. Two scribes wrote the MS. The corrector belonged to about the same time.

B, or *Cod. Vaticanus* (q. v.) (fourth century; in the Vatican) contains complete Bible. The Old Testament lacks Gen., i, 1–xlvi, 28; I and II Mach.; portions of II Kings, ii; and Psalms, cv–cxxxvii. The New Testament wants Heb., ix, 14; I and II Tim.; Titus.; Apoc. Its origin is Lower Egyptian. Hort thinks it akin to the text used by Origen in his Hexapla.

C, or *Cod. Ephræmi Rescriptus* (q. v.) (fifth century palimpsest; in National Library, Paris) contains 64 leaves of Old Testament; most of Eccl.; parts of Ecclus.; Wisd.; Prov. and Cant.; 145 out of 238 leaves of New Testament.

D, or The *Cotton Genesis* (fifth century; in British Museum) contains fragments of Gen.; was almost destroyed by fire in 1731, but had been previously studied.

E, or *Cod. Bodleianus* (ninth or tenth century; in Bodl. Libr., Oxford) contains Heptateuch, fragments.

F, or *Cod. Ambrosianus* (fifth century; at Milan) contains Heptateuch, fragments.

G, or *Cod. Sarravianus* (fifth century; 130 leaves at Leyden, 22 in Paris, one in St. Petersburg) contains the Hexaplaric Octateuch (fragments) with some of the asterisks and obeli of Origen.

H, or *Cod. Petropolitanus* (sixth century; in Imperial Libr., St. Petersburg) contains portions of Numbers.

I, or *Cod. Bodleianus* (ninth century; in Bodl. Libr., Oxford) contains the Psalms.

K, or *Cod. Lipsiensis* (seventh century; in Univ. of Leipzig) contains fragments of Heptateuch.

L, or The *Vienna Genesis* (sixth century; in Imperial Libr., Vienna) contains incomplete Genesis, written with silver letters on purple vellum.

M, or *Cod. Coislinianus* (seventh century; in National Library, Paris) contains Heptateuch and Kings.

N-V, or *Cod. Basiliano-Venetus* (eighth or ninth century; partly in Venice and partly in Vatican) contains complete Gen., Ex., and part of Lev., and was used with B in the critical edition of LXX (Rome, 1587).

O, or *Cod. Dublinensis* (sixth century; in Trinity College, Dublin) contains fragments of Isaias.

Q, or *Cod. Marchalianus* (sixth century; in Vatican) contains Prophets, complete; is very important, and originated in Egypt. The text is probably Hesychian. In the margins are many readings from the Hexapla; it also gives many Hexaplaric signs.

R, or *Cod. Veronensis* (sixth century; at Verona) contains Gr. and Lat. Psalter and Canticles.

T, or *Cod. Zuricensis, the Zürich Psalter* (seventh century) shows, with R, the Western text; silver letters, gold initials, on purple vellum.

W, or *Cod. Parisiensis* (ninth century; in National Library, Paris) contains fragments of Psalms.

X, or *Cod. Vaticanus* (ninth century; in Vatican) contains the Book of Job.

Y, or *Cod. Taurinensis* (ninth century; in National Library, Turin) contains Lesser Prophets.

Z, or *Cod. Tischendorf* (ninth century) contains fragments of Kings; published by Tischendorf.

Γ, or *Cod. Cryptoferratensis* (eighth or ninth century; at Grottaferrata) contains fragments of Prophets.

Δ, or *Cod. Bodleianus* (fourth or fifth century; Oxford, in Bodl. Libr.) contains a fragment of Daniel.

Θ, or *Cod. Washington* (fifth or sixth century, to be in Smithsonian Institution), contains Deut.—Jos., found in Egypt, one of the Freer MSS. There are likewise seven uncial Psalters (two complete) of the ninth or tenth century and eighteen rather unimportant fragments listed by Swete (op. cit., p. 140).

(iii) Vellum Minuscule.—More than 300 are known but unclassified. The Cambridge Septuagint purposes to collate the chief of these minuscules and to group them with a view to discriminating the various recensions of the LXX. More than half of these MSS. are Psalters and few of them give the entire Old Testament. In editing his Alcalá Polyglot, Cardinal Ximenes used minuscules 108 and 248 of the Vatican.

(b) Aquila (see VERSIONS OF THE BIBLE).—MS. traces of the text of Aquila are found in: (i) fragments of Origen's third columns, written as marginal notes to some MSS., such as Q; (ii) the Milan palimpsest of the Hexapla, a most important tenth century copy found by Mercati in 1896. It contains about eleven Psalms, has no Hebrew column, and uses the space thereof for variant readings; (iii) the Cambridge fragment, seventh century, discovered in a Cairo *genizah*. It contains parts of Ps., xxi (see Taylor, "Cairo Genizah Palimpsests", 1900). The name *Jahweh* is written in old Hebrew letters. (iv) The Cairo fragments of the fourth and fifth centuries: three palimpsests (containing III Kings, xx, 7–17; IV Kings, xxiii, 11–27) published by Burkitt in 1897; and four portions of the Psalms (lxxxix, 17–xci, 10; xcv, 7–xcvi, 12; xcviii, 3; ci, 16–cii, 13) published by Taylor (op. cit.). (v) The fourth-century papyrus fragments of Gen., i, 1–5, published, 1900, by Grenfell and Hunt.

(c) Theodotion (see VERSIONS OF THE BIBLE).—The Book of Daniel of Theodotion is found in the LXX MSS. previously mentioned. The Milan palimpsest contains his text in part.

(d) Symmachus (see VERSIONS OF THE BIBLE).—MS. sources are the Milan palimpsest, Cambridge fragment, and Hexaplaric marginal notes, all of which are MS. sources of Aquila.

SWETE, *Introduction to the O. T. in Greek* (1900); KENYON, *Our Bible and the Ancient MSS.* (1898); NESTLE, *Septuagintastudien* (1886–1907); FIELD, *Origenis Hexaplorum quæ supersunt* (Oxford, 1875).

(3) *New Testament MSS.*—(a) In General.—There are, according to the latest authority on this subject, von Soden ("Die Schriften des N. T. in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt", Berlin, 1902), 2328 New-Testament MSS. extant. Only about 40 contain, either entire or in part, all the books of the New Testament. There are 1716 MS. copies of the Gospels, 531 of the Acts, 628 of the Pauline Epistles, 219 of the Apocalypse. The commonly received numeration of the New Testament MSS. is that of Wettstein; uncials are designated by Roman and Greek capitals, minuscules by Arabic numbers. These MSS. are divided into the above-mentioned four groups—Gospels, Acts, Pauline Epistles, Apocalypse. In the case of uncials, an exponent is used to designate the group referred to. D or D^{ev} is Cod. Bezæ, a MS. of the Gospels; D$_2$ or D*paul* is Cod. Claromontanus, a MS. of the Pauline Epistles; E$_2$ or E*act* is Cod. Laudianus, a MS. of the Acts. The nomenclature is less clear for minuscules. Each group has a different set of numbers. If a minuscule be a complete MS. of the New Testament, it is designated by four different numbers. One and the same MS. at Leicester is Evan. 69, Act. 31, Paul. 37, Apoc. 14. Wettstein's lists of New-Testament MSS. were supplemented by Birch and Scholz; later on



CODEX BEZÆ
Opposite Pages, Greek and Latin (Reduced)—Luke, vi, 1–9
MS. in Cambridge University Library

Scrivener and Gregory continued the lists, each with his own nomenclature. Von Soden has introduced a new numeration, so as to indicate the content and date of the MSS. If the content be more than the Gospels, it is marked δ (that is, διαθήκη, "testament"); if only the Gospels, ϵ (i. e., εὐαγγέλιον, "gospel"); if aught else save the Gospels, α (that is, ἀπόστολος). B is δ_1; ℵ is δ_2; Q is ϵ_4, etc. No distinction is made between uncials and minuscules. Scholars admit the logic and scientific worth of this new numeration, but find it too unwieldy and impracticable.

(b) Papyrus.—In the Archduke Rainer collection, Vienna, are several very fragmentary bits of New Testament Greek phrases, which Wessely, the curator of that collection, assigns to the second century. The Grenfell and Hunt excavations in Oxyrhyncus brought to light various fragments of the New Testament which Kenyon, the assistant keeper of the MSS. of the British Museum, assigns to the latter part of the third century. Only one papyrus MS. of the New Testament is important to the text-critic—Oxyrhyncus Pap. 657, third–fourth century; it preserves to us about a third of the Epistle to the Hebrews, an epistle in which Cod. B. is defective.

(c) Vellum Uncials.—There are about 160 vellum uncials of the New Testament; some 110 contain the Gospels or a part thereof. The chiefest of these uncials are the four great codices of the entire Greek Bible, ℵ, A, B, C, for which, see above. The Vatican (B) is the oldest and probably the best New Testament MS.

D. or *Cod. Bezæ* (q. v.) (fifth or sixth century; in University Library, Cambridge) contains Gospels and Acts in Gr. and Lat., excepting Acts, xxii, 29 to the end; it is a unique specimen of a Greek MS. whose text is Western, i. e. that of the Old Latin and Old Syriac.

D_2 or *Cod. Claromontanus* (probably sixth century; in Nat. Libr., Paris) contains Pauline Epistles in Gr. and Lat., each text independent of the other. Before Hebrews is a list of the books of the New Testament and the number of lines (*stichoi*) in each; this list omits Thess., Heb., and Phil., includes four apocryphal books, and follows an unusual order: Matt., John, Mark, Luke, Rom., I and II Cor., Gal., Eph., I and II Tim., Titus, Col., Philem., I and II Pet., James, I, II, and III John, Jude, Barnabas, Apoc., Acts, Hermas, Acts of Paul, Apoc. of Peter.

E, or *Cod. Basileensis* (eighth century; in Univ. Libr., Basle) contains the Gospels.

E_2, or *Cod. Laudianus* (sixth century; Oxford, in Bodl. Library) contains Acts in Gr. and Lat. The former is somewhat like D.

E_3, or *Cod. Sangermanensis* (ninth century; in Imper. Libr., St. Petersburg) contains Pauline Epistles in Gr. and Lat.; of same family as D_2.

F, or *Cod. Boreeli* (ninth century; at Utrecht), contains Gospels.

F_3, or *Cod. Augiensis* (ninth century; in Trinity College, Cambridge), contains Pauline Epp. in Gr. and Lat.; of the same family as D_2, E_2, and G_3.

G, or *Cod. Wolfii A* (ninth or tenth century; at Cambridge, and London), contains the Gospels.

G_3, or *Cod. Boernerianus* (ninth century; at Dresden), contains Paul. Epp. in Gr. and Lat.; text of D_2 type.

H, or *Cod. Wolfii B* (ninth or tenth century; at Cambridge and Hamburg), contains the Gospels.

H_2, or *Cod. Mutinensis* (ninth century; at Modena), contains Acts.

H_3, or *Cod. Coislinianus* (sixth century; originally at Mt. Athos where 8 leaves remain. Other parts were used for binding MSS; 22 leaves thus reached Paris; 3 each were discovered at St. Petersburg, Moscow and Kieff; 1 in Turin). This MS. gives us, in great part, a fourth-century text of Euthalius of Sulca.

K, or *Cod. Cyprius* (ninth century; in Nat. Libr., Paris), contains the Gospels.

K_2, or *Cod. Mosquensis* (ninth century; in Holy Synod Library, Moscow), contains Acts, Cath., and Paul. Epp.

L, or *Cod. Regius* (eighth century; in Nat. Libr., Paris), contains Gospels.

L_2, or *Cod. Angelicus* (ninth century; in Rome), contains Acts, Cath., and Paul. Epp.

M, or *Cod. Campianus* (ninth century; in Nat. Libr., Paris), contains Gospels.

M_2, or *Cod. Hamburgensis* (ninth century; in Hamburg and London), contains Paul. Epp.

N, or *Cod. Purpureus*, called also *Petropolitanus* (sixth century), contains Gospels in silver on purple vellum. About half the MS. is extant: 182 leaves (found in Asia Minor, 1896) are in St. Petersburg, 33 at Patmos, 6 in the Vatican, 4 in British Museum, and 2 in Vienna.

P, or *Cod. Guelferbytanus A* (sixth century; Wolfenbüttel), contains Gosp. fragments.

P_2, or *Cod. Porphyrianus* (ninth century; in St. Petersburg), contains Acts, Cath. and Paul. Epp.



Codex Claromontanus
Greek Page (Reduced)—Rom., vii, 4–7
MS. in Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris

Q, or *Cod. Guelferbytanus B* (fifth century; Wolfenbüttel), contains Gosp. fragments.

R, or *Cod. Nitriensis* (sixth century; in Brit. Mus., London), a palimpsest copy of Luke.

T, or *Cod. Borgianus* (fifth century; in Vatican), Gr. and Sahidic fragments. One has the double ending of Mark; another has 17 leaves of Luke and John, and a text akin to B and ℵ.

Z, or *Cod. Dublinensis* (sixth century; in Trinity Col., Dublin), a palimpsest containing 295 verses of Matt.; text probably Egyptian, akin to ℵ.

Δ, or *Cod. Sangallensis* (ninth or tenth century; at Saint-Gall), contains Gospels in Gr. and Lat.

Λ, or *Cod. Tischendorfianus III* (ninth century), Luke and John in Bodleian, Oxford; Matt. and Mark, written in cursives (Evan. 566), at St. Petersburg.

Σ, or *Cod. Rossanensis* (sixth century; at Rossano, in Calabria), contains Matt. and Mark, in silver letters on purple vellum with illustrations. N, Σ, Σ^b, and Φ are all akin and were probably produced at Constantinople from a single ancestor.

Σ^b, or *Cod. Sinopensis* (sixth century; in Nat. Libr., Paris), consists of 43 leaves (Matt., vii-xxiv), in gold letters on purple vellum with 5 illustrations; it was bought by a French naval officer for a few francs, at Sinope, in 1899, and is called also O and Π.

Φ_1, or *Cod. Beratinus* (sixth century; at Berat in Albania), contains Matt. and Mark.

ב, or *Cod. Patirensis* (fifth century; in the Vatican), contains Act., Cath. and Paul. Epp.

The *American MS. of the Gospels* (fifth century), found in Egypt, 1907, has not yet been published; nor have the fragments of the Pauline Epistles (sixth century) which were found at the same time.

(d) Vellum minuscules.—The vast numbers of minuscule witnesses to the text of the New Testament would seem to indicate a rich field of investigation for the text-critic. The field is not so rich at all. Many of these minuscules have never been fully studied. Ninety-five per cent. of them are witnesses to the same type of text, that of the *textus receptus*. Only those minuscules interest the text-critic which are distinctive of or akin to one of the great uncials. Among the Gospel minuscules, according to Gregory's numeration, the type of Bא is seen more or less in 33; 1, 118, 131, 209; 59, 157, 431, 496, 892. The type of D is that of 235, 431, 473, 700, 1071; and of the "Ferrar group", 13, 69, 124, 346, 348, 543, 713, 788, 826, 828. Among the Acts minuscules, 31 and 61 show some kinship to B; 137, 180, 216, 224 to D. 15, 40, 83, 205, 317, 328, 329, 393 are grouped and traced to the fourth century text of Euthalius of Sulca. Among the Pauline minuscules, this same text (i. e. that of H_3) is found in 81, 83, 93, 379, 381.

(e) Lectionaries.—There are some 1100 MSS. of readings from the Gospels (*Evangelia* or *Evangeliaria*) and 300 MSS. of readings from Acts and Epistles (*Praxapostoli*). Although more than 100 of these lectionaries are uncials, they are of the ninth century or later. Very few of these books of the Epistles and Gospels have been critically examined. Such examination may later on serve to group the New Testament minuscules better and help to localize them.

Scrivener, *Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament* (1894); Gregory, *Textkritik des N. T.* (1900); *Die Griechischen Handschriften des N. T.* (1908); Harris, *Further researches into the history of the Ferrar-group* (1900).

IV. Latin MSS.—Biblical MSS. are far more uniform in Greek than in Latin script. Palæography divides the Greek into uncials and minuscules; the Latin into uncials, semi-uncials, capitals, minuscules and cursives. Even these divisions have subdivisions. The time, place and even monastery of a Latin MS. may be traced by the very distinct script of its text.

(1) *Old Latin.*—Some 40 MSS. have preserved to us a text which antedates the translation of St. Jerome; they are designated by small letters. Unfortunately no two of these MSS. represent to us quite the same text. Corrections introduced by scribes and the inevitable influence of the Vulgate have left it a very difficult matter to group the Old Latin MSS. Text-critics now agree upon an African, a European and an Italian type of text. The African text is that mentioned by Tertullian (c. 150–220) and used by St. Cyprian (c. 200–258); it is the earliest and crudest in style. The European text is less crude in style and vocabulary, and may be an entirely new translation. The Italian text is a version of the European and was revised by St. Jerome in parts of the Vulgate. The most important Old Latin MSS. are the bilingual New Testament MSS. D, D_2, E_2, E_3, F_3, G_3, Δ.

a, or *Cod. Vercellensis* (fourth century; at Vercelli), containing the Gospels.

b, or *Cod. Veronensis* (fifth century; at Verona), containing Gospels on purple vellum. a and b are our chief witnesses to the European text of the Gospels.

e, or *Cod. Palatinus* (fifth century; at Vienna,—one leaf is in Dublin), contains the Gosp. For Acts, e is Lat. of E_2; for Paul. Epp., e is Lat of E_3.

f, or *Cod. Brixianus* (sixth century; at Brescia), contains Gosp. on purple vellum; Italian type, thought by Wordsworth and White to be the best extant representative of the Old Latin text which St. Jerome used when revising the New Testament.

ff_2, or *Cod. Corbeiensis* (fifth century; at Paris), contains the Gospels.

g, or *Cod. Gigas* (thirteenth century; at Stockholm), a complete Bible; Acts and Apoc. are in Old Latin text and are the chief representative of the European type.

h, or *Palimpsest de Fleury* (sixth century; at Paris), contains fragments of Acts, Cath., Ep. and Apoc.; African type.

k, or *Cod. Bobiensis* (fourth or fifth century; at Turin), contains Mark, viii–xvi, 8 and Matt., i–xv; earliest form of Old Latin, African type, closely akin to text used by Saint Cyprian.

q, or *Cod. Monacensis* (sixth or seventh century; at Munich), contains Gospels; Italian type of text.

Burkitt, *The Old Latin and the Itala* (Cambridge, 1896); Wordsworth, Sanday, and White, *Old Latin Biblical Texts* (Oxford, 1883–97); Gregory, *Textkritik des N. T.* (1900).

(2) *Vulgate* (q. v.).—It is estimated that there are more than 8000 MSS. of the Vulgate extant. Most of these are later than the twelfth century and have very little worth for the reconstruction of the text. Tischendorf and Berger designate the chief MSS. by abbreviations of the names: am.=Amiatinus; fu. or fuld.= Fuldensis. Wordsworth and White, in their critical edition of the Gospel and Acts (1899–1905), use Latin capitals to note the 40 MSS. on which their text depends. Gregory (Textkritik, II, 634) numbers 2369 MSS. The most logical and useful grouping of these MSS. is genealogical and geographical. The work of future critics will be to reconstruct the text by reconstructing the various types, Spanish, Italian, Irish, French, etc. The chief Vulgate MSS. are:—

A, or *Cod. Amiatinus* (q. v.) (eighth century; at Florence), contains complete Bible; text probably Italian, best extant MS. of Vulgate.

C, or *Cod. Cavensis* (ninth century; at La Cava, near Naples), a complete Bible; best representative of Spanish type.

Δ, or *Cod. Dunelmensis* (seventh or eighth century; in Durham Cathedral, England), Gospels; text akin to A.

F, or *Cod. Fuldensis* (A. D. 541–546; at Fulda, in Germany), a complete New Testament; Gospels are in form of Tatian's "Diatessaron". Bishop Victor of Capua found an Old Latin version of Tatian's arrangement and substituted the Vulgate for the Old Latin.

G, or *Cod. Sangermanensis* (ninth century; at Paris), contains the Bible. In Acts, Wordsworth uses it more than any other MS.

H, or *Cod. Hubertianus* (ninth century; in Brit. Mus., London), a Bible; Theodulfian type.

θ, or *Cod. Theodulfianus* (ninth century; at Paris), a Bible; Theodulfian type.

K, or *Cod. Karolinus* (ninth century; in Brit. Mus., London), a Bible; Alcuin's type. See V.

O, or *Cod. Oxoniensis* (seventh century; at Oxford, in Bodl.), contains Gosp.; text English, affected by Irish influences.

O_2, or *Cod. Oxoniensis*, or *Selden Acts* (eighth century; at Oxford, in Bodleian), contains Acts; Irish type.

Q, or *Cod. Kenanensis, Book of Kells* (q. v.) (eighth century; in Trinity College, Dublin), contains Gosp.; Irish type.

S, or *Cod. Stonyhurstensis* (seventh century; at Stonyhurst College, England), contains John; text akin to A and probably written near Durham.

V, or *Cod. Vallicellianus* (ninth century; at Rome, in Vallicelliana), a Bible; Alcuin's type. See K.

Y, or *Cod. Lindisfarnensis* (seventh century; in Brit. Mus., London), Gospels. Liturgical directions in text show it is a copy of a MS. written in Naples; text akin to A.

Z, or *Cod. Harleianus* (sixth or seventh century; in Brit. Mus., London), contains Epist. and Apoc.

Wordsworth and White, *Edition of the Vulgate* (1889–1905).

V. Syriac MSS.—(1) *Old Syriac* (*OS*).—The Curetonian and Sinaitic Syriac MSS. represent a version older than the Peshitto and bear witness to an earlier text, one closely akin to that of which D and the Old Latin are witnesses.

(a) The Curetonian Syriac (Syr-Cur) MS. was discovered in 1842, among MSS. brought to the British Museum from the monastery of S. Maria Deipara in the Nitrian desert in Egypt, and was published by Cureton in 1858. It contains five chapters of John, large portions of Matt. and Luke, and Mark, xvi, 17–20, enough to show that the last twelve verses were originally in the document. (b) The Sinaitic Syriac (Syr-Sin) was found by Mrs. Lewis and Mrs. Gibson, during 1892, in the monastery of St. Catherine on Mount Sinai. This palimpsest contains the Four Gospels in great part, though not entire; it is an earlier recension of the same version as Syr-Cur. Both are assigned to the fifth century and represent a Syriac version which cannot be later than A. D. 200.

(2) *The Diatessaron.*—This harmony of the Gospels was written by Tatian, an Assyrian and the disciple of Justin Martyr, about A. D. 170, and was widely used in Syria. Our MS. records are two Arabic versions, discovered one in Rome the other in Egypt, and published 1888. A Latin translation of an Armenian edition of St. Ephraem's commentary on the Diatessaron is in like manner witness to this early version of the Gospels. Scholars are inclined to make Tatian's to be the earliest Syriac translation of the Gospel.

(3) *The Peshitto.*—The earliest MS. of this Syriac Vulgate is a Pentateuch dated A. D. 464; this is the earliest dated Biblical MS.; it is in the British Museum. There are two New Testament MSS. of the fifth century. In all, the Peshitto MSS. number 125 of Gospels, 58 of Acts and Cath. Epp., 67 of Paul. Epp.

(4) *The Philoxenian Syriac* version of the New Testament has come down to us only in the four minor Catholic Epistles, not included in the original Peshitto, and in a single MS. of the Apoc., now at Trinity College, Dublin.

(5) *The Harklean Syriac* version of the New Testament is represented by some 35 MSS. dating from the seventh century and later; they show kinship with a text like to D.

(6) *The Palestinian Syriac* version of the New Testament has reached us by lectionaries and other fragmentary MSS. discovered within the past sixteen years. The three principal MSS. are dated A. D. 1030, 1104, and 1118.

Lewis, *The Four Gospels translated from the Sinaitic Palimpsest* (1894); Woods and Gwilliam in *Studia Biblica*, vols. I and III.

VI. Armenian MSS. date from A. D. 887, and are numerous.

VII. Coptic MSS.—(1) *Sahidic.*—The Apocalypse is the only book of the Old Testament which has come down to us complete in a single MS. of this dialect of Upper Egypt. Many isolated fragments have of recent years been recovered by excavation in Egypt; from these it may soon be possible to reconstruct the Sahidic New Testament. The earliest fragments seem to belong to the fifth century. Some of these MSS. are bilingual (see T of N. T. MSS.). (2) *Bohairic.*—This version in the dialect of Lower Egypt is well represented by MSS. of the same character as Bℵ. The Curzon Catena is the earliest extant Boh. MS. of the Gospels; it is dated A. D. 889 and is in the Parham Library. Others are of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. None is at all so old as the Sah. fragments. (3) *Middle Egyptian* fragments, on vellum and papyrus, have been found in Fayum and near to Akhmim and to Memphis. The largest of these fragments is a Brit. Mus. sixth-century palimpsest of John, iii and iv.

Crum, *Catalogue of Coptic MSS. in the British Museum* (London, 1905); Hyvernat, *Etude sur les versions coptes de la Bible* in *Rev. Bibl.* (1896).

Walter Drum.

Manuterge.—The name given to the towel used by the priest when engaged liturgically. There are two kinds of manuterges. One serves the needs of the sacristy. The priest uses this at the washing of hands before Mass, before distributing Communion outside of Mass, and before administering baptism. It can also be used for drying the hands after they have been washed on occasions not prescribed by the rubrics, but still customary after Mass. There are no prescriptions as to material and form for the towel used in the sacristy. It is usual to have it hanging over a roller, the two ends being sewn together so as to make it into a circular band. The custom of washing the hands before Mass appears to go back to the early days of Christianity; the ceremony is expressly mentioned in the sacramentaries of the ninth and tenth centuries.

The other manuterge is used in the Mass for drying both hands at the Lavabo, an action performed by the priest after the Offertory as he recites the psalm, "Lavabo", and also by the bishop before the Offertory and after the Communion. It is kept on the credence table with the finger-bowl and cruets. There are no ecclesiastical regulations regarding the form and material of this manuterge. The towel, which is used after the Offertory during the recital of the psalm "Lavabo", is usually small (18 in. by 14 in.), only the points of the thumb and two fingers, and not the whole hand, being usually washed (Ritus celebr., VII, n. 6). It usually has lace or embroidery at the ends. This second manuterge is mentioned in chap. v of the "Statuta antiqua" (fifth century): "Subdiaconus cum ordinatur . . . accipiat . . . de manu archidiaconi urceolum, aquamanile et manutergium" (when a subdeacon is ordained he shall receive from the hand of the archdeacon a water-pitcher, a finger-bowl, and a manuterge) is written regarding the rite used in bestowing the subdiaconate, a ceremony in practice, of course, to-day.

Braun, *Winke für die Anfertigung der Paramente* (Freiburg im Br., 1904), 72, 75; Bock, *Geschichte der liturgischen Gewänder* (Bonn, 1871), 23 sq.

Joseph Braun.

Manutius, Aldus (Aldo Manuzio), scholar and printer; b. in 1450, at Sermoneta, near Rome; died in 1515. He studied Latin at Rome and Greek at Ferrara. In 1482 he went to Mirandola, where he lived with his old friend, Giovanni Pico, continuing his Greek studies there for two years. He was appointed by Pico tutor to the latter's nephews, Alberto and Lionello Pio, Princes of Carpi.

At Carpi, in 1490, Aldus conceived his brilliant and original project of establishing a Greek press at Venice. The funds for this great undertaking were supplied by his former pupil, Alberto Pio. Between the years 1494 and 1515 thirty-three first editions of all the greatest Greek authors were issued from the Aldine press. Aldus's house became a gathering-place for the learned Greek scholars of the time. The men employed by him in his work were almost all Greeks, and the prefaces to his great editions were almost always written in Greek. Aldus's aim was to publish the best possible books at the lowest possible prices. The type used for his great library of Greek, Latin, and Italian authors, begun in 1501, was the italic, known as the Aldine, and said to have been adapted from the handwriting of Petrarch. It was cut by Francesco da Bologna, and had already been used (for the first time) in the edition of Virgil published in 1500. In 1493, or before that, the "Hero and Leander" of Musæus was published. This was followed by the

famous first edition of Aristotle, the first volume appearing in 1495, and the remaining four volumes in 1497 and 1498. The work was dedicated by Aldus to his patron, Alberto Pio.

In 1499 Aldus married the daughter of Andrea Torresano, of Asola, a Venetian printer. The two printing establishments were then combined and after that date the names of Aldus and Asolanus appeared on the title-pages of works from the Aldine Press. The device adopted by Aldus for the title-pages of his publications was the dolphin and anchor, with the motto, *Festina lente*. Within the next few years first editions of Aristophanes, Thucydides, Sophocles, Herodotus, Xenophon, Euripides, Demosthenes, Plato, Pindar, and others were produced at Venice. Besides these Greek authors, many Latin and Italian publications were put forth. In 1508 the great Dutch scholar, Erasmus, went to Venice and assisted in the publication of his "Proverbs" by the Aldine Press. In order to promote the study of Greek literature and the publication of Greek authors, Aldus, in 1500, founded the New Academy, or Aldine Academy of Hellenists. The members of this academy were required to speak Greek, and its rules were written in Greek. The organization comprised the most distinguished Greek scholars in Italy, who assisted Aldus in publishing the works of Greek and Latin authors. Under their direction the first Latin and Greek lexicon was given to the world.

Aldus Manutius

Aldus was succeeded in the management of his great printing establishment by his son, Paulus Manutius (Paolo Manuzio), b. at Venice in 1512. He died in 1574. The work was then carried on by the latter's son, Aldus, until his death in 1597.

Symonds, *Renaissance in Italy*, II (London, 1898); Sandys, *History of Classical Scholarship*, II (Cambridge, 1908), 98 sqq.; Didot, *Alde Manuce* (Paris, 1875). For chronology of the early Aldines, see Christie, *Bibliographica*, I (1895).

Edmund Burke.

Manzoni, Alessandro, Italian poet and novelist, b. at Milan, 7 March, 1785; d. 22 May, 1873. He was the son of Pietro Manzoni, the representative of an old feudal family of provincial landowners with estates near Lecco, and his wife Giulia, the daughter of Cesare Beccaria, the famous writer on political economy. Donna Giulia was separated from her husband in 1792. After his school-days under the Somaschi and the Barnabites, and a short stay at the University of Pavia, the poet grew up at Milan in mingled study and dissipation. In 1805, he joined his mother at Paris, where he imbibed Voltairean principles, and became intimate with Fauriel and others. At Milan, in 1808, he married Henriette-Louise Blondel, the daughter of a Swiss banker, who was a Protestant, and when, in 1810, she became a Catholic at Paris, Manzoni followed her back into the Church. Thenceforth his life was consecrated to religion, patriotism, and literature. He settled at Milan, the neighbourhood of which he practically never left, save for a visit to Tuscany in 1827 for the purpose of making himself better acquainted with what he regarded as the ideal form of the Italian language. His creative work was all done between 1812 and 1827, after which he was mainly absorbed in linguistic studies. Among his chief friends were the Milanese romantic writer, Tommaso Grossi, the Piedmontese novelist and statesman, Massimo d'Azeglio, who married his daughter, and the philosopher Antonio Rosmini, with whom he was closely associated from 1827 until the latter's death in 1855. An ardent patriot, Manzoni was in the fullest sympathy with the movement for the liberation and unification of Italy. After the occupation of Rome in 1870, he was made a Roman citizen; but, whether from old age or the religious difficulty, he never went to the Eternal City to take his seat as a senator.

Manzoni's earliest poem, "Il Trionfo della Libertà" (1801), an allegorical vision in the Petrarchian manner of liberty triumphing over tyranny and superstition, is markedly influenced by Vincenzo Monti, whom he claims as his master and hails as the greatest poet of the age. This and the poems that followed, "In morte di Carlo Imbonati" (1806) and "Urania" (1809), belong to the classical school of which Monti was the recognized head, and show the influence likewise of Parini and Alfieri. After his conversion, Manzoni's art changed no less than his life, and he became the chief representative of the romantic school, the principles of which he defended later in his letter "Sul Romanticismo" (1823 and 1871). At the same time he desired to make his work a literary defence of the Catholic Faith. He began a series of twelve "Inni Sacri" to celebrate the chief feasts of the Church, of which only five were written: "La Resurrezione" (1812), "Il Nome di Maria" and "Il Natale" (1813), "La Passione" (1815), "La Pentecoste" (1822). In these he brought back the old medieval simplicity into Italian religious poetry, freeing it from the conventionalities that had become traditional since the Renaissance. Two patriotic lyrics, celebrating the Milanese insurrection of 1814 and Murat's proclamation of Italian nationality at Rimini in 1815, belong to the same epoch. His two tragedies, "Il Conte di Carmagnola" (1820) and "L'Adelchi" (1822), are noble works, but somewhat lacking in true dramatic qualities; inspired in part by Schiller and Goethe, they give expression to the national aspirations of the Italians at a time when these seemed far off from realization. This poetic period closes with "Il Cinque Maggio" (1822), an ode on the death of Napoleon, which remains the most popular Italian lyric of the nineteenth century.

Alessandro Manzoni

"I Promessi Sposi", Manzoni's great masterpiece, was written between 1821 and 1825, and rewritten in 1840. Sir Walter Scott was not alone in regarding it as the greatest romance of modern times. Against the historical background of the Spanish oppression in Milan and the war of the Mantuan succession (1628–1630), we have the story of the love and fortunes of two young peasants, and a whole series of inimitable portraits of men and women painted with the art of a realist in the highest sense of the word. Earnestness of purpose is combined with a peculiarly delicate humour, and the author's moral intention, the application of Catholic morality to the study of life and history, is harmonized with his artistic instincts, and in no wise obtrudes itself upon the reader. Among Manzoni's minor prose works are the "Osservazioni

sulla morale cattolica" (1819), a defence of Catholicism against the attacks of Sismondi; the "Storia della Colonna infame" (1840), an historical appendix to his romance; the dialogue "Dell' Invenzione (1845); and an essay on the unity of the Italian language (1868). In his private life, Manzoni was under every aspect most admirable and exemplary; as a public character, he is the noblest figure in the Italian literature of the nineteenth century.

Opere di Alessandro Manzoni, ed. SCHERILLO AND SFORZA, (Milan, 1905, etc.); *Opere inedite o rare di Alessandro Manzoni*, ed. BONGHI (Milan, 1883–1898); SFORZA, *Scritti postumi di Alessandro Manzoni* (Milan, 1900); BONOLA, *Carteggio fra Alessandro Manzoni e Antonio Rosmini* (Milan, 1901); PRINA, *Alessandro Manzoni* (Milan, 1874); GUBERNATIS, *Alessandro Manzoni, studio biografico* (Florence, 1879); STOPPANI, *I primi anni di Alessandro Manzoni* (new ed., Milan, 1894); PETROCCHI, *I Promessi Sposi raffrontati sulle due edizioni del 1825 e 1840* (Florence, —); FORNACIARI, *Disegno storico della letteratura italiana* (Florence, 1898).

EDMUND G. GARDNER.

Map (sometimes wrongly written MAPES), WALTER, Archdeacon of Oxford, b. at, or in the vicinity of, Hereford, c. 1140; d. between 1208 and 1210. Belonging by birth to the Welsh Marches, he was in all probability Welsh by extraction, though the two languages through which he has become known in literature are medieval church Latin, and the so-called Norman-French spoken at the Court of Henry II of England as well as in the law courts of that age and country. At the age of fourteen Walter went to the University of Paris where he studied until 1160 under Girard la Pucelle. In 1162 he was at the Court of England. Henry made him a clerk of his household, which implies that Map had received, or was about to receive, Holy orders. After this the road to other preferments was open to him. He was the King's representative at the Third Lateran Council (1179), where he was appointed to dispute with the Waldensians. He held various benefices and at last, in 1197, he was made Archdeacon of Oxford. An unsuccessful effort to obtain the See of Hereford brought him into contact with St. Hugh, Bishop of Lincoln.

The place of Walter Map, however, is rather in the history of profane literature than in ecclesiastical history. As a churchman, though his life must have been respectable enough, his conversation can hardly have tended to edification, and he was the avowed enemy of the White Monks. Giraldus Cambrensis, his friend and admirer, states that in his oath as a king's justice, to do justice to all men, Map made a distinct exception of Jews and Cistercians, "who were just to none". Only one literary work can be attributed to him with certainty: "De Nugis curialium" (Courtiers' Triflings), a book of gossip, anecdote, and observation, written, regardless of form, on the suggestion of one Geoffrey, to set down his (Map's) sayings and doings that had not been committed to writing. It is also implied by Map that he wrote at the wish of Henry II, at whose court the work was composed. Besides this work in Latin, there is good reason to believe that the earliest prose "Lancelot" was based on a French poem of Walter Map (see LEGENDS, *Arthur*). Lastly, much of the "Goliardic" Latin satire on the clergy of that period has without sufficient reason been ascribed to him, the most noted among that class of writing being the "Confessio Goliæ" from which is taken the famous bacchanalian lyric begining "Mihi est propositum in taberna mori".

The chief original sources are the *De nugis curialium* and GIRALDUS CAMBRENSIS, *Opera*. Modern authorities are: WRIGHT in *Preface* to his edition of *De nugis curialium* (London, 1850); IDEM in *Preface* to *Latin Poems attributed to Walter Map* (London, 1841); KINGSFORD in *Dict. of Nat. Biogr.*, s. v.

E. MACPHERSON.

Maphrian.—The Syriac word *mafriano* signifies one who fructifies, a consecrator. It is used to designate the prelate who holds the second rank after the patriarch among the Jacobite Syrians. This ecclesiastical dignity goes back certainly to the seventh century and perhaps to the closing years of the sixth. When the theological school of the Persians at Edessa had been closed, first by Nonnus, successor of Ibas (457), and definitively by the Monophysite, Cyrus (489), Nestorianism triumphed in the Empire of the Sassanides. The few Persian Monophysites, like Xenaias (Philoxenus) of Tahal, were forced to go into exile. Xenaias became Bishop of Mabug (Hieropolis). In Persia, the town of Tagrit alone did not adopt the prevailing religion; it became the centre of the Monophysite missions at the commencement of the sixth century. The energetic James Baradæus ordained for the Persians a bishop, Ahudenuneh, who died a martyr in 575. But the efforts of the monk Maruthas were to be crowned with greater success. At one time from the monastery of Mar Mattai (near Nineveh), at another from Tagrit itself, he undertook fruitful missionary work among the Arabs and throughout the valley of the Tigris. He relied on the influence of Chosroes II's physician, Gabriel de Shiggar, who had completely won the confidence of the Christian queen, Shirin.

From time to time the Persian armies, which invaded the Roman territories so often at this period, would bring back a multitude of captives, Byzantines, Egyptians, Euphratesians or Edessans, mostly Jacobites. So in 628–9 it was judged suitable to organize the Monophysite Church in Persia. The Jacobite Patriarch of Antioch, Athanasius the Chancellor, saw that it would be necessary to grant the Syrians in the Persian Empire a large ecclesiastical autonomy. In fact one of the most serious objections raised by the Nestorians against the Monophysites was that the latter obeyed a spiritual head residing in Byzantine territory and that they were therefore inclined to become the subjects of the Emperor of Constantinople. Hence the Monophysites were frequently denounced at the Court of Seleucia as conspirators favouring the Romans. The Sassanides would then become incensed and persecute the Jacobites. Athanasius moreover knew certain canons which prescribed that the head of the "Oriental" Christians, namely the Persians, was alone entitled to consecrate "Oriental" bishops, and he was aware that these canons dated back to the very beginning of the Syrian Churches. He decided that the metropolitans of Tagrit, when ordained by him, would become autonomous and be sole rulers of the Monophysite churches in Persia. Maruthas had a dozen bishops subject to him. The fall of the Sassanide Empire which soon occurred did not change this arrangement. The Metropolitan of Tagrit received at a time which cannot be definitely fixed the title of "Mafriano".

The relations of the maphrian and the Jacobite Patriarch of Antioch were, despite several schisms, maintained harmoniously. In 869 it was decided that just as the patriarch consecrated the maphrian so the consecration of a new patriarch would be reserved to the maphrian. Within their own circumscriptions the maphrians had often disputes with the metropolitan of the monastery of Mar Mattai (near Nineveh) who was jealous of the preponderating influence of Tagrit. In 1089 the churches of that town having been destroyed by the Mussulmans, the maphrians abandoned it and settled in Mosul. From A. D. 1155 they generally resided at Mar Mattai while retaining an immediate jurisdiction over Tagrit and Nineveh. The only maphrian worthy of being specially mentioned is the celebrated Gregory Abulfaradj, surnamed Bar Hebræus (q. v.) (d. 1286), the most highly cultured man of his age. There has been preserved a history by him of his predecessors. This work was continued by his brother, and later by unscholarly annalists, and stops in the fifteenth century (1496). For a long time past the Jacobite Christians of the valley

of the Tigris have seriously decreased in numbers. The title of maphrian still exists, but the office has lost all its importance and dignity.

ASSEMANI, *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, I, 175; II, liv, 209, 214, 215; BAR HEBRAEUS, *Chronicon ecclesiasticum*, ed. ABBELOOS AND LAMY, II, part i, pref., p. xviii; part iii, epilogue; *Vie de Maruta*, ed. by NAU; LABOURT, *Le christianisme dans l'empire Perse* (Paris, 1904).

J. LABOURT.

Maran, PRUDENTIUS, a learned Benedictine of the Maurist Congregation, b. 14 October, 1683, at Sézanne, in the Department of Marne; d. 2 April, 1762, at Paris. After studying humanities at Paris he became a Benedictine at the abbey of St. Faron near Meaux on 30 January, 1703, and continued his studies at the abbey of St. Denis. He was then sent to St. Germain-des-Prés to collaborate with his confrere Touttée in the edition of the works of St. Cyril of Jerusalem. In 1734 he was forced to leave St. Germain-des-Prés at the instance of Cardinal Bissy, who suspected him of keeping his confreres from accepting the Bull "Unigenitus". After spending a year at the abbey of Orbais, he was sent to St. Martin de Pontoise and in 1737 he was transferred to the abbey of Blancs-Manteaux, where he spent the remainder of his life. His profound knowledge of theology and patristics is attested by the learned and exhaustive introductions which he prefixed to his critical editions of Greek and Latin Fathers as well as by his other literary productions.

His masterpiece is the edition of the works of St. Justin: "Justini philos. et martyris opera quæ extant omnia necnon Tatiani, Athenagoræ, S. Theophili, Hermiæ" (Paris, 1742; P. G., IV). He further edited the works of St. Cyril of Jerusalem which had been prepared by Touttée: "S. Cyrilli Hieros. opera" (Paris, 1720; P. G., XXXIII); the works of St. Cyprian which had been begun by St. Baluze: "S. Cypriani opera", to which he prefixed a basic life of St. Cyprian (Paris, 1726, P. L., IV); the third volume of the works of St. Basil, the two first volumes of which had been completed by Garnier (Paris, 1730). His other works, all anonymous, are "Dissertation sur les Sémiariens" (Paris, 1722); "Divinitas domini nostri Jesu Christi manifesta in scripturis et traditione" (Paris, 1746; new ed., Würzburg, 1859); "La divinité de Jésus Christ prouvée contre les hérétiques et les déistes", 3 vols. (Paris, 1751); "La doctrine de l'écriture et des pères sur les guérisons miraculeuses" (Paris, 1754); "Les grandeurs de Jésus Christ avec la défense de sa divinité" (Paris, 1756).

TASSIN, *Hist. litt. de la congrég. de Saint-Maur* (Brussels, 1770), 741–9 (Germ. tr., Frankfurt, 1773), II, 541–553; LE CERF, *Bibliothèque hist. et crit. des auteurs de la congrég. de Saint-Maur* (The Hague, 1726), 293–8; LAMA, *Bibl. des écrivains de la Congrég. de Saint-Maur* (Munich and Paris, 1882), 180–2; HURTER, *Nomenclator Literarius*, IV, 3rd ed. (Innsbruck, 1910), 1452–5.

MICHAEL OTT.

Maranatha. See ANATHEMA.

Maranhao. See SAO LUIZ DO MARANHAO, DIOCESE OF.

Marash, an Armenian Catholic Diocese. The ancient name of this village was most probably Germanicia, the seat of a titular see (see Vol. VI, 475). A patriarch resided here under Alexis Comnenus, shortly after which the country fell into the hands of the Armenian princes. It then passed into the power of the Crusaders, who established there a countship dependent on that of Edessa. The Seljuks captured it in 1155, and after various changes of masters it belonged from the sixteenth century to the Osmanli Turks. The town, built on the slopes of Ahour-dagh, is watered by numerous water-courses, tributaries of Pyramus. It numbers 52,000 inhabitants, nearly 15,000 of whom are Catholics: Armenians, Chaldeans, Latins, Melchites, and Syrians; there are besides about 10,000 schismatic Christians, the greater number being Armenians. Many of these depend on the American Protestant mission. The Catholic diocese contains 6000 faithful, 12 native priests, 6 parishes or stations, 5 schools. The Armenian Sisters of the Immaculate Conception have an establishment, as have the Franciscans for the Latin Catholics. The town, which is a sandjak of the vilayet of Aleppo, has a very bad reputation. The Christians suffered particularly at the hands of the Mussulmans in 1895 and 1909.

CUINET, *La Turquie d'Asie*, II (Paris, 1892), 226–39; DU CANGE, *Les familles d'outre-mer* (Paris, 1869), 391 sq.; *Missiones catholicæ* (Rome, 1907), 755.

S. VAILHÉ.

Maratta, CARLO, Italian painter, b. at Camerino, in the March of Ancona, 13 May, 1625; d. in Rome, 15 December, 1713. From very early years Maratta showed an extraordinary skill in design, and was sent by his patrons to Rome to study under Andrea Sacchi, with whom he remained for many years, and for the rest of his life regarded as his greatest friend and benefactor. After a while he returned to his own part of Italy, and then in 1650, in company with the governor of Ancona, Cardinal Albrizio, who had very much admired his talent, he came again to Rome, and was introduced to Alexander VII, who at once gave him many commissions, and eventually, at the request of Sacchi, the important one for a painting of Constantine destroying the idols for the Baptistery of the Lateran. This was one of his greatest works, and increased his popularity at the Vatican. In 1704 he was knighted by Clement XI, and given the Order of Christ, while in the same year he was created painter in ordinary by Louis XIV of France, who had seen his picture of Daphne and greatly admired it. It was during his residence in Rome that Maratta was styled Maratti by the Romans, and his name is frequently written in that form, although originally it was as we have given it. The painter was a member of the Academy of St. Luke in Rome, and was not only a skilful artist but extremely clever at cleaning and repairing frescoes, and was employed by Clement XI to carry out such work as was necessary for the Raphael frescoes in the Vatican. He was also a clever etcher, using the tool with much freedom and spirit.

His pictures are very numerous. There are several in the Louvre and others in Berlin, Munich, Vienna, Brussels, Rome, Florence, St. Petersburg, and in the National Gallery, Hampton Court, and at Devonshire House in England. As a portrait painter he takes high place. He was also a skilful architect, and responsible for the designs of several buildings. His religious pictures are marked by a certain strength and nobility, coupled with a gracious harmony. He was not so skilful in arranging drapery, and was a little disposed to exaggerate the details and accessories, breaking in upon the general effect of his pictures, but this fault is less seen in his portraits than in his Madonna groups and religious compositions.

VASARI, *Le Vite dei Pittori* (Milanese ed., Florence, 1878, 1885); *Allgemeines Kunstler-Lexicon* (Frankfort, 1898); LANZI, *Storia Pittorica della Italia* (Bassano, 1806); DOMINICI, *Vite dei Pittori* (Naples, 1742); CONCA, *Descrizione Odeporica della*

CARDINAL GIULIO ROSPIGLIOSI, AFTERWARDS POPE CLEMENT IX

CARLO MARATTA, PINAKOTHEK, MUNICH

Spagna (Palma, 1793); PALOMINO DE CASTRO Y VELASCO, *El Museo Pictórico y Escala* (Madrid, 1715).

GEORGE CHARLES WILLIAMSON.

Marbodius, Bishop of Rennes, ecclesiastical writer and hymnologist, b. about 1035 at Angers, France, d. there 11 September, 1123. He received his early education at Angers under Rainaldus, a disciple of Fulbert of Chartres. After teaching some time at the cathedral school of Angers, he was put at the head of the educational system of the city and Diocese of Angers by Bishop Eusebius Bruno in 1067. Later he became archdeacon and in 1096 Urban II appointed him Bishop of Rennes. In his youth he indulged in many excesses, but from the time he became bishop his life was without reproach. In 1104 he was present at the Council of Tours, and in 1109 Bishop Rainaldus of Martigne made him administrator of the Diocese of Angers while he himself made a journey to Rome. At the age of eighty-eight he resigned his diocese and withdrew to the Benedictine monastery of St. Aubin at Angers where he died soon after. His works were first published at Rennes in 1524. A new and enlarged edition was published by Beaugendre (Paris, 1708), reprinted in P. L. They comprise many lives of saints, various epistles and some elegantly written hymns. A French translation of his hymns was edited by Ropartz (Rennes, 1873).

ERNAULT, *Marbode, évêque de Rennes, sa vie et ses ouvrages* (Rennes, 1890); FERRY, *De Marbodi rhedonensis episcopi vita et carminibus* (Paris, 1899); *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, X, 343–392. Concerning his hymns see BLUME AND DREVES, *Analecta hymnica*, I (Leipzig, 1907), 388 sq.

MICHAEL OTT.

Marca, PIERRE DE, French bishop and scholar, b. at Gan in Béarn, 24 Jan., 1594, of a family distinguished in the magistracy; d. at Paris, 29 June, 1662. After studying letters at the college of Auch and law in the University of Toulouse, he became councillor (1615), and then president (1621), of the Parliament of Pau, and finally intendant of Béarn (1631), where his influence greatly helped to restore the Catholic religion almost extinguished by the queen, Jeanne d'Albret. His wife, who had borne him four children, died in 1631, and from that moment he used all his spare time in studying and in writing works on religious controversy, history—notably the "Histoire de Béarn"—and canon law. For the sake of utilizing his ecclesiastical learning, Louis XIII summoned him to Paris to be a member of the Council of State (1639). At Cardinal Richelieu's request he published the treatise "Concordia sacerdotii et imperii" (1641), in which he sets forth his Gallican views. After ten years of pious and laborious life as a widower, he decided to enter the priesthood. On 28 Dec., 1641, the king made him Bishop of Couserans (Gascogny), but he was not preconized until ten years later, after having seen his "Concordia" placed on the Index and having signed a retractation of the views there expressed. Sent as intendant to Catalonia, which had submitted to France (1644), he wrote its history, under the title of "Marca Hispanica"; this work was published after his death by his secretary, the learned Baluze. Shortly after his return from Catalonia, Marca was made Archbishop of Toulouse (28 May, 1652), and when Innocent X condemned Jansenism in 1653, he used his influence to have the condemnation accepted. After that he inspired the chief measures taken against this heresy in the general assemblies of the clergy (1655–60) and received from Pope Alexander VII (1656) a highly commendatory letter. Less commendable, however, was his attitude when Louis XIV caused the arrest of Cardinal de Retz, Archbishop of Paris, for his share in the uprising of the Fronde. In opposition to the pope and clergy who were offended by this violation of ecclesiastical immunities, Marca became the king's counsellor, and wrote several pamphlets, some of them anonymous, defending the Crown. After the submission and resignation of Cardinal de Retz, Marca was given the Archbishopric of Paris, but died about three weeks after being preconized. He left a great reputation as historian, jurist, and canonist, but his theological learning was deficient, and his subservience to the royal power excessive. He displayed a certain inconstancy in his opinions, and too much ambition and attachment to his own interests.

Among his numerous publications the most important are: "Histoire de Béarn", folio (Paris, 1640); "De concordia sacerdotii et imperii seu de libertatibus ecclesiæ gallicanæ", folio (Paris, 1641) (and other editions); "Marca hispanica seu limes hispanicus", published by Baluze, folio (Paris, 1688). Some "Lettres inédites de Marca" have been published by Tarizey de Larroque (Paris, 1881) and by J. Bonnet in the "Revue de Gascogne", January–June, 1910.

BALUZE, *Vita illustrissimi viri Petri de Marca archiepiscopi Parisiensis*, at the beginning of the editions of *Concordia* after 1663; DE FAGET, *Vita illustrissimi et reverendissimi Petri de Marca* in *Petri de Marca dissertationes posthumæ;* DUBARAT, *Notice biographique sur Pierre de Marca* (Pau, 1896).

ANTOINE DEGERT.

Marcellina, SAINT, only sister of St. Ambrose of Milan, b. about 330–5; d. about 398. She was older than St. Ambrose, and was born most probably at Trier, where her father resided as *præfectus prætorio Galliarum*. Even before her father's death she went to Rome, the home of her family, and, before her mother's arrival at the capital with her two sons, had already forsaken the world, elected to live a life of Christian virginity, and devoted herself to the practices of piety and asceticism. On Christmas Day, probably in 353, she received the veil of consecrated virginity from the hand of Pope Liberius. The advice, which the pope addressed to her on this occasion, has been preserved by St. Ambrose (De virginibus, III, i–iii), especially emphasized being the obligations of Christian virgins to preserve virginal purity. After Ambrose had become Bishop of Milan (374), he summoned his sister thither, and found in her a zealous assistant in fostering and extending the ascetic life among the maidens of Milan. To her Ambrose dedicated his work on virginity, written in 377 ("Libri III de virginibus ad Marcellinam" in P. L., XVI, 187–232). Marcellina survived her brother, and died in 398 or shortly afterwards. She also was buried in the crypt under the altar of the Ambrosian Basilica, and was honoured as a saint. Her feast is celebrated on 17 July.

Laudatio Marcellinæ in MOMBRITIUS, *SS.*, II, 95–7; *Acta SS.*, IV, July, 231–8; BIRAGHI, *Vita della vergine romana-milanese S. Marcellina, sorella di S. Ambrogio* (4th ed., Milan, 1889); SEPTIMIUS A LAUDE ET ALANUS DE MACULANIS, *Dissert. hist. de tumulo S. Marcellinæ virg. sororis S. Ambrosii in eiusdem imperiali basilica humatæ* (Milan, 1725). See also bibliography to AMBROSE, SAINT.

J. P. KIRSCH.

Marcellinus, SAINT, POPE, date of birth unknown; elected 30 June, 296; died 304. According to the "Liber Pontificalis" he was a Roman, son of a certain Projectus. The Liberian Catalogue of popes (ed. Duchesne, "Lib. Pont." I, 6–7) gives 30 June as the day of his election, and the years 296–304 as the time of his pontificate. These dates, accepted by the author of the "Liber Pontificalis", are verified by that ancient source. Nothing has been handed down concerning the activities of this pope in his reign of eight years. We learn from the Roman deacon Severus's epitaph in the Catacomb of Callistus (De Rossi, "Roma Sotterranea", III, 46 tav. V) that at that time new burial chambers were made in the chief cemetery of the Roman Church. Severus says that he had laid out a double *cubiculum* with *luminare* and *arcosolium*, "jussu papæ sui Marcellini". This happened before the outbreak of the great Diocletian persecution; for in this the Callistus Catacomb was

confiscated, like the other public meeting-places of the Roman community. De Rossi assumes that the Christians blocked up the principal galleries of the catacomb at this time, to protect from desecration the tombs of the numerous martyrs buried there. The Diocletian persecution, whose severe edicts against the Christians were executed by Maximianus Herculeus, caused the greatest confusion in the Roman Church after 303. Marcellinus died in the second year of the persecution and, in all probability, a natural death. No trustworthy sources of the fourth or fifth century mention him as a martyr. His name does not occur either in the list of martyrs or the bishops in the Roman "Chronograph" of the year 354. Neither is he mentioned in the "Martyrologium Hieronymianum". The "Marcellinus episcopus" on 4 Oct. in "Codex Bernensis" (ed. De Rossi-Duchesne, 129) is probably not identical with the pope. In mentioning Marcellinus, Eusebius uses an obscure expression; he merely says: "the persecution also affected him" (*ὃν καὶ αὐτὸν κατείληφεν ὁ διωγμὸς* "Hist. Eccl.", VII, 32). From this one must obviously conclude that the pope did not suffer martyrdom, otherwise Eusebius would have distinctly stated it. There were even later reports in circulation that accused him of having given up the sacred books after the first edict, or even of having offered incense to the gods, to protect himself from the persecution. But the sources in which this reproach is clearly stated are very questionable.

The Donatist Bishop Petilianus of Constantine in Africa asserted, in the letter he wrote in 400 and 410, that Marcellinus and the Roman priests Melchiades, Marcellus, and Sylvester (his three successors) had given up the sacred books, and had offered incense. But he could not adduce any proof. In the Acts of confiscation of the church buildings at Rome, which at the great Carthaginian conference between Catholics and Donatists, were brought forward by the latter, only two Roman deacons, Straton and Cassius, were named as traitors. St. Augustine, in his replies to Petilianus, disputes the truth of the latter's report ("Contra litteras Petiliani", II, 202: "De quibus et nos solum respondemus: aut non probatis et ad neminem pertinet, aut probatis et ad nos non pertinet"; "De unico baptismo contra Petilianum", cap. xvi: "Ipse scelestos et sacrilegos fuisse dicit; ego innocentes fuisse respondeo"). One can only conclude from Petilianus's accusation that such rumours against Marcellinus and Roman priests were circulated in Africa; but that they could not be proved, otherwise St Augustine would not have been able to assert the innocence of the accused so decidedly, or safely to have referred to the matter at the Carthaginian conference. But even in Rome similar stories were told of Marcellinus in certain circles, so that in two later legendary reports a formal apostasy was attributed to this pope, of course followed by repentance and penance. The biography of Marcellinus in the "Liber Pontificalis", which probably alludes to a lost "passio" of his, relates that he was led to the sacrifice that he might scatter incense, which he did. But after a few days he was seized with remorse, and was condemned to death by Diocletian with three other Christians, and beheaded. It is clear that this report attempts to combine a rumour that the pope had offered incense to the gods, with the fact that, in other circles he was regarded as a martyr and his tomb venerated.

At the beginning of the sixth century, rather later than this "passio Marcellini", a collection of forged documents appeared, which were manufactured in the dispute between Pope Symmachus and Laurentius. Among them are also found apocryphal Acts of an alleged synod of 300 bishops, which took place in 303 at Sinuessa (between Rome and Capua), in order to inquire into the accusation against Marcellinus that he had sacrificed at Diocletian's order. On the first two days Marcellinus had denied everything, but on the third day he admitted his lapse and repented; however the synod passed no sentence on him "quia prima sedes non judicatur a quoquam". When Diocletian learnt of the occurrence, he had the pope and several bishops of this synod executed (Hefele, "Konziliengeschichte", I, 2 Aufl. 143–45). The spuriousness of these acts is almost certain. The forger has made the most of the rumour of Marcellinus's lapse for his own purposes in a different way from the author of the "passio", which crept into the "Liber Pontificalis". These apocryphal fragments cannot by themselves be considered as historical proofs, any more than the rumours in Donatist circles in Africa. It is accepted as certain that the pope did not comply with the imperial edict by any overt act, such as the surrender of the sacred writings, or even the offering of incense before the statue of a god. Such an apostasy of a Roman bishop would without a doubt have been given the greatest prominence by contemporary authors. Eusebius has not made use of the above mentioned idea. And later, Theodoret was still less in a position to state in his "Church History", that Marcellinus had been prominent in the persecution *τον ἐν τῷ διωγμῷ διαπρέψαντα* (Hist. Eccl., I, 2). And Augustine also would not have been able to assert so curtly in answer to Petilian, that Marcellinus and the priests accused with him as traitors and "lapsi" were innocent.

On the other hand it is remarkable, that in the Roman "Chronograph" whose first edition was in 336, the name of this pope alone is missing, while all other popes from Lucius I onwards are forthcoming. In the MS. there is indeed under 16 Jan. (XVIII kal. Feb.) the name Marcellinus, but this is clearly a slip of the pen for "Marcellus"; for the feast of this pope is found both in the "Martyrologium Hieronymianum" and in the old liturgical Roman books under this date, while in the "Liber Pontificalis" and, in connection therewith, in the historical martyrologies of the ninth century, the feast of Marcellinus is transferred to 26 April (Acta SS., June, VII, 185). By certain investigators (Mommsen, de Smedt) the lack of Marcellinus's name was traced to the omission of a copyist, owing to the similarity of the names, and in the "Depositio Episcoporum" they claimed to supplement the "Chronograph": XVII kal. Febr. Marcelli in Priscillæ; VI kal. Maii Marcellini in Priscillæ (de Smedt, "Introductio in hist. eccl. critice tractandam", 512–13). But this hypothesis is not accepted. The dates of the death of the popes, as far as Sylvester in the list of successions, are identical with the days of the month on which their feasts are celebrated. Thus Marcellinus must come first after Gaius, whose name is quoted under the date X kal. Maii. Then Marcellinus is lacking not only in the "Chronograph", but also in the "Martyrologium Hieronymianum", and in all fifth and sixth century lists of popes. This omission is therefore not accidental, but intentional.

In connection with the above mentioned rumours and the narratives of apocryphal fragments, it must indeed be admitted that in certain circles at Rome the conduct of the pope during the Diocletian persecution was not approved. In this persecution we know of only two Roman clerics who were martyred: the priest Marcellinus and the exorcist Petrus. The Roman bishop and the other members of the higher clergy, except the above clerics, were able to elude the persecutors. How this happened we do not know. It is possible that Pope Marcellinus was able to hide himself in a safe place of concealment in due time, as many other bishops did. But it is also possible that at the publication of the edict he secured his own immunity; in Roman circles this would have been imputed to him as weakness, so that his memory suffered thereunder, and he was on that account omitted by the author of the "Depositio Episcoporum" from

the "Chronograph", while he found a place in the "Catologus Liberianus", which was almost contemporary. But his tomb was venerated by the Christians of Rome, and he was afterwards recognized as a martyr, as the "passio" shows. Marcellinus died in 304. The day of his death is not certain; in the "Liber Pontificalis" his burial is wrongly placed at 26 April, and this date is retained in the historical martyrologies of the ninth century, and from them, in the later martyrologies. But if we calculate the date of his death from the duration of his office given in the Liberian Catalogue, he would have died on 24 or 25 Oct., 304. His body was interred in the Catacomb of Priscilla on the Via Salaria, near the crypt where the martyr Crescentius found his resting-place. The Catacomb of Callistus, the official burial place of the Roman Church, where the predecessors of Marcellinus were buried during several decades, was evidently confiscated in the persecution, while the Catacomb of Priscilla, belonging to the Acilii Glabriones, was still at the disposal of the Christians.

The tomb of Marcellinus was venerated at a very early date by the Christians of Rome. The precise statements about its position, in the "Liber Pontificalis", indicate this. In one of the seventh century itineraries of the graves of the Roman martyrs, in the "Epitome de locis ss. martyrum", it is expressly mentioned among the sacred graves of the Catacomb of Priscilla (De Rossi, "Roma sotterranea", I, 176). In the excavations at this catacomb the crypt of St. Crescentius, beside which was the burial chamber of Marcellinus, was satisfactorily identified. But no monument was discovered which had reference to this pope. The precise position of the burial chamber is therefore still uncertain. The lost "passio" of Marcellinus written towards the end of the fifth century, which was utilized by the author of the "Liber Pontificalis", shows that he was honoured as a martyr at that time; nevertheless his name appears first in the "Martyrology" of Bede, who drew his account from the "Liber Pontificalis" (Quentin, "Les martyrologes historiques", 103, sq.). This feast is on 26 April. The earlier Breviaries, which follow the account of the "Liber Pontificalis" concerning his lapse and his repentance, were altered in 1883.

Liber Pontificalis, ed. DUCHESNE, I, 6, 7, 162–163; cf. *Introduction*, LXXIV sq. XCIX; *Acta Sanct.*, April, III, 412–415, 999–1001; DE CASTRO, *Difesa della causa di S. Marcellino I, Pont. Rom.* (Rome, 1819); LANGEN, *Geschichte der römischen Kirche*, I, 370–372; ALLARD, *Histoire des persécutions*, IV, 376–379; DUCHESNE, *Histoire ancienne de l'Eglise*, II, 92 sq.; MARUCCHI, *Il sepolcro del papa Marcellino nel cimitero di Priscilla* in *Nuovo Bull. di archeol. crist.* (1907), 115 sq.

J. P. KIRSCH.

Marcellinus, FLAVIUS, date of birth unknown; d. 12 September, 413. He was a high official (*tribunus et notarius*) at the court of Emperor Honorius, and possessed the confidence of his imperial master owing to his good sense, and unblemished conduct. In 411 Honorius sent him to Africa as plenipotentiary judge, to preside and pass sentence at the great conference between the representatives of the Catholics and the Donatists, which began on 1 June of the same year and lasted several days. Marcellinus, who had conducted the negotiations with great patience and entire impartiality, decided in favour of the Catholics, whereupon new imperial decrees were published against the Donatists. The great interest which the imperial envoy showed in theological and religious questions, brought about close and friendly relations between him and St. Augustine, who wrote him several letters, and dedicated various books to him ("De peccatorum meritis et remissione", "De baptismo parvulorum", the first three books of "De Civitate Dei"). St. Jerome also wrote him a letter. In 413 Marcellinus and his brother Apringius were imprisoned by Marinus, who had crushed the rising of Heraclianus, as being alleged supporters and partisans of the latter. Jerome says the Donatists falsely accused him out of hatred (Adv. Pelagium, III, 6). Although St. Augustine interceded for him, and several other African bishops came forward in his favour, he was beheaded 12 September, 413, by order of Marinus; the latter was soon after called away from Africa, and in the edict of 30 August, 414, which regulated the carrying out of the decrees against the Donatists, Marcellinus was referred to with honour. His name is in the Roman Martyrology, and his feast is celebrated on 6 April as that of a martyr.

Acta SS., April, I, 539–42; *Dict. Christ. Biog.*, III, 806–7; LECLERCQ, *L'Afrique chrétienne*, II (Paris, 1904), 107–8, 139–40.

J. P. KIRSCH.

Marcellinus Comes, Latin chronicler of the sixth century. He was an Illyrian by birth, but spent his life at the court of Constantinople. Under Justin I (518–527) Marcellinus was chancellor to Justinian, the Emperor's nephew already chosen as his successor. When Justinian succeeded to the throne (527–565), his chancellor remained in favour and obtained various high places in the government. Otherwise little or nothing is known of his life. He died apparently soon after 534. The only surviving work of Marcellinus is his chronicle (Annales), one of the many continuations of Eusebius. It covers the period from 379 to 534. First he brought it down to 518, then he added a continuation to 534, as he says himself in the work. An unknown writer added a continuation down to 566. Although the work is in Latin, it describes almost exclusively the affairs of the East. The author says truly that he has "followed only the Eastern Empire". The few facts about Western Europe, taken from Orosius's "Historia adv. paganos" and Gennadius's "De viris illustribus", are introduced only in as much as they relate in some way to Constantinople. On the other hand the chronicle is filled with unimportant details and anecdotes about that city and its court. Contemporary Church history is described fully as far as the East is concerned. Marcellinus is uncompromisingly orthodox and has no good word to say of any of the heretics who appear in his pages. He is often inaccurate. He mentions Theodoret of Cyrus in 466, whereas that person died ten years earlier. Cassiodorus (De Institut. divinis, XVII) mentions two other works of this author, four books "De temporum qualitatibus et positionibus locorum"; and a "most exact description of the cities of Constantinople and Jerusalem in four little books". Both are lost.

Marcellinus's "Annales" were first published at Paris in 1546 (by A. Schonhovius); again by J. Sirmond (Paris, 1619); in the Lyons "Maxima Bibliotheca veterum Patrum" (1677), IV, 517; in Gallandi's "Bibliotheca veterum Patrum", X, 343; and in "P. L.", LI, 917. The best text is that of Mommsen in his "Chronica minora" in "Monum. Germ. hist. auct. antiquiss." (Berlin, 1894), IX, pp. 37 sq. The work is used by Jordanis the Goth (d. c. 560).

HOLDER-EGGER, *Die Chronik des Marcellinus comes* in *Neues Archiv für ältere deutsche Geschichte* (1876), 250–253; IDEM, *Die Chronik des Marcellinus comes u. die oströmischen Fasten. ib.* (1877), 49–109; BURY, *Hist. of the Later Roman Empire* (London, 1889); KRUMBACHER, *Gesch. d. byzant. Lit.* (2nd ed., Munich, 1896).

ADRIAN FORTESCUE.

Marcellinus of Civezza (in the world PIETRO RANISE), O.F.M., modern Franciscan author, born at Civezza in Liguria, Italy, 29 May, 1822; d. at Leghorn, 27 March, 1906. He entered the order of the Friars-Minor in the Roman province, receiving the habit at Cori, 1 Feb., 1838. He completed his philosophical-theological studies at Tivoli and Lucca. In 1844 he obtained the degree of Lector (Professor) in philosophy, and in the following year, 17 May, was ordained priest. For some years he taught at Tivoli, Ferentino, Viterbo, Aracœli in Rome; in 1854 he retired to Recco

in his native province of Genoa. By order of Bernardino Trionfetti, minister-general of the Friars-Minor, Marcellinus in 1856 was entrusted with the gigantic task of writing the history of the Franciscan missions, to which the greater part of his life was devoted, and for which he undertook great journeys all over Europe, bringing home great literary treasures, especially from the libraries and archives of Spain. Later on he resided mostly at Prato and at Rome, engaged in the publication of his works. From 1881 to 1889 Marcellinus was definitor-general of his order, and finally in 1899 he retired to the convent of Leghorn, where he peacefully died. During his long literary career Marcellinus made the acquaintance of many prominent men, with whom he carried on a large correspondence, preserved in the convent of Leghorn. He enjoyed also the high esteem of Leo XIII, to whom he dedicated some of his works.

The total number of books and brochures published by Marcellinus amounts to between seventy and eighty. Though his method was not always strictly scientific, he has the undeniable merit of having aroused interest in Franciscan history and literature, which of late has spread so widely. Only a few of his most important works can be mentioned here: (1) "Storia universale delle Missioni Francescane" (Rome, Prato, Florence, 1857–1895), 11 vols. in 8vo. A French version of this work was begun by Victor-Bernardin de Rouen, O.F.M., 4 vols. (Paris, 1898–99); (2) "Saggio di Bibliografia geografica, storica, etnografica Sanfrancescana" (Prato, 1879), 8vo; (3) "Epistolæ Missionariorum Ordinis S. Francisci ex Frisia et Hollandia" (Quaracchi, 1888), 8vo; (4) two periodicals: (a) "Cronaca delle Missioni Francescane", 6 vols. 8vo (Rome, 1860–66; Fr. trans., Louvain, 1861–67); (b) "Le Missioni Francescane in Palestina ed in altre regioni della Terra", 8 vols. 8vo (Rome, Florence, Assisi, 1890–97); (5) "Il Romano Pontificato nella Storia d'Italia", 3 vols. 8vo (Florence, 1886–87); (6) "Fratris Johannis de Serravalle Ord. Min. . . . translatio et commentum totius libri Dantis Aldigherii, cum textu italico Fratris Bartholomæi a Colle eiusdem Ordinis" (Prato, 1891), in fol.; (7) "La Leggenda di San Francesco, scritta da tre suoi Compagni (*legenda trium Sociorum*) pubblicata per la prima volta nella vera sua integrità" (Rome, 1899; Fr. trans. by Arnold Goffin, Brussels, 1902). Numbers (3), (4b), (6), (7) were published with the collaboration of Father Theophil Domenichelli, O.F.M., his inseparable friend.

Domenichelli, *In Memoria del P. Marcellino da Civezza* (Florence, 1906); *Acta Ordinis Fratrum Minorum, XXV* (Quaracchi, 1906), 263–64.

Livarius Oliger.

Marcello, Benedetto, b. in Venice in 1696; d. at Brescia in July, 1739. Marcello's life was a strange mixture of the political and the artistic. In 1730 he became Proveditore of Pola, but his health failed here and he assumed the duties of Camerlengo at Brescia. He furnished the libretto of Ruggieri's "Arato in Sparta". The library at San Marco in Venice possesses the manuscript copy of his well known "Teoria Musicale" and in the Royal Library of Dresden are original copies of "Il Timoteo" and "La Cassandra". The Royal Library at Brussels has preserved the MS. copy of "Il Trionfo della Musica nel celebrarsi la morte di Maria Vergine". His great "Paraphrase of the Psalms" is his best work though his settings of the Salve Regina, the Miserere, and the Lamentations of Jeremias contain features of deep interest to the student of the history of music. The "Paraphrase" appeared in instalments, the first publication being in 1724. His collaborator was the poet Giustiniani.

Burney, *General History of Music*, IV; Grove, *Dictionary of Music;* Bingley, *History of the Musicians of 16th & 17th Centuries*, II.

William Finn.

Marcellus I, Saint, Pope, date of birth unknown; elected pope in May or June, 308; d. in 309. For some time after the death of Marcellinus in 304 the Diocletian persecution continued with unabated severity. After the abdication of Diocletian in 305, and the accession in Rome of Maxentius to the throne of the Caesars in October of the following year, the Christians of the capital again enjoyed comparative peace. Nevertheless, nearly two years passed before a new Bishop of Rome was elected. Then in 308, according to the "Catalogus Liberianus", Pope Marcellus first entered on his office: "Fuit temporibus Maxenti a cons. X et Maximiano usque post consulatum X et septimum" ("Liber Pontif.", ed. Duchesne, I, 6–7). This abbreviated notice is to be read: "A cons. Maximiano Herculio X et Maximiano Galerio VII [308] usque post cons. Maxim. Herc. X et Maxim. Galer. VII [309]" (cf. de Rossi, "Inscriptiones christ. urbis Romæ", I, 30). At Rome, Marcellus found the Church in the greatest confusion. The meeting-places and some of the burial-places of the faithful had been confiscated, and the ordinary life and activity of the Church was interrupted. Added to this were the dissensions within the Church itself, caused by the large number of weaker members who had fallen away during the long period of active persecution and later, under the leadership of an apostate, violently demanded that they should be readmitted to communion without doing penance. According to the "Liber Pontificalis" Marcellus divided the territorial administration of the Church into twenty-five districts (*tituli*), appointing over each a presbyter, who saw to the preparation of the catechumens for baptism and directed the performance of public penances. The presbyter was also made responsible for the burial of the dead and for the celebrations commemorating the deaths of the martyrs. The pope also had a new burial-place, the *Cœmeterium Novellæ* on the Via Salaria (opposite the Catacomb of St. Priscilla), laid out. The "Liber Pontificalis" (ed. Duchesne, I, 164) says: "Hic fecit cymiterium Novellae via Salaria et XXV titulos in urbe Roma constituit quasi dicœcesis propter baptismum et pœnitentiam multorum qui convertebantur ex paganis et propter sepulturas martyrum". At the beginning of the seventh century there were probably twenty-five titular churches in Rome; even granting that, perhaps, the compiler of the "Liber Pontificalis" referred this number to the time of Marcellus, there is still a clear historical tradition in support of his declaration that the ecclesiastical administration in Rome was reorganized by this pope after the great persecution.

The work of the pope was, however, quickly interrupted by the controversies to which the question of the readmittance of the *lapsi* into the Church gave rise. As to this, we gather some light from the poetic tribute composed by Damasus in memory of his predecessor and placed over his grave (De Rossi, "Inscr. christ. urbis Romæ", II, 62, 103, 138; cf. Idem, "Roma sotterranea", II, 204–5). Damasus relates that the truth-loving leader of the Roman Church was looked upon as a wicked enemy by all the lapsed, because he insisted that they should perform the prescribed penance for their guilt. As a result serious conflicts arose, some of which ended in bloodshed, and every bond of peace was broken. At the head of this band of the unfaithful and rebellious stood an apostate who had denied the Faith even before the outbreak of persecution. The tyrannical Maxentius had the pope seized and sent into exile. This took place at the end of 308 or the beginning of 309 according to the passages cited above from the "Catalogus Liberianus", which gives the length of the pontificate as no more than one year, six (or seven) months, and twenty days. Marcellus died shortly after leaving Rome, and was venerated as a saint. His feast-day was 16 January, according to the "Depositio episcoporum"

of the "Chronography" of 354 and every other Roman authority. Nevertheless, it is not known whether this is the date of his death or that of the burial of his remains, after these had been brought back from the unknown quarter to which he had been exiled. He was buried in the catacomb of St. Priscilla, where his grave is mentioned by the itineraries to the graves of the Roman martyrs as existing in the basilica of St. Silvester (De Rossi, "Roma sotterranea", I, 176)

A fifth-century "Passio Marcelli", which is included in the legendary account of the martyrdom of St. Cyriacus (cf. Acta Sanct., Jan., II, 369) and is followed by the "Liber Pontificalis", gives a different account of the end of Marcellus. According to this version, the pope was required by Maxentius, who was enraged at his reorganization of the Church, to lay aside his episcopal dignity and make an offering to the gods. On his refusal, he was condemned to work as a slave at a station on the public highway (*catabulum*). At the end of nine months he was set free by the clergy; but a matron named Lucina having had her house on the Via Lata consecrated by him as "titulus Marcelli" he was again condemned to the work of attending to the horses brought into the station, in which menial occupation he died. All this is probably legendary, the reference to the restoration of ecclesiastical activity by Marcellus alone having an historical basis. The tradition related in the verses of Damasus seems much more worthy of belief. The feast of St. Marcellus, whose name is to this day borne by the church at Rome mentioned in the above legend, is still celebrated on 16 January. There still remains to be mentioned Mommsen's peculiar view that Marcellus was not really a bishop, but a simple Roman presbyter to whom was committed the ecclesiastical administration during the latter part of the period of vacancy of the papal chair. According to this view, 16 January was really the date of Marcellinus's death, the next occupant of the chair being Eusebius (Neues Archiv, 1896, XXI, 350–3). This hypothesis has, however, found no support.



SARCOPHAGUS OF MARCELLUS II (IV CENTURY)
Vatican Basilica, Rome

Liber Pontif., ed. DUCHESNE, I, 164–6; cf. Introduction, xcix–c; *Acta SS.*, Jan., II, 369; LANGEN, *Gesch. der röm. Kirche*, I, 379 sqq.; ALLARD, *Hist. des persécutions*, V, 122–4; DUCHESNE, *Hist. ancienne de l'Eglise*, II, 95–7.

J. P. KIRSCH.

Marcellus II, POPE (MARCELLO CERVINI DEGLI SPANNOCHI), b. 6 May, 1501, at Montepulciano in Tuscany; d. 6 May, 1555, at Rome. His father, Ricardo Cervini, was Apostolic treasurer in the March of Ancona. After studying some time at Siena, he came to Rome, shortly after the accession of Clement VII, in 1523, to continue his studies, and through his purity of life and longing for knowledge gained the respect and friendship of many persons of high influence. Paul III, who had succeeded Clement VII in 1534, appointed him prothonotary apostolic and papal secretary. When, in 1538, Paul III entrusted his youthful nephew, Cardinal Alessandro Farnese, with practically the complete management of the temporal affairs of the Church, the prudent and virtuous Cervini was appointed the adviser and private secretary of the young and inexperienced cardinal and as such had a great influence in the papal curia. He accompanied Farnese on his various legations, and in order that he might take actual part in the consultations and negotiations between Farnese and the monarchs of Europe, he was created cardinal-priest of the title of Santa Croce in Gerusalemme, 19 December, 1539. He had already been appointed to the See of Nicastro, in addition to which he became administrator of the Diocese of Reggio the following year, and that of Gubbio in 1544. In 1539 he accompanied Farnese on an important legation to Charles V of Germany and Francis I of France. The purpose of this legation was to induce the two monarchs to send the prelates of their countries to the intended General Council of the Church and to gain their assistance against Henry VIII of England and the Turks.

They had an audience with Francis I at Amiens on 9 February, 1540, and with the emperor at Ghent on the twenty-fourth of the same month, but their mission proved useless. They were already returning to Rome when Cervini received orders from the pope to stay as legate at the imperial court and to represent him at the Diet which the emperor wished to convene at Speyer. When, however, it became evident that the Protestants would be predominant at the Diet and had no desire to come to an understanding with the Catholics, the pope counteracted his order and sent no representative to the Diet which in the meantime had been transferred to Hagenau. In October, 1540, Cervini returned to Rome, not, however, before he had urgently requested the pope to send a representative to the intended Diet of Worms. In a consistory held at Rome on 6 February, 1545, he was appointed one of the three presidents of the Council of Trent. His two colleagues were Cardinals Giovanni Maria del Monte (afterwards Julius III) and Reginald Pole. On 13 March, 1545, he arrived at Trent. During the first period of the Council, i. e. from its opening session on 13 December, 1545, until its prorogation for an indefinite period at Bologna on 14 September, 1547, he fearlessly represented the interests of the pope and the Church against all opposition from the emperor, whose extreme hatred he in consequence incurred. In 1548 he succeeded Agostino Steuco as librarian of the Vatican with the title of "Bibliothecæ Apostolicæ Vaticanæ Protector". Under his protectorate the Vatican library was soon put in a flourishing condition. More than 500 Latin, Greek and Hebrew volumes were added, and new catalogues of the Greek and Latin manuscripts were prepared. As early as 1539 he had induced the pope to have printed at least the most valuable Greek manuscripts. Cervini's public activity was less prominent during the pontificate of Julius III (1550–5). He was replaced as president of the Council of Trent by Marcello Crescenzi in the hope that the emperor would give his support to the presidents of the Council.

After the death of Julius III (23 March, 1555), the

cardinals present in Rome, 39 in number, entered the conclave on 4 April, and four days later Cardinal Marcello Cervini was elected pope, although the emperor had instructed his cardinals to prevent his election. Contrary to custom, Cervini, like Adrian VI, retained his old name of Marcello and was called Marcellus II. On the following day, 10 April, he was consecrated bishop, for, though he had administered the Dioceses of Nicastro, Reggio, and Gubbio, he had not yet received episcopal consecration. He was crowned pope on the same day, but without the customary solemnity, on account of the Lenten season. The new pope had been one of those cardinals who were desirous of an inner reform of the Church. While administrator of Reggio he undertook a thorough visitation of the diocese in 1543, and abolished abuses wherever they were found. Immediately upon his accession he took the work of reform in hand; he died after a reign of only 22 days, of a sickness resulting from overexertion during the pontifical functions of Holy Week and Easter. Palestrina entitled one of his famous polyphone masses "Missa Papæ Marcelli" in his honour. This mass was not, however, as is often asserted, chanted in the presence of Marcellus II; it was not composed until after the death of this pope.

POLYDORUS, *De vita gestis et moribus Marcelli II, Papæ* (Rome, 1744); PASTOR, *Geschichte der Paepste seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalters*, V (Freiburg im Br., 1909), passim; EHSES, *Concilium Tridentinum*, I (Freiburg im Br., 1909), IV (1904), passim; *Nuntiaturberichte aus Deutschland nebst ergaenzenden Aktenstuecken*, V, October, 1539–November, 1540 (Gotha, 1908), passim, especially 249 sq.; see also bibliography under TRENT, COUNCIL OF.

MICHAEL OTT.

Marcellus of Ancyra, one of the bishops present at the Councils of Ancyra and of Nicæa, a strong opponent of Arianism, but in his zeal to combat Arius adopting the opposite extreme of modified Sabellianism and being several times condemned, dying deprived of his see c. A. D. 374. A few years after the Council of Nicæa Marcellus wrote a book against Asterius, a prominent Arian. In this work he maintained that the trinity of persons in the Godhead was but a transitory dispensation. God was originally only One Personality, but at the creation of the universe the Word or Logos went out from the Father and was God's Activity in the world. This Logos became incarnate in Christ and was thus constituted Son of God. The Holy Ghost likewise went forth as third Divine Personality from the Father and from Christ according to St. John, xx, 22. At the consummation of all things, however (I Cor., xv, 28), Christ and the Holy Ghost will return to the Father and the Godhead be again an absolute Unity. The bishops at Jerusalem having condemned his works, Marcellus was first deposed at Constantinople in 336 at a council under the presidency of Eusebius of Nicomedia, the Arian, and Basil of Ancyra appointed to his see. Marcellus sought redress at Rome from Julius I, who in the autumn of 340 declared Marcellus innocent of the charges brought against him, and reinstated him in his see. Constantius, when threatened by his brother, allowed the restoration of Athanasius, Marcellus and others to their sees in 348. Marcellus' return was resisted by the populace of Ancyra, but he succeeded in occupying his see for a few years, only to be finally deposed by the Macedonian faction at Constantinople and succeeded by Basil, c. 353. St. Athanasius himself at last recognized Marcellus' heterodoxy; Pope Damasus likewise, in 380, and the Second General Council pronounced against him. Eusebius of Cæsarea wrote against him two works: "Contra Marcellum", an exposition of Marcellus' doctrine, and "On the Theology of the Church," a refutation of Marcellus.

ZAHN, *Marcellus of Ancyra* (Gotha, 1867); LOOFS, *Sitzber. der Berlin. Academie* (Berlin, 1902), 764 sqq.

J. P. ARENDZEN.

March, AUZIAS, Catalan poet, b. perhaps in the last quarter of the fourteenth century, at Valencia; d. there in 1458. He is the greatest lyric poet of the older period of Catalan literature, and among foreigners is one of the best to realize the spirit of Petrarch's love lyric. A knowledge of Dante's work is also apparent in his poetical imagery, which rises superior to that of the troubadour poetry still written by March's contemporaries. According to report, March was a soldier of fame and took part in the expedition of Alfonso V of Aragon against Naples; this report needs verification. He certainly came of a noble stock, and seems to have contracted marriage twice. His extant poems consist of ninety-three love songs (or *Cants d'amor*) and eight death songs or elegies (*Cants de mort*), besides some moralizing poems (*Cants morals*), a long *Cant espiritual*, and a brief "Demanda feta a la Senyora Na Tecla de Borja". The lady celebrated in the love lyrics is said to have been a fair gentlewoman of Valencia, Teresa Bou (or Monboy), whom March met for the first time—even as Petrarch had met his Laura—in church on a Good Friday. Following Petrarch's example, the Catalan poets sings her not only in life, but also in death. In these compositions March reveals himself as a genuine poet, in spite of the occasional obscurity of his lines. It is to be remembered also to his credit that the Catalan language was a very imperfect medium for poetical expression when he began to write, so that he had many difficulties to overcome when seeking to give utterance to subtle poetic thought such as Petrarch had set down in the far more supple Italian. In the "Cants morals" he brings an indictment against the contemporary society for its materialism and sinfulness; while in the "Cant espiritual" he arraigns himself for his own shortcomings. The "Demanda" is a poetical epistle of slight account. It is a notable fact that in his own time March was already lauded as a great poet by the well-informed Castilian, the Marquis of Santillana. In the sixteenth century his lyrics were translated twice into Castilian, first by Baltasar de Romani (printed in 1539, four years before the first edition of the original Catalan text), and again by Jorge de Montemayor. His influence is clear in a number of the leading poets writing in Spanish in the same century, such as Boscan, Garcilaso de la Vega, and Mendoza.

Among modern editions of the work of March see that of Barcelona, 1864, and that also of Barcelona, of 1888, neither of which is very good. Cf. RUBIO Y ORS, *Ausias M. y su época* (Barcelona, 1862); PAGES, *Documents inédits relatifs à la vie d'A.M.* in *Romania*, XVII, 186; MOREL-FATIO in GRÖBER, *Grundriss der roman. Philologie*, II, ii, 79; and DENK, *Einführung in die Geschichte der altcatalanischen Litteratur* (Munich, 1893), 567 sqq. (a book to be used with caution).

J. D. M. FORD.

March, JOHN. See HARBOR GRACE, DIOCESE OF.

Marchand, JEAN BAPTISTE, second principal in order of succession of the Sulpician College of Montreal and missionary of the Detroit Hurons at Sandwich, Ont.; b. at Verchères, Que., 25 Feb., 1760, son of Louis Marchand and Marguerite de Niverville; d. at Sandwich, 14 Apr., 1825. Marchand was ordained 11 March, 1786, affiliated to the Sulpician Seminary of Montreal, 21 Oct., 1788, and thereupon named principal of what is now called Montreal College. This institution was cradled in the presbytery of M. Jean Baptiste Curateau de la Blaiserie, S.S., parish priest at Longue Pointe, an outlying village; the first students having been received there about the year 1767. It was removed to the city 1 Oct., 1773, and installed in the old Château Vaudreuil, Jacques Cartier Square, where it was known as St. Raphael's College until 1803 when the Château was destroyed by fire. M. Marchand's administration of St. Raphael's lasted till 1796, when the death occurred of M. François Xavier Dufaux, S.S., missionary to the Hurons at Assumption Parish opposite Detroit, at what is now Sandwich, and

M. Marchand was chosen to succeed him. It was during M. Marchand's administration in 1801, that Mgr. Denaut, Bishop of Quebec, made the first episcopal visitation recorded in the parish, and confirmed some five hundred persons. He at the same time gave M. Marchand an assistant in the person of Rev. Félix Gratien, who was recalled in 1806 to fill the chair of philosophy in the Quebec Seminary. M. Marchand toiled on, unaided for the most part, for all but thirty years, and died at his post among his beloved Indians.

TANGUAY, *Répertoire Général du Clergé Canadien;* HUGUET-LATOUR, *Annuaire de Ville Marie.*

ARTHUR EDWARD JONES.

Marchant, PETER, theologian, b. at Couvin, a village in the principality of Liège, in 1585; d. at Ghent, 11 Nov., 1661. His brother James was the author of the well-known work "Hortus Pastorum". Peter entered the Franciscan Order in 1601. He led an austere life and was a strict observer of the Franciscan Rule. He acquired a profound knowledge of Scholastic philosophy and theology and for several years taught in the schools of his order. In 1625 he was elected definitor general of the order at the general chapter held in Rome; and in 1639 was appointed commissary general over the provinces of Germany, Belgium, Holland, Great Britain, and Ireland. His duties as commissary general brought him into contact with Irish politics during the troublesome times of the "Confederation of Kilkenny". Unfortunately he allowed himself to be deceived by false reports on the true state of affairs in Ireland and he took sides with the Ormondists and gave encouragement to Peter Walsh and his supporters in their opposition to the nuncio Rinaccini. He was called upon by the authorities of the order to justify his conduct in connexion with the Irish question, and in 1661 he addressed to the general chapter then assembled in Rome his *apologia* under the title of "Relatio veridica et sincera status Provinciae Hiberniæ", etc. This is a very rare book, as it was never widely circulated and was condemned by the general chapter and ordered to be destroyed.

PETER MARCHANT

Marchant was a voluminous author. His chief work is "Tribunal Sacramentale" (3 vols., Ghent, 1642; Antwerp, 1672), for the use of confessors. It contains a full exposition of moral theology. He puts aside all disputed opinions, and simply states the doctrinal teaching of the Church, drawing his proofs from Holy Scripture, the decisions of councils, the constant tradition of the Church, and the writings of the saints. The treatise on Probabilism is lucid and complete. Its principles are in accordance with the restrictions placed on the doctrine later on by the decrees of Alexander VII and Innocent XI; and in many points is identical with the doctrine subsequently propounded by Daniel in his refutation of the "Lettres Provinciales". Marchant wrote several works on the cultus of St. Joseph. His work intituled "Sanctificatio S. Joseph Sponsi Virginis in utero asserta" (Bruges, s. d.), was placed on the Index, 19 March, 1633. He also wrote "Baculus Pastoralis sive Potestas Episcoporum in Regulares exemptos ab originibus suis explicata" (Bruges, 1638); "Resolutiones notabiles variorum casuum et quæstionum a multis hactenus desideratæ" (Antwerp, 1655). Many of his works are on the history and legislation of the Franciscan Order.

WADDING-SBARALEA, *Scriptores Ord. Min.* (Rome, 1806); JOANNES A S. ANT., *Bibliotheca Univ. Franciscana* (Madrid, 1732); FOPPENS, *Bibliotheca Belgica* (Brussels, 1739); DIRKS, *Histoire littéraire*, etc. (Antwerp, 1885); *Contemporary History of Affairs in Ireland*, ed. GILBERT (Dublin, 1879–80).

GREGORY CLEARY.

Marchesi, POMPEO, a Lombard sculptor of the neoclassic school, b. at Saltrio, near Milan, 7 August, 1790; d. at Milan, 6 February, 1858. He studied in Rome under Canova and received much encouragement from his master. The greater part of his life was spent in Milan, where for many years he was professor of sculpture at the Academy. He executed a great number of groups in marble and portrait busts. One of his earliest works was a colossal statue of St. Ambrose, patron of the city; for the Arco della Pace (Simplon commemorative arch), completed 1838, he made the reliefs of Terpsichore and Venus Urania. He decorated the façade of the Castello with twelve figures of great Italian captains, and that of the Palazzo Saporiti with reliefs in modern classic style. One of his best-known compositions is the group of the "Mater Dolorosa", in the church of San Carlo, at which he laboured many years. Works outside of Milan are the colossal statue of Charles Emmanuel III at Novara; that of Philibert Emanuel of Savoy at Turin; the sitting figure of Goethe for the library at Frankfort; two statues of the Emperor Francis I of Austria, one made with the assistance of Manfredoni, for Goritz, and another, unassisted, for the Hofburg at Vienna. He also executed the monument to Volta at Como; the monument of the singer Malibran; others to Beccaria and Bellini and a bust of Professor Zuccala for the Atheneum of Bergamo.

BOCCARDO, *Nuova Enciclopedia Italiana*, XIII (Turin, 1882); BAEDEKER, *Guide Book for Italy* (New York, 1904).

M. L. HANDLEY.

Marchi, GIUSEPPE, archæologist, b. at Tolmezzo near Udine, 22 Feb., 1795; d. at Rome, 10 Feb., 1860. He entered the Society of Jesus at Rome 12 November, 1814, shortly after the re-establishment of the order and was professor of humanities successively in the colleges of Terni, Reggio-Emilia, Modena, and St. Andrew of the Quirinal. After completing his course and making his religious profession (1833) he became professor of rhetoric in the Roman College and held this position until 1842. Meanwhile, he devoted his leisure to study, applying himself through choice to profane antiquities. In 1838 he was made prefect of the Kircher Museum which office he retained until his death. He soon gave special attention to Christian antiquities, hoping thus to find a means of restoring Christian art. In 1840 he announced his intention of collecting into one large publication the monuments of Christian architecture, painting, and sculpture. His archæological pursuits recommended him to Gregory XVI as qualified to succeed Settele in the position of "Conservatore dei sacri cimiteri di Roma" (1842). About this time Marchi made the acquaintance of youthful Giovanni Battista De Rossi, who accepted him as master and thenceforth accompanied him on his visits to the catacombs. These ancient cemeteries had been deplorably abandoned but thereafter were more accessible and could be studied on the ground. In 1844 Marchi published the first volume of his "Monumenti", devoted to the construction of the catacombs, especially that of St. Agnes. He proved the Christian origin of these ancient burial-places and, through his studies, was brought about (21 March, 1845) the discovery of the crypts of Saints Peter and Hyacinth in the catacomb of St. Hermes. To De

Rossi, however, was reserved the honour of the great discoveries in the Roman catacombs. He knew better than Marchi how to make use of ancient topographical data and all the resources of learning. Marchi was appointed Consultor of the Congregation of the Index in 1847 and several years later (1854) he took part in the creation of the Lateran Museum of which, with de Fabris, he became director. In July, 1855, his labours were interrupted for the first time by a stroke of apoplexy, to which he succumbed in 1860. The notes intended for the continuation of the "Monumenti" were lost, but some of them were found by Father Bonavenia and made known at the Second Congress of Christian Archæology at Rome (1900). These recovered documents were destined for the second volume of the "Monumenti", which was to treat of the non-cemeterial Christian architecture of Rome. The full titles of his works are: "Musei Kircherniani Inscriptiones ethnicæ et christianæ" (Milan, 1837); "L'aes grave del Museo Kircheriano, ovvero le monete primitive dei popoli dell' Italia media," in collaboration with P. Tessieni (Rome, 1839); "Monumenti delle arti cristiane primitive nella metropoli del cristianesimo: I. Architettura della Roma sotteranea cristiana" (Rome, 1844).

CELI, *Giuseppe Marchi, S.J. dopo cinquant' anni* in *Civiltà Cattolica*, I, 1910, 308–322; 447–465.

R. MAERE.

Marcian (MARCIANUS, Μαρκιᾶνος), Roman Emperor at Constantinople, b. in Thrace about 390; d. January, 457. He became a soldier; during his early life he was poor, and it is said that he arrived at Constantinople with only two hundred pieces of gold, which he had borrowed. He served in the army under Ardaburius the Alan and his son Aspar; he distinguished himself in the wars against the Persians and Huns. Aspar was a kind of king-maker, and general-in-chief for the East (*magister militum per orientem*), also for a time the most powerful man at Constantinople. But since he was a foreigner and an Arian he could not be emperor himself. Instead he placed a succession of his favourites on the throne. One of these was Marcian. At Constantinople Marcian became a senator and was a well-known and popular person. He was a widower; his daughter by the first marriage, Euphemia, afterwards married Anthemius, Emperor in the West (467–472). He was about sixty years old when Theodosius II died (450).

Theodosius II (408–450) had succeeded his father, Arcadius (395–408), as a young child. During the greater part of his reign his elder sister Pulcheria managed the Government. Already during the reign of Theodosius Pulcheria was "Augusta". With her two sisters, Arcadia and Marina, she made a public vow of celibacy. When her brother died all difficulty about the succession was ended by the unanimous choice of her (who had long really guided the State) as empress. Thus began the reign of Pulcheria. Wishing to strengthen her position (it was the first case of a woman succeeding to the Roman throne) she at once made a nominal marriage with Marcian. He seems to have been the best person she could have chosen; the friendship of Aspar as well as his own reputation had long pointed him out for some high place. It is said that Theodosius on his death-bed had told him: "It has been revealed to me that you will succeed me." Marcian was crowned by the patriarch, 25 August, 450. It is the first instance of the religious ceremony of coronation, imitated later in the West, and was to have far-reaching consequences. The first act of the new reign was the trial and execution of Chrysaphius, a eunuch and court favourite long unpopular, who had brought Theodosius to a humiliating apology and the payment of a large fine by an unsuccessful conspiracy to murder Attila. Marcian belonged to the party of reform, of which the founder, under Theodosius, had been Anthemius. As soon as he became emperor he began a policy of moderation, especially in taxation, that made his reign prosperous and himself popular, though he did little by force of arms to repress the ever-encroaching Huns and other enemies of Rome.

He reduced the expenses of the treasury and Court, and did away with the *gleba*, or *follis*, an oppressive tax on property that was specially obnoxious to the upper classes. There was a harsh system by which any senator might be forced to accept the unwelcome honour of the *prætura*. As a prætor he was obliged to live at Constantinople during his time of office, and spend large sums on providing games and shows. This was specially hard on senators who lived in the provinces, who had therefore to come to the capital and live for months there at ruinous expense. Marcian modified this law so as to excuse people living away from the city, and he ordered the consuls to take their share of the expenses. He reformed the navy on a more economical basis. There were at that time frequent earthquakes, by which whole cities were destroyed. In these cases Marcian and Pulcheria came to the help of the sufferers generously with supplies from the imperial treasury.

Marcian had a conscientious idea of the responsibilities of his office. In the second *novella* of his code he defines his view of an emperor's duty: "It is our business to provide for the care of the human race." And he was conscious of the distress caused by the excessive taxation and general maladministration of his predecessors. The first *novella* announces that complainants have flocked to the Government from all sides, there are "endless crowds of petitioners"; this is because of the want of "integrity and severity" in the judges. Marcian's laws are well-meant and successful attempts to cope with these difficulties. A very popular measure was his refusal to pay to Attila the tribute that had been paid regularly by Theodosius II. This refusal both saved a great expense and restored the dignity of the empire that had been degraded by so great a humiliation. As the Huns were just beginning their quarrel with the Franks, they could not afford to go to war with the empire. No doubt Marcian knew this when he defied them.

But the chief event of this reign was the beginning of the great Monophysite quarrel and the Council of Chalcedon. Marcian was conspicuously pious and orthodox. As soon as he was crowned he wrote a very friendly and respectful letter to Pope Leo I (440–461), whom he calls the guardian of the Faith, asking for his prayers, and declaring himself anxious to support the council proposed by the pope (*σοῦ αὐθεντοῦντος*) in order to settle the question raised by Eutyches, Dioscurus, and their friends (ep. lxxiii among St. Leo's letters; Mansi, VI, 94). On 22 November, 450, he writes again in the same way, and speaks of the pleasure with which he had welcomed the pope's legates. He hopes that Leo will be able to come to the council himself; if not he, Marcian, will summon it to some convenient place; it shall define the Faith according to Leo's letter to Flavian of Constantinople (ibid., lxxxvi; Mansi, VI, 99). Pulcheria also wrote; she too says that that the council shall be summoned by the pope's authority. Leo had already asked Theodosius II to summon the council (ep. xliv, 3; P. L., LIV, 826); Marcian clearly only meant to carry out this commission as Theodosius's successor. Meanwhile Dioscurus and his party knew quite well that Marcian would not be their friend. They had tried and failed to prevent his recognition in Egypt; the attempt only made their case worse with the Government.

The Eastern Church had been disturbed by the teaching of Eutyches since immediately after the Council of Ephesus (431) and the Nestorian troubles. In 448 Eusebius of Dorylæum had accused Eutyches

and his formula "one nature after the union" (*μετὰ τὴν ἕνωσιν μία φύσις*) at Constantinople. Dioscurus of Alexandria had taken up the cause of Eutyches, and had condemned Dyophysism at the Robber Council of Ephesus in 449 (for all this see MONOPHYSITISM). Pope Leo hoped for a time to restore peace without another general council (his letters to Marcian, lxxviii, to Pulcheria, lxxix, and to the Patriarch Anatolius of Constantinople, lxxx). But meanwhile Marcian, acting on Leo's former proposal, summoned a council on 17 May, 451, by letters addressed to all the metropolitans of the empire. It is clear that he acted on a misunderstanding, and had not yet received the pope's later letter (Hefele-Leclercq, II, 639). Leo then accepted what had happened, and appointed as his legates Paschasinus, Bishop of Lilybæum in Sicily, and a priest Boniface (ep. lxxxix; Mansi, VI, 125). The council was to have met at Nicæa; many bishops had already arrived there in the summer of 451, when the emperor wrote to tell them to wait till he could join them (his letter in Mansi, VI, 553). He was busy at the frontier of the empire arranging its defence against the Huns. The bishops wrote to complain of the delay, and Marcian answered their letter telling them to go to Chalcedon, opposite the capital on the other side of the Bosphorus (Mansi, V, 557); in this way he could attend to the council without leaving Constantinople.

The council opened in the church of St. Euphemia at Chalcedon on 8 October, 451, and lasted till 1 November. About 600 bishops attended. The imperial commissioners were present and regulated the exterior business at each session. The papal legate, Paschasinus, opened the council. Marcian and Pulcheria assisted at the sixth session (25 October). The emperor opened the proceedings that day with a speech in Latin (Mansi, VII, 129). One notices that what was still the official language of the empire was used on specially solemn occasions. His speech was then repeated in Greek. At this session the decree of the council was read (see CHALCEDON). On 27 February, 452, Marcian, together with his Western colleague, Valentinian III (423–455), made a law enforcing the decree and canons of the council as the law of the empire, and threatening heavy penalties against all who disputed them. Marcian alone repeated the same law on 13 March (Mansi, VII, 475–480). The famous twenty-eighth canon (giving Constantinople rank immediately after Rome) and the pope's protest against it caused further correspondence between him and the emperor and empress (Ep. Leonis I., cv, cvi; Mansi, VI, 187, 195), but did not disturb their good relations. Marcian's laws produced uniformity at Constantinople and in the neighbourhood of the Government, but he could not enforce them so successfully in Syria and Egypt. The rest of his reign was troubled by the revolution in these provinces, which remained one of the chief difficulties of the Government under his successors for two centuries. Marcian made no concessions towards the Syrian and Egyptian Monophysites. His Government carried out the deposition of Dioscurus, and an edict of 28 July, 452, insisted under heavy penalties on the recognition of Proterius, the Orthodox Patriarch of Alexandria. A large force (2000 soldiers) was sent to Egypt. It was not until after Marcian's death that a party at Constantinople under Aspar and Anatolius began to compromise with the heretics.

In the year 453 Attila died. It is said that Marcian dreamed, at the moment of Attila's death, that he saw the bow of his great enemy broken. The Empress Pulcheria died in the same year. She is canonized by both Catholics and Orthodox; her feast is on 10 September in both calendars. Marcian survived his wife four years. The end of his reign was occupied by the increasing troubles in Egypt. He was succeeded by Leo I (457–474). Marcian was, by marriage, the last emperor of the House of Theodosius I. The Orthodox have canonized him also, and keep his feast (with Pulcheria) on 17 February.

EVAGRIUS, *Hist. Eccl.*, II; TILLEMONT, *Histoire des Empereurs*, VI; BURY, *History of the Later Roman Empire*, I (London, 1889), 135–136; GIBBON, *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, with BURY'S notes, III (London, 1897), 444–474; HEFELE, tr. LECLERCQ, *Histoire des Conciles*, II (Paris, 1908).

ADRIAN FORTESCUE.

Marciane, a titular see of Lycia, suffragan of Myra. It figures in the "Notitiæ episcopatuum" from the sixth to the twelfth or thirteenth centuries, but it is not mentioned by any author and its situation remains unknown. Le Quien (Oriens christ., I, 983) cites three bishops: Januarius, who attended in 448 the Council of Constantinople against Eutyches; Augustine, who signed in 459 the synodal decree of Gennadius of Constantinople against simoniacs; Marcian, who signed in 518 the decretal letter of the Council of Constantinople against Severus and other heretics, and the report to Pope Hormisdas on the ordination of Epiphanius, Patriarch of Constantinople. S. PÉTRIDÈS.

Marcianopolis, a titular see in Lower Mœsia, on the right bank of the Danube, so called by Trajan after his sister Marciana (Amm. Marcellinus, XXVII, 2) and previously known as Parthenopolis. Emperor Claudius II repeatedly repulsed the Goths near this town (Trebellius Pollio, "Claudius", 9; Zosimus, I, 42); Valens made it his winter quarters in 368 and succeeding years (Amm. Marcell., XXVII, 5; Theophanis, "Chronographia", A. M. 5859, 5860, 5861). In 587 it was sacked by the king of the Avars, and at once retaken by the Romans (Theophanis, "Chronographia", A. M. 6079). The Roman army quartered there in 596 before crossing the Danube to assault the Avars (op. cit., A. M. 6088). Marcianopolis was the home of many saints or martyrs, e. g., St. Meletina, whose feast is kept on 15 Sept., and whose remains were carried to Lemnos; St. Alexander, martyred under Maximianus, and whose feast is kept on 2 Febr. Saints Maximus, Theodotus, Asclepiodotus, martyred at Adrianople under Maximianus, and whose feast is kept on 15 Sept., were born at Marcianopolis. The "Ecthesis" of the pseudo-Epiphanius (c. 640) gives the Metropolitical See of Marcianopolis in the Balkans five suffragans (Gelzer, "Ungedruckte . . . Texte der Notitiæ Episcopatuum", 542). The "Notitia Episcopatuum" of the Armenian cleric, Basil (c. 840) confirms this (Gelzer, "Georgii Cyprii descriptio orbis romani", 25). On the other hand Marcianopolis is not mentioned in the "Notitia" of Leo the Wise (c. 900), nor in that of Constantine Porphyrogenitus (c. 940), because the region had at that time been overrun by the Bulgarians. Le Quien (Oriens Christ., I, 1217–1220) mentions many bishops of Marcianopolis and Preslau, erroneously identifying these two towns. The Preslau of the Middle Ages remains Preslau to this day, and his Marcianopolis is now the village of Devna, a little to the west of Varna in Bulgaria. This name under the form Diabaina is mentioned by Pachymeros on account of something that took place there in 1280 (De Michaele Palæologo, VI, 49).

FARLATI, *Illyricum Sacrum*, VIII, 85–105; TOMASCHEK, *Zur Kunde der Hæmus-Halbinsel* (Vienna, 1887), 28.

S. VAILHÉ.

Marcionites.—Heretical sect founded in A. D. 144 at Rome by Marcion and continuing in the West for 300 years, but in the East some centuries longer, especially outside the Byzantine empire. They rejected the writings of the Old Testament and taught that Christ was not the Son of the god of the Jews, but the Son of the good God, who was different from the god of the Ancient Covenant. They anticipated the more consistent dualism of Manichæism and were finally absorbed by it. As they arose in the very infancy of Christianity and adopted from the beginning a strong ecclesiastical organization, parallel to that of the Cath-

olic Church, they were perhaps the most dangerous foe Christianity has ever known. The subject will be treated under the following heads: I. Life of Marcion; II. Doctrine and Discipline; III. History; IV. Mutilation of the New Testament; V. Anti-Marcionite Writers.

I. Life of Marcion.—Marcion was son of the Bishop of Sinope in Pontus, born c. A. D. 110, evidently from wealthy parents. He is described as *ναύτης*, *nauclerus*, a shipowner, by Rhodon and Tertullian, who wrote about a generation after his death. Epiphanius (Hæres., XLII, ii) relates that Marcion in his youth professed to lead a life of chastity and asceticism, but in spite of his professions fell into sin with a young maiden. In consequence his father, the bishop, cast him out of the Church. He besought his father for reconciliation, i. e. to be admitted to ecclesiastical penance, but the bishop stood firm in his refusal. Not being able to bear with the laughter and contempt of his fellow townsmen, he secretly left Sinope and travelled to Rome. The story of Marcion's sin is rejected by many modern scholars (e. g. G. Krüger) as a piece of malicious gossip of which they say Epiphanius was fond; others see in the young maiden but a metaphor for the Church, the then young bride of Christ, whom Marcion violated by his heresy, though he made great professions of bodily chastity and austerity. No accusations of impurity are brought against Marcion by earlier church writers, and Marcion's austerity seems acknowledged as a fact. Irenæus states that Marcion flourished under Pope Anicetus (c. 155–166) [*invaluit sub Aniceto*]. Though this period may mark Marcion's greatest success in Rome, it is certain that he arrived there earlier, i. c. A. D. 140, after the death of Hyginus, who died that year and apparently before the accession of Pius I. Epiphanius says that Marcion sought admittance into the Roman Church but was refused. The reason given was that they could not admit one who had been expelled by his own bishop without previous communication with that authority. This story has likewise been pointed out as extremely unlikely, implying, as it does, that the great Roman Church professed itself incompetent to override the decision of a local bishop in Pontus. It must be borne in mind, however, that Marcion arrived at Rome *sede vacante*, "after the death of Hyginus", and that such an answer sounds natural enough on the lips of presbyters as yet without a bishop.

Moreover it is obvious that Marcion was already a consecrated bishop. A layman could not have disputed on Scripture with the presbyters as he did, nor have threatened shortly after his arrival: "I will divide your Church and cause within her a division, which will last for ever", as Marcion is said to have done; a layman could not have founded a vast and world-wide institution, of which the main characteristic was that it was episcopalian; a layman would not have been proudly referred to for centuries by his disciples as their first *bishop*, a claim not disputed by any of their adversaries, though many and extensive works were written against them; a layman would not have been permanently cast out of the Church without hope of reconciliation by his own father, notwithstanding his entreaties, for a sin of fornication, nor therefore have become an object of laughter to his heathen fellow townsmen, if we accept the story of Epiphanius. A layman would not have been disappointed that he was not made bishop shortly after his arrival in a city whose see was vacant, as Marcion is said to have been on his arrival at Rome after the death of Hyginus.

This story has been held up as the height of absurdity and so it would be, if we ignored the facts that Marcion was a bishop, and that according to Tertullian (De Præscr., xxx) he made the Roman community the gift of two hundred thousand sesterces soon after his arrival. This extraordinary gift of £1400 (7000 dollars), a huge sum for those days, may be ascribed to the first fervour of faith, but is at least as naturally ascribed to a lively hope. The money was returned to him after his breach with the Church. This again is more natural if it was made with a tacit condition, than if it was absolute and the outcome of pure charity. Lastly the report that Marcion on his arrival at Rome had to hand in or to renew a confession of faith (Tert., "De Præscr.", xxx; "Adv. Mar.", I, xx; "De carne Christi", ii) fits in naturally with the supposition of his being a bishop, but would be, as G. Krüger points out, unheard of in the case of a layman.

We can take it for granted then that Marcion was a bishop, probably an assistant or suffragan of his father at Sinope. Having fallen out with his father he travels to Rome, where, being a seafarer or shipowner and a great traveller, he may already have been known and where his wealth obtains him influence and position. If Tertullian supposes him to have been admitted to the Roman Church and Epiphanius says that he was refused admittance, the two statements can easily be reconciled if we understand the former of mere membership or communion, the latter of the acceptance of his claims. His episcopal dignity has received mention at least in two early writers, who speak of him as having "from bishop become an apostate" (Optatus of Mileve, IV, v), and of his followers as being surnamed after a bishop instead of being called Christians after Christ (Adamantius, "Dial.", I, ed. Sande Bakhuysen). Marcion is said to have asked the Roman presbyters the explanation of Matt., ix, 16, 17, which he evidently wished to understand as expressing the incompatibility of the New Testament with the Old, but which they interpreted in an orthodox sense. His final breach with the Roman Church occurred in the autumn of 144, for the Marcionites counted 115 years and 6½ months from the time of Christ to the beginning of their sect. Tertullian roughly speaks of a hundred years and more. Marcion seems to have made common cause with Cerdo (q. v.), the Syrian Gnostic, who was at the time in Rome; that his doctrine was actually derived from that Gnostic seems unlikely. Irenæus relates (Adv. Hær., III, iii) that St. Polycarp meeting Marcion in Rome was asked by him: Dost thou recognize us? and gave answer: I recognize thee as the first-born of Satan. This meeting must have happened in 154, by which time Marcion had displayed a great and successful activity, for St. Justin Martyr in his First Apology (written about 150), describes Marcion's heresy as spread everywhere. These half a dozen years seem to many too short a time for such prodigious success, and they believe that Marcion was active in Asia Minor long before he came to Rome. Clement of Alexandria (Strom., VII, vii, 106) calls him the older contemporary of Basilides and Valentinus, but if so, he must have been a middle-aged man when he came to Rome, and a previous propaganda in the East is not impossible. That the Chronicle of Edessa places the beginning of Marcionism in 138, strongly favours this view. Tertullian relates in 207 (the date of his Adv. Marc., IV, iv) that Marcion professed penitence and accepted as condition of his readmittance into the Church that he should bring back to the fold those whom he had led astray, but death prevented his carrying this out. The precise date of his death is not known.

II. Doctrine and Discipline.—We must distinguish between the doctrine of Marcion himself and that of his followers. Marcion was no Gnostic dreamer. He wanted a Christianity untrammelled and undefiled by association with Judaism. Christianity was the New Covenant pure and simple. Abstract questions on the origin of evil or on the essence of the Godhead interested him little, but the Old Testament was a scandal to the faithful and a stumbling-block to the refined and intellectual Gentiles by its crudity and cruelty, and the Old Testament had to be set aside. The two great obstacles in his way he removed

by drastic measures. He had to account for the existence of the Old Testament and he accounted for it by postulating a secondary deity, a demiurgus, who was god in a sense, but not the supreme God; he was just, rigidly just, he had his good qualities, but he was not the good God, who was Father of Our Lord Jesus Christ. The metaphysical relation between these two gods troubled Marcion little; of divine emanation, æons, syzygies, eternally opposed principles of good and evil, he knows nothing. He may be almost a Manichee in practice, but in theory he has not reached absolute consistency as Mani did a hundred years later. Marcion had secondly to account for those passages in the New Testament which countenanced the Old. He resolutely cut out all texts that were contrary to his dogma; in fact, he created his own New Testament, admitting but one Gospel, a mutilation of St. Luke, and an Apostolicon containing ten epistles of St. Paul. The mantle of St. Paul had fallen on the shoulders of Marcion in his struggle with the Judaisers. The Catholics of his day were nothing but the Judaisers of the previous century. The pure Pauline Gospel had become corrupted and Marcion not obscurely hinted that even the pillar apostles, Peter, James and John, had betrayed their trust. He loves to speak of "false apostles", and lets his hearers infer who they were. Once the Old Testament has been completely got rid of, Marcion has no further desire for change. He makes his purely New Testament Church as like the Catholic Church as possible, consistent with his deep-seated Puritanism. The first description of Marcion's doctrine dates from St. Justin: "With the help of the devil Marcion has in every country contributed to blasphemy and the refusal to acknowledge the Creator of all the world as God. He recognizes another god, who, because he is essentially greater (than the World-maker or Demiurge) has done greater deeds than he (*ὡς ὄντα μείζονα τὰ μείζονα παρὰ τοῦτον πεποιηκέναι*). The Supreme God is *ἀγαθός*, good, kind; the inferior god is merely *δίκαιος*, just and righteous. The good God is all love, the inferior god gives way to fierce anger. Though less than the good God, yet the just god, as world-creator, has his independent sphere of activity. They are not opposed as Ormuzd and Ahriman, though the good God interferes in favour of men, for He alone is all-wise and all-powerful and loves mercy more than punishment. All men are indeed created by the Demiurge, but by special choice he elected the Jewish people as his own and thus became the god of the Jews.

His theological outlook is limited to the Bible, his struggle with the Catholic Church seems a battle with texts and nothing more. The Old Testament is true enough, Moses and the Prophets are messengers of the Demiurge, the Jewish Messias is sure to come and found a millennial kingdom for the Jews on earth, but the Jewish Messias has nothing whatever to do with the Christ of God. The Invisible, Indescribable, Good God (*ἄόρατος, ἀκατάνομαστος, ἀγαθὸς θεός*), formerly utterly unknown to the creator as well as to his creatures, has revealed Himself in Christ. How far Marcion admitted a Trinity of persons in the Supreme Godhead is not known; Christ is indeed the Son of God, but He is also simply "God" without further qualification; in fact, Marcion's Gospel began with the words: "In the fifteenth year of the Emperor Tiberius God descended in Capharnaum and taught on the Sabbaths". However daring and capricious this manipulation of the Gospel text, it is at least a splendid testimony that in Christian circles of the first half of the second century the Divinity of Christ was a central dogma. To Marcion however Christ was God Manifest, not God Incarnate. His Christology is that of the Docetæ (q. v.) rejecting the inspired history of the Infancy, in fact any childhood of Christ at all; Marcion's Saviour is a "deus ex machina" of which Tertullian mockingly says: "Suddenly a Son, suddenly Sent, suddenly Christ!" Marcion admitted no prophecy of the Coming of Christ whatever; the Jewish prophets foretold a Jewish Messias only, and this Messias had not yet appeared. Marcion used the story of the three angels, who ate, walked and conversed with Abraham and yet had no real human body, as an illustration of the life of Christ (Adv. Marc., III, ix). Tertullian says (*ibid.*) that when Apelles and seceders from Marcion began to believe that Christ had a real body indeed, not by birth but rather collected from the elements, Marcion would prefer to accept even a putative birth rather than a real body. Whether this is Tertullian's mockery or a real change in Marcion's sentiments, we do not know. To Marcion matter and flesh are not indeed essentially evil, but are contemptible things, a mere production of the Demiurge, and it was inconceivable that God should really have made them His own. Christ's life on earth was a continual contrast to the conduct of the Demiurge. Some of the contrasts are cleverly staged: the Demiurge sent bears to devour children for puerile merriment (Kings) —Christ bade children come to Him and He fondled and blessed them; the Demiurge in his law declared lepers unclean and banished them — but Christ touched and healed them. Christ's putative passion and death was the work of the Demiurge, who in revenge for Christ's abolition of the Jewish law delivered Him up to hell. But even in hell Christ overcame the Demiurge by preaching to the spirits in Limbo, and by His Resurrection He founded the true Kingdom of the good God. Epiphanius (Hær., xlii, 4) says that Marcionites believed that in Limbo Christ brought salvation to Cain, Core, Dathan and Abiron, Esau and the Gentiles, but left in damnation all Old Testament saints. This may have been held by some Marcionites in the fourth century, but it was not the teaching of Marcion himself, who had no Antinomian tendencies. Marcion denied the resurrection of the body, "for flesh and blood shall not inherit the Kingdom of God", and he denied the second coming of Christ to judge the living and the dead, for the good God, being all goodness, does not punish those who reject Him; He simply leaves them to the Demiurge, who will cast them into everlasting fire.

With regard to discipline, the main point of difference consists in his rejection of marriage, i. e. he baptized only those who were not living in matrimony: virgins, widows, celibates and eunuchs (Tert., "Adv. Marc.", I, xxix); all others remained catechumens. On the other hand the absence of division between catechumens and baptized persons in Marcionite worship, shocked orthodox Christians, but it was emphatically defended by Marcion's appeal to Gal., vi, 6. According to Tertullian (Adv. Marc., I, xiv) he used water in baptism, anointed his faithful with oil and gave milk and honey to the catechumens and in so far retained the orthodox practices, although, says Tertullian, all these things are "beggarly elements of the Creator." Marcionites must have been excessive fasters to provoke the ridicule of Tertullian in his Montanist days. Epiphanius says they fasted on Saturday out of a spirit of opposition to the Jewish God, who made the Sabbath a day of rejoicing. This however may have been merely a western custom adopted by them.

III. History.—It was the fate of Marcionism to drift away almost immediately from its founder's ideas towards mere Gnosticism. Marcion's creator or Jewish god was too inconsistent and illogical a conception, he was inferior to the good God, yet he was independent; he was just and yet not good; his writings were true and yet to be discarded; he had created all men and done them no evil, yet they had not to worship and serve him. Marcion's followers sought to be more logical, they postulated three principles: good, just and wicked, opposing the first two to the last; or one principle only, the just god being a mere creation of the good God. The first opinion was maintained by

Syneros and Lucanus or Lucianus. Of the first we know nothing beyond the mention of him in Rhodon; of the second we possess more information, and Epiphanius has devoted a whole chapter to his refutation. Both Origen and Epiphanius, however, seem to know of Lucanus' sect only by hearsay; it was therefore probably extinct towards the end of the third century. Tertullian (de Resur. Carn., ii) says that he outdid even Marcion in denying the resurrection not only of the body but also of the soul, only admitting the resurrection of some *tertium quid* (πνεῦμα as opposed to ψυχή?). Tertullian says that he had Lucanus' teaching in view when writing his "De Anima". It is possible that Lucanus taught transmigration of souls; according to Epiphanius some Marcionites of his day maintained it. Though Lucanus' particular sect may have soon died out, the doctrine comprised in the three principles was long maintained by Marcionites. In St. Hippolytus' time (c. 225) it was held by an Assyrian called Prepon, who wrote in defence of it a work called "Bardesanes the Armenian" (Hipp., "Adv. Hær.", VII, xxxi). Adamantius in his "Dialogue" (see below) introduces a probably fictitious Marcionite doctrine of three principles, and Epiphanius evidently puts it forward as the prominent Marcionite doctrine of his day (374). The doctrine of the One Principle only, of which the Jewish god is a creature, was maintained by the notorious Apelles, who, though once a disciple of Marcion himself, became more of a Gnostic than of a Marcionist. He was accompanied by a girl called Philumena, a sort of clairvoyante who dabbled in magic, and who claimed frequent visions of Christ and St. Paul, appearing under the form of a boy. Tertullian calls this Philumena a prostitute, and accuses Apelles of unchastity, but Rhodon, who had known Apelles personally, refers to him as "venerable in behaviour and age". Tertullian often attacks him in writings ("De Præscr.", lxvii; "Adv. Marc.," III, g. 11, IV, 17) and even wrote a work against him: "Adversus Apelleiacos", which is unfortunately lost, though once known to St. Hippolytus and St. Augustine. Some fragments of Apelles have been collected by A. Harnack (first in "Texte u. Unters.", VI, 3, 1890, and then *ibid.*, XX, or new ser., V, 3, 1900), who wrote "De Apelles Gnosi Monarchica" (Leipzig, 1874), though Apelles emphatically repudiated Marcion's two gods and acknowledged "One good God, one Beginning and one Power beyond all description" (ἀκατανόμαστος).

This "Holy and Good God above", according to him, took no notice of things below, but made another god, who made the world. Nor is this creator-god the only emanation of the Supreme God; there is a fire-angel or fire-god ("Igneus Præses mali" according to Tertullian, "De Carne", viii) who tampered with the souls of men; there is a Jewish god, a law-god, who presumably wrote the Old Testament, which Apelles held to be a lying production. Possibly, however, the fire-god and the law-god were but manifestations of the creator-god. Apelles wrote an extensive work called Συλλογισμοί to prove the untrustworthiness of the Old Testament, of which Origen quotes a characteristic fragment (In Gen., II, ii). Apelles' Antidocetism has been referred to above. Of other followers of Marcion the names only are known. The Marcionites differed from the Gnostic Christians in that they thought it unlawful to deny their religion in times of persecution, nobly vying with Catholics in shedding their blood for the name of Christ. Marcionite martyrs are not infrequently referred to in Eusebius' "Church History" (IV, xv, xlvi; V, xvi, xxi; VII, xii). Their number and influence seem always to have been less in the West than in the East, and in the West they soon died out. Epiphanius, however, testifies that in the East in A. D. 374 they had deceived "a vast number of men" and were found "not only in Rome and Italy but in Egypt, Palestine, Arabia, Syria, Cyprus and the Thebaid and even in Persia". And Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrus in the Province of the Euphrates from 423 to 458, in his letter to Domno, the Patriarch of Antioch, refers with just pride to his having converted one thousand Marcionites in his scattered diocese. Not far from Theodoret's diocese, near Damascus, an inscription was found of a Marcionite church, showing that in A. D. 318–319 Marcionites possessed freedom of worship (Le Boss and Waddington, "Inscr. Grec.", Paris, 1870). Constantine (Eusebius, "Vita", III, lxiv) forbade all public and private worship of Marcionism. Though the Paulicians are always designated by their adversaries as Manichæans, and though their adoption of Manichæan principles seems undeniable, yet according to Petrus Siculus, who lived amongst Paulicians (868–869) in Tibrike and is therefore a trustworthy witness, their founder, Constantine the Armenian, on receiving Marcion's Gospel and Apostolicon from a deacon in Syria, handed it to his followers, who at first at least kept it as their Bible and repudiated all writings of Mani. The refutation of Marcionism by the Armenian Archpriest Eznic in the fifth century shows the Marcionites to have been still numerous in Armenia at that time (Eznik, "Refutation of the Sects", IV, Ger. tr., J. M. Schmid, Vienna, 1900). Ermoni maintains that Eznik's description of Marcion's doctrine still represents the ancient form thereof, but this is not acknowledged by other scholars ("Marcion dans la littérat. Arménienne" in "Revue de l'Or. Chrét.", I).

IV. Mutilation of the New Testament.—Marcion's name appears prominently in the discussion of two important questions, that of the Apostles' Creed and that of the Canon of the New Testament. It is maintained by recent scholars that the Apostles' Creed was drawn up in the Roman Church in opposition to Marcionism (cf. F. Kattenbusch, "Das Apost. Symbol", Leipzig, 1900; A. C. McGiffert, "The Apostles' Creed", New York, 1902). Passing over this point, Marcion's attitude towards the New Testament must be further explained. His cardinal doctrine was the opposition of the Old Testament to the New, and this doctrine he had amply illustrated in his great (lost) work Ἀντιθέσεις or "Contrasts". In order, however, to make the contrast perfect he had to omit much of the New Testament writings and to manipulate the rest. He took one Gospel out of the four, and accepted only ten epistles of St. Paul. Marcion's Gospel was based on our canonical St. Luke with omission of the first two chapters. The text has been as far as possible restored by Th. Zahn, "Geschichte d. N. T. Kanons", II, 456–494, from all available sources, especially Epiphanius, who made a collection of 78 passages. Marcion's changes mainly consist in omissions, where he modifies the text. The modifications are slight, thus: "I give thee thanks, Father, God of heaven and earth", is changed to "I give thanks, Father, Lord of heaven". "O foolish and hard of heart to believe in all that the prophets have spoken", is changed into: "O foolish and hard of heart to believe in all that I have told you." Sometimes slight additions are made: "We found this one subverting our nation" (the accusation of the Jews before Pilate) receives the addition: "and destroying the law and the prophets". A similar process was followed with the Epistle of St. Paul. By the omission of a single preposition Marcion had coined a text in favour of his doctrine out of Ephes., iii, 10: "the mystery which from the beginning of the world has been hidden *from* the god who created all things" (omitting ἐν before θεῷ). However cleverly the changes were made, Catholics continued to press Marcion even with the texts which he retained in his New Testament, hence the continual need of further modifications. The Epistles of St. Paul which he received were, first of all, Galatians, which he considered the charter of Marcionism, then Corinthians I and II, Romans I and II, Thessalonians,

Ephesians (which, however, he knew under the name of Laodiceans), Colossians, Philippians and Philemon. The Pastoral Epistles, the Catholic Epistles, Hebrews and the Apocalypse, as well as Acts, were excluded. Recently de Bruyne ("Revue Benedictine", 1907, 1–16) has made out a good case for the supposition that the short prefaces to the Pauline epistles, which were once attributed to Pelagius and others, are taken out of a Marcionite Bible and augmented with Catholic headings for the missing Epistles.

V. ANTI-MARCIONITE WRITERS.—(1) St. Justin the Martyr (150) refers to the Marcionites in his first Apology; he also wrote a special treatise against them. This, however, mentioned by Irenæus as Σύνταγμα πρὸς Μαρκίωνα, is lost. Irenæus (Hær., IV, vi, 2) quotes short passages of Justin containing the sentence: "I would not have believed the Lord himself if he had announced any other than the Creator"; also V, 26, 2. (2) Irenæus (c. 176) intended to write a special work in refutation of Marcion, but never carried out his purpose (Hær., I, 27, 4; III, 12, 13); he refers to Marcion, however, again and again in his great work against Heresies, especially III, 4, 2; III, 27, 2; IV, 38, 2 sq.; III, 11, 7, 25, 3. (3) Rhodon (180–192) wrote a treatise against Marcion, dedicated to Callistion. It is no longer extant, but is referred to by Eusebius (H. E., V, 13) who gives some extracts. (4) Tertullian, the main source of our information, wrote his "Adversus Marcionem" (five books) in 207, and makes reference to Marcion in several of his works: "De Præscriptione", "De Carne Christi", "De Resurrectione Carnis", and "De Anima". His work against Apelles is lost. (5) Pseudo Tertullian (possibly Commodian. See H. Waitz, "Ps. Tert. Gedicht Adv. M.", Darmstadt, 1901) wrote a lengthy poem against Marcion in doggerel hexameters, which is now valuable. Pseudo Tertullian's (possibly Victorinus of Pettau) short treatise against all heresies (c. A. D. 240) is also extant. (6) Adamantius.—Whether this is a real personage or only a nom de plume is uncertain. His Dialogue, "De Recta in Deum Fide", has often been ascribed to Origen, but it is beyond doubt that he is not the author. The work was probably composed about A. D. 300. It was originally written in Greek and translated by Rufinus. It is a refutation of Marcionism and Valentinianism. The first half is directed against Marcionism, which is defended by Megethius (who maintains three principles) and Marcus (who defends two). (Berlin ed. of the Fathers by Sande Bakhuysen, Leipzig, 1901.) (7) St. Hippolytus of Rome (c. 220) speaks of Marcion in his "Refutation of all Heresies", Book VII, ch. 17–26, and X, 15. (8) St. Epiphanius wrote his work against heresies in 374, and is the second main source of information in his Ch. xlii–xliv. He is invaluable for the reconstruction of Marcion's Bible text, as he gives 78 and 40 passages from Marcion's New Testament where it differs from ours and adds a short refutation in each instance. (9) St. Ephraem (373) maintains in many of his writings a polemic against Marcion, as in his "Commentary on the Diatessaron" (J. R. Harris, "Fragments of Com. on Diates.", London, 1895), and in his "Metrical Sermons" (Roman ed., Vol. II, 437–560, and Overbeck's Ephrem etc., Opera Selecta). (10) Eznik, an Armenian Archpriest, or possibly Bishop of Bagrewand (478), wrote a "Refutation of the Sects", of which Book IV is a refutation of Marcion. Translated into German, J. M. Schmid, Vienna, 1900.

MEYBOOM, *Marcion en de Marcionieten* (Leyden, 1888); IDEM, *Het Christendom der tweede Eeuw* (Groningen, 1897); KRÜGER, extensive article in HAUCK, *Real Encyclop. der Prot. Theol.*, XII (1903), s. v.; HARNACK, *Geschichte der altchrist. Lit.*, I, 191–197, 839–840; *Texte und Untersuchung*, VI, 3 pp., 109–120; XX, 3, pp. 93–100 (1900); 2nd II, 2, 537; BARDENHEWER, *Gesch. der altkirchl. lit.*, II (1902); ZAHN, *Geschichte des N. T. Kanons*, I and II (1888); *Das Apost. Symbol* (Leipzig, 1893); HILGENFELD, *Ketzergeschichte des Ur-Christenthums* (Leipzig, 1884).

J. P. ARENDZEN.

Marcopolis, a titular see of Asia Minor, suffragan of Edessa. The native name of this city is not known, but it owes its Greek name to the Emperor Marcus Aurelius. Marcopolis is described at the beginning of the seventh century by the geographer George of Cyprus ("Descriptio orbis romani", ed. Gelser, 46), and in the "Notitiæ episcopatuum" of Antioch (sixth century) is alluded to as a see of Osrhoene (Echos d'Orient, X, 145). Two of its early bishops are known: Cyrus, who attended the Council of Ephesus in 431 (Mansi, "Conciliorum collectio", IV, 1269; V, 776, 797) and Caioumas, present at the Council of Chalcedon in 451 (Mansi, "Conc. coll.", VI, 572, 944; VII, 148). Eubel ("Hierarchia catholica medii ævi", Munich, I, 341) mentions four other titulars between 1340 and 1400, and a fifth from 1441 to 1453 (ibid., II, 204). The site of this city has not been found.

S. VAILHÉ.

Marco Polo. See POLO, MARCO.

Marcosians, a sect of Valentinian Gnostics, founded by Marcus (q. v.) and combated at length by Irenæus (Hær., I, xii–xxiii). In the district of Lyons, the Rhone Valley and Spain, they continued to exist till well into the fourth century. They maintained their Gnostic system not merely in theory but, forming Gnostic communities, they were addicted to Gnostic practices. In their conventicles prophecy was habitually practised; not only men but women were bidden by their leaders or by lot to stand up in the congregation and prophesy. The incoherent gibberish they uttered was taken for the voice of God. Women were likewise bidden to utter the Eucharistic formula over the elements. The wine was then poured in a larger cup and by a chemical trick increased in volume. Irenæus scornfully repeats that the sect was an affair of silly women, ruining their souls and their bodies, and narrates that women who repented and returned to the Church confessed their past degradation.

The Marcosian system was a degraded variety of that of Valentinus (q. v.). It retained the 30 Æons, but called them "Greatnesses" and gave them numerical values. It kept the myth of the fall of Sophia but called it a "Divine Deficiency". Peculiar to it was the adaptation of the Pythagorean number theory to Gnosticism. The 30 Æons are obtained by adding the numbers of the Ogdoad together: $1+2+3+4+5+7+8=30$. The 6 is purposely omitted for it is the ἐπίσημον and not a letter of the usual Greek alphabet. The fall of Sophia is clearly shown by the fact that Λ which equals 30, or the complete set of Greatnesses, is really only the eleventh letter of the alphabet, but to make up for this deficiency it sought a consort and so became M (= ΑΑ). The *episemon*, or 6, is a number full of potency; the name Ἰησους consists of six letters, hence the name of the Saviour. When the Propator, who is the Μόνας, willed the Unspeakable to be spoken, He uttered the Word which has 4 syllables and 30 letters. The plenitude of Greatness is 2 tetrads, a decad and a dodecad $(4+4+10+12=30)$; the 2 tetrads are the Unspeakable, Silence, Father and Truth followed by Logos, Life, Man and Church. These form the Ogdoad. The mutes of the Greek alphabet belong to Father and Truth (The Unspeakable, and Silence, of course, do not count); these being mute reveal nothing to man. The semivowels belong to Word and Life, but the vowels to Man and Church, for through Man voice gave power to all. The 7 Greek vowels go through the seven heavens, which thus sing the Great Doxology in harmony. Even numbers are female, odd numbers male, by the union of the first of these, 2×3, was begotten the *episemon*, or 6, the number of our Salvation. G. Salmon well remarks that Marcus's system is the most worthless of all that passed under the name of knowledge in second century literature. Irenæus (l. c.) is practically our only authority. (See GNOSTICISM.) J. P. ARENDZEN.

Marcoux, Joseph, missionary among the Iroquois, b. in Canada, 16 March, 1791; d. there 29 May, 1855. He was ordained 12 January, 1813, and spent the remaining forty-two years of his life evangelizing the Iroquois, first at St. Regis and later at Caughnawaga, or Sault-St-Louis. In addition to his fruitful efforts towards the betterment of the spiritual and social condition of the Indians, he acquired such proficiency in the Iroquois tongue as to attain a high rank among philologists through his Iroquois grammar and his French-Iroquois dictionary. For his flock, whom he had provided with church and schools (1845), he translated into Iroquois Père de Ligny's "Life of Christ", and published in their own language, a collection of prayers, hymns, and canticles (1852), a catechism (1854), a calendar of Catholic ritual, and a number of sermons. He died in 1855 of typhoid fever, at that time epidemic among the Iroquois.

Appleton, *Cyclopædia of American Biography*, s. v.; Tanguay, *Rép. général du clergé canadien.*

Florence Rudge McGahan.

Marculf. See Formularies.

Marcus, the name of three leading Gnostics.

I. The founder of the Marcosians (q. v.) and elder contemporary of St. Irenæus, who, c. A. D. 175, in his refutation addresses him as one apparently still living (Adv. Hær., I, xi, 3, where the "clarus magister" is Marcus, not Epiphanes; and I, xiii, 21). Irenæus, from whom St. Epiphanius (Hær., xxxiv) and St. Hippolytus (Hær., VI, xxxix–lv) quote, makes Marcus a disciple of Valentinus (q. v.), with whom Marcus's œnology mainly agrees. St. Jerome (Ep. 75, 3) makes him a follower of Basilides (q. v.), confusing him no doubt with Marcus of Memphis. Clement of Alexandria, himself infected with Gnosticism, actually uses Marcus's number system though without acknowledgment (Strom., VI, xvi). Marcus first taught in Asia Minor and possibly later in the West also. His immoralities and juggling tricks (colouring the contents of the cup and increasing the quantity) are described by Irenæus and Hippolytus. (For his system see Marcosians.)

II. One of the two defenders of Marcionism in Adamantius's Dialogue "De Recta in Deum fide"; the other is called Megethius; but whether these are fictitious or real personages is uncertain. Marcus's dualism is more absolute than that of Marcion himself: the *demiurgus* is the absolute evil principle. He inclines further towards Apelles, accepting salvation neither for the body nor the *psyche* but only for the *pneuma*.

III. A Manichean Gnostic, a native of Memphis, who introduced dualistic doctrines into Spain about the middle of the fourth century. His precise activity was unknown even to Sulpicius Severus (Hist. Sacr., II, xliv), c. A. D. 400, who only knows that he had two hearers or disciples: Agape, a wealthy matron, and the orator Elpidius, who became the instructors of Priscillian ("ab his Priscillianus est institutus") when still a layman. Elpidius and Priscillian were both condemned by the Council of Saragossa, but Elpidius did not share Priscillian's tragic fate in A. D. 385.

J. P. Arendzen.

Marcus Aurelius. See Aurelius Antoninus Marcus.

Marcus Diaconus. See Porphyrius, Bishop of Gaza.

Marcus Diadochus (Μάρκος ὁ διάδοχος), an obscure writer of the fourth century of whom nothing is known but his name at the head of a "Sermon against the Arians", discovered by Wetsten in a manuscript codex of St. Athanasius at Basle and published by him at the end of his edition of Origen: "De oratione" (Basle, 1694). Another version of the same work was lent by Galliciollus to Galland and published in the "Veterum Patrum Bibliotheca", V (Venice, 1765–1781). This is the text in P. G., LXV, 1149–1166. The sermon quotes and expounds the usual texts, John, i, 1; Heb., i, 3; Ps. cix, 3–4; John, xiv, 6, 23, etc., and answers difficulties from Mark, xiii, 32; x, 10; Matt., xx, 23, etc.

A quite different person is Diadochus, Bishop of Photike in Epirus in the fifth century, author of a "Sermon on the Ascension" and of a hundred "Chapters on Spiritual Perfection" (P. G., LXV, 1141–1148, 1167–1212), whom Victor Vitensis praises in the prologue of his history of the Vandal persecution (Ruinart's edition, Paris, 1694, not. 3). The two are often confounded, as in Migne.

P. G., LXV, 1141–1212; Jungmann-Fessler, *Institutiones Patrologiæ* (Innsbruck, 1896), IIb, 147–148; Chevalier, *Bio-Bibl.*, s. v.

Adrian Fortescue.

Marcus Eremita (Μάρκος ὁ ἐρημίτης, or *μοναχός*, or *ἀσκητής*), a theologian and ascetic writer of some importance in the fifth century. Various theories about his period and works have been advanced. These seem now to be supplanted by J. Kunze in his study of this writer.

According to Kunze, Mark the Hermit was superior of a laura at Ancyra; he then as an old man left his monastery and became a hermit, probably in the desert east of Palestine, near St. Sabas. He was a contemporary of Nestorius and died probably before the Council of Chalcedon (451). Nicephorus Callistus (fourteenth century) says he was a disciple of St. John Chrysostom ("Hist. Eccl." in P. G., CXLVI, XIV, 30). Cardinal Bellarmine [de Script. eccl. (1631), p. 273] thought that this Mark was the monk who prophesied ten more years of life to the Emperor Leo VI in 900. He is refuted by Tillemont [Mémoires (1705), X, 456 sq.]. Another view supported by the Byzantine "Menaia" (Acta Sanct., March 1) identifies him with the Egyptian monk mentioned in Palladius, "Historia Lausiaca", XX (P. G., XXXII), who lived in the fourth century. The discovery and identification of a work by him against Nestorius by P. Kerameus in his *Ἀνάλεκτα ἱεροσολ. σταχυολογίας* (St. Petersburg, 1891), I, pp. 89–113, makes his period certain, as defended by Kunze.

Mark's works are: (1) Of the spiritual law; (2) Concerning those who think to be justified through works (both ascetic treatises for monks); (3) Of penitence; (4) Of baptism; (5) To Nicholas on refraining from anger and lust; (6) Disputation against a scholar (against appealing to civil courts and on celibacy); (7) Consultation of the mind with its own soul (reproaches that he makes Adam, Satan, and other men responsible for his sins instead of himself); (8) On fasting and humility; (9) On Melchisedek (against people who think that Melchisedek was an apparition of the Word of God). All the above works are named and described in the "Myrobiblion" (P. G., CIII, 668 sq.) and are published in Gallandi's collection. To them must be added: (10) Against the Nestorians (a treatise against that heresy arranged without order). Mark is rather an ascetic than a dogmatic writer. He is content to accept dogmas from the Church; his interest is in the spiritual life as it should be led by monks. He is practical rather than mystic, belongs to the Antiochene School and shows himself to be a disciple of St. John Chrysostom.

Gallandi, *Bibliotheca veterum Patrum*, VIII (Venice, 1788), 1–104, reprinted with Gallandi's prolegomena in *P. G.*, LXV, 893–1140; Fabricius-Harles, *Bibliotheca græca*, IX (Hamburg, 1804), 267–269; Jungmann-Fessler, *Institutiones Patrologiæ*, II (Innsbruck, 1892), 143–146; Kunze, *Marcus Eremita, ein neuer Zeuge für das altkirchliche Taufbekenntnis* (Leipzig, 1896).

Adrian Fortescue.

Mardin, a residential Armenian archbishopric, a Chaldean bishopric, and a residential Syrian bishopric; moreover it is the headquarters of the Capuchin mission of Mardin and Amida.

The ancient Syriac name was Marda, which meant

fortress. It is mentioned as early as the time of Emperor Constantius (Amm. Marcell. xix, 9, 4) and again in the year 506 (Theophanis, "Chronogr." A. M., 5998). The town became Christian under Tiridates II, King of Armenia, at the close of the third century, and it is probable that the churches, mausoleums, and houses, the ruins of which have been discovered, belong to this period. It played an important part in the religious controversies between the Catholics and Monophysites, who made it one of their principal monasteries. It had a Jacobite bishop in 684 (see the list of Syrian titulars, in Lequien, "Oriens Christ.," II, 1457–1462; also "Revue de l'Orient Chrétien", VI, 200; also the list of Chaldean titulars given in Lequien, op. cit., II, 1321). After 1166 the Jacobite patriarch, who had hitherto resided at Diarbekir, took up his residence in Mardin. During the Middle Ages, thanks to its strong position, the town escaped the attacks of Houlagon, grandson of Genghis Khan, and of Tamerlane. Since 1574 it has belonged to the Ottoman Empire, and is a sanjak in the vilayet of Diarbekir. It is situated at about 3600 feet above sea-level, on a rugged browed and impregnable green hill; the grassy plain in the valley below is known as the Sea of Mardin. The population is computed at 25,000, of whom 15,500 are Mussulmans, the remainder being Christians. The number of Catholics of various rites is about 3000. In the Armenian archdiocese there are 8000 faithful, 16 native priests, 8 churches or chapels, 5 central stations, and 10 chapels of ease. The Syrian Catholic diocese has existed since 1852, and its title has been joined with that of Amida since 1888. The patriarch ought to reside at Mardin, but for some years past he has preferred Beirut on account of facility of communication with Europe. In the Syrian diocese there are 3500 Catholics, 25 priests, 8 churches and chapels, 11 stations, and the monastery of St. Ephraim. The Chaldean diocese, which is limited to the town of Mardin, has 750 faithful, 4 native priests, 1 parish, and 3 stations. The Capuchin mission dates from the seventeenth century, but its headquarters have been changed many times. It consists of 15 religious, of whom 11 are priests, and it has 6 houses (Diarbekir or Amida, Orfa or Edessa, Malatea or Melitene, Kharpout, Mamouret-ul-Aziz or Mozera, and Mardin). The mission owns 6 churches and 5 chapels; it carries on 18 primary schools, a college at Mamouret-ul-Aziz, 2 orphanages. The Franciscan Sisters of Lons-le-Saunier have three establishments for girls, one at Diarbekir, one at Orfa, and one at Mardin. The superior of the mission is Rev. J. Antonius a Mediolano, O.M.C. There is moreover a schismatic Armenian archbishop in the town, and an American Protestant mission is in activity.

ASSEMANI, *Bibliotheca orientalis*, II, 470; CHAPOT, *La frontière de l'Euphrate* (Paris, 1907), 312; CUINET, *La Turquie d'Asie*, II, 494–502; PIOLET, *Les missions catholiques françaises au XIX^e siècle*, I (Paris), 274–294; *Missiones Catholicæ* (Rome, 1907) 161, 756, 805, 810.

S. VAILHÉ.

Mardochai. See ESTHER.

Maréchal, AMBROSE, third Archbishop of Baltimore; b. at Ingres near Orléans, France, 28 August, 1764; d. at Baltimore, 29 January, 1828. Yielding to his parents' desires he studied for the legal profession, but later entered the Sulpician seminary at Orléans, where he received tonsure towards the close of 1787. Owing to the chaotic condition of France, he was obliged to leave Paris for Bordeaux, where he was ordained in 1792. On the day of his ordination, and at the risk of his life, accompanied by Abbés Richard, Martignon, and Cicquard, he sailed for America and arrived at Baltimore (24 June, 1792), where he offered his first Mass. He was sent on the mission in St. Mary's County, and later to Bohemia on the eastern shore of Maryland. In 1799, he was teaching theology at St. Mary's College, Baltimore; in 1801 he was on the staff of Georgetown College, but after a while returned to St. Mary's, which was then in the hands of the Sulpicians, of which order he was a member. Civil government having been restored in France under Napoleon, Father Maréchal was summoned by his superiors to teach at Saint-Flour, Lyons, Aix and Marseilles. His pupils at Marseilles presented him with the marble altar which now stands in the Cathedral of Baltimore, and Louis XVIII also testified his regard by presenting him with several paintings, which also remain in Baltimore Cathedral.

In 1812 he was again teaching in Baltimore; in 1816 he was nominated Bishop of Philadelphia, but at his request the nomination was withdrawn; in 1817, on 24 July, he was appointed coadjutor to Archbishop Neale of Baltimore, and Titular of Stauropolis. The Brief of appointment had not reached Baltimore when Archbishop Neale died, and the Titular of Stauropolis was consecrated Archbishop of Baltimore by Bishop Cheverus of Boston, 14 December, 1817. He soon had to face serious dissensions over the claim by the laity to a voice in the appointment of clergy; he tactfully induced his flock to yield, and established the right of the ordinary to make all such appointments. The building of the Cathedral which had been begun under Archbishop Carroll in 1806, was now resumed and completed so that the edifice was consecrated 31 May, 1821. In that year Archbishop Maréchal went to Rome on business of his diocese, and in connexion with the White Marsh plantation which the Archbishop claimed as Diocesan property, but which had been devised to the Jesuits (17 Feb., 1728), and was claimed by them as property of the society to be employed in the interests of the Church of Maryland. The archbishop secured from Rome a Bull in his favour. (See SOCIETY OF JESUS, *in the United States*.) From his "Relatio Status" for 1821–1822 we learn that in the United States as they then existed there were 9 dioceses and 117 priests, including the Archdiocese of Baltimore, which had 40 priests, 52 churches, 80,000 Catholics, 1 seminary, 1 Sulpician college, 1 Jesuit college, 1 Carmelite convent, 1 Convent of St. Vincent of Paul nuns, and 1 convent of Ursulines. In 1826 Archbishop Maréchal made a journey to Canada, and on his return fell ill. His coadjutor, Rev. James Whitfield, who succeeded him as Archbishop, had not yet been consecrated when death came. His writings consist almost entirely of letters and documents scholarly in style and are to be found in "The History of the Society of Jesus in North America" by Hughes.

CLARKE, *Lives of Deceased Bishops*, I (New York, 1872) 238–255; HUGHES, *History of the Society of Jesus in North America*, I (Cleveland, 1910) Part II; SHEA, *History of the Catholic Church in the U. S.* (New York, 1886–1892).

J. P. W. MCNEAL.

Marenco, (1), CARLO, Italian dramatist, born at Cassolo (or Cassolnuovo) in Piedmont in 1800; died at Savona in 1846. He studied law for a while, but finally determined to devote himself to literature. To make sure of a competency he applied for and obtained a public post connected with the Treasury Department of Savona. As a writer, Carlo Marenco belongs to the Romantic school, for he rejects the unity of time in his plays and gives to his plots a more ample development than the classic rules allow. In general his characters are lifelike and his style elegant. Perhaps it may be urged against his tragic plots that they tend unduly to the sentimental. For some of his tragedies he derived inspiration from Dante, as in the "Pia de' Tolomei", the "Corso Donati", and the "Conte Ugolino". In the "Pia" we observe traits of the Roman Lucretia and the Susannah of the Bible combined with characteristics of the Dantesque figure. Of other plays bearing upon more or less historical personages there may be listed "Arnoldo da Brescia", "Berengario", "Arrigo di Svevia", and "Corradino" (see his "Tragedie", Turin, 1837–44, and "Tragedie inedite", Florence, 1856).

(2) Leopoldo, Italian dramatic poet, b. at Ceva in 1831; d. 1899, son of Carlo Marenco. Like his father he held a government post under the Treasury Department, one which took him to Sardinia. In 1860 he became Professor of Latin literature at Bologna and later occupied a similar chair at Milan. In 1871 he retired to Turin. His plays in verse, written after 1860, are more notable for their lyrical qualities than they are for excellence of dramatic technique. Among them are "Celeste", "Tempeste alpine", "Marcellina", "Il falconiere di Pietra Ardena", "Adelasia", "La famiglia", "Carmela", "Piccarda Donati", "Saffo", "Rosalinda", etc. Subjects from modern and medieval history were treated by him, and he followed his father's example in drawing from Dante. See the collection of his plays, "Teatro di L. M." (Turin, 1884).

J. D. M. Ford.

Marenzio, Luca, musical composer, b. in 1550 at Coccaglia, near Brescia; d. at Rome 1599. His chief legacy to the musical world are his books of madrigals. His first collection was published in 1581 and was dedicated to Alphonse d'Este, the duke of Ferrara. Many of his 159 Madrigals and Motets have been translated into modern notation by Proske. A number of madrigals were published in 1588 in "Musica Trans-Alpina"; this collection became immediately popular. A "Mass" in eight parts is well known, and is worthy to be classed with the "Masses" of more illustrious church musicians. In a collection called "Villanelle e Arie alla Napolitana" he has left 113 exquisite madrigals and motets for three and four voices. The most notable of his compositions may be found printed in modern notation by Proske in "Musica Divina", II (Ratisbon, 1853).

Rossi, *Elogi Historici di Bresciani illustri* (Brescia, 1620); Peacham, *The Compleat Gentleman* (London, 1622).

William Finn.

Margaret, Saint, Virgin, and Martyr, also called Marina, belonged to Pisidian Antioch in Asia Minor, where her father was a pagan priest. Her mother dying soon after her birth, Margaret was nursed by a pious woman five or six leagues from Antioch. Having embraced Christianity and consecrated her virginity to God, she was disowned by her father and adopted by her nurse. While she was one day engaged in watching the flocks of her mistress, a lustful Roman prefect named Olybrius caught sight of her, and attracted by her great beauty sought to make her his concubine or wife. When neither cajolery nor threats of punishment could succeed in moving her to yield to his desires, he had her brought before him in public trial at Antioch. Threatened with death unless she renounced the Christian faith, the holy virgin refused to adore the gods of the empire, and an attempt was made to burn her, but the flames, we are told in her Acts, left her unhurt. She was then bound hand and foot and thrown into a cauldron of boiling water, but at her prayer her bonds were broken and she stood up uninjured. Finally the prefect ordered her to be beheaded. The Greek Church honours her under the name Marina on 13 July; the Latin, as Margaret on 20 July. Her Acts place her death in the persecution of Diocletian (A. D. 303–5), but in fact even the century to which she belonged is uncertain. St. Margaret is represented in art sometimes as a shepherdess, or as leading a chained dragon, again carrying a little cross or a girdle in her hand, or standing by a large vessel which recalls the cauldron into which she was plunged. Relics said to belong to the saint are venerated in very many parts of Europe: at Rome, Montefiascone, Brussels, Bruges, Paris, Froidmont, Troyes, and various other places. Curiously enough this virgin has been widely venerated for many centuries as a special patron of women who are pregnant.

Acta Sanctorum, XXIX, 24–44; *Les Petits Bollandistes*, VIII, pp. 509–16; Assemani, *Kalend. Eccles. Univ.*, VI, pp. 483–5; Tillemont, *Hist. Eccles.*, V, 797–798; Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, 20 July.

J. MacRory.

Margaret Colonna, Blessed, Poor Clare, b. in Rome, date uncertain; d. there, 20 September, 1284. Her parents died in Rome when she was still a young girl, and she was left to the care of her two brothers, the youngest of whom was raised to the cardinalate by Nicholas III in 1278. Having resolutely refused the proposal of marriage made to her by the chief magistrate of Rome, she retired to a lonely retreat near Palestrina where she passed her time in practices of piety and penance. Her charity towards the poor was unbounded, and was more than once miraculously rewarded. Through the influence of her brother, Cardinal Colonna, Blessed Margaret obtained the canonical erection of a community of Urbanist Poor Clares at Palestrina, of which she most probably became superioress. Seven years before her death she was attacked with a fearful and painful ulcer which till the end of her life she bore with the most sublime and generous resignation. After the death of Blessed Margaret, the community of Palestrina was transferred to the convent of San Silvestro in Capite. The nuns were driven from their cloister by the Italian Government at the time of the suppression; and the monastery has since been used as the central post-office of Rome. The exiled religious found shelter in the convent of Santa Cecilia in Trastevere, to which place the body of Blessed Margaret was removed.

Leo, *Lives of the Saints and Blessed of the Three Orders of St. Francis* (Taunton, 1887) IV, 70–73.

Stephen M. Donovan.

Margaret Haughery, "the mother of the orphans", as she was familiarly styled, b. in Cavan, Ireland, about 1814; d. at New Orleans, Louisiana, 9 February, 1882. Her parents, Charles and Margaret O'Rourke Gaffney, died at Baltimore, Maryland, in 1822 and she was left to her own resources and was thus deprived of acquiring a knowledge of reading and writing. A kind-hearted family of Welsh extraction sheltered the little orphan in their home. In 1835 she there married Charles Haughery and went to New Orleans with him. Within a year her husband and infant died. It was then she began her great career of charity. She was employed in the orphan asylum and when the orphans were without food she bought it for them from her earnings. The Female Orphan Asylum of the Sisters of Charity built in 1840 was practically her work, for she cleared it of debt. During the yellow fever epidemic in New Orleans in the fifties she went about from house to house, without regard to race or creed, nursing the victims and consoling the dying mothers with the promise to look after their little ones. St. Teresa's Church was practically built by Margaret, in conjunction with Sister Francis Regis. Margaret first established a dairy and drove around the city delivering the milk herself;

Statue of Margaret Haughery
New Orleans

afterwards she opened a bakery, and for years continued her rounds with the bread cart. Although she provided for orphans, fed the poor, and gave enormously in charity, her resources grew wonderfully and Margaret's bakery (the first steam bakery in the South) became famous. She braved General Butler during the Civil War and readily obtained permission to carry a cargo of flour for bread for her orphans across the lines. The Confederate prisoners were the special object of her solicitude.

Seated in the doorway of the bakery in the heart of the city, she became an integral part of its life, for besides the poor who came to her continually she was consulted by the people of all ranks about their business affairs, her wisdom having become proverbial. "Our Margaret" the people of New Orleans called her, and they will tell you that she was masculine in energy and courage but gifted with the gentlest and kindest manners. Her death was announced in the newspapers with blocked columns as a public calamity. All New Orleans, headed by the archbishop, the governor, and the mayor attended her funeral. She was buried in the same grave with Sister Francis Regis Barret, the Sister of Charity who died in 1862 and with whom Margaret had cooperated in all her early work for the poor. At once the idea of erecting a public monument to Margaret in the city arose spontaneously and in two years it was unveiled, 9 July, 1884. The little park in which it is erected is officially named Margaret Place. It has often been stated that this is the first public monument erected to a woman in the United States, but the monument on Dustin Island, N. H., to Mrs. Hannah Dustin who, in 1697, killed nine of her sleeping Indian captors and escaped (Harper's Encyclopædia of American History, New York, 1902) antedates it by ten years.

GRACE KING, *New Orleans, the Place and the People* (New York, 1899), 272–8; *Notable Americans*, V (Boston, 1904); *Appletons' Cyclopædia of American Biography*, s. v.; *The Ave Maria*, LVI, 7; The files of the *New Orleans Picayune* and other New Orleans newspapers. REGINA RANDOLPH.

Margaret Mary Alacoque, BLESSED, religious of the Visitation Order, Apostle of the Devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus, b. at Lhautecour, France, 22 July, 1647; d. at Paray-le-Monial, 17 Oct., 1690. Her parents, Claude Alacoque and Philiberte Lamyn, were distinguished less for temporal possessions than for their virtue, which gave them an honourable position. From early childhood Margaret showed intense love for the Blessed Sacrament, and preferred silence and prayer to childish amusements. After her first communion at the age of nine, she practised in secret severe corporal mortifications, until paralysis confined her to bed for four years. At the end of this period, having made a vow to the Blessed Virgin to consecrate herself to the religious life, she was instantly restored to perfect health. The death of her father and the injustice of a relative plunged the family in poverty and humiliation, after which more than ever Margaret found her consolation in the Blessed Sacrament, and Christ made her sensible of His presence and protection. He usually appeared to her as the Crucified or the *Ecce Homo*, and this did not surprise her, as she thought others had the same Divine assistance. When Margaret was seventeen, the family property was recovered, and her mother besought her to establish herself in the world. Her filial tenderness made her believe that the vow of childhood was not binding, and that she could serve God at home by penance and charity to the poor. Then, still bleeding from her self-imposed austerities, she began to take part in the pleasures of the world. One night upon her return from a ball, she had a vision of Christ as He was during the scourging, reproaching her for infidelity after He had given her so many proofs of His love. During her entire life Margaret mourned over two faults committed at this time—the wearing of some superfluous ornaments and a mask at the carnival to please her brothers.

On 25 May, 1671, she entered the Visitation Convent at Paray, where she was subjected to many trials to prove her vocation, and in Nov., 1672, pronounced her final vows. She had a delicate constitution, but was gifted with intelligence and good judgment, and in the cloister she chose for herself what was most repugnant to her nature, making her life one of inconceivable sufferings, which were often relieved or instantly cured by our Lord, Who acted as her Director, appeared to her frequently and conversed with her, confiding to her the mission to establish the devotion to His Sacred Heart. These extraordinary occurrences drew upon her the adverse criticism of the community, who treated her as a visionary, and her superior commanded her to live the common life. But her obedience, her humility, and invariable charity towards those who persecuted her, finally prevailed, and her mission, accomplished in the crucible of suffering, was recognized even by those who had shown her the most bitter opposition.

Margaret Mary was inspired by Christ to establish the Holy Hour and to pray lying prostrate with her face to the ground from eleven till midnight on the eve of the first Friday of each month, to share in the mortal sadness He endured when abandoned by His Apostles in His Agony, and to receive holy Communion on the first Friday of every month. In the first great revelation, He made known to her His ardent desire to be loved by men and His design of manifesting His Heart with all Its treasures of love and mercy, of sanctification and salvation. He appointed the Friday after the octave of the feast of Corpus Christi as the feast of the Sacred Heart; He called her "the Beloved Disciple of the Sacred Heart", and the heiress of all Its treasures. The love of the Sacred Heart was the fire which consumed her, and devotion to the Sacred Heart is the refrain of all her writings. In her last illness she refused all alleviation, repeating frequently: "What have I in heaven and what do I desire on earth, but Thee alone, O my God", and died pronouncing the Holy Name of Jesus. The discussion of the mission and virtues of Margaret Mary continued for years. All her actions, her revelations, her spiritual maxims, her teachings regarding the devotion to the Sacred Heart, of which she was the chief exponent as well as the apostle, were subjected to the most severe and minute examination, and finally the Sacred Congregation of Rites passed a favourable vote on the heroic virtues of this servant of God. In March, 1824, Leo XII pronounced her Venerable, and on 18 Sept., 1864, Pius IX declared her Blessed. When her tomb was canonically opened in July, 1830, two instantaneous cures took place. Her body rests under the altar in the chapel at Paray, and many striking favours have been obtained by pilgrims attracted thither from all parts of the world. Her feast is celebrated on 17 October.

The Letters, Instructions, and Autobiography of Bl. Margaret Mary are included in *Vie et Œuvres par les Contemporains* (2 vols., Paris, 1901); LANGUET, *La Vie de la Vén. Marguerite-Marie* (Paris, 1729), tr. (London, 1850); HAMON, *Vie de la b. M. d'après les manusc. et les docum. orig.* (Paris, 1907); BOUGAUD, *Revelations of the Sacred Heart*, tr. (New York, 1890). See also biographies by GAUTHEY (Paris, 1890); BOULANGER (Paris, 1847); DANIEL, tr. by a SISTER OF MERCY (New York); TICKELL (New York, 1900); *Life of the Blessed Margaret Mary Alacoque* in *The Messenger of the Sacred Heart* (1905), seriatim. SISTER MARY BERNARD DOLL.

Margaret of Cortona, SAINT, a penitent of the Third Order of St. Francis, born at Laviano in Tuscany in 1247; died at Cortona, 22 February, 1297. At the age of seven years Margaret lost her mother and two years later her father married a second time. Between the daughter and her step-mother there seems to have been but little sympathy or affection, and

Margaret was one of those natures who crave affection. When about seventeen years of age she made the acquaintance of a young cavalier, who, some say, was a son of Guglielmo di Pecora, lord of Valiano, with whom she one night fled from her father's house. Margaret in her confessions does not mention her lover's name. For nine years she lived with him in his castle near Montepulciano, and a son was born to them. Frequently she besought her lover to marry her; he as often promised to do so, but never did. In her confessions she expressly says that she consented to her lover's importunities unwillingly. Wadding and others who have described her in these early years as an abandoned woman, either had not rightly read her legend, or had deepened the shadows of her early life to make her conversion seem the more wonderful. Even during this period Margaret was very compassionate towards the poor and relieved their wants; she was also accustomed to seek out quiet places where she would dream of a life given to virtue and the love of God. Once some of her neighbours bade her look to her soul before it was too late. She replied that they need have no fear of her, for that she would die a saint and that her critics would come as pilgrims to her shrine.

She was at last set free from her life of sin by the tragic death of her lover, who was murdered whilst on a journey. Margaret's first intimation of his death was the return of his favourite hound without its master. The hound led her to his body. It was characteristic of her generosity that she blamed herself for his irregular life, and began to loathe her beauty which had fascinated him. She returned to his relatives all the jewels and property he had given her and left his home; and with her little son set out for her father's house. Her father would have received her, but his wife refused, and Margaret and her child were turned adrift. For a moment she felt tempted to trade upon her beauty; but she prayed earnestly and in her soul she seemed to hear a voice bidding her go to the Franciscan Friars at Cortona and put herself under their spiritual direction. On her arrival at Cortona, two ladies, noticing her loneliness, offered her assistance and took her home with them. They afterwards introduced her to the Franciscan Friars at the church of San Francesco in the city. For three years Margaret had to struggle hard with temptations. Naturally of a gay spirit, she felt much drawn to the world. But temptation only convinced her the more of the necessity of self-discipline and an entire consecration of herself to religion. At times remorse for the past would have led her into intemperate self-mortifications, but for the wise advice of her confessors. As it was, she fasted rigorously, abstaining altogether from flesh-meat, and generally subsisting upon bread and herbs. Her great physical vitality made such penance a necessity to her.

After three years of probation Margaret was admitted to the Third Order of St. Francis, and from this time she lived in strict poverty. Following the example of St. Francis, she went and begged her bread. But whilst thus living on alms, she gave her services freely to others; especially to the sick-poor whom she nursed. It was about the time that she became a Franciscan tertiary that the revelations began which form the chief feature in her story. It was in the year 1277, as she was praying in the church of the Franciscan Friars, that she seemed to hear these words: "What is thy wish, *poverella?*" and she replied: "I neither seek nor wish for aught but Thee, my Lord Jesus." From this time forth she lived in intimate communing with Christ. At first He always addressed her as "*poverella*", and only after a time of probation and purification did He call her "My child". But Margaret, though coming to lead more and more the life of a recluse, was yet active in the service of others. She prevailed upon the city of Cortona to found a hospital for the sick-poor, and to supply nurses for the hospital, she instituted a congregation of Tertiary Sisters, known as *le poverelle*. She also established a confraternity of Our Lady of Mercy; the members of which bound themselves to support the hospital, and to help the needy wherever found, and particularly the respectable poor. Moreover on several occasions Margaret intervened in public affairs for the sake of putting an end to civic feuds. Twice in obedience to a Divine command, she upbraided Guglielmo Ubertini Pazzi, Bishop of Arezzo, in which diocese Cortona was situated, because he lived more like a secular prince and soldier, than like a pastor of souls. This prelate was killed in battle at Bibbiena in 1289. The year previous to this, Margaret for the sake of greater quiet had removed her lodging from the hospital she had founded to near the ruined church of St. Basil above the city. This church she now caused to be repaired. It was here that she spent her last years, and in this church she was buried. But after her death it was rebuilt in more magnificent style and dedicated in her own name. There her body remains enshrined to this day, incorrupt, in a silver shrine over the high-altar. Although honoured as a *beata* from the time of her death, Margaret was not canonized until 16 May, 1728.

St. Margaret of Cortona
Giovanni Barbieri (Guercino), The Vatican

The original "Legend of St. Margaret" was written by her director and friend, Fra Giunta Bevegnati. It is almost entirely taken up with her revelations, and was mainly dictated by Margaret herself, in obedience to her directors. It is published by the Bollandists in "Acta SS., mense Februarii, die 22". The most notable edition of the "Legend" however is that published in 1793 by da Pelago, together with an Italian translation and twelve learned dissertations dealing with the life and times of the saint. In 1897 a new edition of da Pelago's work, but without the dissertations, was published at Siena by Crivelli. An English version of the greater part of the "Legend", with an introductory essay, has been published by Fr. Cuthbert, O.S.F.C. (London, 1906).

See also Marchese, *Vita di S. Margherita* (Rome, 1674); Chérance, *Sainte Marguerite de Cortone*, tr. O'Connor (London).

Father Cuthbert.

Margaret of Hungary, Blessed, daughter of King Bela I of Hungary and his wife Marie Laskaris,

born 1242; died 18 Jan., 1271. According to a vow which her parents made when Hungary was liberated from the Tatars that their next child should be dedicated to religion, Margaret, in 1245, entered the Dominican Convent of Veszprém. Invested with the habit at the age of four, she was transferred in her tenth year to the Convent of the Blessed Virgin founded by her parents on the Hasen Insel near Buda, the Margareten Insel near Budapest to-day, and where the ruins of the convent are still to be seen. Here Margaret passed all her life, which was consecrated to contemplation and penance, and was venerated as a saint during her lifetime. She strenuously opposed the plans of her father, who for political reasons wished to marry her to King Ottokar II of Bohemia. Margaret appears to have taken solemn vows when she was eighteen. All narratives call special attention to Margaret's sanctity and her spirit of earthly renunciation. Her whole life was one unbroken chain of devotional exercises and penance. She chastised herself unceasingly from childhood, wore hair garments, and an iron girdle round her waist, as well as shoes spiked with nails; she was frequently scourged, and performed the most menial work in the convent.

Shortly after her death, steps were taken for her canonization, and in 1271–1276 investigations referring to this were taken up; in 1275–1276 the process was introduced, but not completed. Not till 1640 was the process again taken up, and again it was not concluded. Attempts which were made in 1770 by Count Ignatz Batthyányi were also fruitless; so that the canonization never took place, although Margaret was venerated as a saint shortly after her death; and Pius VI consented on 28 July, 1789, to her veneration as a saint. Pius VII raised her feast day to a *festum duplex*. The minutes of the proceedings of 1271–1272 record seventy-four miracles; and among those giving testimony were twenty-seven in whose favour the miracles had been wrought. These cases refer to the cure of illnesses, and one case of awakening from death. Margaret's remains were given to the Poor Clares when the Dominican Order was dissolved; they were first kept in Pozsony and later in Buda. After the order had been suppressed by Joseph II, in 1782, the relics were destroyed in 1789; but some portions are still preserved in Gran, Györ, Pannonhalma. The feast day of the saint is 18 January. In art she is depicted with a lily and holding a book in her hand.

NÉMETHY-FRAKNÓI, *Arpádházi b. Margit történetéhez* (Budapest, 1885), being contributions on the history of Blessed Margaret of the House of Arpaden; DEMKÓ, *Arpádházi b. Margit élete* (Budapest, 1895), a life of the saint. Further bibliographical particulars in *Árpád and the Arpaden*, edited by CSÁNKI (Budapest, 1908), 387–388; minutes of the proceedings of 1271–72, published in *Monumenta Romana Episcopatus Vesprimiensis*, I (Budapest, 1896).

A. ÁLDÁSY.

Margaret of Lorraine, BLESSED, Duchess d'Alençon, religious of the order of Poor Clares, born in 1463 at the castle of Vaudémont (Lorraine); died at Argentan (Brittany) 2 November, 1521. The daughter of Ferri de Vaudémont and of Yolande d'Anjou, little Margaret became an orphan at an early age and was brought up at Aix-en-Provençe, by King René of Anjou, her grandfather. The latter dying in 1480 she was sent back to Lorraine to her brother, René II, who gave her in marriage at Paris, in 1488, to the Duke d'Alençon. Left a widow in 1492 she busied herself in the administration of her duchy and the education of her children. When she was relieved of the duties imposed on her by her position she decided to renounce the world and retired to Mortagne, to a monastery of religious women who followed the rule of Saint Elizabeth. Later having brought with her to Argentan some of these nuns she founded there another monastery which she placed, with the authorization of the pope, under the rule of Saint Clare, modified by the Minor Observants. She herself took the religious habit in this house and made her vows on 11 October, 1520, but on 2 November, 1521, after having lived for a year in the most humble and austere manner, she died a most holy death in her modest cell at the age of sixty-two. Her body, preserved in the monastery of the Poor Clares, was transferred when that monastery was suppressed to the church of St. Germain d'Argentan, but in 1793 it was profaned and thrown into the common burying-place.

The memory of Margaret of Lorraine is preserved in the "Martyrologium Franciscanum" and in the "Martyrologium gallicanum". After an invitation made by the Bishop of Séez, Jacques Camus de Pontcarré, Louis XIII begged Pope Urban VIII to order a canonical inquiry into the virtues and the miracles of the pious Duchess d'Alençon; unfortunately in the political agitations of the time the realization of this plan was lost sight of. At the initiative of the present Bishop of Séez an effort is being made to obtain recognition at the Court of Rome of her cultus. The process is well on its way.

HAMEAU, *La vie de Marguerite de Lorraine, duchesse d'Alençon* (Paris, 1628); LAMBEL, *Marguerite de Lorraine, duchesse d'Alençon* (Lille, 1862); LAURENT, *Histoire de Marguerite de Lorraine, duchesse d'Alençon, fondatrice et religieuse du monastère de Ste. Claire d'Argentan* (Paris, 1854); SERRE, *Vie de la B. Marguerite de Lorraine, duchesse d'Alençon* (Paris, 1652).

LÉON CLUGNET.

Margaret of Savoy, BLESSED, Marchioness of Montferrat, born at Pignerol in 1382; died at Alba, 23 November, 1464. She was the only daughter of Louis of Savoy, Prince of Achaia, and of Bonne, daughter of Amadeus VI, Count of Savoy, and was given in marriage in 1403 to Theodore, Marquis of Montferrat, a descendant of the Greek emperors, the Palæologi, and widower of Jeanne, daughter of the duke of Bar and of Lorraine. Her piety, already great, increased after she had heard the preaching of St. Vincent Ferrer, who spent several months in Montferrat. Therefore, when she was left a widow in 1418, she decided to abandon the world. Leaving the direction of the affairs of the marquisate to Jean-Jacques, the son of her husband by his first marriage, she retired to Alba where she joined the Third Order of St. Dominic. A little later, Philip Maria, duke of Milan, asked her hand in marriage and begged the pope to relieve her of her vow. But Margaret opposed a formal refusal to this request and thoroughly resolved to give herself entirely to God: with several young women of rank, she founded a monastery and placed it under the rule of the order of St. Dominic. Redoubling her mortifications she made rapid progress in the way of perfection and died in a saintly manner. On 13 December, 1464, her remains were placed in a simple tomb; in 1481 they were transferred to a different and much more beautiful sepulchre built in her monastery at the expense of William, Marquis of Montferrat.

ALLARIA, *Storia della B. Margherita di Savoia, marchesa di Montferrato* (Alba, 1877); BARESIANO, *Vita della B. Margherita di Savoia, domenicana, principessa di Piemonte* (Turin, 1638); BARISANO, *Vita della B. Margherita di Savoia, Marchesa di Montferrato* (Turin, 1692; *ibid.*, 1892); CARRARA, *Vita civile e religiosa della B. Margherita di Savoia, marchesa di Montferrato* (Turin, 1833); CODRETTO, *Vita e miracolosi portenti della B. Margherita di Savoia* (Turin, 1653); RECHAC, *Les saintes de l'ordre de St. Dominique* (Paris, 1635); REYNAUD, *Vie de la B. Marguerite de Savoie de l'ordre de St. Dominique* (Paris, 1674); SEMERIA, *Vita della B. Margherita di Savoia* (Turin, 1833).

LÉON CLUGNET.

Margaret of Scotland, SAINT, b. about 1045, d. 16 Nov., 1093, was a daughter of Edward "Outremere", or "the Exile", by Agatha, kinswoman of Gisela, the wife of St. Stephen of Hungary. She was the granddaughter of Edmund Ironside. A constant tradition asserts that Margaret's father and his brother Edmund were sent to Hungary for safety during the reign of Canute, but no record of the fact has been found in that country. The date of Margaret's birth cannot be

ascertained with accuracy, but it must have been between the years 1038, when St. Stephen died, and 1057, when her father returned to England. It appears that Margaret came with him on that occasion and, on his death and the conquest of England by the Normans, her mother Agatha decided to return to the Continent. A storm however drove their ship to Scotland, where Malcolm III received the party under his protection, subsequently taking Margaret to wife. This event had been delayed for a while by Margaret's desire to enter religion, but it took place some time between 1067 and 1070.

In her position as queen, all Margaret's great influence was thrown into the cause of religion and piety. A synod was held, and among the special reforms instituted the most important were the regulation of the Lenten fast, observance of the Easter communion, and the removal of certain abuses concerning marriage within the prohibited degrees. Her private life was given up to constant prayer and practices of piety. She founded several churches, including the Abbey of Dunfermline, built to enshrine her greatest treasure, a relic of the true Cross. Her book of the Gospels, richly adorned with jewels, which one day dropped into a river and was according to legend miraculously recovered, is now in the Bodleian library at Oxford. She foretold the day of her death, which took place at Edinburgh on 16 Nov., 1093, her body being buried before the high altar at Dunfermline.

In 1250 Margaret was canonized by Innocent IV, and her relics were translated on 19 June, 1259, to a new shrine, the base of which is still visible beyond the modern east wall of the restored church. At the Reformation her head passed into the possession of Mary Queen of Scots, and later was secured by the Jesuits at Douai, where it is believed to have perished during the French Revolution. According to George Conn, "De duplici statu religionis apud Scotos" (Rome, 1628), the rest of the relics, together with those of Malcolm, were acquired by Philip II of Spain, and placed in two urns in the Escorial. When, however, Bishop Gillies of Edinburgh applied through Pius IX for their restoration to Scotland, they could not be found.

The chief authority for Margaret's life is the contemporary biography printed in "Acta SS.", II, June, 320. Its authorship has been ascribed to Turgot, the saint's confessor, a monk of Durham and later Archbishop of St. Andrews, and also to Theodoric, a somewhat obscure monk; but in spite of much controversy the point remains quite unsettled. The feast of St. Margaret is now observed by the whole Church on 10 June.

Acta SS., II, June, 320; CAPGRAVE, *Nova Legenda Angliæ* (London, 1515), 225; WILLIAM OF MALMESBURY, *Gesta Regum* in *P. L.*, CLXXIX, also in *Rolls Series*, ed. STUBBS (London, 1887–9); CHALLONER, *Britannia Sancta*, I (London, 1745), 358; BUTLER, *Lives of the Saints*, 10 June; STANTON, *Menology of England and Wales* (London, 1887), 544; FORBES-LEITH, *Life of St. Margaret . . .* (London, 1885); MADAN, *The Evangelistarium of St. Margaret* in *Academy* (1887); BELLESHEIM, *History of the Catholic Church in Scotland*, tr. BLAIR, III (Edinburgh, 1890), 241–63.

G. ROGER HUDLESTON.

Margaret of the Blessed Sacrament, Carmelite nun, b. in Paris, 6 March, 1590; d. there 24 May, 1660. She was the second daughter of the celebrated Madame Acarie, otherwise known as Blessed Marie de l'Incarnation (q. v.), who introduced the Reformed Carmelites into France. Carefully reared by her mother and directed by M. de Bérulle, she took the religious habit at the first Carmelite convent, Rue St. Jacques, Paris, 15 September, 1605. On 21 November, 1606, she made her vows privately, and on 18 March, 1607, she made them solemnly, under the care of Mother Anne de Saint-Barthélemi. In 1615 she was made sub-prioress, and in 1618, prioress of the convent of Tours. In these offices she showed such ability that she was sent in 1620 to restore harmony in the convent at Bordeaux. Shortly after this she was ordered to the convent of Saintes, where she remained eighteen months, and in 1624 was recalled to Paris, to replace as prioress Mother Madeleine de Saint-Joseph in the convent situated in the Rue Chapon. After having been several times prioress of the convent of the Rue Chapon, where she edified the community by a zeal for bodily mortification that her superiors had sometimes to moderate, she was attacked by dropsy, to which she succumbed. Her heart was taken to the monastery of Pontoise, where her saintly mother had been buried, and her body remained in the convent of the Rue Chapon, where it was kept until 1792.

See bibliography of article MARIE DE L'INCARNATION and BOUCHER, *Hist. de la Bienheureuse Marie de l'Incarnation*, II, (Paris, 1854), 168–80.

LÉON CLUGNET.

Margaret Pole, BLESSED, Countess of Salisbury, martyr; b. at Castle Farley, near Bath, 14 August, 1473; martyred at East Smithfield Green, 28 May, 1541. She was the daughter of George Plantagenet, Duke of Clarence, and Isabel, elder daughter of the Earl of Warwick (the king-maker), and the sister of Edmund of Warwick who, under Henry VII, paid with his life the penalty of being the last male representative of the Yorkist line (28 Nov., 1499). About 1491 Henry VII gave her in marriage to Sir Richard Pole, whose mother was the half-sister of the king's mother, Margaret Beaufort. At her husband's death in 1505 Margaret was left with five children, of whom the fourth, Reginald, was to become cardinal and Archbishop of Canterbury, and also the indirect cause of his mother's martyrdom. Henry VIII, on his accession, reversed her brother's attainder, created her Countess of Salisbury, and an Act of Restitution was passed by which she came into possession of her ancestral domains: the king considered her the saintliest woman in England, and, after the birth of the Princess Mary, Margaret of Salisbury became her sponsor in baptism and confirmation and was afterwards appointed governess of the princess and her household. As the years passed there was talk of a marriage between the princess and the countess's son Reginald, who was still a layman. But when the matter of the king's divorce began to be talked of Reginald Pole boldly spoke out his mind in the affair and shortly afterwards withdrew from England. The princess was still in the countess's charge when Henry married Anne Boleyn, but when he was opposed in his efforts to have his daughter treated as illegitimate he removed the countess from her post, although she begged to be allowed to follow and serve Mary at her own charge. She returned to court after the fall of Anne, but in 1530 Reginald Pole sent to Henry his treatise "Pro ecclesiasticæ unitatis defensione", in answer to questions propounded to him in the king's behalf by Cromwell, Tunstall, Starkey, and others. Besides being a theological reply to the questions, the book was a denunciation of the king's courses (see POLE, REGINALD). Henry was beside himself with rage, and it soon became evident that, failing the writer of the "Defensio", the royal anger was to be wreaked on the hostages in England, and this despite the fact that the countess and her eldest son had written to Reginald in reproof of his attitude and action.

In November, 1538, two of her sons and others of their kin were arrested on a charge of treason, though Cromwell had previously written that they had "little offended save that he [the Cardinal] is of their kin", they were committed to the Tower, and in January, with the exception of Geoffrey Pole, they were executed. Ten days after the apprehension of her sons the venerable countess was arrested and examined by Fitzwilliam, Earl of Southampton, and Goodrich, Bishop of Ely, but these reported to Cromwell that although they had "travailed with her" for many hours she would "nothing utter", and they were forced to conclude that either her sons had not made her a sharer

in their "treason" or else she was "the most arrant traitress that ever lived". In Southampton's custody she was committed to Cowdray Park, near Midhurst, and there subjected to all manner of indignity. In May Cromwell introduced against her a Bill of Attainder, the readings of which were hurriedly got over, and at the third reading Cromwell produced a white silk tunic found in one of her coffers, which was embroidered on the back with the Five Wounds, and for this, which was held to connect her with the Northern Uprising, she was "attainted to die by act of Parliament". The other charges against her, to which she was never permitted to reply, had to do with the escape from England of her chaplain and the conveying of messages abroad. After the passage of the Act she was removed to the Tower and there, for nearly two years, she was "tormented by the severity of the weather and insufficient clothing". In April, 1541, there was another insurrection in Yorkshire, and it was then determined to enforce without any further procedure the Act of Attainder passed in 1539. On the morning of 28 May (de Marillac; Gairdner, following Chapuys, says 27) she was told she was to die within the hour. She answered that no crime had been imputed to her; nevertheless she walked calmly from her cell to East Smithfield Green, within the precincts of the Tower, where a low wooden block had been prepared, and there, by a clumsy novice, she was beheaded.

De Castillon and de Marillac, *Correspondance politique;* Morris in *The Month* (April, 1889); Camm, *Lives of the English Martyrs,* I (London, 1904), 502 sqq.; Gairdner in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, s. v. *Pole;* Gillow, *Dict. Eng. Cath.*, s. v.

Blanche M. Kelly.

Margaritæ (Decreti Decretorum, Decretalium). —The canonists of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries who taught canon law by commenting on the Decretum of Gratian and on the various collections of the Decretals, gave the most varied forms and diverse names to their treatises. The "Margaritæ" are collections specially intended to help the memory. In them are arranged, either in alphabetical order or according to the subject matter, the more important propositions, résumés, and axioms; some of them consisted of more or less felicitous mnemonic verses. A number of these "Margaritæ" have been preserved, but not all the authors are known with certainty. Some of the treatises have been printed with the Decretum or the Decretals. Thus several editions of the Decretum contain the "Modus legendi" in verse, beginning:

Collige versibus quid vult distinctio quævis,
Ut videat quisquis divinum jus hominisque.

Another, as yet unpublished, which may be the "Breviarium pauperum metrice compilatum", contains in verse the five books of the Decretals and ends thus: "Hos quinque libros metrice conscribere tempto."

Schulte, *Geschichte der Quellen des canonischen Rechts* (Stuttgart, 1875), I, 218; II, 490, 492, 495.

A. Boudinhon.

Margil, Antonio, b. at Valencia, Spain, 18 August, 1657; d. at Mexico, 6 Aug., 1726. He entered the Franciscan Order in his native city on 22 April, 1673. After his ordination to the priesthood he volunteered for the Indian missions in America, and arrived at Vera Cruz on 6 June, 1683. He was stationed at the famous missionary college of Santa Cruz, Querétaro, but was generally engaged in preaching missions all over the country, in Yucatan, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, and especially in Guatemala, where he merited the name of Apostle of Guatemala. He always walked barefooted, without sandals, fasted every day in the year, never used meat or fish, and applied the discipline as well as other instruments of penance to himself unmercifully. He slept very little, but passed in prayer the greater part of the night, as well as the time allotted for the *siesta.* The result was that his efforts for the salvation of Indians and colonists were crowned with extraordinary success. On 25 June, 1706, he was appointed first guardian of the newly-erected missionary college of Guadalupe, Zacatecas. In 1716 he led a band of three fathers and two lay-brothers into Texas, and founded the missions of Guadalupe among the Nacogdoches, Dolores among the Ays, and San Miguel among the Adays. When the French destroyed these missions, Father Margil withdrew to the Rio San Antonio, and remained near the present city of San Antonio for more than a year. He then returned with his friars to the scene of his former activity, restored the missions, and even gave his attention to the French settlers in Louisiana. In 1722 he was elected guardian of his college and compelled to leave his beloved Indians. At the close of his term of office he resumed missionary work in Mexico. He died at the capital in the famous Convento Grande de San Francisco, in the odour of sanctity. Gregory XVI in 1836 declared Father Antonio Margil's virtues heroic.

Espinosa, *Crónica Apostólica y Seráfica* (Mexico, 1746); Vilaplana, *Vida del V. P. Fr. Antonio Margil* (Madrid, 1775); Arricivita, *Crónica Seráfica y Apostólica* (Mexico, 1792); Sotomayor, *Historia del Apostólico Colegio de Guadalupe* (Zacatecas, 1874); Shea, *Catholic Church in Colonial Days* (New York, 1886).

Zephyrin Engelhardt.

Margotti, Giacomo, a Catholic publicist, born 11 May, 1823; died 6 May, 1887. He was a native of San Remo, where his father was president of the Chamber of Commerce, and there he studied the classics and philosophy, after which he entered the seminary of Ventimiglia; in 1845, he obtained the doctorate at the University of Genoa and was received into the Royal Academy of Superga, where he remained until 1849. Already in 1848, in company with Mgr. Moreno, Bishop of Ivrea, Professor Audisio, and the Marquis Birago, he had established the daily paper "L'Armonia", which soon had other distinguished contributors; among them, Rosmini and Marquis Gustavo, brother of Cavour; the managing editor, however, and the soul of the publication, was Margotti, whose writings combined soundness of philosophy and of theological doctrine with rare purity of style, while his ready ability for reply, and the brilliancy of his polemics made him feared by the sects and by the Sardinian government, which at that moment, in furtherance of its policy of territorial expansion, had entered upon a course of legislation that was hostile to the Church and at variance with the wishes of a great majority of the people. As a result, Margotti underwent frequent trials, and was often subjected to fines and to other impositions; and in 1859, Cavour suppressed the "L'Armonia". This publication was replaced by "Il Piemonte"; but when the period of agitation passed, "L'Armonia" reappeared; its name was changed, however, conformably with the wish of Pius IX, on the twenty-fifth of December, 1863, after which date it was called "L'Unità Cattolica". On the other hand, Margotti continued to be the object of attacks and of plots, and once, at Turin, an attempt was made upon his life; but nothing intimidated him; while his journalistic proficiency was eulogized by the "British Review" in its issue for August, 1865.

For a long time, the opinion of Margotti on questions of Catholic interest had the force of oracle for Italian Catholics; and if he was not the author of the axiom "nè eletti, nè elettori"—"be neither elector nor elected"—he, more effectually than any one else, presented its truth to the Catholics, to convince them that, in the face of revolutionary triumphs, it was idle to hope for a successful reaction through parliament; in which he was in accordance with the views of Pius IX, who, in 1868, said to Margotti that Catholics should not go to the ballot-box: "Non si vada alle urne". He was foreign to all sense of personal ag-

grandizement; Pius IX, referring to this fact, once said: "Margotti never asked me for anything: he was right; for any dignity that I could have conferred upon him would have been inferior to his merits". By his will, Margotti left nearly 100,000 lire for charitable purposes. Besides the articles in "L'Unità", Margotti wrote "Il processo di Nepomuceno Nuytz, prof. di Diritto Canonico nella Università di Torino" (1851); "Considerazioni sulla separazione dello Stato dalla Chiesa in Piemonte" (1855); "Le vittorie della Chiesa nei primi anni del Pontificato di Pio IX" (1857); "Memorie per la storia dei nostri tempi" (1863, 6 vols.); "Le consolazioni del S. P. Pio IX" (1863); "Pio IX e il suo episcopato nelle diocesi di Spoleto e d'Imola" (1877).

Civiltà Cattolica (Rome), ser. XIII, vol. VI, p. 485; vol. VII, p. 1 sq.; DELLA CASA, *I Nostri* (Treviso, 1903), 31 sq.

U. BENIGNI.

Maria-Laach (ABBATIA BEATÆ MARIÆ VIRGINIS AD LACUM, or BEATÆ MARIÆ LACENSIS), a Benedictine abbey on the south-west bank of Lake Laach, near Andernach in Rhineland, Germany. It was founded in the year 1093 by the Palsgrave Henry II of Lorraine who probably was a descendant from the line of the Counts of Hochstaden (P. Adalbert Schippers, O.S.B., "The Palsgrave Henry II's Charter of Foundation for Laach" in the "Trierisches Archiv", XV, 1909, 53 sq.). In the year 1112 his stepson Siegfried of Ballenstadt renewed the foundation (P. Ildefons Herwegen, O.S.B., "The Palsgraves of Lorraine and the Benedictine monasteries of the Lower Rhine" in "Annalen der historischen Vereins für den Niederrhein", LXXXIX, 1910, 46 sq.). The monastery, which was handed over to the Cluniac Benedictines from the abbey of Afflighem in Belgium, welcomed its first abbot in the accomplished Gilbert, in 1127, and thus became independent. His memorial tablet in mosaic with portrait and epitaph is in the Rhine Provincial Museum at Bonn. A facsimile of the same has found a place in the cloister at Maria-Laach. Until the middle of the fourteenth century discipline was severe. Abbot Fulbert (1152–1177) did good work for the library and promoted scientific activity, while the Abbots Albert (1199–1217) and Theoderich II (1256–1295) directed their energies towards the structural embellishment and artistic decoration of the church and monastery. The last named erected the tomb of the founder, one of the finest pieces of thirteenth century sculpture on the Rhine (Hasak, "Gesch. der deutschen Bildhauerkunst im 13. Jahrhundert", Berlin, 1899, page 92 sq.). He also succeeded in tiding over a serious economic crisis.

In the fourteenth century there began in Germany, owing to the unfavourable conditions of the time, a deterioration in the spiritual life of the Benedictine Order. Under the thirteenth abbot, Johannes I (1328–1333), it came gradually into notice in Maria-Laach as well. It was only in the second half of the fifteenth century, through an alliance with the congregation of Bursfeld, that the monastic spirit began once more to flourish. A number of the monks held out against reform, but the sagacity and energy of the celebrated Abbot Johannes IV of Deidesheim (1469–1491) prevailed finally on the side of discipline. With improvement in discipline there came a new literary life. The Humanities were ably represented by Siberti, Tilmann of Bonn, Benedict of Munstereifel, and above all by Prior Johannes Butzbach (1526). Most of Butzbach's poetical and prose works remain in manuscript in the University Library at Bonn, and have not all been published. His best known work is his "Hodoipsorikon", an account of his years of travel before his entry into the monastery at Laach, issued by D. J. Becker (Ratisbon, 1869) as the "Chronicle of a Travelling Scholar". His "Auctarium in librum Johannis Trithemii de scriptoribus ecclesiasticis", a supplement to the Abbot von Sponheim's "Scholars' Catalogue", is also noteworthy. The abbey chronicle written by Butzbach has unfortunately been lost. The world-famous story of Genevieve, the scene of which is at Lake Laach, goes back, in the oldest form that has come down to us, to Johannes von Andernach, a contemporary monk at Laach (Brull, "Andernach Programme, 1896–97"; Idem, "Prumm Programme, 1898–99"). The Abbot Johann Augustin (1552–1568) left behind a book on "The practices and customs of Laach" (Rituale monasticæ Hyparchiæ cœnobii lacensis) that is now numbered among the manuscripts in the library of Bonn University.

Until the dissolution of the abbey in the great secularizing movement of the year 1802, Maria-Laach remained a centre of religious and literary activity. The church and monastery went first to the French and then, in 1815, to the Prussian government. In the year 1820 the monastery became private property and in 1863 was acquired by the Society of Jesus. The abbey church has remained to this day the property of the Prussian Exchequer. The Jesuits made Maria-Laach a home of learning. It became a place of study for the scholastics and a meeting place for the leading savants of the Society. Among them P. Schneemann distinguished himself as chief worker on the "Collectio lacensis" ("Acta et decreta sacrorum conciliorum recentiorum", 7 volumes, Freiburg, 1870–1890), which represents a valuable continuation of the older collections of the Councils. P. Schneemann issued vols. I to VI (1682–1870); P. Granderath vol. VII (1870–1882) dealing with the Vatican Council. Here also was begun the "Philosophia lacensis", a collection of learned books on the different branches of philosophy (logic, cosmology, psychology, theodicy, natural law) and published at Freiburg, 1880–1900. The "Stimmen aus Maria-Laach", however, bore the name of the monastery farthest. Under the direction of P. Schneemann the first series began in 1865, and appeared as occasional pamphlets. They were undertaken at the suggestion of the provincial, P. Anderledy, in defence of the Encyclical "Quanta cura", and the Syllabus of Pius IX (1864) against the attacks of Liberalism. P. Florian Riess had a meritorious share in the publication of a second series at the time of the Vatican Council. Since 1871 the "Stimmen" has been a regular periodical dealing with every department of knowledge. The "Stimmen" retained its old name when the Jesuits were banished from Maria-Laach during the Kulturkampf in 1873.

The Benedictines of the Beuron Congregation moved into the monastery in 1892. In the year 1893 Maria-Laach was canonically raised into an abbey. The first Abbot, Willibrod Benzler, was appointed Bishop of Metz in 1901. Fidelis von Stotzingen succeeded him as second abbot (1901). The community numbers (1910) 41 monks and 74 lay-brothers. The new tenants of the abbey have been allowed the use of the church by the state, but in return have been made responsible for the upkeep and furnishing of the building stripped as it is of all its appointments. The restoration was inaugurated by Kaiser William II, in 1897, through the gift of a high altar. At the present time the monks are engaged in decorating the east apse with mosaics. The church is in basilica style with a transept and double choir. The east choir is flanked by two square towers, while the west façade shows a square central tower with a graceful balcony supported on twin columns. This rich group of towers, to which must be added an imposing cupola, gives the church an exceedingly picturesque appearance. The east and west choir as well as the sides of the church end in an apse. Under the east choir lies a crypt; opening on the west choir there is a vestibule, or *paradisus*, with open arcades, the arches resting on slender twin columns. The doors of the church and vestibule are ornamented with sculpture. In the west choir stands the sarcophagus of the founder under a Barocco stone

canopy. Near this on the pillars are several fifteenth century paintings. The abbey church is a masterpiece of Romanesque architecture, and marks a new phase in the history of German architecture, since it is the first columned basilica built with arches (Schippers, in "Christian Art", IV, 1907–1908, 266, in reply to Schmitt, ibid., 1 sq.). Drawings of its architectural features are given in Geier and Gorz, "Monuments of Roman Architecture on the Rhine" (Frankfort, 1874). The St. Nicholas Chapel in the monastery garden was built during 1756–1766; its tower belongs, however, to the twelfth century. Several tombstones of earlier abbots grace the cloisters of the monastery. Only the portrait in relief of the Abbot Simon von der Leyen (1491–1512) has however any claim to art.

WEGELER, *Das Kloster Laach, Geschichte und Urkunden* (Bonn, 1854); RICHTER, *Die Benediktiner- Abtei Maria-Laach* (Hamburg, 1896); IDEM, *Die Schriftsteller der Benediktiner-Abtei Maria-Laach* in *Westdeutsche Zeitschrift*, XVII (1898), 41 sq., 277 sq.; KNIEL, *Die Benediktiner- Abtei Maria-Laach* (3rd ed., Cologne, 1902). See also bibliography in *Studien und Mitteilungen aus dem Benediktiner- und Cistercienser Orden*, IX (1896), 277 sq.

ILDEFONSUS HERWEGEN.

Mariales, XANTES, Dominican, b. about 1580; d. at Venice in April, 1660. He was of a noble Venetian family. At an early age he entered the Dominican convent of Sts. John and Paul. Remarkable for his versatility and prodigious memory, he was soon sent to Spain, where he completed his studies. He first taught at Venice, then at Padua where he thrice exercised the office of regent. From 1624 onwards he led a most retired life at Venice, devoting his time exclusively to prayer, reading, and study. He possessed in a high degree the more kindly and winsome external accomplishments. In his writings he displayed such zeal for the Holy See that he was twice exiled by the Venetian senate. At Milan, Ferrara, and Bologna where he took refuge, he was greatly esteemed for his learning and holiness. He died at Venice from a stroke of apoplexy. The obsequies were honoured by the presence of the Venetian nobility. Among his works the following are noteworthy: "Controversiæ ad universam Summam theol. S. Th. Aq." (Venice, 1624); "Amplissimum artium scientiarumque omnium amphitheatrum" (Bologna, 1658).

HURTER, *Nomenclator*, who summarizes "*Scriptores O. P.*", II (Paris, 1721), 600; "*Elogium*" in "*Acta Capituli Generalis O. P.*" (Rome, 1670).

THOS. Á K. REILLY.

Mariana, JUAN, author and Jesuit, b. at Talavera, Toledo, Spain, probably in April, 1536; d. at Toledo, 16 February, 1624.

He is one of the most maligned members of the Jesuit order, owing to the opinions expressed in his book "De rege et regis institutione", on the killing of despots. He joined the order 1 January, 1554. Nothing more is known of his parentage or his family history.

It is an evidence of his talent that, as early as 1561, after finishing his studies, he was called by his superiors to Rome, where he taught theology for four years. After a further short sojourn in Sicily he occupied the chair of theology in Paris (1569–1574), but was obliged through illness to return to Spain. There he spent a great number of years at Toledo, occupied almost exclusively with literary work.

Among his literary labours the most important is undoubtedly his great work on the history of Spain, which is still remembered to-day. There was published as late as 1854, in Madrid, an improved and richly illustrated edition continued up to that year. The work first appeared as "Historiæ de rebus Hispaniæ libri XX, Toleti, typis P. Roderici. 1592". A later edition of the compiler himself, carried on still further, is the "De rebus Hispaniæ libri XXX", published at Mainz in 1605. This edition bears the imprimatur of the order for the thirty books, given by Stephen Hojeda, visitor from Dec., 1598, and of the provincial from 1604. The author had in the meantime converted the Latin edition into Spanish and this appeared complete, containing the thirty books of the Latin edition, at Toledo in 1601. This went through a number of editions during the lifetime of the author and through others after his death.

The second work published is that mentioned above, "De Rege et Regis institutione libri III ad Philippum III Hispaniæ Regem Catholicum, 1599". The work was written at the solicitation of the tutor of the royal princes and at the expense of Philip II (Garcias de Loaysa), but was dedicated to Philip III, who had become king in the meantime. It was not objected to by the king nor anywhere else in Spain; it was obviously calculated to bring up the king as the true father of his people and as a pattern of virtue for the whole nation. The Protestant Dr. Leutbecher (Erlangen, 1830) expressed his judgment of the book in the following terms: "Mariana's excellent mirror for kings . . . contains more healthy materials for the education of future kings than any other existing princely mirror, and is worthy of all respect as much from kings themselves, as from their educators. . . . Would that all kings were as Mariana wanted them to be."—The book certainly contained a misconstrued observation in favour of the assassination of Henry III of France, and defended, though with many restrictions and precautions, the deposition and killing of a tyrant. This did not escape the Jesuits in France and they drew the attention of the general of the order to it. The general at once expressed his regret, stating that the work had been published without his knowledge and that he would take care that the book should be corrected. In 1605 there really appeared a somewhat altered edition at Mainz; to what degree the book had been corrected by the order is hard to discover. Mariana himself had not prepared another edition. But in 1610 a real storm broke loose against the book in France; by the order of Parliament the book was publicly burnt by the hand of the public executioner, while in Spain it continued to enjoy the royal favour. The general of the order forbade members to preach that it is lawful to kill despots.

There was still a whole series of smaller works from the pen of Mariana; many of them are only in manuscript. Some of his published works are not without value in political economy—his work, "De ponderibus et mensuris," for example, which appeared at Toledo in 1599 and at Mainz in 1605, and his little "De monetæ mutatione", which appeared in a general collection of his works in 1609. In a criticism of this small publication, Pascal Duprat (Sommervogel, V, 562), a French economist, declared as late as 1870 that Mariana had set forth the true principles of the money question far better than his contemporaries. This work, however, proved fatal to the author. The fact that he had opposed with genuine courage the depreciation of the currency laid him under a charge of treason to the king, and Mariana, then seventy-three years old, was actually condemned to lifelong imprisonment, which took the form of committal to a Franciscan convent. He was only to be allowed freedom shortly before his death.

The vehement character of Mariana, that strove against real or intended wrong, had also its dark side. The period of his old age coincided with a stormy time in the history of the order. In the order, which had just then begun to flourish, there were a number of members who were not satisfied with the approved principles of the founder and the Holy See, especially as there was a good deal in them that did not correspond with the principles of the older orders. Even the solemn Bulls of Gregory XIII, which again expressly confirmed the points criticised from within and without the order, did not altogether bring quiet, so that in the year 1593, under the government of Aqua-

viva, there was a general congregation for the purpose of expelling some of the members. Juan Mariana, for a long period at least, was numbered among the dissatisfied and the advocates of change. In the year 1589 Mariana had already prepared a manuscript to defend the order against the attacks of some of his opponents; the general, Aquaviva, was inclined to have it published, but as it was desirable not to disturb the momentary calm that had come in Spain, this "Defensorium" was never printed. Some time later Mariana, when internal dissensions prevailed in the order, was engaged in the preparation of a memorial, which it is highly probable he intended to forward to Rome. According to Astrain ("Historia de la compañia de Jésus", III, 417), it must have been written in 1605. The author took great care of the manuscript; there are no indications that it was ever intended to be published. But on his arrest in 1610 all Mariana's papers were seized, and in spite of his request nothing was returned. After his death the memorial was published at Bordeaux by the opponents of the order in 1625 under the title "Discursus de erroribus qui in forma gubernationis Societatis occurrunt". After the expulsion of the Jesuits from Spain it was often printed again (1468, 1841) in Spanish, and named "Discorso de los enfermedades de la Compañia". Since the publication of all these editions was the work of opponents of the order, there is no guarantee that the original text had been reproduced whole. Astrain, nevertheless, showed (op. cit., III, 560, note 3) that the copies of the manuscript which had passed through his hands agreed with the printed work. The original text was thus published without being essentially altered. It is but the effusion of a dissatisfied member of the order. The further development of the order and the further papal confirmation of the principle of the order show Mariana to have been wrong in his criticisms, though his subjective culpability is much lessened by the circumstances. He never left the order; and there seems to have been an entire reconciliation in his last years.

Sommervogel, *Bib. de la Comp. de Jésus* (Brussels and Paris, 1894), 1547 sqq.; Cassani, *Varones ilustres*, V, 88–98; Duhr, *Jesuitenfabeln* (Freiburg, 1899), n. 25; Astrain, *Historia de la Compañía de Jésus*, III (Madrid, 1909).

Aug. Lehmkuhl.

Mariana, Archdiocese of (Marianensis), situated in the centre of Minas Geraes, the great mining state of Brazil, is bounded on the north, south, and west respectively by its suffragan sees, Diamantina, Pouso Alegre, Goyaz, and Uberaba. The city of Mariana, formerly Ribeirão do Carmo (population over 6000), established in 1711, lies about seven miles east of Ouro Preto, the former capital of the state. A bishopric was erected there in December, 1745, by Benedict XIV, the first occupant of the see being Frei Manoel da Cruz (1745–1764), who was translated from the Diocese of Maranhão. For over a century Mariana was the ecclesiastical centre of Minas Geraes. In 1854 some parishes were detached from it to form part of the new Diocese of Diamantina, and others in 1900 on the establishment of that of Pouso Alegre. In May, 1906, Mariana was made an archdiocese, having previously been a suffragan of Rio de Janeiro. It embraces an area of 110,000 square miles, nearly one-half of Minas Geraes, and contains over 2,000,000 Catholics, there being only about 2000 Protestants, mostly foreigners in the mining centres. It has 311 parishes, and 611 churches or chapels, served by 545 secular and 104 regular priests. The theological seminary is under the care of the Lazarists. The present occupant of the see who is the ninth ordinary of Mariana and the first archbishop, Mgr. Silverio Gomes Pimenta, was born at Congonhas do Campo, near the celebrated shrine of Mattosinhos, on 12 January, 1840; he was ordained on 20 July, 1862, at Sabará, by Bishop Viçoso, and for many years professed history and philosophy in the diocesan seminary; named coadjutor to the Bishop of Mariana, he was consecrated at São Paulo by the Archbishop of Rio de Janeiro on 31 August, 1890, as Titular Bishop of Camachus in Armenia. On 16 April, 1897, he succeeded to the see on the death of Mgr. Corrêa de Sá y Benevides. Mgr. Pimento is the first native of Minas Geraes to rule this bishopric, all his predecessors except Mgr. Benevides, having been Portuguese by birth.

From 1711 till 1897 the capital of the state was at Ouro Preto near Mariana, but it has now been transferred to the new and rapidly growing city of Bello Horizonte, founded in February, 1894. It is situated on the west side of the valley of the Rio das Velhas, and lies 390 miles northwest of Rio de Janeiro. It has a population of about 17,615, of whom 17,490 are Catholics. It has five churches, and a college in charge of nuns for the higher education of women. A large cathedral is being erected there. Many laymen and clerics distinguished in science and literature are natives of or have laboured in the Diocese of Mariana. Among them may be mentioned the following priests: José Basilio da Gama (1740–95), the author of the epic "Uruguay", a work which unfortunately pays no tribute to the labours of the Jesuits, of which body da Gama was a member before the suppression; José da Santa Rita Durão (1737–83), a Jesuit born in Infecçaoado, Minas Geraes, a brilliant novelist and author of the famous poem "Caramurú"; Felix Lisboa, the sculptor; José Mariano da Concecção Velloso (1742–1811), the great botanist, author of "Flora Fluminese"; José Corrêa de Almeida, b. 4 September, 1820, at Barbacena; d. there, 5 April, 1905, poet (23 volumes published) and historian; Bishop de Sousa, of Diamantina, author of "O Lar Catholico" and other works well known in Brazil, is also a native of the diocese.

Diogo de Vasconellas, *Historia antiga das Minas Geraes* (Bello Horizonte, 1907); Miguel, *Cartas sertanejas* (Mariana, 1905); Renault, *Indigenas de Minas Geraes* (Bello Horizonte, 1904); de Senna, *Annuario de Minas Geraes* (Bello Horizonte, 1906, etc.); Idem, *Notas e chronicas* (São Paulo, 1907).

A. A. MacErlean.

Mariana Islands, Prefecture Apostolic of.— The Marianas Archipelago (also called the Ladrone Islands) is a chain of fifteen islands in the Northern Pacific, situated between 13° and 21° N. Lat. and 144° and 146° E. long. The islands were first discovered in 1521 by Magellan, who called them *Las Islas de los Ladrones* (Thieves' Islands) on account of the predilection of the natives for thieving. In 1667 the Spanish established a regular colony there, and gave the islands the official title of *Las Marianas* in honour of Queen Maria Anna of Austria. They then possessed a population of 40–60,000 inhabitants, but so fierce was the opposition offered to the Spaniards that the natives were almost exterminated before Spanish rule was made secure. The Marianas remained a Spanish colony under the general government of the Philippines until 1898, when, as a result of the Spanish-American War, Guam was ceded to the United States. By Treaty of 12 Feb., 1899, the remaining islands (together with the Carolines) were sold to Germany for about $4,100,000. Guam is 32 miles long, from 3 to 10 miles broad, and about 200 sq. miles in area. Of its total population of 11,490 (11,159 natives), Agana, the capital, contains about 7,000. Possessing a good harbour, the island serves as a United States naval station, the naval commandant acting also as governor. The products of the island are maize, copra, rice, sugar, and valuable timber. The remaining islands of the archipelago belong to the German Protectorate of New Guinea; their total population is only 2,646 inhabitants, the ten most northerly islands being actively volcanic and uninhabited. The prefecture Apostolic was erected on 17 Sept., 1902, by the Constitution

"Quæ mari sinico" of Leo XIII. The islands had previously formed part of the Diocese of Cebu. By Decree of 18 June, 1907, they were entrusted to the Capuchin Fathers of the Westphalian Province, to which order the present prefect Apostolic, Very Rev. Paul von Kirchhausen (appointed August, 1907; residence in Saipan, Carolina Islands), belongs. There are two public schools, but accommodation is so inadequate that the boys attend in the morning and the girls in the evening. The instruction is given in English, and, in addition to the usual elementary subjects, carpentry and other trades are taught. Two priests are stationed at Agana; one in each of the smaller settlements, Agat and Merizo. In addition to the churches at these places, there is a church at Samay and several little chapels in the mountains. A priest from Agana visits each month the colony where the lepers are segregated, to celebrate Mass and administer the sacraments. Catholicism is the sole religion of the islands. Until 1908 the Institute of the Mission Helpers of the Sacred Heart had a house at Agana.

BATTANDIER, *Annuaire Pontificale* (1910); *Report of the Smithsonian Institution* (1903); *Statesman's Year-Book* (1910).

THOMAS KENNEDY.

Mariannhill, CONGREGATION OF THE MISSIONARIES OF.—Mariannhill is located in Natal, near Pinetown, 15 miles from Durban, and 56 from Pietermaritzburg. In 1882 the Rev. Francis Pfanner, then prior of the Trappist (Reformed Cistercian) Monastery of Mariastern (Bosnia), at the invitation of the late Bishop Ricards, and with the consent of the general chapter of that branch of the order called the Congregation of De Rancé, volunteered to establish a monastery in Cape Colony, in order to try to adapt their rule to the missionary life. He landed at Port Elizabeth with thirty-one companions in July, 1880, and settled in a place he called Dunbrody, after an old Irish monastery. This he had to abandon in 1882; and at the solicitation of the late Bishop Jolivet, O.M.I., transferred his community to Mariannhill. Upon arrival there he set to work with indefatigable energy in the missionary field, and was blessed with such success that in 1885 Mariannhill was erected into an abbey, and Father Pfanner was unanimously elected its first abbot, receiving the abbatial blessing on the third anniversary of the founding of the monastery, 27 Dec., 1885. The same year Abbot Pfanner had started a branch of missionary sisters called "Sisters of the Precious Blood" to take charge of the native children and women; this congregation flourished abundantly, and was approved by Rome in 1907.

Mariannhill was too restricted for the zeal of Abbot Pfanner, so in the course of a few years, he founded seven mission stations, scattered over Natal, from Transvaal (Ratschitz) to Cape Colony (Lourdes) in Griqualand. Each of these stations had a small community of monks, and another of sisters, with church, school, etc., according to the needs of the natives. In 1892 Abbot Pfanner, who was then sixty-seven years of age, resigned and retired to Emmaus, one of the stations, where he died on 24 May, 1909. He was immediately succeeded by Dom Amandus Schoelzig as administrator, and in 1894 as abbot. Under his wise administration nine stations were founded in Natal and Cape Colony, and two houses in German East Africa. Abbot Amandus died in January, 1900, a martyr to the great work and its many cares. In Sept. of the same year he was succeeded by Abbot Gerard Wolpert, who had spent the greater part of his missionary life at the Czenstochau Station. He founded a station in Mashonaland, Rhodesia, and two more in Natal, so that his activity was divided between German East Africa, Rhodesia, Natal and Cape Colony. This, however, was too much for his strength; his health gave way, and being anxious to return to his mission life at Czenstochau, he resigned his position in 1904.

During the general chapter of the order held that year at Citeaux, the Rt. Rev. Edmond M. Obrecht, Abbot of the Abbey of Gethsemani, U. S. A., was appointed, with the approbation of the Holy See, Administrator of Mariannhill. His principal labour was to enquire into the adaptability of the Cistercian to the missionary life; after three years of work in Africa the Abbot of Gethsemani submitted his report to Rome and the general chapter, from which it was decided that Mariannhill should become an independent congregation, as otherwise either the monastic observances or the missionary labour had to suffer. Consequently Propaganda delegated Rt. Rev. Bishop Miller, O.M.I., Vicar-Apostolic of Transvaal, to arrange for such independence, according to the wishes of the Reformed Cistercians, and the members of Mariannhill. Finally the Congregation of Regulars, on 2 Feb., 1909, issued a decree separating Mariannhill from the Order of Reformed Cistercians, forming of it the "Congregation of the Mariannhill Missionaries" and erecting their church into a Collegiate Church, under the guidance of a provost. The members of the congregation take simple, but perpetual, vows; and are exempt from the jurisdiction of the Ordinary of the diocese. They at present number about 60 priests, with 260 choir-religious and lay-brothers. From its foundation until 1 Jan. 1910, nearly 20,000 persons, the greater number adults, have been baptized in the 55 churches and chapels scattered throughout the 26 missions and stations.

Trappisten Missions Kloster Mariannhill (Freiburg, 1907); *Vergissmeinnicht, Zeitschrift der Mariannhiller Mission, 1883–1910; Mariannhiller Kalender, 1888–1910; Acta S. Sedis*, 20 Dec., 1909; *Actes du Chapitre Gén. des Cisterciens Réformés* (1904–1907); *Trappisten und ihre Mission in Mariannhill; Abt Franz Pfanner* (1885); BOEKEN, *Um und in Afrika* (Cologne, 1903).

EDMOND M. OBRECHT.

Marian Priests.—This term is applied to those English priests who being ordained in or before the reign of Queen Mary (1553–1558), survived into the reign of Elizabeth. The expression is used in contradistinction to "Seminary Priests" by which was meant priests ordained at Douai, Rome, or other English seminaries abroad. Shortly after Elizabeth's accession ordinations ceased altogether in England in consequence of the imprisonment of the surviving bishops, and unless the Seminary priests had begun to land in England to take the place of the older priests who were dying off, the Catholic priesthood would have become extinct in England. There was an important distinction between the Marian priests and the Seminary priests in the fact that the penal legislation of the rigorous statute 27 Eliz. c. 2 only applied to the latter who were forbidden to come into or remain in the realm under pain of high treason. Therefore the Marian priests only came under the earlier statutes, e. g. 1 Elizabeth c. 1 which inflicted penalties on all who maintained the spiritual or ecclesiastical authority of any foreign prelate, or 5 Eliz. c. 1 which made it high treason to maintain the authority of the Bishop of Rome, or to refuse the Oath of Supremacy. The recent researches of Dom Norbert Birt have shown that the number of Marian priests who were driven from their livings was far greater than has been commonly supposed. After a careful study of all available sources of information he estimates the number of priests holding livings in England at Elizabeth's accession at 7500 (p. 162). A large number, forming the majority of these, accepted, though unwillingly, the new state of things, and according to tradition many of them were in the habit of celebrating Mass early, and of reading the Church of England service later on Sunday morning. But the number of Marian priests who refused to conform was very large, and the frequently repeated statement that only two hundred of

them refused the Oath of Supremacy has been shown to be misleading, as this figure was given originally in Sander's list, which only included dignitaries and was not exhaustive. Dom Norbert Birt has collected instances of nearly two thousand priests who were deprived or who abandoned their livings for conscience' sake. As years went on, death thinned the ranks of these faithful priests, but as late as 1596 there were nearly fifty of them still working on the English mission. Owing to their more favourable legal position they escaped the persecution endured by the Seminary priests, and only one—the Venerable James Bell—is known to have suffered martyrdom.

BIRT, *The Elizabethan Religious Settlement* (London, 1907); SANDER, *Report to Cardinal Moroni* in *Cath. Record Soc.*, I (London, 1905); *First and Second Douay Diaries: Appendix LIV* (London, 1878).

EDWIN BURTON.

Marianus of Florence, Friar Minor and historian, b. at Florence about the middle of the fifteenth century, exact date of birth uncertain; d. there, 20 July, 1523. Very little is known of the life and personality of this great chronicler of the Franciscan Order. That his writings should, likewise, share in this general oblivion is due to a number of causes, principal among which is the difficulty of procuring them, not any of his chronicles or other works ever having been published. In his most noted work entitled "Fasciculus Chronicarum", there is contained a history of the Franciscan Order from the beginning up to the year 1486. That Marianus should have written three centuries after the death of St. Francis in no way tells against his trustworthiness as a historian, for he had access to original sources now lost, of which some precious fragments have been passed on to us through him. The crudeness and inelegance of his style of which Wadding complains may, perhaps, have been due to the impatience of the good nun Dorothea Broccardi (*Dorothea scripsit* appears on all her handiwork), who offered to be his amanuensis and who was continually pressing him for copy. Marianus fell a victim to the plague while engaged in administering the last sacraments to the stricken inhabitants of his native city. Besides the "Fasciculus Chronicarum", he is the author of a "Catalogus seu brevis historia feminarum ordinis Sanctæ Claræ" which contains biographical sketches of more than 150 illustrious women of the Second Order of St. Francis. Among his other writings may be mentioned "Historia Montis Alverniæ", "Historia Provinciæ Etruriæ Ordinis Minorum", "Itinerarium Urbis Romæ", and "Historia Translationis Habitus Sancti Francisci a Monte Acuto ad Florentiam" which has been translated into Italian and published by Fr. Roberto Razzoli in his monograph, "La Chiesa d'Ognissanti in Firenze, Studi storicocritici" (Florence, 1898).

WADDING, *Scriptores Ordinis Minorum* (Rome, 1907), 167; BARTHOLI, *Tractatus de Indulgentia S. Mariæ de Portiuncula*, ed. SABATIER (Paris, 1900), 136–164; GOLUBOVICH, *Biblioteca Bio-Bibliografica della Terra Santa* (Quaracchi, 1906), 77–80; ROBINSON, *A Short Introduction to Franciscan Literature* (New York, 1907), 17, 42.

STEPHEN M. DONOVAN.

Marianus Scotus.—There were two Irish scholars of this name who attained distinction in the eleventh century. Both spent the greater part of their lives in Germany.

(1) MARIANUS SCOTUS, the chronicler, whose Irish name was Maelbrigte, or "Servant of Brigid", b., according to his own "Chronicle", in Ireland in 1028; d. at Mainz, 1082. From the same source we learn also that in 1052 he became a monk, assuming the name Marianus, and that in 1056 he went to Cologne, where he entered the Irish monastery of St. Martin. Two years later, he tells us, he went to Fulda, visited Paderborn, and in 1059 was ordained priest at Würzburg. In 1060 he became a hermit, or recluse, at Fulda, whence in 1070 he moved to Mainz in obedience to an order from his former abbot, Siegfried, who was now archbishop of that see. His remains were interred in the monastery of St. Martin at Mainz. The only work which can with certainty be ascribed to Marianus is the "Universal Chronicle" (the *incipit* has the title "Mariana Scoti cronica clara"), a history of the world, year by year, from the beginning of the Christian era down to 1082. It has been published in various editions, the best of which are the Waitz edition in the "Monumenta Germaniæ" (V, 481 sqq.) and Migne's (P. L., CLXVII, 623 sqq.). It exists in at least two eleventh-century manuscripts, one of which (Vatican, 830) has strong claims to be considered an autograph. The material which Marianus gathered together with a great deal of intelligent industry was used very freely by subsequent chroniclers, such as Florence of Worcester and Siegbert of Gembloux. The chronological system, however, which Marianus defended as preferable, and which was based on his contention that the date of Christ's birth given by Dionysius Exiguus was twenty-two years too late, did not meet with general acceptance. He himself gives both systems. Besides the "Chronicle" several other works were ascribed to Marianus owing to a confusion of his name with that of his countryman, Marianus, Abbot of St. Peter's at Ratisbon.

P. L., CXLVII, 602 sqq.; *Mon. Germ. Hist.: Script.*, V, 481 sqq.; HAUSSEN, *Diss. critica de antiquiss. cod. chronici Mar. Scoti* (Frankfort, 1782); WATTENBACH, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen*, II (Berlin, 1874), 83 sqq.

(2) MARIANUS SCOTUS, Abbot of St. Peter's at Ratisbon, b. in Ireland before the middle of the eleventh century; d. at Ratisbon towards the end of the eleventh century, probably in 1088. In 1067 he left his native country, intending to make a pilgrimage to Rome. Like many of his countrymen, however, who visited the Continent, he decided to settle in Germany, and did not return to Ireland. At Bamberg he became a Benedictine monk, and thence he went with some companions to Ratisbon (or Regensburg), where he founded the monastery of St. Peter and became its first abbot. After his death he was honoured as a saint, his feast being observed on 17 April, 4 July, or, according to the Bollandists, on 9 February. Marianus devoted himself to transcribing and glossing the text of the Scriptures. His success as a scribe, and the exceptional beauty of his calligraphy may be judged by a specimen of his work which has come down to us. This is Codex 1247 of the Imperial Library of Vienna containing the Epistles of St. Paul with glosses, some of which are in Latin and others in Irish. The latter were collected and published by Zeuss in his "Grammatica Celtica" (p. xxiv). The manuscript ends with the words "In honore individuæ trinitatis Marianus Scotus scripsit hunc librum suis fratribus peregrinis . . ." (the date given is 16 May, 1078). Over the words "Marianus Scotus" is the gloss: "Muirdach trog macc robartaig, i. e. Marianus miser filius Robartaci." The Irish form of his name was, therefore, Muirdach (from the root *muir;* hence, instead of the Latin form Marianus, there sometimes occurs Pelagius), and his family name was Robartaig, or Rafferty.

Acta SS., Feb., II, 361 sqq.; *Revue celtique*, I (1870), 262 sqq.; *Proceed., Royal Irish Acad.*, VII, 290 sqq.; *Verhandl. hist. Ver. Oberpfalz-Regensburg* (1879), XXVI.

WILLIAM TURNER.

Maria Theresa, Queen of Hungary and Bohemia, Archduchess of Austria, Roman-German Empress, born 1717; died 1780.

I. FROM 1717 TO 1745.—Maria Theresa was born on 13 May, 1717, the daughter of the German Emperor Charles VI (1711–1740) and his wife Elizabeth von Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel. Her elder brother Leopold had died a short time before and the emperor was left without male issue. As early as 1713 he had promulgated a family law, the Pragmatic Sanction, by

virtue of which the possessions of the Hapsburgs were to remain undivided and, in default of a male heir, fall to his eldest daughter. He was constantly negotiating with foreign powers to secure their recognition of this Pragmatic Sanction. Maria Theresa was endowed with brilliant gifts, with beauty, amiability and intelligence, and was universally admired as a girl. On 14 February, 1736, she married Duke Francis Stephen of Lorraine, who by the Peace of Vienna, in 1738, received Tuscany instead of Lorraine. Charles VI died unexpectedly on 20 October, 1740, at the age of 56, and Maria Theresa came into possession of the territories of Austria without having any political training. Her husband was an amiable man, but of mediocre mental endowments and consequently of little assistance to her. Charles, moreover, left the internal affairs of his monarchy, particularly the finances and the army, in a lamentable condition. His family regarded the future with misgiving and perplexity. Maria Theresa was the first to recover her self-possession and to appreciate the problems before her. On the very day of her father's death, she received the homage of Privy Councillors and nobility as Queen of Hungary, Queen of Bohemia, and Archduchess of Austria, and at her first cabinet meeting expressed her determination to uphold to the full every right she had inherited. All admired her firmness, dignity and strength of spirit. Certainly they were few who believed she would succeed.

At Vienna men were familiarizing themselves with the idea "of becoming Bavarian". The Elector Charles Albert of Bavaria, who had never recognized the Pragmatic Sanction, laid claim to Austria as the descendant of a daughter of Emperor Ferdinand I (1556–1564), and referred to a testament of 1547, in which mention was made however not of the failure of "male" but of "legitimate" issue. He secured the support of France, which induced Spain and Saxony also to lay claims to the succession. A greater peril appeared in a quarter where it was least expected: King Frederick II of Prussia laid claim to Silesia. He promised to help Maria Theresa, provided she ceded to him Jägerndorf, Brieg, Wohlau and Liegnitz, to which he pretended to have hereditary claims. Otherwise he would ally himself with France, Bavaria and Saxony and make war on her. He wanted, like a good merchant, to take advantage of the opportunity, and proposed a deal by which Maria Theresa and himself could settle the account between them. For in case of her acceptance of his proposal, Maria Theresa would have been spared the war arising out of the Austrian succession. Maria Theresa was, however, as convinced of her rights as she was determined to enforce them by action. That Prussia had a right to expect concessions from Austria, since, in 1686, indemnification had been promised her for the Duchies of Silesia, Maria Theresa did not take into account. The king hastily invaded Silesia and dispatched a disagreeable, conceited courtier as his representative. Thus the first Silesian war came about (1740–1742). Frederick II gained a great victory at Mollwitz (10 April, 1741). On 4 June he allied himself with France which now gave its support to the Elector of Bavaria, who aspired to the imperial dignity and won most of the electors to his side. Maria Theresa vainly strove to secure the crown for her spouse Francis Stephen. In her hereditary lands she found her principal support against the threats of her foes. The energetic bearing of the princess roused general enthusiasm. When in Pressburg she appealed to the chivalry of the Hungarians, the nobles cried out that they were ready to give their blood and life for their queen (September, 1741). However, as the Bavarians, French and Saxons were advancing against her, she was compelled to arrange a truce with Prussia in order to avoid danger from that side.

Charles Albert of Bavaria with the French had occupied Passau on 31 July and Linz on 15 September, and had been acknowledged by the Upper Austrian Diet. On 26 November he surprised Prague with Saxon assistance, and had himself crowned King of Bohemia on 7 December. On 24 January, 1742 he was also elected Roman emperor as Charles VII. His success however was short-lived. The queen's forces had already made an entry into his own country. Still, what was most needful was to rid herself of her most dangerous antagonist. Frederick II had broken the truce, had entered Moravia "to pluck the Moravian hens", and won a victory at Chotusitz (17 May, 1742). Maria Theresa concluded the peace of Breslau (6 June, 1742) and ceded to him Silesia except Teschen, Troppau and Jägerndorf. She now turned against the Bavarians and the French. Bohemia was retaken and

Maria Theresa Monument, Vienna

Maria Theresa crowned queen (May, 1743). Her ally, King George II of England, marched forward with the "pragmatic army" and defeated the French at Dettingen (27 June, 1743). The emperor became a fugitive in Frankfort. His rival's advantageous position inspired Frederick II with the fear that he might again lose his recent conquests in Silesia. He therefore again allied himself with France and the emperor and broke the peace by invading Bohemia. But as the French failed to send the promised army and Charles VII died on 20 January, 1745, the King of Prussia was compelled to rely upon his own forces and to retreat to Silesia. The Bavarians made peace with Austria and in Dresden (May, 1745) Bavaria, Saxony and Austria agreed to reduce Prussia to its former condition as the Electorate of Brandenburg. The Prussian victories at Hohenfriedberg, Soor-Trautenau and Kesselsdorf (June, September and December, 1745) overthrew the allies, and the second Silesian war had thus to be settled by the Peace of Dresden, where Prussia was confirmed in its possession of Silesia. Meanwhile Maria Theresa's husband, Francis Stephen, was chosen emperor on 4 October, 1745. Prussia acknowledged him. He took the name of Francis I (1745–1765). Thus the high-spirited woman had obtained what it was possible for her to obtain; the imperial dignity remained in her family, and the pragmatic sanction was practically

confirmed. War continued to be waged in the Netherlands and Italy, but this conflict was no longer formidable. The conclusion of peace at Aix la Chapelle, in 1748, put an end to the war of the Austrian succession. The relations of the European Powers were not vitally altered. What was important was that Prussia, though not recognized as a great power, had to be tolerated as such.

II. The Peace Interval (1746–1756).—Directly after the Peace of Dresden the empress applied herself to the reform of the administration. In a memorandum dated 1751 she herself says: "Since the Peace of Dresden it has been my sole aim to acquaint myself with the condition and strength of my states, and then honestly to become acquainted with the abuses existing in them and in the Dicasteriis (courts of justice) where everything was found to be in the utmost confusion." The initiative came from the queen herself. Her assistant was Count Frederick William von Haugwitz. Finances and the army were in sorest need of reorganization. The greatest necessity was the raising of the money needed for a standing army of 108,000 men in the hereditary states and in Hungary. For this purpose 14 millions of gulden were required. The diets were to raise them by regular grants for a number of years, and in return would be free from all taxes in kind. The rights of the several diets were thus restricted for the benefit of the country. Against this opposition arose. Maria Theresa, however, came forward energetically in support of the authority of the government and by her personal influence carried out the project. For the present the people of the several countries made grants for a period of ten years, and when these had passed the new conditions had become habitual and become settled. To the credit of the empress it ought not to be forgotten that in the levying of this contribution for the army she did not permit any oppression of the working class. A much more important measure from the point of view of the well-being of the state was the separation of administration and justice. The Austrian and Bohemian court chancelleries, hitherto separate, were combined into a single supreme administrative office. On the other hand, for the administration of the law, the supreme court was established. In 1753 the empress appointed a commission to compile a new civil code. It was only in 1811, however, that it was published. During her reign (1768) the "Constitutio criminalis Theresiana" was also promulgated for criminal law. Up to that time a heterogeneous procedure prevailed in the different countries. Centralization was also aided by the creation of new district officials who were to carry out the measures of the government in the several countries. As they had often to protect the subjects against the oppression of the lords, the people became much more devoted to the government.

For the promotion of trade and industry a bureau of commerce was established in 1746, but its development was hindered by the internal duties. The oversea trade greatly increased. The army was improved, the Prussian army being taken as a model; in 1752 a military academy, and in 1754 an academy of engineering science were established. The empress also gave her attention to education and especially to the middle and higher schools. The gymnasia received a new curriculum in 1752. The medical faculty of the University of Vienna, after being long neglected, was raised to greater efficiency. The legal faculty also became a strong body. Moreover, the empress founded the academy of the nobles (Theresianum) and the academy for Oriental languages as well as the archives for the imperial family, court and state, which since 1749, had been a model of its kind. In her dealings with Catholicism the empress adopted the principle "cujus regio, ejus religio", and defended unity of faith in the State not only for Christian and religious, but also for political, reasons. The Jews were not regarded by her with favour. After 1751 Protestants were not permitted to sell their property and emigrate, but all, who declined solemnly to become Catholics, were required to emigrate to Transylvania where the Evangelical worship was permitted. "Transmigration" took the place of "emigration". Later she came to the conclusion that compulsion ought to be avoided, but that those who had gone astray should be led to conversion by argument and careful instruction. At court she was strict in regard to attendance at church, frequent communion, and fasting. She broke up the Freemason lodges by force in 1743.

III. The Seven Years' War (1756–1763).—Maria Theresa would have carried out many more useful measures had she not again turned to foreign politics. But she was irresistibly impelled to punish Prussia and to reconquer Silesia. Her court and state chancellor, Count Kaunitz (since 1753) recognized at times that it was better to come to an agreement with Prussia, but he had not the courage to oppose the empress's designs. The opportunity of taking revenge on Prussia came when England and France made war on each other in North America and looked about for European allies. In 1755 England received the assurance of aid from Russia. To make Russia's assistance useless and in fact to paralyze her, Frederick the Great made the Westminster Treaty of Neutrality in January, 1756 with England, by which the two Powers bound themselves to prevent their respective allies, namely France and Russia, from attacking the territory of the Confederates. This allowed the old rivals, Austria and France, to combine. Maria Theresa was annoyed that England had joined Prussia, and France was disgusted with Prussia's independent policy, for she had reckoned upon Frederick's help. Thus France and Austria made the defensive treaty of Versailles on 1 May, 1756. As to the origin of the Seven Years' War, whether it was an offensive or defensive war on the part of Frederick the Great, this has been the subject of much dispute. It must be granted that Austria called upon France to participate actively in a war against Prussia, and in return had offered concessions in the Low Countries. She had also come to a similar agreement with Russia. The new war was an unfortunate undertaking. The prospects of regaining Silesia were not great, and the hope of weakening Prussia was an absolute chimera. Besides, France had no great interest in weakening Prussia, and her active participation was doubtful from the beginning. In Russia the death of the empress and a consequent change of policy was imminent.

Frederick the Great foresaw the intentions of Maria Theresa in good time, and anticipated her before the preparations of his enemy were completed. As the empress made an evasive reply or no reply at all to his enquiries as to her aims he entered Saxony on 28 August, 1756, and Bohemia in September and defeated the Austrians on 1 October, at Lobositz. The attack, which was clearly a breach of the peace, brought about the immediate conclusion of the alliances. Frederick made an alliance with England in January, 1757. France and Austria came to an agreement (on 1 May, 1757) in regard to the partition of Prussia, after Austria had come to an understanding with Russia in January. Frederick had to defend himself on every side. He was on the offensive only in 1757 and 1758. Later he had to confine himself to acting on the defensive. The Seven Years' War was a long struggle in which fortune alternately favoured either side. In contrast with Frederick the Great's victories at Prague (6 May, 1757), at Rossbach (5 November, 1757), at Leuthen (15 December, 1757), at Torgau (3 November, 1760) stand his serious defeats at Kolin (18 June, 1757), at Hochkirch (14 October, 1758), and at Kunersdorf (12 August, 1759). In the West the allies effected very little against the

English. In the East on the other hand, Frederick seemed on the point of succumbing (1761). The English did not renew the agreement to subsidize Frederick. His opponents, it is true, were equally exhausted financially, as well as weary and disappointed. The decisive turn of events was brought about by the death of the Russian Empress Elizabeth (1762). Her successor, Peter III, an admirer of Frederick's, made peace with him and even sought his alliance and sent him 20,000 men. When Peter lost his throne and life, the Empress Catharine, it is true, withdrew from the Prussian alliance, but the last successes of Frederick were largely due to the Russians (Burkersdorf, 21 July; Freiberg, 29 October). As France and England concluded peace in Paris on 10 February, 1763, the empress was compelled to do the same. The Peace of Hubertsburg (15 February, 1763) restored to each belligerent the possessions he had held before the war. But apart from the loss in men and treasure, the war injured the policy of the empress and Count Kaunitz by strengthening the position of Prussia as a great power. Frederick the Great had maintained Prussia's power in a severe ordeal.

IV. The Evening of Life (1763–1780).—The empress had still seventeen years to rule. However, this period no longer exclusively bore the impress of her personality. She did not indeed give up the reins, but she could not make headway against the passionate impulses of her son Joseph II, or entirely carry out her own views. Thus the Theresian period gradually became the "Josephine" period. On 27 March, 1763, Joseph was chosen as Roman king. Francis I to whom Theresa was really devoted, and to whom she had borne sixteen children (eleven daughters and five sons), died suddenly, fifty-seven years old (1765), Joseph II became emperor (1765–1790), and in Austria co-regent with his mother. To her ambitious son, brimful of projects, the liberal-minded autocrat who with the noblest intentions was able to effect nothing, she could not transmit her political talent. In many respects their views differed, particularly on religious affairs. Joseph had entirely different ideas on the treatment of non-Catholics. Indeed even under Maria Theresa the politico-ecclesiastical policy known as "Josephinism" had its rise, though the empress was a pious woman and attended strictly to her religious duties. Papal Bulls were only to be made public with the consent of the government, and intercourse with Rome was to be conducted through the Foreign Office. Festivals were reduced in number. The jurisdiction of the Church over the laity ceased, as well as the immunity from taxes enjoyed by the clergy. The number of monasteries was restricted. The Jesuits lost their standing as confessors at the court, as well as the direction of the theological and philosophical faculties at the University of Vienna, and were confined to the lower schools.

The empress maintained a neutral attitude towards the dissolution of the Jesuit Order. Her fortune was devoted to the care of souls and to education. In foreign politics a conflict of views between mother and son arose on the occasion of the first Partition of Poland. The empress not only doubted that the acquisition of Polish territory would be an advantage, but she also recoiled from doing wrong to others. At last she yielded to the pressure of her son and Count Kaunitz, but later she often regretted having given her assent. Nor did she approve of the War of the Bavarian Succession, clearly foreseeing that Prussia would interfere. She could not sufficiently thank Providence for the fortunate issue of the affair. In the last ten years of her life she developed an unremitting activity on behalf of the improvement of the primary schools. The excellent Abbot Felbiger, the father of the Catholic primary schools of Germany, was summoned from Silesia. She also tried to improve the condition of the peasantry, and to put an end to the oppression of the landlords. When she sought to abolish the serfdom in Bohemia she encountered unexpected opposition from the emperor, whom the landowners had caused to hesitate.

She was tireless in her care for the welfare and education of her children. When they were at a distance she carried on a busy correspondence with them and gave them wise instruction and advice. Marie Antoinette, the Dauphiness, and afterwards Queen, of France, with her light and thoughtless temperament, her frivolous disregard of dignity, her love of pleasure and her extravagance, caused her much anxiety. Nearest to her heart was her daughter Maria Christina who was happily married to Prince Albert of Saxony-Teschen. Death was made hard for the courageous woman. On 15 October, 1780, she made her will and in it directed, which was characteristic of her, besides generous bequests to the poor, the granting of a month's pay to the soldiers. On 8 November she was present at a hunt and appears to have caught a cold in the pouring rain. Night and day she suffered from a racking cough and choking fits, nevertheless she was but little in bed, but busied herself by putting her papers in order, and consoling her children. On the 25th she received Communion; on the 28th extreme unction was given to her, and with her own hand she put certain bequests on paper, among them, again characteristic of her disposition, 100,000 florins for the funds of the normal schools. During the night of 29 November, 1780, she died, at the age of sixty-three years.

She was the last and beyond doubt the greatest of the Hapsburgs. She is not only, as Sonnenfels described her as early as 1780, the restorer, but rather the foundress of the Austrian monarchy, which with a skilful hand she built up out of loose parts into a well rivetted whole, while in all essential respects she left the administration radically improved. In her personal character she was a thorough German, always proud of her German descent and nationality, intelligent, affable, cheerful, pleasant, fond of music, and at the same time thoroughly moral and deeply religious. In her character were united, as v. Zwiedineck-Südenhorst says, all that was amiable and honourable, all that was worthy and winning, all the strength and gentleness of which the Austrian character is capable. Klopstock was right when he appraised her as "the greatest of her line because she was the most human", and even Frederick the Great recognized her merits when he said: "She has done honour to the throne and to her sex; I have warred with her but I have never been her enemy."

von Arneth, *Geschichte Maria Theresias*, I–X (Vienna, 1863–1879); Wolf and Zwiedineck-Südenhorst, *Oesterreich unter Maria Theresia, Josef II. und Leopold II.* (Berlin, 1884); von Arneth in the *Allg. deutsche Biographie*, XX (Leipzig, 1884), p. 340–365; Khuen in Wetzer and Welte, *Kirchenlex.*, 2nd ed., VIII (Freiburg, 1891), 777–786; v. Zwiedineck-Südenhorst, *Maria Theresia* (Bielefeld and Leipzig, 1905); *The Cambridge Modern History*, vol. VI (Cambridge, 1909).

Klemens Löffler.

Marie Antoinette, Queen of France, b. at Vienna, 2 November, 1755; executed in Paris, 16 October, 1793. She was the youngest daughter of Francis I, German Emperor, and of Maria Theresa. The marriage of Louis XVI and Marie Antoinette was one of the last acts of Choiseul's policy (see Choiseul); but the Dauphiness from the first shared the unpopularity attaching to the Franco-Austrian alliance. Ambassador Mercy and Abbé de Vermond, the former tutor of the archduchess in Austria and now her reader in France, endeavoured to make her follow the prudent counsels as to her conduct sent by her mother, Maria Theresa, and to enable her thus to overcome all the intrigues of the Court. Marie Antoinette's disdain of Madame du Barry, the mistress of Louis XV, was perhaps, from a political standpoint, a mistake, but it is an honourable evidence of the high character

and self-respect of the Dauphiness. Having become queen on 10 May, 1774, she adopted an imprudent course of action, both in her political and private life. In politics she was always so uncompromisingly attached to the Franco-Austrian alliance that she was nicknamed "L'Autrichienne" by Mme Adélaïde and the Duc d'Aiguillon's party. Her unpopularity reached a climax when, in 1778, Austria laid claim to the throne of Bavaria and she tried to bring about French mediation between Austria and Prussia. In truth, it was to the interest of France not to permit the indefinite growth of the Prussian power; but the routine diplomats, believing that Austria was to be forever the enemy of France, and the philosophers, who were favourably disposed towards Prussia, as a Protestant nation, abhorred any display of sympathy for Austria.

In her private life, Marie Antoinette may justly be blamed for her prodigality, for having, between 1774 and 1777, by certain notorious escapades (sleigh racing, opera balls, hunting in the Bois de Boulogne, gambling) and by her amusements at the Trianon (see VERSAILLES), given occasion for calumnious reports. But she confessed to Mercy that she indulged in this dissipation to console herself for having no children; and the tales of Besenval, Lauzun, and Soulavie, about the *amours* of Marie Antoinette, cannot stand against the testimony of the Prince de Ligne: "Her pretended gallantry was never any more than a very deep friendship for one or two individuals, and the ordinary coquetry of a woman, or a queen, trying to please everyone." De Goltz, the Prussian minister, also wrote that though a malicious person might interpret the queen's conduct unfavourably, there was nothing in it beyond a desire to please everybody. Besides, the queen continued to give edification by her regular practice of her religious duties. "If I were only a mother, I should be considered a Frenchwoman", wrote Marie Antoinette to Mercy in 1775. She became the mother of Madame Royale in 1778, in 1781 of a Dauphin who was to die eight years later, and of little Louis XVII in 1785. But the ill-feeling towards "L'Autrichienne" was stirred up by the lamentable "Affair of the Diamond Necklace" (1784–86). Cardinal de Rohan, *grand aumônier* of France, deceived by an adventuress, who called herself Comtesse de la Motte-Valois, purchased for 1,600,000 *livres* a necklace which he believed the queen wished to have; the lawsuit begun by the unpaid jewellers resulted in the acquittal of Cardinal de Rohan, while the publicity of the allegations of Mme de la Motte, who pretended that the queen was aware of the transaction, and the romantic story of a nocturnal rendezvous at the Tuileries, were exploited by Marie Antoinette's enemies. The Comte d'Artois compromised her by his intimacy, scurrilous pamphlets were circulated, and, particularly in certain court circles, that abominable campaign of mendacity was inaugurated to which the queen fell a victim at a later period.

In 1789, at the opening of the States-General, the crowd, acclaiming the queen's enemy, shouted in her hearing: "Long live the Duc d'Orléans!" The events of October, 1789, which forced the Court to return from Versailles to Paris, were directed especially against her. In June, 1791, the projected flight which she had planned with the assistance of Fersen and Bouillé, failed, the royal couple being arrested at Varennes. Marie Antoinette secretly negotiated with foreign powers for the king's safety; but when, on 27 August, 1791, Leopold of Austria and Frederick William of Prussia bound themselves, by the Declaration of Pillnitz, never to allow the new French Constitution to be established, she wrote to Mercy that "each one is at liberty to adopt in his own country the domestic laws that please him", and she regretted the extravagances of the *émigrés*. She wished the powers to hold a kind of "armed congress" which, without making war on France, should give moral support to the French king, and inspire the better class of his subjects with courage to rally round him. But the Revolution was hastening: on 13 August, 1792, Marie Antoinette was shut up in the Temple; on 1 August, 1793, she was sent to the Conciergerie; her trial took place on 14 October. Accused by Fouquier-Tinville of having tried to foment both war with foreign nations and civil war, the "Widow Capet" was defended by Chauveau-Lagarde and Tronson Ducoudray, who were forthwith cast into prison. She may have received absolution from the Curé of Ste-Marguerite, who was in a cell opposite to hers; at all events, she refused to make her confession to the Abbé Girard, a "constitutional" priest, who offered her his services. She mounted the scaffold undauntedly. Her historian, M. de la Rocheterie, says of her: "She was not a guilty woman, neither was she a saint; she was an upright, charming woman, a little frivolous, somewhat impulsive, but always pure; she was a queen, at times ardent in her fancies for her favourites and thoughtless in her policy, but proud and full of energy; a thorough woman in her winsome ways and tenderness of heart, until she became a martyr."

MARIE ANTOINETTE
Painting by Marie Vigée Lebrun

DE BEAUCOURT AND DE LA ROCHETERIE, eds., *Lettres de Marie-Antoinette* (2 vols., Paris, 1895, 1896) (the only edition to consult, since Geffroy has convicted Feuillet de Conches' earlier publication of inaccuracies and interpolations); ARNETH AND GEFFROY, eds., *Correspondance secrète entre Marie-Thérèse et Mercy Argenteau* (Paris, 1874); ARNETH ET FLAMMERMONT, eds., *Correspondance de Joseph II avec le prince de Kaunitz* (Paris, 1889–91); ARNETH, ed., *Marie-Antoinette, Joseph II. und Leopold II., ihr Briefwechsel* (Leipzig, 1866); IDEM, ed., *Maria-Theresia und Marie-Antoinette, ihr Briefwechsel* (Leipzig, 1866); DE LA ROCHETERIE, *Histoire de Marie-Antoinette* (Paris, 1908); DE NOLHAC, *La reine Marie-Antoinette* (Paris, 1898); IDEM, *Marie Antoinette, the Dauphine*, tr. from the French (folio, Paris, 1897); IDEM, *Versailles au temps de Marie-Antoinette* (Paris, 1892); DE SÉGUR, *Au couchant de la monarchie* (Paris, 1910); BICKNELL, *The Story of Marie Antoinette* (London, 1897); BLENNERHASSETT, *Marie-Antoinette Königin von Frankreich* (Bielefeld, 1903); BOUTRY, *Autour de Marie-Antoinette* (Paris, 1907); FUNCK-BRENTANO, *L'affaire du collier* (Paris, 1901); IDEM, *La mort de la reine* (Paris, 1902).—An excellent study of the historical sources on Marie-Antoinette is TOURNEUX, *Marie-Antoinette devant l'histoire. Essai bibliographique* (2nd ed., Paris, 1901).

GEORGES GOYAU.

Marie Christine of Savoy, BLESSED, b. at Cagliari, Sardinia, 14 November, 1812; d. at Naples, 31 January, 1836. She was the daughter of Victor

Emanuel I, King of Sardinia, and of Maria Teresa of Austria, niece of the Emperor Joseph II. She lost her father in 1824 and her mother at the beginning of the year 1832. Charles Albert, who succeeded to the throne of Sardinia, insisted upon her appearing at the court of Turin, and she married Ferdinand II, King of the Two Sicilies (21 November, 1832). She died at the age of twenty-three, after having given birth fifteen days before to a son, Francesco-Maria-Leopold, Duke of Calabria. The renown of her virtues had been so great during her brief life, and after her death the graces obtained by her intercession were so numerous, that the Italian episcopate and many Catholic sovereigns obtained from Pius IX the signature, on 9 February, 1859, of the decree by which the process of her canonization was introduced before the Congregation of Rites. This resulted in her name being inscribed, in 1872, in the list of the Blessed.

Vie de la vénérable servante de Dieu Marie-Christine de Savoie, reine des Deux-Siciles (Paris, 1872); GUÉRIN, *Les Petits Bollandistes*, XV (Bar-le-Duc, 1874), 37–51.

LEON CLUGNET.

Marie de France, a French poetess of the twelfth century. She has this trait in common with the other trouvères, that she had no biographer; at least no biography of her has come down to us, and it is mostly by inference that scholars have been able to gather the meagre information that we possess about her. In one of her verses, she tells us her name and that of her native country: *Marie ai nun, si sui de France* (Roquefort, "Poésies de Marie de France", II, p. 401). Her lays are dedicated to a King Henry, and her "Ysopet" to a Count William. Who were this King Henry, and this Count William? This question, which puzzled scholars for a long time, has been settled only recently by a careful philological study of her works. She was a native of Normandy and lived in the second half of the twelfth century, because she uses the pure Norman dialect of that time, and the two personages alluded to in her works were Henry II of England and his son William, Count of Salisbury. Marie was then a contemporary and, very likely, a habitual guest of the brilliant court of troubadours and Gascon knights who gathered in the castles of Anjou and Guyenne around Henry II and Queen Eleanor; a contemporary, too, of Chrétien de Troyes, who, about that time, was writing the adventures of Yvain, Erec and Lancelot for the court of Champagne. Marie's contributions to French literature consist of lays, the "Ysopet", and a romance published by Roquefort under the title, "Legend of the Purgatory of Saint Patrick".

The lays, which number fifteen, belong to the Breton Cycle, or more accurately, to what might be termed the "love group" of that cycle. They are little poems in octosyllabic verses, in which are told the brave deeds of Breton knights for the sake of their lady-love. These little tales of love and knightly adventure show on the part of the writer a sensibility which is very rare among trouvères. The style is simple and graceful, the narrative clear and concise. The "Ysopet" is a collection of 103 fables translated into French from the English translation of Henry Beauclerc. In the "Purgatory of Saint Patrick" the author tells us of the adventures of an Irish knight who, in atonement for his sins, descends into a cavern where he witnesses the torments of the sinners and the happiness of the just.

BEDIER, *Les lais de Marie de France* in *Revue des Deux Mondes* (Paris, 15 Oct., 1891); *Histoire littéraire de la France*, XXX (Paris, 1888); PARIS in *Romania* (Paris, 1872, 1907); ROQUEFORT, *Poésies de Marie de France* (Paris, 1820); WARNKE, *Marie de France und die Anonymen lais* (Coburg, 1892).

P. J. MARIQUE.

Marie de l'Incarnation, BLESSED, known also as Madame Acarie, foundress of the French Carmel, b. in Paris, 1 February, 1566; d. at Pontoise, April, 1618. By her family Barbara Avrillot belonged to the higher bourgeois society in Paris. Her father, Nicholas Avrillot was accountant general in the Chamber of Paris, and chancellor of Marguerite of Navarre, first wife of Henri IV; while her mother, Marie Lhuillier was a descendant of Etienne Marcel, the famous *prévôt des marchands* (chief municipal magistrate). She was placed with the Poor Clares of Longchamp for her education, and acquired there a vocation for the cloister, which subsequent life in the world did not alter. In 1684, through obedience she married Pierre Acarie, a wealthy young man of high standing, who was a fervent Christian, to whom she bore six children. She was an exemplary wife and mother.

Pierre Acarie was one of the stanchest members of the League, which, after the death of Henry III, opposed the succession of the Huguenot prince, Henry of Navarre, to the French throne. He was one of the sixteen who organized the resistance in Paris. The cruel famine which accompanied the siege of Paris gave Madame Acarie an occasion of displaying her charity. After the dissolution of the League, brought about by the abjuration of Henry IV, Acarie was exiled from Paris and his wife had to remain behind to contend with creditors and business men for her children's fortune, which had been compromised by her husband's want of foresight and prudence. In addition she was afflicted with physical sufferings, the consequences of a fall from her horse, and a very severe course of treatment left her an invalid for the rest of her life.

At the beginning of the seventeenth century Madame Acarie was widely known for her virtue, her supernatural gifts, and especially her charity towards the poor and the sick in the hospitals. To her residence came all the distinguished and devout people of the day in Paris, among them Mme de Meignelay, née de Gondi, a model of Christian widows, Mme Jourdain and Mme de Bréauté, future Carmelites, the Chancellor de Merillac, Père Coton the Jesuit, St. Vincent of Paul, and St. Francis of Sales, who for six months was Mme Acarie's director. The pious woman had been living thus retired from the world, but sought by chosen souls, when, toward the end of 1601, there appeared a French translation of Ribera's life of St. Teresa. The translator, Abbé de Brétigny, was known to her. She had some portions of the work read to her. A few days later St. Teresa appeared to her and informed her that God wished to make use of her to found Carmelite convents in France. The apparitions continuing, Mme Acarie took counsel and began the work. Mlle de Longueville wishing to defray the cost of erecting the first monastery, in Rue St. Jacques, Henry IV granted letters patent, 18 July, 1602. A meeting in which Pierre de Bérulle, future founder of the Oratory, St. Francis of Sales, Abbé de Brétigny, and the Marillacs took part, decided on the foundation of the "Reformed Carmel in France", 27 July, 1602. The Bishop of Geneva wrote to the pope to obtain the authorization, and Clement VIII granted the Bull of institution, 23 November, 1603. The following year some Spanish Carmelites were received into the Carmel of Rue St. Jacques, which became celebrated. Mme de Longueville, Anne de Gonzague, Mlle de la Vallieres, withdrew to it; there also Bossuet and Fenelon were to preach. The Carmel spread rapidly and profoundly influenced French society of the day. In 1618, the year of Mme Acarie's death, it numbered fourteen houses.

Mme Acarie also shared in two foundations of the day, that of the Oratory and that of the Ursulines. She urged De Bérulle to refuse the tutorship of Louis XIII, and on 11 November, 1611 she, with St. Vincent de Paul, assisted at the Mass of the installation of the Oratory of France. Among the many postulants whom Mme Acarie received for the Carmel, there were some who had no vocation, and she conceived the idea

of getting them to undertake the education of young girls, and broached her plan to her holy cousin, Mme. de Sainte-Beuve. To establish the new order they brought Ursulines to Paris and adopted their rule and name. M. Acarie having died in 1613, his widow settled her affairs and begged leave to enter the Carmel, asking as a favour to be received as a lay sister in the poorest community. In 1614 she withdrew to the monastery of Amiens, taking the name of Marie de l'Incarnation. Her three daughters had preceded her into the cloister, and one of them was sub-prioress at Amiens. In 1616, by order of her superiors, she went to the Carmelite convent at Pontoise, where she died. Her cause was introduced at Rome in 1627; she was beatified, 24 April, 1791; her feast is celebrated in Paris on 18 April.

Du Val, *La vie admirable de la servante de Dieu, soeur Marie de l'Incarnation connue dans le monde sous le nom de Mdme Acarie* (Paris, 1621; latest edition, Paris, 1893); Houssaye, *M. de Bérulle et les Carmélites de France* (Paris, 1875); de Broglie, *La bienheureuse Marie de l'Incarnation, Madame Acarie* (Paris, 1903).

A. Fournet.

Marie de l'Incarnation, Venerable (in the world Marie Guyard), first superior of the Ursulines of Quebec, b. at Tours, France, 28 Oct., 1599; d. at Quebec, Canada, 30 April, 1672. Her father was by birth a bourgeois; her mother was connected with the illustrious house of Barbon de la Bourdaisière. From infancy Marie gave evidences of great piety and detachment from the world. At the age of seventeen, in obedience to her parents, she was married to a silk-manufacturer of the name of Martin, and devoted herself without reserve to the duties of a Christian wife. The union was a source of trials: the only consolation it brought her was the birth of a son, who afterwards became a Benedictine as Dom Claude, wrote his mother's biography, and died in the odour of sanctity. Left a widow after two years of married life, she entertained the idea of joining the Ursulines, but the care which her child required of her delayed the realization of this project, until he had reached the age of twelve, when she followed her vocation unhesitatingly. The Ursuline Order had recently been introduced into France by Madame de Sainte-Beuve, and Madame Martin took the veil in the house of that order at Tours. The care of the novices was confided to her two years after her entry into the convent. She always felt intense zeal for saving souls, and at the age of about thirty-four she experienced new impulses of "the apostolic spirit which transported her soul even to the ends of the earth"; and the longing for her own sanctification, and the salvation of so many souls still under the shadows of paganism inspired her with the resolution to go and live in America. She communicated this desire to her confessor, who, after much hesitation, approved it. A pious woman, Mme de la Peltrie, provided the means for its execution. This lady, better known as Marie-Madeleine de Chauvigny, by her generosity, and the sacrifice she made in leaving her family and her country, deserved to be called the co-worker of Marie de l'Incarnation in Canada. Sailing from Dieppe 3 April, 1639, with a few sisters who had begged to be allowed to accompany her, Marie de l'Incarnation, after a perilous voyage of three months, arrived at Quebec and was there joyfully welcomed by the settlers (4 July). She and her companions at first occupied a little house in the lower town (Basse-Ville). In the spring of 1641 the foundation-stone was laid of the Ursuline monastery, on the same spot where it now stands. Marie de l'Incarnation was acknowledged as the superior. To be the more useful to the aborigines, she had set herself to learn their languages immediately on her arrival. Her piety, her zeal for the conversion and instruction of the young aborigines, and the wisdom with which she ruled her community were alike remarkable. She suffered great tribulations from the Iroquois who were threatening the colony, but in the midst of them she stood firm and was able to comfort the downcast. On 29 December, 1650, a terrible conflagration laid the Ursuline monastery in ashes. She suffered much from the rigours of winter, and took shelter first with the Hospitalières and then with Mme de la Peltrie. On 29 May of the following year she inaugurated the new monastery. The rest of her life she passed teaching and catechizing the young Indians, and died after forty years of labours, thirty-three of them spent in Canada.

Marie de l'Incarnation has left a few works which breathe unction, piety, and resignation to Divine Providence. "Des Lettres" (Paris, 1677–1681) contains in its second part an account of the events which took place in Canada during her time, and constitute one of the sources for the history of the French colony from 1639 to 1671. There are also a "Retraite", with a short exposition of the Canticle of Canticles, and a familiar "Explication" of the mysteries of the Faith—a catechism which she compiled for young religious women.

Casgrain, *Histoire de la Vén. Mère Marie de l'Incarnation*, (Quebec, 1888); Chapot, *Hist. de la Vén. Mère Marie de l'Incarnation* (Paris, 1892); Richaudeau, *Lettres de la rév. Mère M. de l'I* (Paris, 1876).

A. Fournet.

Marienberg, Benedictine abbey of the Congregation of St. Joseph near Mals, Tyrol (in Vintschgau). The history of the founding goes back to Charlemagne, who established between 780 and 786 a Benedictine monastery near Taufers (Tuberis) in Graubünden (in Upper Vintschau), which later (after 880) was dissolved and then became a convent for both sexes. Two hundred years later there was a reorganization: Eberhard of Tarasp built for the male portion the little monastery of Schuls in the Engadine, consecrated by Cardinal Gregor in 1078 or 1079, while the female inmates remained at Taufers (later called Münster). Destroyed by lightning, Schuls was rebuilt, and consecrated in 1131. Ulrich IV of Tarasp shortly after called monks from Ottobeuern to Schuls to instil new life into the monastery. At the same time the monastery, which till then had been merely a priory, was made an abbey. In 1146 he removed the community to St. Stephen in Vintschgau, and in 1150 to the hill near the village of Burgeis, where the abbey has since continued under the name of Marienberg. Ulrich himself later assumed the habit of the order (about 1164) in Marienberg, and died on 14 December, 1177. Under Abbot Konrad III (1271–98) Marienberg was sacked by two nobles, and in 1304 Abbot Hermann was killed by Ulrich of Matsch. In 1348 the plague carried away every inmate of the monastery except Abbot Wyho, a priest, one lay brother, and Goswin, later a chronicler. Goswin became a priest in 1349, and compiled new choir-books, two estate registers (*Urbare*), and the chronicle of the monastery. The chronicle, most of which Goswin had finished in 1374, is divided into three books, the first of which gives the story of the founding and donations, the second the history of the abbots, and the third the privileges conferred by popes and princes. It gives an account, without regard for order or chronology, of the founders, fortunes, benefactors, and oppressors of the monastery. Documents take up the greater part, and the narrative is poor. Under Abbot Nicholas (1362–88) Goswin became prior, while in 1374 he was appointed court chaplain to Duke Leopold III of Austria. In 1418 Marienberg was burned down. After a period of decline in the sixteenth century, Abbot Mathias Lang (1615–40), from Weingarten monastery, became the reformer of the abbey. In 1634 Marienberg joined the Benedictine Congregation of Swabia. Lang's successor, Jacob Grafinger (1640–53), enlarged the library, and made the younger members finish their education at schools of repute. In 1656 the

abbey was again burned down. Abbot Johann Baptist Murr (1705–32) founded in 1724 the gymnasium at Meran, still administered by the monks of Marienberg. Abbot Pacidus Zobel (1782–1815) compiled a chronicle of the abbots. In 1807 Marienberg was dissolved by the Bavarian government, but was again restored by Emperor Francis II in 1816. In the nineteenth century the following well-known scholars were monks of Marienberg: (1) Beda Weber (1798–1858), from 1849 parish-priest in Frankfort and canon of Limburg, noted as historian, homilist, gifted poet, and energetic priest; member of the Academy in Munich and Vienna; (2) Albert Jäger (1801–91), professor of history at Innsbruck, gymnasium director at Meran, from 1851 professor in Vienna and member of the Academy; (3) Pius Zingerle (1801–81), professor in Meran, in 1862 professor at the Sapienza in Rome, later *scriptor* of the Vatican library, and the greatest authority on Syrian literature. The monastery has now 52 members (40 priests). Apart from the gymnasium at Meran it has the care of four parishes.

Goswin, *Chronik des Stiftes M.*, ed. Schwitzer in *Tirolische Geschichtsquellen*, II (Innsbruck, 1880); Goswin, *Urbare*, ed. Schwitzer, *ibid.*, III (1891); Sidler, *Münster-Tuberis, eine Karolingische Stiftung* in *Jahrbuch für Schweizerische Gesch.*, XXXI (Zurich, 1906), 207–348.

Klemens Löffler.

Marini (de Marinis), name of an ancient and noble family of the Republic of Genoa, distinguished alike in the Island of Chios, one of its dependencies, where it possessed many beautiful and valuable estates. Besides giving to the Church one pope, Urban VII, it adorned the Dominican Order with several eminent theologians and distinguished religious.

(1) Leonardo Marini, archbishop, b. 1509 on the island of Chios, in the Ægean Sea; d. 11 June, 1573, at Rome. He entered the order in his native place, and, after his religious profession, made his studies in the Convent of Genoa with great distinction, obtaining finally the degree of Master of Sacred Theology. He was a man of deep spirituality, and was esteemed the most eloquent of contemporary orators and preachers. Paul III, recognizing his piety and extraordinary executive ability, decided to choose him as coadjutor with the right of succession to the Bishopric of Perugia, but death frustrated his plans. On 5 March, 1550, Julius III created him titular Bishop of Laodicea and administrator of the Diocese of Mantua. In 1553 he was appointed papal nuncio to the court of Charles V of Spain, where, by his fearless defence of the rights and authority of the Holy See, he effected a complete adjustment of the religious troubles of the country. On 26 Feb., 1562, Pius IV elevated him to the metropolitan See of Lanciano, and the same year, at the request of Cardinal Hercules Gonzaga, appointed him papal legate to the Council of Trent, in all the deliberations of which he took a prominent part. On the termination of the council, after visiting his archdiocese, he was sent to the court of Maximilian II to adjust certain ecclesiastical matters, and, on his return, the pope determined to raise him to the cardinalate, but death prevented him from carrying out his plans. Marini now resigned his diocesan duties and retired to the castle of his brother to combat by pen and prayer the errors of the reformers. Pius V, however, not slow in recognizing his brilliant talents, appointed him to the See of Alba and made him Apostolic Visitor of twenty-five dioceses, a proof of the anxiety of the pontiff to carry into effect the Tridentine reforms. In 1572 he was sent by Gregory XIII on a mission to Philip II of Spain and Sebastian of Portugal to secure from these monarchs a renewal of their alliance against the Turks. His mission was successful. He returned to Rome to be elevated to the cardinalate, but died two days after his return. By order of the pope and the Council of Trent, Marini, with the assistance of two of his brethren, Egidio Foscarari and Francesco Foreiro, composed the famous Roman Catechism, "Catechismus Romanus vulgo dictus ex decreto Concilii Tridentini compositus et Pii V jussu editus" (Rome, 1566). He was also a member of the commission of theologians appointed by Pius V to prepare a new and improved edition of the Breviary (1568) and of the Missal (1570). By order of Pius IV he revised also the Rules and Constitutions of the Barnabite Order.

Quétif-Echard, *Script. Ord. Præd.*, II, 228; Touron, *Hommes illustres de l'ordre de S. Dominique*, IV, 393–410; Theiner, *Acta genuina SS. œcum. Conc. Trid.* (Rome, 1874), I, 696; II, 59, 98, 276.

(2) Tommaso Marini, grand-nephew of the foregoing, date of birth unknown; d. 1635 at Naples. He was of an exceptionally religious family, of which three sons entered the Order of St. Dominic and four daughters took the religious habit. Tommaso, the eldest made his novitiate and studies in the Minerva convent at Rome. In 1608 he was made master of sacred theology, and was assigned the chair of that science in his convent. He was secretary at three general chapters of the order. In 1611 he became *socius* to the general with the title of Provincial of the Holy Land. In 1615 and 1622 he was definitor at the chapters of Bologna and Milan respectively, and in 1618 was appointed visitor for the German and Bohemian, and in 1634 for the Sicilian, provinces. In 1623 and 1624 he was vicar of the Roman provinces, in which he succeeded in introducing a severer discipline.

Mon. Ord. Præd. Hist., XI, 105, 151, 186, 239, 304, 319, 321, 350; XII, 352.

(3) Giovanni Baptista Marini, brother of the foregoing, b. 28 Nov., 1597, at Rome; d. there, 6 May, 1669. He entered the Dominican order at the age of sixteen, and, after his religious profession, studied philosophy and theology at the universities of Salamanca and Alcalá. On the completion of these he returned to Rome, taught theology at the Minerva convent, obtained the degree of Master of Theology, and was appointed by Urban VIII in 1628 secretary of the Congregation of the Index. In the long conscientious management of this office he received not a little abuse from censured authors, being especially persecuted by the learned but bitter opponent of the Index, Theophilus Raynaud, S.J., who, in the pseudonymous work "De immunitate Cyriacorum (*sc.* the Dominicans) a censura diatribae Petri a Valleclausa", published a pungent satire replete with personal invectives against the Dominicans, the alleged controlling element of the Inquisition and the Index, but principally against the secretary of the latter. The work was condemned on 20 June, 1662. On 17 Nov., 1664, a similar fate befell two works published by Dominicans in reply to Raynaud and in defence of themselves, the Index, and its secretary. The first of these was that of Vincent Baron, "Apologia pro sacra Congregatione Indicis ejusque secretario ac Dominicanis" (Rome, 1662), the other that of John Casalas, "Candor lilii seu Ordo FF. Prædicatorum a calumniis et contumeliis Petri a Valleclausa vindicatus" (Paris, 1664). During his office as secretary he provided for the publication of "Index librorum prohibitorum cum decretis omnibus a S. Congregatione emanatis post indicem Clementis VIII". In 1650 he was elected general of the order, which office he held till his death. At the request of Alexander VII, he composed also a "Tractatus de Conceptione B. M. Virginis", which still remains unpublished.

Quétif-Echard, *Script. Ord. Præd.*, II, 561, 615; *Mon. Ord. Præd. Hist.*, XII, 126, 276, 375; *Der Katholik*, I (1864), 433.

(4) Domenico Marini, theologian and brother of the two preceding, b. 21 Oct., 1599, at Rome; d. 20 June, 1669, at Avignon. On 2 Feb., 1615, he followed his two brothers into the Dominican order, where he soon became noted for his piety and learning. Having finished his academic studies in Rome, he was sent for his theological studies to the universities of Salamanca and Alcalá. On his return to Rome, he was assigned the chair of theology in the Minerva convent, but, learn-

ing that a severer discipline prevailed in the convent at Toulouse, he went there, taught theology for some time, and was then appointed to teach the same in the convent of St. Honoré at Paris. Recalled to Rome by the general, Nicolao Ridolphi, he was made master of theology and *regens primarius* of studies in his former convent. Later he became prior, and in that capacity demolished the old, and in its place erected the present Minerva convent. On 18 Oct., 1648, Innocent X created him Archbishop of Avignon. His attention here was first directed towards providing the university—which, since the return of the popes to Rome, had practically lost all significance—with a representative theological faculty. From his private funds he founded chairs of philosophy and theology and supplied them with professors of his own order, thus restoring to the institution the teachings of St. Augustine and Aquinas. He is the author of "Expositio commentaria in I, II et III partem S. Thomæ" (Lyons, 1663–5).

QUÉTIF-ECHARD, *Script. Ord. Præd.*, II, 627; HURTER, *Nomencl.*, II (2nd ed.), 15; *Mon. Ord. Præd. Hist.*, XII, 75, 78, 341; BERTHIER, *L'Eglise de la Minerve à Rome* (Rome, 1910).

JOSEPH SCHROEDER.

Marini, LUIGI GAETANO, natural philosopher, jurist, historian, archeologist, b. at Sant' Orcangelo (pagus Acerbotanus), 18 Dec., 1742; d. at Paris, 7 May, 1815. Having received a comprehensive preparatory education at the College of San Marino and at the seminary at Rimini, he was able to pass through the legal and philological studies at Bologna University brilliantly, and to graduate at Ravenna *in utroque jure* (in both branches of law). He went to Rome in Dec., 1764, where he gained the friendship of Cardinal Alessandro Albani and Garampi. He entered into relations with the most distinguished scholars of his day, and maintained with them an extensive correspondence. In 1772 he was appointed coadjutor to Marino Zampini, prefect of the archives; and was also given the position by the Roman Republic of prefect of the archives at the Vatican and the Castle of St. Angelo, as well as that of president of the Vatican Museum and the Vatican Library. On 18 Aug., 1800, Pius VII made him *primus custos* of the Vatican Library and also prefect of the archives. In Jan., 1805, he was made a *cameriere d'onore* to the pope.

When the archives of the Curia were carried off to Paris by Napoleon, he accompanied them, and reached Paris, 11 April, 1810. After Napoleon's fall the Count of Artois, viceregent and brother of the king, issued a decree on 19 April, 1814, directing the restitution to the Holy See of the archives, of all documents and MSS., and of several other collections. On 28 April the papal commissioners, Mgr. de Gregorio, Mgr. Gaetano Marini, and his nephew Don Marino Marini, took charge of the whole of this property; but before it had reached Rome Gaetano Marini, who had long been an invalid, died at Paris. He was a scholar of eminent parts, a thorough master of Latin, Greek, and Hebrew; and possessed profound legal knowledge. By choice he took up questions of natural philosophy; as an archæologist and historian he is esteemed even today. His great work on papyrus records is a standard work on the investigation of papyri. His book on the Arval Brothers of ancient Rome, showed great erudition and brought to light so much that was new, that its appearance created considerable stir. His classification of five thousand inscriptions, both Christian and heathen, in the Galleria Lapidaria at the Vatican, is a masterpiece, and earned for him the honorary title of "Restorer" of Latin epigraphics ["Inscriptiones (only preserved in MS.) christianæ Latinæ et Græcæ ævi Milliarii conlegit digessit adnotationibusque auxit Caietanus Marinus a Bibliotheca Vaticana item a scriniis sedis apostolicæ. Duæ partes"]. Marini was a cleric, but not a priest. He was distinguished for his piety, often praying for hours before the Blessed Sacrament. He went to communion three times a week. During his residence in Paris he gave away alms to the extent of 3000 scudi (dollars).

MARINO MARINI, *Degli. Aneddoti di Gaetano Marini: Commentario di suo nipote* (Rome, 1822); MORONI, *Dizionario di Erudizione Storico-Ecclesiatica*, IV, 286; MARINO MARINI, *Memorie Storiche dell' occupazione e restitutione degli Archivii della S. Sede e del riacquisto de' Codici e Museo Numismatico del Vaticano e de' Manoscritti e parte del Museo di Storia Naturale di Bologna* (Rome, 1885).

PAUL MARIA BAUMGARTEN.

Marinus I, POPE (882–4).—There is reason for believing that Marinus I was elected on the very day of the death of John VIII (16 Dec., 882), and that he was consecrated without waiting for the consent of the incompetent emperor, Charles the Fat. If the actual date of his election is uncertain, that of his death is still more so; but it was perhaps 15 May, 884. In the seventh century there was a pope, St. Martinus I, and, owing to the similarity between the names Martinus and Marinus, some chroniclers called Pope Marinus *Martinus*. Hence, some modern historians have erroneously described the two popes Marinus as Martinus II and Martinus III respectively, and the successor of Nicholas III called himself Martinus IV. Marinus, about whom but little is known, had a distinguished career before he became pope. He was the son of the priest Palumbo, was born at Gallese, and was attached to the Roman Church at the age of twelve. Leo IV ordained him sub-deacon, and, after he had been made a deacon, he was sent on three important embassies to Constantinople. The second time he went there (869) to preside, as one of the legates of Adrian II, over the Eighth General Council. John VIII, who made him Bishop of Cære (Cervetri), treasurer (*arcarius*) of the Roman Church, and archdeacon, despatched him on that mission to Constantinople, which resulted in his imprisonment for his firmness in carrying out his instructions. Although a bishop, he was elected to succeed John VIII, whose policy he partly abandoned and partly followed. In the hope of lessening the factions in Rome, he, most unfortunately as the sequel proved, reversed the action of his predecessor regarding Bishop Formosus of Porto, whom he absolved from all censures, and permitted to return to Rome. But Marinus vigourously upheld the policy of John VIII with regard to Photius, whom he himself condemned. Trusting to get support from Charles the Fat, he met that useless emperor in 833. But, unable to help himself, Charles could do nothing for others. Marinus sent the pallium to the distinguished Fulk of Reims, and, at the request of King Alfred of England, freed from all taxes the *Schola Anglorum*, or headquarters of the English in Rome. Marinus was buried in the portico of St. Peter's.

JAFFÉ, *Regesta Pont. Rom.*, I (Leipzig, 1885); *Liber Pontif.*, II, ed. DUCHESNE; *Annals of Fulda* and other annals in *Mon. Germ. Script.*, I; DUCHESNE, *The Beginning of the Temporal Sovereignty of the Popes* (London, 1908), 187 sq.; MANN, *Lives of the Popes in the Early Middle Ages*, III, 353 sqq.

HORACE K. MANN.

Marinus II, POPE (942–946), d. in April or May, 946. A Roman, and a cardinal of the title of St. Ciriacus, he was one of the popes placed on the throne of St. Peter by the power of Alberic, Prince of the Romans, and who, though virtuous "durst not put their hands to anything without his permission." Consequently Marinus II made little impression on the world. In an unassuming manner he worked for reform—abroad by his legates, at home by his own exertions. He also favoured that monastic development which had already set in, and which through the influence especially of the Congregation of Cluny, was to reform Europe. He is also said to have devoted himself to the repair of the basilicas, and to the care of the poor.

JAFFÉ, *Regesta Pont. Rom.* (2nd ed.); *Liber Pontif.*, II, ed. DUCHESNE; a few *Privileges* for monasteries in *P. L.*, CXXXIII; MANN, *Lives of the Popes in the Early Middle Ages*, IV, 218 sqq.

HORACE K. MANN.

Mariotte, EDME, French physicist, b. at Dijon, France, about 1620; d. at Paris, 12 May, 1684. His residence was at Dijon, and some of his works are dated from that place. He was ordained and, as a reward for his successful scientific labours, was made prior of Saint-Martin-sous-Beaune near Dijon. Condorcet remarks on that subject that "no profane use is made of the property of the Church, when it goes to reward services rendered to humanity". Mariotte is pronounced the first in France to "bring into the study of physics a spirit of observation and of doubt, and to inspire that caution and timidity so necessary to those who question nature and who try to interpret her answers." In his "Essay on Logic" he enumerates rules of reasoning as well as the fundamental principles themselves, especially in the case of what he calls the natural and the moral sciences. He there teaches a method of experimental research for the establishment of truth, so that we are thus able to study the methods which he used himself to obtain those great results from his experiments.

His fame rests on his work on hydrostatics and on the establishment of the law of gases that bears his name. This was first published in an essay on the nature of air in 1676. "The diminution of the volume of the air proceeds in proportion to the weights with which it is loaded." This law is now stated as follows: The volume of a gas, kept at a constant temperature, changes inversely as the pressure upon the gas. This is the fundamental generalization of our knowledge concerning gases. He invented a device for proving and illustrating the laws of impact between bodies. The bobs of two pendulums are struck against each other, and the resultant motions are measured and studied. He added to the mathematical deductions of Galileo, Pascal, and others, a number of experimental demonstrations of the laws of the pendulum, of the flow of water through orifices, of hydrostatic pressure etc. Mariotte's flask is an ingenious device to obtain a uniform flow of water. His work included experiments on heat and cold, light, sight, and colour. He was a member of the Royal Society of Science from its foundation in 1666. His contributions (Œuvres) were collected and published at Leyden in 1717, and again at The Hague in 1740. They include reprints of the following: "Nouvelles découvertes touchant la vue" (Paris, 1668); "Expériences sur la congélation de l'eau" (Paris, 1682); "Traité du nivellement" (Paris, 1672–4); "Traité de la percussion des corps" (Paris, 1676); "Essais de physique" (4 vols., Paris, 1676–81); "De la végétation des plantes" (Paris, 1679 and 1686); "De la nature de l'air" (Paris, 1679); "Traité des couleurs" (Paris, 1681); "Essai de logique" (Paris, 1678); "Traité du mouvement des eaux et des autres corps fluides" (Paris, 1686; 2nd ed., 1700).

MERLIEUX in *Nouv. Biogr. Gén.*, s. v.; CONDORCET in *Œuvres*, I, 61–75, *Éloge* (Brunswick and Paris, 1804).

WILLIAM FOX.

Maris, Martha, Audifax, and Abachum, SAINTS, martyred at Rome in 270. Maris and his wife Martha, who belonged to the Persian nobility, came to Rome with their children in the reign of Emperor Claudius II. As zealous Christians, they sympathized with and succoured the persecuted faithful, and buried the bodies of the slain. This exposed them to the imperial vengeance; they were seized and delivered to the judge Muscianus, who, unable to persuade them to abjure their faith, condemned them to various tortures. At last, when no suffering could subdue their courage, Maris and his sons were beheaded at a place called Nymphæ Catabassi, thirteen miles from Rome, and their bodies burnt. Martha was cast into a well. A Roman lady named Felicitas, having succeeded in securing the half-consumed remains of the father and sons and also the mother's body from the well, had the sacred relics secretly interred in a catacomb, on the thirteenth before the Kalends of February (20 January). The commemoration of these four martyrs, however, has been appointed for 19 February, doubtless so as to leave the twentieth for the feast of St. Sebastian.

Acta SS. (1643), II Jan., 214–6; BARONIUS, *Annales* (1589), 270, 2–9, 12–16; BOSCO, *Una famiglia di martiri ossia vita dei SS. Mario, Marta, Audifaxe ed Abaco* (Turin, 1892); MOMBRITIUS, *Sanctuarium* (1479), II, cxxxi–iii; SURIUS, *De vitis sanctorum* (Venice, 1581), I, 309–10; TILLEMONT, *Mém. pour servir à l'hist. ecclés.* (1696), IV, 675–7.

LÉON CLUGNET.

Marisco, ADAM DE (or ADAM MARSH), Franciscan. He probably came from the county of Somerset, but the date of his birth is unknown; d. at the end of 1257 or the beginning of 1258. He was educated at Oxford, where he acquired a great reputation. He had been for three years rector of Wearmouth, in Durham, when he joined the Friars Minor about 1237. He succeeded Robert Grosseteste as lecturer at the Franciscan house in Oxford, and soon became acquainted with many of the most distinguished men of the time. The extent and character of his correspondence shows how widespread was his personal influence, and is a striking illustration of the moral force exerted by the early Franciscans in England. Adam was intimate with Grosseteste and Archbishop Boniface, with Richard of Cornwall and Simon de Montfort. Always a reformer himself, he must have helped to give Earl Simon, who began his career in England as a foreign favourite, his deep patriotic and religious interest in the cause of reform. Over Henry III he had no direct influence, but he had friends at Court and he was most anxious to combine peace and reform. Unfortunately he died just when the great political crisis of the reign was beginning. Before his death his name was proposed by Archbishop Boniface for the See of Ely, where there had been a disputed election, but he seems to have been opposed by the monastic interest. As a man of learning Adam had much to do with the organization of studies at Oxford, and as "Doctor Illustris" was known throughout Europe. Roger Bacon professed for him the same perhaps rather excessive admiration with which he regarded Grosseteste, calling them the "greatest clerks in the world". Among the works attributed to Adam are commentaries on the Master of the Sentences, on parts of Scripture, and on Dionysius the Areopagite.

The chief source of information is Adam's own correspondence published in BREWER, *Monumenta Franciscana* (*Rolls Series*). ECCLESTON, *De Adventu Minorum*, GROSSETESTE'S *Letters* and MATTHEW PARIS'S *Chronicle* should also be consulted. Modern works: BREWER, *Preface* to *Monumenta;* RASHDALL, *Universities of the Middle Ages*, II (Oxford, 1895); STEVENSON, *Life of Grosseteste* (London, 1899); CREIGHTON in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, s. v. *Adam de Marisco.*

F. F. URQUHART.

Marist Brothers. See MARY, LITTLE BROTHERS OF.

Marists. See MARY, SOCIETY OF.

Marius Aventicus (or AVENTICENSIS), SAINT, Bishop of Avenches (Switzerland) and chronicler, b. about 530 in the present Diocese of Autun; d. at Lausanne, 31 December, 594. Of the events of his life little is known. From an inscription on his tomb in the church of St. Thyrsius in Lausanne (published in the "Monumenta Germ. Scriptores", XXIV, 795), we learn that he came of a distinguished, rich and probably Roman family, and at an early age embraced the ecclesiastical state. In 574 he was made Bishop of Avenches, took part in the Council of Mâcon in 585, and shortly afterwards transferred his episcopal see from Avenches, which was rapidly declining, to Lausanne. He is extolled as an ideal bishop; as a skilled goldsmith who made the sacred vessels with his own hands; as a protector and benefactor of the poor; as a man of prayer, and as a scholar full of enthusiasm for serious intellectual studies. In 587 he consecrated St. Mary's church at Payerne,

which had been built at his expense and through his efforts. After his death he was venerated in the Diocese of Lausanne as a saint, and his feast was celebrated on 9 or 12 February. The church of St. Thyrsius received at an early date the name of St. Marius. A chronicle of his is still preserved, and purports to be a continuation of the chronicle of Prosper Tiro, or rather of the "Chronicon Imperiale". It extends from 455 to 581, and, although consisting only of dry, annalistic notes, it is valuable for Burgundian and Franconian history, especially for the second half of the sixth century. This explains the fact that, notwithstanding its brevity, it has been frequently published—first by Chifflet in André Duchesne's "Historiæ Francorum Scriptores", I (1636), 210–214; again by Migne in P. L., LXXII, 793–802, and finally by Mommsen in "Mon. Germ., Auctores antiqui", XI (1893), 232–9.

ARNDT, *Bischof Marius von Aventicum. Sein Leben u. seine Chronik* (Leipzig, 1875); MOMMSEN in his edition, *Præfatio*, 227–31; POTTHAST, *Bibl. hist. med. ævi*, I (Berlin, 1896), 667.

PATRICIUS SCHLAGER.

Marius Maximus, LUCIUS PERPETUUS AURELIANUS, Roman historian, lived c. 165–230. No connected account of his life exists, but he is frequently quoted as an authority in the first half of the "Historia Augusta", and Valesius and Borghesi have identified him (Fragm. hist. Rom., p. xxv sq.) with the prefect of the same name, mentioned both in the inscriptions and by Dion Cassius. According to these he served in the Roman army, received prætorian rank at Rome, took part as commander in the campaigns in Gaul, Belgium, Germany, and Cœle-Syria, and was employed in high offices of administration. During the reign of the Emperor Septimius Severus (193–211) he was made consul for the first time shortly after 197, and in 217 Macrinus appointed him prefect. In the reign of Alexander Severus (222–235) he was, in 223, appointed consul for the second time and governed the Provinces of Asia and Africa as proconsul, these offices being due to the special favour of the emperor. Later, Marius Maximus devoted himself to historical writing and wrote biographies of the emperors from Nerva (96–98) to Heliogabalus (d. 222). As the biographies stop with Heliogabalus, although Maximus was intimately connected with Alexander Severus, it is supposed that he did not survive the latter emperor during whose reign, it is thought, his work was probably written. The history of the earlier emperors is not extant, but it can be inferred from the fragments preserved that he adopted the method and views of Suetonius of whose biographies of the emperors his work was a continuation. His description of the lives and acts of the emperors is influenced by his friendliness towards the senate. His style is diffuse and detailed. Often he introduces personal occurrences, and offers official instruments and records of the senate as documentary proof. The biographies of Marius Maximus were greatly admired by his contemporaries and were especially read by the Roman senators. Some of the biographies were continued and enlarged by other writers. Ælius Junius Cordus wrote supplementary lives of the usurpers, Cæsars, and coadjutor-emperors, up to Alexander Severus.

HERRMANN, *Scriptores hist. Aug.* (Leipzig, 1865); IDEM, *Die geschichtliche Literatur über die römische Kaiserzeit bis Theodosius*, II (Leipzig, 1897); PLEW, *Marius Maximus als direkte und indirekte quelle d. scriptores hist. Aug.* (1878); MÜLLER, *Der Geschichtschreiber Marius Maximus* in BÜDINGER, *Untersuchungen zur römischen Kaiseregsch*, III; TEUFFEL, *Gesch. derröm. Literatur*, new ed. SCHWABE (Leipzig, 1890).

KARL HOEBER.

Marius Mercator, ecclesiastical writer, b. probably in Northern Africa about 390; d. shortly after 451. In 417 or 418 he was in Rome where he wrote two anti-Pelagian treatises, which he submitted to St. Augustine (Ep. ad M. M., no. 193). From 429 till about 448 he was in Constantinople. His works, mostly translations and compilations of excerpts from heretical as well as orthodox Greek theological writers, were edited by Garnier (Paris, 1673), reprinted in Migne (P. L., XLVIII, Paris, 1846). They were also edited by Baluze (Paris, 1684), reprinted with corrections in Galland, "Bibliotheca veterum Patrum", VIII (Venice, 1772), 613–738. His treatises "Commonitorium super nomine Cælestii", and "Commonitorium adversus hæresim Pelagii et Cælestii vel etiam scripta Juliani" are against the Pelagians. The former (in Migne, loc. cit., 63–108) effected the expulsion of Julian of Eclanum and Cælestius from Constantinople and their condemnation at Ephesus in 431. The latter is in Migne, loc. cit., 109–172. Against the Nestorians he wrote "Epistola de discrimine inter hæresim Nestorii et dogmata Pauli Samosateni, Ebionis, Photini atque Marcelli" (Migne, loc. cit., 773) and "Nestorii blasphemiarum capitula XII" (Migne, loc. cit., 907–932). Among his translations are extracts from Cyril of Alexandria, Nestorius, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret, Pelagius, and others.

BARDENHEWER, *Patrologie*, tr. SHAHAN (Freiburg im Br. and St. Louis, 1908), 508–10; KIHN, *Patrologie* (Paderborn, 1908), 356–8; KOCH in *Theologische Quartalschrift*, LXXXI (Tübingen, 1899), 396–433; PHILLOTT in *Dict. Christ. Biog.*, s. v.; LOOFS, *Nestoriana* (Halle, 1905), 34 sq., 120 sq. The second part of the last mentioned work contains the Nestorian fragments that owe their preservation to Marius Mercator.

MICHAEL OTT.

Marius Victorinus. See VICTORINUS.

Mark (Μάρκος, MARCUS), SAINT AND EVANGELIST. —It is assumed in this article that the individual referred to in Acts as John Mark (xii, 12, 25; xv, 37), John (xiii, 5, 13), Mark (xv, 39), is identical with the Mark mentioned by St. Paul (Col., iv, 10; II Tim., iv, 11; Philem., 24) and by St. Peter (1 Peter, v, 13). Their identity is not questioned by any ancient writer of note, while it is strongly suggested, on the one hand by the fact that Mark of the Pauline Epistles was the cousin (ὁ ἀνεψιός) of Barnabas (Col., iv, 10), to whom Mark of Acts seems to have been bound by some special tie (Acts, xv, 37, 39); on the other by the probability that the Mark, whom St. Peter calls his son (I Peter, v, 13), is no other than the son of Mary, the Apostle's old friend in Jerusalem (Acts, xii, 12). To the Jewish name John was added the Roman prenomen Marcus, and by the latter he was commonly known to the readers of Acts (xv, 37, τὸν καλούμενον Μάρκον) and of the Epistles. Mark's mother was a prominent member of the infant Church at Jerusalem; it was to her house that Peter turned on his release from prison; the house was approached by a porch (πυλών), there was a slave girl (παιδίσκη), probably the portress, to open the door, and the house was a meeting-place for the brethren, "many" of whom were praying there the night St. Peter arrived from prison (Acts, xii, 12–13).

When, on the occasion of the famine of A. D. 45–46, Barnabas and Saul had completed their ministration in Jerusalem, they took Mark with them on their return to Antioch (Acts, xii, 25). Not long after, when they started on St. Paul's first Apostolic journey, they had Mark with them as some sort of assistant (ὑπηρέτην, Acts, xiii, 5); but the vagueness and variety of meaning of the Greek term makes it uncertain in what precise capacity he acted. Neither selected by the Holy Spirit nor delegated by the Church of Antioch, as were Barnabas and Saul (Acts, xiii, 2–4), he was probably taken by the Apostles as one who could be of general help. The context of Acts, xiii, 5, sugggests that he helped even in preaching the Word. When Paul and Barnabas resolved to push on from Perga into central Asia Minor, Mark departed from them, if indeed he had not already done so at Paphos, and returned to Jerusalem (Acts, xiii, 13). What his reasons were for turning back, we cannot say with certainty; Acts, xv, 38, seems to suggest that he feared the toil. At any rate, the incident was not forgotten by St. Paul, who

refused on account of it to take Mark with him on the second Apostolic journey. This refusal led to the separation of Paul and Barnabas, and the latter, taking Mark with him, sailed to Cyprus (Acts, xv, 37–40). At this point (A. D. 49–50) we lose sight of Mark in Acts, and we meet him no more in the New Testament, till he appears some ten years afterwards as the fellow-worker of St. Paul, and in the company of St. Peter, at Rome.

St. Paul, writing to the Colossians during his first Roman imprisonment (A. D. 59–61), says: "Aristarchus, my fellow prisoner, saluteth you, and Mark, the cousin of Barnabas, touching whom you have received commandments; if he come unto you, receive him" (Col., iv, 10). At the time this was written, Mark was evidently in Rome, but had some intention of visiting Asia Minor. About the same time St. Paul sends greetings to Philemon from Mark, whom he names among his fellow-workers (*συνεργοί*, Philem., 24). The Evangelist's intention of visiting Asia Minor was probably carried out, for St. Paul, writing shortly before his death to Timothy at Ephesus, bids him pick up Mark and bring him with him to Rome, adding "for he is profitable to me for the ministry" (II Tim., iv, 11). If Mark came to Rome at this time, he was probably there when St. Paul was martyred. Turning to I Peter, v, 13, we read: "The Church that is in Babylon, elected together with you, saluteth you, and (so doth) Mark my son" (*Μάρκος, ὁ υἱός μου*). This letter was addressed to various Churches of Asia Minor (I Peter, i, 1), and we may conclude that Mark was known to them. Hence, though he had refused to penetrate into Asia Minor with Paul and Barnabas, St. Paul makes it probable, and St. Peter certain, that he went afterwards, and the fact that St. Peter sends Mark's greeting to a number of Churches implies that he must have been widely known there. In calling Mark his "son", Peter may possibly imply that he had baptized him, though in that case *τέκνον* might be expected rather than *υἱός* (cf. I Cor., iv, 17; I Tim., i, 2, 18; II Tim., i, 2; ii, 1; Tit., i, 4; Philem., 10). The term need not be taken to imply more than affectionate regard for a younger man, who had long ago sat at Peter's feet in Jerusalem, and whose mother had been the Apostle's friend (Acts, xii, 12). As to the Babylon from which St. Peter writes, and in which Mark is present with him, there can be no reasonable doubt that it is Rome. The view of St. Jerome: "St. Peter also mentions this Mark in his First Epistle, while referring figuratively to Rome under the title of Babylon" (De Vir. Illustr., viii), is supported by all the early Fathers who refer to the subject. It may be said to have been questioned for the first time by Erasmus, whom a number of Protestant writers then followed, that they might the more readily deny the Roman connexion of St. Peter. Thus, we find Mark in Rome with St. Peter at a time when he was widely known to the Churches of Asia Minor. If we suppose him, as we may, to have gone to Asia Minor after the date of the Epistle to the Colossians, remained there for some time, and returned to Rome before I Peter was written, the Petrine and Pauline references to the Evangelist are quite intelligible and consistent.

SAINT MARK
Fra Bartolommeo, Pitti Palace, Florence

When we turn to tradition, Papias (Eusebius, "Hist. eccl.", III, xxxix, in P. G., XX, 300) asserts not later than A. D. 130, on the authority of an "elder", that Mark had been the interpreter (*ἑρμηνευτής*) of Peter, and wrote down accurately, though not in order, the teaching of Peter (see below MARK, GOSPEL OF SAINT, II). A widespread, if somewhat late, tradition represents St. Mark as the founder of the Church of Alexandria. Though strangely enough Clement and Origen make no reference to the saint's connexion with their city, it is attested by Eusebius (op. cit., II, xvi, xxiv, in P. G., XX, 173, 205), by St. Jerome ("De Vir. Illust.", viii, in P. L., XXIII, 622), by the Apostolic Constitutions (VII, xlvi), by Epiphanius ("Hær.", li, 6, in P. G., XLI, 899) and by many later authorities. The "Martyrologium Romanum" (25 April) records: "At Alexandria the anniversary of Blessed Mark the Evangelist . . . at Alexandria of St. Anianus Bishop, the disciple of Blessed Mark and his successor in the episcopate, who fell asleep in the Lord" (cf. Le Quien, "Oriens Christ.", II, Paris, 1740, 334; "Acta SS.", IX, 344–9; Lipsius, 323 sqq.). The date at which Mark came to Alexandria is uncertain. The Chronicle of Eusebius (P. G., XIX, 539) assigns it to the first years of Claudius (A. D. 41–4), and later on (ibid., 543) states that St. Mark's first successor, Anianus, succeeded to the See of Alexandria in the eighth year of Nero (61–2). This would make Mark Bishop of Alexandria for a period of about twenty years. This is not impossible, if we might suppose in accordance with some early evidence that St. Peter came to Rome in A. D. 42, Mark perhaps accompanying him. But Acts raises considerable difficulties. On the assumption that the founder of the Church of Alexandria was identical with the companion of Paul and Barnabas, we find him at Jerusalem and Antioch about A. D. 46 (Acts xii, 25), in Salamis about 47 (Acts, xiii, 5), at Antioch again about 49 or 50 (Acts, xv, 37–9), and when he quitted Antioch, on the separation of Paul and Barnabas, it was not to Alexandria but to Cyprus that he turned (Acts, xv, 39). There is nothing indeed to prove absolutely that all this is inconsistent with his being Bishop of Alexandria at the time, but seeing that the chronology of the Apostolic age is admittedly uncertain, and that we have no earlier authority than Eusebius for the date of the foundation of the Alexandrian Church, we may perhaps conclude with more probability that it was founded somewhat later. There is abundance of time between A. D. 50 and 60, a period during which the New Testament is silent in regard to St. Mark, for his activity in Egypt.

In the preface to his Gospel in manuscripts of the Vulgate, Mark is represented as having been a Jewish priest: "Mark the Evangelist, who exercised the priestly office in Israel, a Levite by race". Early authorities, however, are silent upon the point, and it is

perhaps only an inference from his relation to Barnabas the Levite (Acts, iv, 36). Papias (in Eusebius, "Hist. eccl.", III, xxxix, in P. G., XX, 300) says, on the authority of "the elder", that Mark neither heard the Lord nor followed Him (*οὔτε γὰρ ἤκουσε τοῦ κυρίου οὔτε παρηκολούθησεν αὐτῷ*), and the same statement is made in the Dialogue of Adamantius (fourth century, Leipzig, 1901, p. 8), by Eusebius ("Demonst. Evang.", III, v, in P. G., XXII, 215), by St. Jerome ("In Matth." in P. L., XXVI, 18), by St. Augustine ("De Consens. Evang." in P. L., XXXIV, 1043), and is suggested by the Muratorian Fragment. Later tradition, however, makes Mark one of the seventy-two disciples, and St. Epiphanius ("Hær.", li, 6, in P. G., XLI, 899) says he was one of those who withdrew from Christ (John, vi, 67). The later tradition can have no weight against the earlier evidence, but the statement that Mark neither heard the Lord nor followed Him need not be pressed too strictly, nor force us to believe that he never saw Christ. Many indeed are of opinion that the young man who fled naked from Gethsemane (Mark, xiv, 51) was Mark himself. Early in the third century Hippolytus ("Philosophumena", VII, xxx, in P. G., VI, 3334) refers to Mark as *ὁ κολοβοδάκτυλος*, i. e. "stump-fingered" or "mutilated in the finger(s)", and later authorities allude to the same defect. Various explanations of the epithet have been suggested: that Mark, after he embraced Christianity, cut off his thumb to unfit himself for the Jewish priesthood; that his fingers were naturally stumpy; that some defect in his toes is alluded to; that the epithet is to be regarded as metaphorical, and means "deserter" (cf. Acts, xiii, 13).

The date of St. Mark's death is uncertain. St. Jerome ("De Vir. Illustr.", viii, in P. L., XXIII, 622) assigns it to the eighth year of Nero (62–63) (*Mortuus est octavo Neronis anno et sepultus Alexandriæ*), but this is probably only an inference from the statement of Eusebius ("Hist. eccl.", II, xxiv, in P. G., XX, 205), that in that year Anianus succeeded St. Mark in the See of Alexandria. Certainly, if St. Mark was alive when II Tim. was written (II Tim., iv, II), he cannot have died in 61–62. Nor does Eusebius say he did; the historian may merely mean that St. Mark then resigned his see, and left Alexandria to join Peter and Paul at Rome. As to the manner of his death, the "Acts" of Mark give the saint the glory of martyrdom, and say that he died while being dragged through the streets of Alexandria; so too the Paschal Chronicle. But we have no evidence earlier than the fourth century that the saint was martyred. This earlier silence, however, is not at all decisive against the truth of the later tradition. For the saint's alleged connexion with Aquileia, see "Acta SS.", XI, pp. 346–7, and for the removal of his body from Alexandria to Venice and his cultus there, ibid., pp. 352–8. In Christian literature and art St. Mark is symbolically represented by a lion. The Latin and Greek Churches celebrate his feast on 25 April, but the Greek Church keeps also the feast of John Mark on 27 September.

Acta SS., XI, 344–58; *P. G.*, CXV, 164–70; MANGENOT in VIGOUROUX, *Dict. de la Bible*, s. v. *Marc, Saint;* LIPSIUS, *Die apocryph. Apostelgesch. u. Apostelleg.*, II, ii, pp. 321–53; SWETE, *Gospel of St. Mark*, pp. xiii–xxviii; CHASE in HASTINGS, *Dict. of the Bible*, s. v. *Mark (John);* ZAHN, *Introd. to the N. T.*, II (Edinburgh, 1909), 427–56.

J. MACRORY.

Mark, SAINT, POPE, date of birth unknown; consecrated 18 Jan., 336; d. 7 Oct., 336. After the death of Pope Sylvester, Mark was raised to the Roman episcopal chair as his successor. The "Liber Pontificalis" says that he was a Roman, and that his father's name was Priscus. Constantine the Great's letter, which summoned a conference of bishops for the investigation of the Donatist dispute, is directed to Pope Miltiades and one Mark (Eusebius, "Hist. Eccl.", X, v). This Mark was evidently a member of the Roman clergy, either priest or first deacon, and is perhaps identical with the pope. The date of Mark's election (18 Jan., 336) is given in the Liberian Catalogue of popes (Duchesne, "Liber Pontificalis", I, 9), and is historically certain; so is the day of his death (7 Oct.), which is specified in the same way in the "Depositio episcoporum" of Philocalus's "Chronography", the first edition of which appeared also in 336. Concerning an interposition of the pope in the Arian troubles, which were then so actively affecting the Church in the East, nothing has been handed down. An alleged letter of his to St. Athanasius is a later forgery. Two constitutions are attributed to Mark by the author of the "Liber Pontificalis" (ed. Duchesne, I, 20). According to the one, he invested the Bishop of Ostia with the pallium (q. v.), and ordained that this bishop was to consecrate the Bishop of Rome. It is certain that, towards the end of the fourth century, the Bishop of Ostia did bestow the episcopal consecration upon the newly-elected pope; Augustine expressly bears witness to this (Breviarium Collationis, III, 16). It is indeed possible that Mark had confirmed this privilege by a constitution, which does not preclude the fact that the Bishop of Ostia before this time usually consecrated the new pope. As for the bestowal of the pallium, the account cannot be established from sources of the fourth century, since the oldest memorials which show this badge, belong to the fifth and sixth centuries, and the oldest written mention of a pope bestowing the pallium dates from the sixth century (cf. Grisar, "Das römische Pallium und die ältesten liturgischen Schärpen", in "Festschrift des deutschen Campo Santo in Rom", Freiburg im Br., 1897, 83–114).

The "Liber Pontificalis" remarks further of Marcus: "Et constitutum de omni ecclesia ordinavit"; but we do not know which constitution this refers to. The building of two basilicas is attributed to this pope by the author of the "Liber Pontificalis". One of these was built within the city in the region "juxta Pallacinis"; it is the present church of San Marco, which however received its present external shape by later alterations. It is mentioned in the fifth century as a Roman title church, so that its foundation may without difficulty be attributed to St. Mark. The other was outside the city; it was a cemetery church, which the pope got built over the Catacomb of Balbina, between the Via Appia and the Via Ardeatina (cf. de Rossi, "Roma sotterranea", III, 8–13; "Bullettino di arch. crist.", 1867, 1 sqq.; Wilpert, "Topographische Studien über die christlichen Monumente der Appia und der Ardeatina", in "Röm. Quartalschrift", 1901, 32–49). The pope obtained from Emperor Constantine gifts of land and liturgical furniture for both basilicas. Mark was buried in the Catacomb of Balbina, where he had built the cemetery church. His grave is expressly mentioned there by the itineraries of the seventh century (de Rossi, "Roma sotterranea", I, 180–1). The feast of the deceased pope was given on 7 Oct. in the old Roman calendar of feasts, which was inserted in the "Martyrologium Hieronymianum"; it is still kept on the same date. In an ancient manuscript a laudatory poem is preserved (unfortunately in a mutilated text), which Pope Damasus had composed on a Saint Marcus (de Rossi, "Inscriptiones christ. urbis Romæ.", II, 108; Ihm, "Damasi epigrammata", Leipzig, 1895, 17, no. 11). De Rossi refers this to Pope Mark, but Duchesne (loc. cit., 204), is unable to accept this view. Since the contents of the poem are of an entirely general nature, without any particularly characteristic feature from the life of Pope Mark, the question is not of great importance.

Liber Pontif., ed. DUCHESNE, I, 202–4; URBAIN, *Ein Martyrologium der christl. Gemeinde zu Rom am Anfang des V. Jahrh.* (Leipzig, 1901), 198; LANGEN, *Gesch. der röm. Kirche*, I, 423.

J. P. KIRSCH.

Mark, GOSPEL OF SAINT.—The subject will be treated under the following heads: (I) Contents,

Selection and Arrangement of Matter; (II) Authorship; (III) Original Language, Vocabulary, and Style; (IV) State of Text and Integrity; (V) Place and Date of Composition; (VI) Destination and Purpose; (VII) Relation to Matthew and Luke.

I. Contents, Selection and Arrangement of Matter.—The Second Gospel, like the other two Synoptics, deals chiefly with the Galilean ministry of Christ, and the events of the last week at Jerusalem. In a brief introduction, the ministry of the Precursor and the immediate preparation of Christ for His official work by His Baptism and temptation are touched upon (i, 1–13); then follows the body of the Gospel, dealing with the public ministry, Passion, Death, and Resurrection of Jesus (i, 14–xvi, 8); and lastly the work in its present form gives a summary account of some appearances of the risen Lord, and ends with a reference to the Ascension and the universal preaching of the Gospel (xvi, 9–20). The body of the Gospel falls naturally into three divisions: the ministry in Galilee and adjoining districts: Phœnicia, Decapolis, and the country north towards Cæsarea Philippi (i, 14–ix, 49); the ministry in Judea and (καὶ πέραν, with B, ℵ, C*, L, Ψ, in x, 1) Peræa, and the journey to Jerusalem (x, 1–xi, 10); the events of the last week at Jerusalem (xi, 11–xvi, 8).

Beginning with the public ministry (cf. Acts, i, 22; x, 37), St. Mark passes in silence over the preliminary events recorded by the other Synoptists: the conception and birth of the Baptist, the genealogy, conception, and birth of Jesus, the coming of the Magi, etc. He is much more concerned with Christ's acts than with His discourses, only two of these being given at any considerable length (iv, 3–32; xiii, 5–37). The miracles are narrated most graphically and thrown into great prominence, almost a fourth of the entire Gospel (in the Vulg., 164 verses out of 677) being devoted to them, and there seems to be a desire to impress the readers from the outset with Christ's almighty power and dominion over all nature. The very first chapter records three miracles: the casting out of an unclean spirit, the cure of Peter's mother-in-law, and the healing of a leper, besides alluding summarily to many others (i, 32–34); and, of the eighteen miracles recorded altogether in the Gospel, all but three (ix, 16–28; x, 46–52; xi, 12–14) occur in the first eight chapters. Only two of these miracles (vii, 31–37; viii, 22–26) are peculiar to Mark, but, in regard to nearly all, there are graphic touches and minute details not found in the other Synoptics. Of the parables proper Mark has only four: the sower (iv, 3–9), the seed growing secretly (iv, 26–29), the mustard seed (iv, 30–32), and the wicked husbandman (xii, 1–9); the second of these is wanting in the other Gospels. Special attention is paid throughout to the human feelings and emotions of Christ, and to the effect produced by His miracles upon the crowds. The weaknesses of the Apostles are far more apparent than in the parallel narratives of Matt. and Luke, this being, probably due to the graphic and candid discourses of Peter, upon which tradition represents Mark as relying.

The repeated notes of time and place (e. g. i, 14, 19, 20, 21, 29, 32, 35) seem to show that the Evangelist meant to arrange in chronological order at least a number of the events which he records. Occasionally the note of time is wanting (e. g. i, 40; iii, 1; iv, 1; x, 1, 2, 13) or vague (e. g. ii, 1, 23; iv, 35), and in such cases he may of course depart from the order of events. But the very fact that in some instances he speaks thus vaguely and indefinitely makes it all the more necessary to take his definite notes of time and sequence in other cases as indicating chronological order. We are here confronted, however, with the testimony of Papias, who quotes an elder (presbyter), with whom he apparently agrees, as saying that Mark did not write in order: "And the elder said this also: Mark, having become interpreter of Peter, wrote down accurately everything that he remembered, without, however, recording in order what was either said or done by Christ. For neither did he hear the Lord, nor did he follow Him, but afterwards, as I said, (he attended) Peter, who adapted his instructions to the needs (of his hearers), but had no design of giving a connected account of the Lord's oracles [v. l. "words"]. So then Mark made no mistake [Schmiedel, "committed no fault"], while he thus wrote down some things (ἔνια) as he remembered them; for he made it his one care not to omit anything that he had heard, or set down any false statement therein" (Euseb., "Hist. Eccl.", III, xxxix, in P. G., XX, 300). Some indeed have understood this famous passage to mean merely that Mark did not write a literary work, but simply a string of notes connected in the simplest fashion (cf. Swete, "The Gospel acc. to Mark", pp. lx–lxi). The present writer, however, is convinced that what Papias and the elder deny to our Gospel is chronological order, since for no other order would it have been necessary that Mark should have heard or followed Christ. But the passage need not be understood to mean more than that Mark occasionally departs from chronological order, a thing we are quite prepared to admit. What Papias and the elder considered to be the true order we cannot say; they can hardly have fancied it to be represented in the First Gospel, which so evidently groups (e. g. viii–ix), nor, it would seem, in the Third, since Luke, like Mark, had not been a disciple of Christ. It may well be that, belonging as they did to Asia Minor, they had the Gospel of St. John and its chronology in mind. At any rate, their judgment upon the Second Gospel, even if it be just, does not prevent us from holding that Mark, to some extent, arranges the events of Christ's life in chronological order.

II. Authorship.—All early tradition connects the Second Gospel with two names, those of St. Mark and St. Peter, Mark being held to have written what Peter had preached. We have just seen that this was the view of Papias and the elder to whom he refers. Papias wrote not later than about A. D. 130, so that the testimony of the elder probably brings us back to the first century, and shows the Second Gospel known in Asia Minor and attributed to St. Mark at that early time. St. Irenæus says: "Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, himself also handed down to us in writing what was preached by Peter" ("Adv. Hær.", III, i, in P. G., VIII, 845; ibid., x, 6, in P. G., VII, 878). St. Clement of Alexandria, relying on the authority of "the elder presbyters", tells us that, when Peter had publicly preached in Rome, many of those who heard him exhorted Mark, as one who had long followed Peter and remembered what he had said, to write it down, and that Mark "composed the Gospel and gave it to those who had asked him for it" (Euseb., "Hist. Eccl.", VI, xiv, in P. G., XX, 552). Origen says (ibid., VI, xxv, in P. G., XX, 581) that Mark wrote as Peter directed him (ὡς Πέτρος ὑφηγήσατο αὐτῷ), and Eusebius himself reports the tradition that Peter approved or authorized Mark's work ("Hist. Eccl.", II, xv, in P. G., XX, 172). To these early Eastern witnesses may be added, from the West, the author of the Muratorian Fragment, which in its first line almost certainly refers to Mark's presence at Peter's discourses and his composition of the Gospel accordingly (*Quibus tamen interfuit et ita posuit);* Tertullian, who states: "The Gospel which Mark published (*edidit*) is affirmed to be Peter's, whose interpreter Mark was" ("Contra Marc.", IV, v, in P. L., II, 367); St. Jerome, who in one place says that Mark wrote a short Gospel at the request of the brethren at Rome, and that Peter authorized it to be read in the Churches ("De Vir. Ill.", viii, in P. L., XXIII, 621), and in another that Mark's Gospel was composed, Peter narrating and Mark writing (*Petro narrante et illo scribente*—"Ad Hedib.", ep. cxx, in P. L., XXII, 1002). In every

one of these ancient authorities Mark is regarded as the writer of a Gospel, which is looked upon at the same time as having Apostolic authority, because substantially at least it had come from St. Peter. In the light of this traditional connexion of the Gospel with St. Peter, there can be no doubt that it is to it St. Justin Martyr, writing in the middle of the second century, refers ("Dial.", 106, in P. G., VI, 724), when he says that Christ gave the title of "Boanerges" to the sons of Zebedee (a fact mentioned in the N. T. only in Mark, iii, 17), and that this is written in the "memoirs" of Peter (ἐν τοῖς ἀποπνημανεύμασιν αὐτοῦ—after he had just named Peter). Though St. Justin does not name Mark as the writer of the memoirs, the fact that his disciple Tatian used our present Mark, including even the last twelve verses, in the composition of the "Diatessaron", makes it practically certain that St. Justin knew our present Second Gospel, and like the other Fathers connected it with St. Peter.

If, then, a consistent and widespread early tradition is to count for anything, St. Mark wrote a work based upon St. Peter's preaching. It is absurd to seek to destroy the force of this tradition by suggesting that all the subsequent authorities relied upon Papias, who may have been deceived. Apart from the utter improbability that Papias, who had spoken with many disciples of the Apostles, could have been deceived on such a question, the fact that Irenæus seems to place the composition of Mark's work after Peter's death, while Origen and others represent the Apostle as approving of it (see below, V), shows that all do not draw from the same source. Moreover, Clement of Alexandria mentions as his source, not any single authority, but "the elders from the beginning" (τῶν ἀνέκαθεν πρεσβυτέρων—Euseb., "Hist. Eccl.", VI, xiv, in P.G., XX, 552). The only question, then, that can be raised with any shadow of reason, is whether St. Mark's work was identical with our present Second Gospel, and on this there is no room for doubt. Early Christian literature knows no trace of an *Urmarkus* different from our present Gospel, and it is impossible that a work giving the Prince of the Apostles' account of Christ's words and deeds could have disappeared utterly, without leaving any trace behind. Nor can it be said that the original Mark has been worked up into our present Second Gospel, for then, St. Mark not being the actual writer of the present work and its substance being due to St. Peter, there would have been no reason to attribute it to Mark, and it would undoubtedly have been known in the Church, not by the title it bears, but as the "Gospel according to Peter".

Internal evidence strongly confirms the view that our present Second Gospel is the work referred to by Papias. That work, as has been seen, was based on Peter's discourses. Now we learn from Acts (i, 21–22; x, 37–41) that Peter's preaching dealt chiefly with the public life, Death, Resurrection, and Ascension of Christ. So our present Mark, confining itself to the same limits, omitting all reference to Christ's birth and private life, such as is found in the opening chapters of Matthew and Luke, and commencing with the preaching of the Baptist, ends with Christ's Resurrection and Ascension. Again (1) the graphic and vivid touches peculiar to our present Second Gospel, its minute notes in regard to (2) persons, (3) places, (4) times, and (5) numbers, point to an eyewitness like Peter as the source of the writer's information. Thus we are told (1) how Jesus took Peter's mother-in-law by the hand and raised her up (i, 31), how with anger He looked round about on His critics (iii, 5), how He took little children into His arms and blessed them and laid His hands upon them (ix, 35; x, 16), how those who carried the paralytic uncovered the roof (ii, 3, 4), how Christ commanded that the multitude should sit down upon the green grass, and how they sat down in companies, in hundreds and in fifties (vi, 39–40); (2) how James and John left their father in the boat with the hired servants (i, 20), how they came into the house of Simon and Andrew, with James and John (i, 29), how the blind man at Jericho was the son of Timeus (x, 46), how Simon of Cyrene was the father of Alexander and Rufus (xv, 21); (3) how there was no room even about the door of the house where Jesus was (ii, 2), how Jesus sat in the sea and all the multitude was by the sea on the land (iv, 1), how Jesus was in the stern of the boat asleep on the pillow (iv, 38); (4) how on the evening of the Sabbath, when the sun had set, the sick were brought to be cured (i, 32), how in the morning, long before day, Christ rose up (i, 35), how He was crucified at the third hour (xv, 25), how the women came to the tomb very early, when the sun had risen (xvi, 2); (5) how the paralytic was carried by four (ii, 3), how the swine were about two thousand in number (v. 13), how Christ began to send forth the Apostles, two and two (vi, 7). This mass of information which is wanting in the other Synoptics, and of which the above instances are only a sample, proves beyond doubt that the writer of the Second Gospel must have drawn from some independent source, and that this source must have been an eyewitness. And when we reflect that incidents connected with Peter, such as the cure of his mother-in-law and his three denials, are told with special details in this Gospel; that the accounts of the raising to life of the daughter of Jaïrus, of the Transfiguration, and of the Agony in the Garden, three occasions on which only Peter and James and John were present, show special signs of first-hand knowledge (cf. Swete, op. cit., p. xliv) such as might be expected in the work of a disciple of Peter (Matthew and Luke may also have relied upon the Petrine tradition for their accounts of these events, but naturally Peter's disciple would be more intimately acquainted with the tradition); finally, when we remember that, though the Second Gospel records with special fullness Peter's three denials, it alone among the Gospels omits all reference to the promise or bestowal upon him of the primacy (cf. Matt., xvi, 18–19; Luke, xxii, 32; John, xxi, 15–17), we are led to conclude that the eyewitness to whom St. Mark was indebted for his special information was St. Peter himself, and that our present Second Gospel, like Mark's work referred to by Papias, is based upon Peter's discourses. This internal evidence, if it does not actually prove the traditional view regarding the Petrine origin of the Second Gospel, is altogether consistent with it and tends strongly to confirm it.

III. Original Language, Vocabulary, and Style. —It has always been the common opinion that the Second Gospel was written in Greek, and there is no solid reason to doubt the correctness of this view. We learn from Juvenal (Sat., III, 60 sq.; VI, 187 sqq.) and Martial (Epig., XIV, 58) that Greek was very widely spoken at Rome in the first century. Various influences were at work to spread the language in the capital of the Empire. "Indeed, there was a double tendency which embraced at once classes at both ends of the social scale. On the one hand among slaves and the trading classes there were swarms of Greeks and Greek-speaking Orientals. On the other hand in the higher ranks it was the fashion to speak Greek; children were taught it by Greek nurses; and in after life the use of it was carried to the pitch of affectation" (Sanday and Headlam, "Romans", p. lii). We know, too, that it was in Greek St. Paul wrote to the Romans, and from Rome St. Clement wrote to the Church of Corinth in the same language. It is true that some cursive Greek MSS. of the tenth century or later speak of the Second Gospel as written in Latin (ἐγράφη Ῥωμαϊστὶ ἐν Ῥώμῃ), but scant and late evidence like this, which is probably only a deduction from the fact that the Gospel was written at Rome, can be allowed no weight. Equally improbable seems the view of Blass (Philol. of the Gosp., 196 sqq.) that the Gospel was originally written in Aramaic. The

arguments advanced by Blass (cf. also Allen in "Expositor", 6th series, I, 436 sqq.) merely show at most that Mark may have thought in Aramaic; and naturally his simple, colloquial Greek discloses much of the native Aramaic tinge. Blass indeed urges that the various readings in the MSS. of Mark, and the variations in Patristic quotations from the Gospel, are relics of different translations of an Aramaic original, but the instances he adduces in support of this are quite inconclusive. An Aramaic original is absolutely incompatible with the testimony of Papias, who evidently contrasts the work of Peter's interpreter with the Aramaic work of Matthew. It is incompatible, too, with the testimony of all the other Fathers, who represent the Gospel as written by Peter's interpreter for the Christians of Rome.

The vocabulary of the Second Gospel embraces 1330 distinct words, of which 60 are proper names. Eighty words, exclusive of proper names, are not found elsewhere in the N. T.; this, however, is a small number in comparison with more than 250 peculiar words found in the Gospel of St. Luke. Of St. Mark's words, 150 are shared only by the other two Synoptists; 15 are shared only by St. John (Gospel); and 12 others by one or other of the Synoptists and St. John. Though the words found but once in the N. T. (*ἅπαξ λεγόμενα*) are not relatively numerous in the Second Gospel, they are often remarkable; we meet with words rare in later Greek such as *εἶτεν*, *παιδιόθεν*, with colloquialisms like *κεντυρίων*, *ξέστης*, *σπεκουλάτωρ*, and with transliterations such as *κορβᾶν*, *ταλειθὰ κοῦμ*, *ἐφφαθά*, *ῥαββουνεί* (cf Swete, op. cit., p. xlvii). Of the words peculiar to St. Mark about one-fourth are non-classical, while among those peculiar to St. Matthew or to St. Luke the proportion of non-classical words is only about one-seventh (cf. Hawkins, "Hor. Synopt.", 171). On the whole, the vocabulary of the Second Gospel points to the writer as a foreigner who was well acquainted with colloquial Greek, but a comparative stranger to the literary use of the language.

St. Mark's style is clear, direct, terse, and picturesque, if at times a little harsh. He makes very frequent use of participles, is fond of the historical present, of direct narration, of double negatives, of the copious use of adverbs to define and emphasize his expressions. He varies his tenses very freely, sometimes to bring out different shades of meaning (vii, 35; xv, 44), sometimes apparently to give life to a dialogue (ix, 34; xi, 27). The style is often most compressed, a great deal being conveyed in very few words (i, 13, 27; xii, 38–40), yet at other times adverbs and synonyms and even repetitions are used to heighten the impression and lend colour to the picture. Clauses are generally strung together in the simplest way by *καί*; *δέ* is not used half as frequently as in Matthew or Luke; while *οὖν* occurs only five times in the entire Gospel. Latinisms are met with more frequently than in the other Gospels, but this does not prove that Mark wrote in Latin or even understood the language. It proves merely that he was familiar with the common Greek of the Roman Empire, which freely adopted Latin words and, to some extent, Latin phraseology (cf. Blass, "Philol. of the Gosp.", 211 sq.). Indeed such familiarity with what we may call Roman Greek strongly confirms the traditional view that Mark was an "interpreter" who spent some time at Rome.

IV. State of Text and Integrity.—The text of the Second Gospel, as indeed of all the Gospels, is excellently attested. It is contained in all the primary uncial MSS., C, however, not having the text complete, in all the more important later uncials, in the great mass of cursives; in all the ancient versions: Latin (both Vet. It., in its best MSS., and Vulg.), Syriac (Pesh., Curet., Sin., Harcl., Palest.), Coptic (Memph. and Theb.), Armenian, Gothic, and Ethiopic; and it is largely attested by Patristic quotations. Some textual problems, however, still remain, e. g. whether *Γερασηνῶν* or *Γεργεσηνῶν* is to be read in v, 1, *ἠπόρει* or *ἐποίει* in vi, 20, and whether the difficult *αὐτοῦ*, attested by B, ℵ, A, L, or *αὐτῆς* is to be read in vi, 20. But the great textual problem of the Gospel concerns the genuineness of the last twelve verses. Three conclusions of the Gospel are known: the long conclusion, as in our Bibles, containing verses 9–20, the short one ending with verse 8 (*ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ*), and an intermediate form which (with some slight variations) runs as follows: "And they immediately made known all that had been commanded to those about Peter. And after this, Jesus Himself appeared to them, and through them sent forth from East to West the holy and incorruptible proclamation of the eternal salvation." Now this third form may be dismissed at once. Four uncial MSS., dating from the seventh to the ninth century, give it, indeed, after xvi, 8, but each of them also makes reference to the longer ending as an alternative (for particulars cf. Swete, op. cit., pp. cv–cvii). It stands also in the margin of the cursive MS. 274, in the margin of the Harclean Syriac and of two MSS. of the Memphitic version; and in a few MSS. of the Ethiopic it stands between verse 8 and the ordinary conclusion. Only one authority, the Old Latin k, gives it alone (in a very corrupt rendering), without any reference to the longer form. Such evidence, especially when compared with that for the other two endings, can have no weight, and in fact, no scholar regards this intermediate conclusion as having any title to acceptance.

We may pass on, then, to consider how the case stands between the long conclusion and the short, i. e. between accepting xvi, 9–20, as a genuine portion of the original Gospel, or making the original end with xvi, 8. In favour of the short ending Eusebius ("Quæst. ad Marin.", in P. G., XXII, 937–40) is appealed to as saying that an apologist might get rid of any difficulty arising from a comparison of Matt., xxviii, 1, with Mark, xvi, 9, in regard to the hour of Christ's Resurrection, by pointing out that the passage in Mark beginning with verse 9 is not contained in all the MSS. of the Gospel. The historian then goes on himself to say that in nearly all the MSS. of Mark, at least, in the accurate ones (*σχεδὸν ἐν ἅπασι τοῖς ἀντιγράφοις . . . τὰ γοῦν ἀκριβῆ*), the Gospel ends with xvi, 8. It is true, Eusebius gives a second reply which the apologist might make, and which supposes the genuineness of the disputed passage, and he says that this latter reply might be made by one "who did not dare to set aside anything whatever that was found in any way in the Gospel writing". But the whole passage shows clearly enough that Eusebius was inclined to reject everything after xvi, 8. It is commonly held, too, that he did not apply his canons to the disputed verses, thereby showing clearly that he did not regard them as a portion of the original text (see, however, Scriv., "Introd.", II, 1894, 339). St. Jerome also says in one place ("Ad. Hedib.", in P. L., XXII, 987) that the passage was wanting in nearly all Greek MSS. (*omnibus Græciæ libris pæne hoc capitulum in fine non habentibus*), but he quotes it elsewhere ("Comment. on Matt.", in P. L., XXVI, 214; "Ad Hedib.", in P. L., XXII, 987–88), and, as we know, he incorporated it in the Vulgate. It is quite clear that the whole passage where Jerome makes the statement about the disputed verses being absent from Greek MSS. is borrowed almost verbatim from Eusebius, and it may be doubted whether his statement really adds any independent weight to the statement of Eusebius. It seems most likely also that Victor of Antioch, the first commentator of the Second Gospel, regarded xvi, 8, as the conclusion. If we add to this that the Gospel ends with xvi, 8, in the two oldest Greek MSS., B and ℵ, in the Sin. Syriac and in a few Ethiopic MSS., and that the cursive MS. 22 and some Armenian MSS. indicate doubt as to whether the true ending is at verse 8 or verse 20, we have mentioned all the evidence

that can be adduced in favour of the short conclusion. The external evidence in favour of the long, or ordinary, conclusion is exceedingly strong. The passage stands in all the great uncials except B and ℵ—in A, C, (D), E, F, G, H, K, M (N), S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, (Π, Σ), Ω, ב—in all the cursives, in all the Latin MSS. (O. L. and Vulg.) except k, in all the Syriac versions except the Sinaitic (in the Pesh., Curet., Harcl., Palest.), in the Coptic, Gothic, and most MSS. of the Armenian. It is cited or alluded to, in the fourth century, by Aphraates, the Syriac Table of Canons, Macarius Magnes, Didymus, the Syriac Acts of the Apostles, Leontius, Pseudo-Ephraem, Cyril of Jerusalem, Epiphanius, Ambrose, Augustine, and Chrysostom; in the third century, by Hippolytus, Vincentius, the "Acts of Pilate", the "Apostolic Constitutions", and, probably by Celsus; in the second, by Irenæus most explicitly as the end of Mark's Gospel ("In fine autem evangelii ait Marcus et quidem dominus Jesus", etc.—Mark, xvi 19), by Tatian in the "Diatessaron", and most probably by Justin ("Apol. I", 45) and Hermas (Pastor, IX, xxv, 2). Moreover, in the fourth century certainly, and probably in the third, the passage was used in the Liturgy of the Greek Church, sufficient evidence that no doubt whatever was entertained as to its genuineness. Thus, if the authenticity of the passage were to be judged by external evidence alone, there could hardly be any doubt about it.

Much has been made of the silence of some third and fourth century Fathers, their silence being interpreted to mean that they either did not know the passage or rejected it. Thus Tertullian, SS. Cyprian, Athanasius, Basil the Great, Gregory of Nazianzus, and Cyril of Alexandria are appealed to. In the case of Tertullian and Cyprian there is room for some doubt, as they might naturally enough be expected to have quoted or alluded to Mark, xvi, 16, if they received it; but the passage can hardly have been unknown to Athanasius (298–373), since it was received by Didymus (309–394), his contemporary in Alexandria (P. G., XXXIX, 687), nor to Basil, seeing it was received by his younger brother Gregory of Nyssa (P. G., XLVI, 652), nor to Gregory of Nazianzus, since it was known to his younger brother Cæsarius (P. G., XXXVIII, 1178); and as to Cyril of Alexandria, he actually quotes it from Nestorius (P. G., LXXVI, 85). The only serious difficulties are created by its omission in B and ℵ and by the statements of Eusebius and Jerome. But Tischendorf proved to demonstration (Proleg., p. xx, 1 sqq.) that the two famous MSS. are not here two independent witnesses, because the scribe of B copied the leaf in ℵ on which our passage stands. Moreover, in both MSS., the scribe, though concluding with verse 8, betrays knowledge that something more followed either in his archetype or in other MSS., for in B, contrary to his custom, he leaves more than a column vacant after verse 8, and in ℵ verse 8 is followed by an elaborate arabesque, such as is met with nowhere else in the whole MS., showing that the scribe was aware of the existence of some conclusion which he meant deliberately to exclude (cf. Cornely, "Introd.", iii, 96–99; Salmon, "Introd.", 144–48). Thus both MSS. bear witness to the existence of a conclusion following after verse 8, which they omit. Whether B and ℵ are two of the fifty MSS. which Constantine commissioned Eusebius to have copied for his new capital we cannot be sure; but at all events they were written at a time when the authority of Eusebius was paramount in Biblical criticism, and probably their authority is but the authority of Eusebius. The real difficulty, therefore, against the passage, from external evidence, is reduced to what Eusebius and St. Jerome say about its omission in so many Greek MSS., and these, as Eusebius says, the accurate ones. But whatever be the explanation of this omission, it must be remembered that, as we have seen above, the disputed verses were widely known and received long before the time of Eusebius. Dean Burgon, while contending for the genuineness of the verses, suggested that the omission might have come about as follows. One of the ancient church lessons ended with Mark, xvi. 8, and Burgon suggested that the *τέλος*, which would stand at the end of such lesson, may have misled some scribe who had before him a copy of the Four Gospels in which Mark stood last, and from which the last leaf, containing the disputed verses, was missing. Given one such defective copy, and supposing it fell into the hands of ignorant scribes, the error might easily be spread. Others have suggested that the omission is probably to be traced to Alexandria. That Church ended the Lenten fast and commenced the celebration of Easter at midnight, contrary to the custom of most Churches, which waited for cock-crow (cf. Dionysius of Alexandria in P. G., X, 1272 sq.). Now Mark, xvi, 9: "But he rising early", etc., might easily be taken to favour the practice of the other Churches, and it is suggested that the Alexandrians may have omitted verse 9 and what follows from their lectionaries, and from these the omission might pass on into MSS. of the Gospel. Whether there be any force in these suggestions, they point at any rate to ways in which it was possible that the passage, though genuine, should have been absent from a number of MSS. in the time of Eusebius; while, on the other hand, if the verses were not written by St. Mark, it is extremely hard to understand how they could have been so widely received in the second century as to be accepted by Tatian and Irenæus, and probably by Justin and Hermas, and find a place in the Old Latin and Syriac Versions.

When we turn to the internal evidence, the number, and still more the character, of the peculiarities is certainly striking. The following words or phrases occur nowhere else in the Gospel: *πρώτῃ σαββάτου* (v. 9), not found again in the N. T., instead of *τῇ[s] μιᾷ[s] [τῶν] σαββάτων* (v. 2), *ἐκεῖνος* used absolutely (10, 11, 20), *πορεύομαι* (10, 12, 15), *θεάομαι* (11, 14), *ἀπιστέω* (11, 16), *μετὰ ταῦτα* and *ἕτερος* (12), *παρακολουθέω* and *ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι* (17), *ὁ κύριος* (19, 20), *πανταχοῦ*, *συνεργέω*, *βεβαιόω*, *ἐπακολουθέω* (20). Instead of the usual connexion by *καί* and an occasional *δέ*, we have *μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα* (12), *ὕστερον [δέ]* (14), *ὁ μὲν οὖν* (19), *ἐκεῖνοι δέ* (20). Then it is urged that the subject of verse 9 has not been mentioned immediately before; that Mary Magdalen seems now to be introduced for the first time, though in fact she has been mentioned three times in the preceding sixteen verses; that no reference is made to an appearance of the Lord in Galilee, though this was to be expected in view of the message of verse 7. Comparatively little importance attaches to the last three points, for the subject of verse 9 is sufficiently obvious from the context; the reference to Magdalen as the woman out of whom Christ had cast seven devils is explicable here, as showing the loving mercy of the Lord to one who before had been so wretched; and the mention of an appearance in Galilee was hardly necessary, the important thing being to prove, as this passage does, that Christ was really risen from the dead, and that His Apostles, almost against their wills, were forced to believe the fact. But, even when this is said, the cumulative force of the evidence against the Marcan origin of the passage is considerable. Some explanation indeed can be offered of nearly every point (cf. Knabenbauer, "Comm. in Marc.", 445–47), but it is the fact that in the short space of twelve verses so many points require explanation that constitutes the strength of the evidence. There is nothing strange about the use, in a passage like this, of many words rare with the author. Only in the last chapter is *ἀπιστέω* used by St. Luke also (Luke, xxiv, 11, 41), *ἕτερος* is used only once in St. John's Gospel (xix, 37), and *παρακολουθέω* is used only once by St. Luke (i, 3). Besides, in other passages St. Mark uses many words that are not found in the Gospel outside the particular

passage. In the ten verses, Mark, iv, 20–29, the writer has found fourteen words (fifteen, if φανεροῦσθαι of xvi, 12, be not Marcan) which occur nowhere else in the Gospel. But, as was said, it is the combination of so many peculiar features, not only of vocabulary, but of matter and construction, that leaves room for doubt as to the Marcan authorship of the verses.

In weighing the internal evidence, however, account must be taken of the improbability of the Evangelist's concluding with verse 8. Apart from the unlikelihood of his ending with the particle γάρ, he could never deliberately close his account of the "good news" (i, 1) with the note of terror ascribed in xvi, 8, to some of Christ's followers. Nor could an Evangelist, especially a disciple of St. Peter, willingly conclude his Gospel without mentioning some appearance of the risen Lord (Acts, i, 22; x, 37–41). If, then, Mark concluded with verse 8, it must have been because he died or was interrupted before he could write more. But tradition points to his living on after the Gospel was completed, since it represents him as bringing the work with him to Egypt or as handing it over to the Roman Christians who had asked for it. Nor is it easy to understand how, if he lived on, he could have been so interrupted as to be effectually prevented from adding, sooner or later, even a short conclusion. Not many minutes would have been needed to write such a passage as xvi, 9–20, and even if it was his desire, as Zahn without reason suggests (Introd., II, 479), to add some considerable portions to the work, it is still inconceivable how he could have either circulated it himself or allowed his friends to circulate it without providing it with at least a temporary and provisional conclusion. In every hypothesis, then, xvi, 8, seems an impossible ending, and we are forced to conclude either that the true ending is lost or that we have it in the disputed verses. Now, it is not easy to see how it could have been lost. Zahn affirms that it has never been established nor made probable that even a single complete sentence of the N. T. has disappeared altogether from the text transmitted by the Church (Introd., II, 477). In the present case, if the true ending were lost during Mark's lifetime, the question at once occurs: Why did he not replace it? And it is difficult to understand how it could have been lost after his death, for before then, unless he died within a few days from the completion of the Gospel, it must have been copied, and it is most unlikely that the same verses could have disappeared from several copies.

It will be seen from this survey of the question that there is no justification for the confident statement of Zahn that "It may be regarded as one of the most certain of critical conclusions, that the words ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ, xvi, 8, are the last words in the book which were written by the author himself" (Introd., II, 467). Whatever be the fact, it is not at all certain that Mark did not write the disputed verses. It may be that he did not; that they are from the pen of some other inspired writer, and were appended to the Gospel in the first century or the beginning of the second. An Armenian MS., written in A. D. 986, ascribes them to a presbyter named Ariston, who may be the same with the presbyter Aristion, mentioned by Papias as a contemporary of St. John in Asia. Catholics are not bound to hold that the verses were written by St. Mark. But they are canonical Scripture, for the Council of Trent (Sess. IV), in defining that all the parts of the Sacred Books are to be received as sacred and canonical, had especially in view the disputed parts of the Gospels, of which this conclusion of Mark is one (cf. Theiner, "Acta gen. Conc. Trid.", I, 71 sq.). Hence, whoever wrote the verses, they are inspired, and must be received as such by every Catholic.

V. Place and Date of Composition.—It is certain that the Gospel was written at Rome. St. Chrysostom indeed speaks of Egypt as the place of composition ("Hom. I on Matt.", 3, in P. G., LVII, 17), but he probably misunderstood Eusebius, who says that Mark was sent to Egypt and preached there the Gospel which he had written ("Hist. Eccl.", II, xvi, in P. G., XX, 173). Some few modern scholars have adopted the suggestion of Richard Simon ("Hist. crit. du Texte du N. T.", 1689, 107) that the Evangelist may have published both a Roman and an Egyptian edition of the Gospel. But this view is sufficiently refuted by the silence of the Alexandrian Fathers. Other opinions, such as that the Gospel was written in Asia Minor or at Syrian Antioch, are not deserving of any consideration.

The date of the Gospel is uncertain. The external evidence is not decisive, and the internal does not assist very much. St. Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Eusebius, Tertullian, and St. Jerome signify that it was written before St. Peter's death. The subscription of many of the later uncial and cursive MSS. states that it was written in the tenth or twelfth year after the Ascension (A. D. 38–40). The "Paschal Chronicle" assigns it to A. D. 40, and the "Chronicle" of Eusebius to the third year of Claudius (A. D. 43). Possibly these early dates may be only a deduction from the tradition that Peter came to Rome in the second year of Claudius, A. D. 42 (cf. Euseb., "Hist. Eccl.", II, xiv, in P. G., XX, 472; Jer., "De Vir. Ill.", i, in P. L., XXIII). St. Irenæus, on the other hand, seems to place the composition of the Gospel after the death of Peter and Paul (μετὰ δὲ τὴν τούτων ἔξοδον—"Adv. Hær.", III, i, in P. G., VII, 844). Papias, too, asserting that Mark wrote according to his recollection of Peter's discourses, has been taken to imply that Peter was dead. This, however, does not necessarily follow from the words of Papias, for Peter might have been absent from Rome. Besides, Clement of Alexandria (Euseb., "Hist. Eccl.", VI, xiv, in P. G., XX, 552) seems to say that Peter was alive and in Rome at the time Mark wrote, though he gave the Evangelist no help in his work. There is left, therefore, the testimony of St. Irenæus against that of all the other early witnesses; and it is an interesting fact that most present-day Rationalist and Protestant scholars prefer to follow Irenæus and accept the later date for Mark's Gospel, though they reject almost unanimously the saint's testimony, given in the same context and supported by all antiquity, in favour of the priority of Matthew's Gospel to Mark's. Various attempts have been made to explain the passage in Irenæus so as to bring him into agreement with the other early authorities (see, e. g. Cornely, "Introd.", iii, 76–78; Patrizi, "De Evang.", I, 38), but to the present writer they appear unsuccessful if the existing text must be regarded as correct. It seems much more reasonable, however, to believe that Irenæus was mistaken than that all the other authorities are in error, and hence the external evidence would show that Mark wrote before Peter's death (A. D. 64 or 67).

From internal evidence we can conclude that the Gospel was written before A. D. 70, for there is no allusion to the destruction of the Temple of Jerusalem, such as might naturally be expected in view of the prediction in xiii, 2, if that event had already taken place. On the other hand, if xvi, 20: "But they going forth preached everywhere", be from St. Mark's pen, the Gospel cannot well have been written before the close of the first Apostolic journey of St. Paul (A. D. 49 or 50), for it is seen from Acts, xiv, 26; xv, 3, that only then had the conversion of the Gentiles begun on any large scale. Of course it is possible that previous to this the Apostles had preached far and wide among the dispersed Jews, but, on the whole, it seems more probable that the last verse of the Gospel, occurring in a work intended for European readers, cannot have been written before St. Paul's arrival in Europe (A. D. 50–51). Taking the external and internal evidence together, we may conclude that the date of the Gospel probably lies somewhere between A. D. 50 and 67.

VI. Destination and Purpose.—Tradition represents the Gospel as written primarily for Roman Christians (see above, II), and internal evidence, if it does not quite prove the truth of this view, is altogether in accord with it. The language and customs of the Jews are supposed to be unknown to at least some of the readers. Hence terms like Βοανηργές (iii, 17), κορβᾶν (vii, 11), ἐφφαθά (vii, 34) are interpreted; Jewish customs are explained to illustrate the narrative (vii, 3–4; xiv, 12); the situation of the Mount of Olives in relation to the Temple is pointed out (xiii, 3); the genealogy of Christ is omitted; and the O. T. is quoted only once (i, 2–3; xv, 28, is omitted by B, ℵ, A, C, D, X). Moreover, the evidence, as far as it goes, points to Roman readers. Pilate and his office are supposed to be known (xv, 1—cf. Matt., xxvii, 2; Luke, iii, 1); other coins are reduced to their value in Roman money (xii, 42); Simon of Cyrene is said to be the father of Alexander and Rufus (xv, 21), a fact of no importance in itself, but mentioned probably because Rufus was known to the Roman Christians (Rom., xvi, 13); finally Latinisms, or uses of vulgar Greek, such as must have been particularly common in a cosmopolitan city like Rome, occur more frequently than in the other Gospels (v, 9, 15; vi, 37; xv, 39, 44; etc.).

The Second Gospel has no such statement of its purpose as is found in the Third and the Fourth (Luke, i, 1–3; John, xx, 31). The Tübingen critics long regarded it as a "Tendency" writing, composed for the purpose of mediating between and reconciling the Petrine and Pauline parties in the early Church. Other Rationalists have seen in it an attempt to allay the disappointment of Christians at the delay of Christ's Coming, and have held that its object was to set forth the Lord's earthly life in such a manner as to show that apart from His glorious return He had sufficiently attested the Messianic character of His mission. But there is no need to have recourse to Rationalists to learn the purpose of the Gospel. The Fathers witness that it was written to put into permanent form for the Roman Church the discourses of St. Peter, nor is there reason to doubt this. And the Gospel itself shows clearly enough that Mark meant, by the selection he made from Peter's discourses, to prove to the Roman Christians, and still more perhaps to those who might think of becoming Christians, that Jesus was the Almighty Son of God. To this end, instead of quoting prophecy, as Matthew does to prove that Jesus was the Messias, he sets forth in graphic language Christ's power over all nature, as evidenced by His miracles. The dominant note of the whole Gospel is sounded in the very first verse: "The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, Son of God" (the words "Son of God" are removed from the text by Westcott and Hort, but quite improperly—cf. Knabenb., "Comm. in Marc.", 23), and the Evangelist's main purpose throughout seems to be to prove the truth of this title and of the centurion's verdict: "Indeed this man was (the) son of God" (xv, 39).

VII. Relation to Matthew and Luke.—The three Synoptic Gospels cover to a large extent the same ground. Mark, however, has nothing corresponding to the first two chapters of Matthew or the first two of Luke, very little to represent most of the long discourses of Christ in Matthew, and perhaps nothing quite parallel to the long section in Luke, ix, 51–xviii, 14. On the other hand, he has very little that is not found in either or both of the other two Synoptists, the amount of matter that is peculiar to the Second Gospel, if it were all put together, amounting only to less than sixty verses. In the arrangement of the common matter the three Gospels differ very considerably up to the point where Herod Antipas is said to have heard of the fame of Jesus (Matt., xiii, 58; Mark, vi, 13; Luke, ix, 6). From this point onward the order of events is practically the same in all three, except that Matthew (xxvi, 10) seems to say that Jesus cleansed the Temple the day of His triumphal entry into Jerusalem and cursed the fig tree only on the following day, while Mark assigns both events to the following day, and places the cursing of the fig tree before the cleansing of the Temple; and while Matthew seems to say that the effect of the curse and the astonishment of the disciples thereat followed immediately, Mark says that it was only on the following day the disciples saw that the tree was withered from the roots (Matt., xxi, 12–20; Mark, xi, 11–21). It is often said, too, that Luke departs from Mark's arrangement in placing the disclosure of the traitor after the institution of the Blessed Eucharist, but if, as seems certain, the traitor was referred to many times during the Supper, this difference may be more apparent than real (Mark, xiv, 18–24; Luke, xxii, 19–23). And not only is there this considerable agreement as to subject-matter and arrangement, but in many passages, some of considerable length, there is such coincidence of words and phrases that it is impossible to believe the accounts to be wholly independent. On the other hand, side by side with this coincidence, there is strange and frequently recurring divergence. "Let any passage common to the three Synoptists be put to the test. The phenomena presented will be much as follows; first, perhaps, we shall have three, five, or more words identical; then as many wholly distinct; then two clauses or more expressed in the same words, but differing in order; then a clause contained in one or two, and not in the third; then several words identical; then a clause or two not only wholly distinct, but apparently inconsistent; and so forth; with recurrences of the same arbitrary and anomalous alterations, coincidences, and transpositions (Alford, "Greek Testament", I, prol., 5).

The question then arises, how are we to explain this very remarkable relation of the three Gospels to each other, and, in particular, for our present purpose, how are we to explain the relation of Mark to the other two? For a full discussion of this most important literary problem see Synoptics. It can barely be touched here, but cannot be wholly passed over in silence. At the outset may be put aside, in the writer's opinion, the theory of the common dependence of the three Gospels upon oral tradition, for, except in a very modified form, it is incapable by itself alone of explaining all the phenomena to be accounted for. It seems impossible that an oral tradition could account for the extraordinary similarity between, e. g. Mark, ii, 10–11, and its parallels. Literary dependence or connexion of some kind must be admitted, and the question is, what is the nature of that dependence or connexion? Does Mark depend upon Matthew, or upon both Matthew and Luke, or was it prior to and utilized in both, or are all three, perhaps, connected through their common dependence upon earlier documents or through a combination of some of these causes? In reply, it is to be noted, in the first place, that all early tradition represents St. Matthew's Gospel as the first written; and this must be understood of our present Matthew, for Eusebius, with the work of Papias before him, had no doubt whatever that it was our present Matthew which Papias held to have been written in Hebrew (Aramaic). The order of the Gospels, according to the Fathers and early writers who refer to the subject, was Matthew, Mark, Luke, John. Clement of Alexandria is alone in signifying that Luke wrote before Mark (Euseb., "Hist. Eccl.", VI, xiv, in P. G., XX, 552), and not a single ancient writer held that Mark wrote before Matthew. St. Augustine, assuming the priority of Matthew, attempted to account for the relations of the first two Gospels by holding that the second is a compendium of the first (*Matthæum secutus tanquam pedisequus et breviator*—"De Consens. Evang.", I, ii, in P. L., XXXIV). But, as soon as the serious study of the Synoptic

Problem began, it was seen that this view could not explain the facts, and it was abandoned. The dependence of Mark's Gospel upon Matthew's, however, though not after the manner of a compendium, is still strenuously advocated. Zahn holds that the Second Gospel is dependent on the Aramaic Matthew as well as upon Peter's discourses for its matter, and, to some extent, for its order; and that the Greek Matthew is in turn dependent upon Mark for its phraseology. So, too, Belser ("Einleitung in das N. T.", 1889) and Bonaccorsi ("I tre primi Vangeli", 1904). It will be seen at once that this view is in accordance with tradition in regard to the priority of Matthew, and it also explains the similarities in the first two Gospels. Its chief weakness seems to the present writer to lie in its inability to explain some of Mark's omissions. It is very hard to see, for instance, why, if St. Mark had the First Gospel before him, he omitted all reference to the cure of the centurion's servant (Matt., viii, 5–13). This miracle, by reason of its relation to a Roman officer, ought to have had very special interest for Roman readers, and it is extremely difficult to account for its omission by St. Mark, if he had St. Matthew's Gospel before him. Again, St. Matthew relates that when, after the feeding of the five thousand, Jesus had come to the disciples, walking on the water, those who were in the boat "came and adored him, saying: Indeed Thou art [the] Son of God" (Matt., xiv, 33). Now, Mark's report of this incident is: "And he went up to them into the ship, and the wind ceased: and they were exceedingly amazed within themselves: for they understood not concerning the loaves, but their heart was blinded" (Mark, vi, 51–52). Thus Mark makes no reference to the adoration, nor to the striking confession of the disciples that Jesus was [the] Son of God. How can we account for this, if he had Matthew's report before him? Once more, Matthew relates that, on the occasion of Peter's confession of Christ near Cæsarea Philippi, Peter said: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God" (Matt., xvi, 16). But Mark's report of this magnificent confession is merely: "Peter answering said to him: "Thou art the Christ" (Mark, viii, 29). It appears impossible to account for the omission here of the words: "the Son of the living God", words which make the special glory of this confession, if Mark made use of the First Gospel. It would seem, therefore, that the view which makes the Second Gospel dependent upon the First is not satisfactory. A somewhat detailed criticism of the view will be found in Stanton, "The Gospels as Historical Documents" (1909), part II, 38–42.

The prevailing view at present among Protestant scholars and not a few Catholics, in America and England as well as in Germany, is that St. Mark's Gospel is prior to St. Matthew's, and used in it as well as in St. Luke's. Thus Gigot writes: "The Gospel according to Mark was written first and utilized by the other two Synoptics" ("The New York Review", Sept.—Dec., 1907). So too Bacon, Yale Divinity School: "It appears that the narrative material of Matthew is simply that of Mark transferred to form a framework for the masses of discourse" . . . "We find here positive proof of dependence by our Matthew on our Mark" (Introd. to the N. T., 1905, 186–89). Allen, art. "Matthew" in "The International Critical Commentary", speaks of the priority of the Second to the other two Synoptic Gospels as "the one solid result of literary criticism"; and Burkitt in "The Gospel History" (1907), 37, writes: "We are bound to conclude that Mark contains the whole of a document which Matthew and Luke have independently used, and, further, that Mark contains very little else beside. This conclusion is extremely important; it is the one solid contribution made by the scholarship of the nineteenth century towards the solution of the Synoptic Problem". See also Hawkins, "Horæ Synopt." (1899), 122; Salmond in Hast., "Dict. of the Bible", III, 261; Plummer, "Gospel of Matthew" (1909), p. xi; Stanton, "The Gospels as Historical Documents" (1909), 30–37; Jackson, "Cambridge Biblical Essays" (1909), 455.

Yet, notwithstanding the wide acceptance this theory has gained, it may be doubted whether it can enable us to explain all the phenomena of the first two Gospels; Orr, "The Resurrection of Jesus" (1908), 61–72, does not think it can, nor does Zahn (Introd., II, 601–17), some of whose arguments against it have not yet been grappled with. It offers indeed a ready explanation of the similarities in language between the two Gospels, but so does Zahn's theory of the dependence of the Greek Matthew upon Mark. It helps also to explain the order of the two Gospels, and to account for certain omissions in Matthew (cf. especially Allen, op. cit., pp. xxxi-xxxiv). But it leaves many differences unexplained. Why, for instance, should Matthew, if he had Mark's Gospel before him, omit reference to the singular fact recorded by Mark that Christ in the desert was with the wild beasts (Mark, i, 13)? Why should he omit (Matt., iv, 17) from Mark's summary of Christ's first preaching, "Repent and believe in the Gospel" (Mark, i, 15), the very important words "Believe in the Gospel", which were so appropriate to the occasion? Why should he (iv, 21) omit ὀλίγον and tautologically add "two brothers" to Mark, i, 19, or fail (iv, 22) to mention "the hired servants" with whom the sons of Zebedee left their father in the boat (Mark, i, 20), especially since, as Zahn remarks, the mention would have helped to save their desertion of their father from the appearance of being unfilial. Why, again, should he omit viii, 28–34, the curious fact that though the Gadarene demoniac after his cure wished to follow in the company of Jesus, he was not permitted, but told to go home and announce to his friends what great things the Lord had done for him (Mark, v, 18–19). How is it that Matthew has no reference to the widow's mite and Christ's touching comment thereon (Mark, xii, 41–44) nor to the number of the swine (Matt., viii, 3–34; Mark, v, 13), nor to the disagreement of the witnesses who appeared against Christ? (Matt., xxvi, 60; Mark, xiv, 56, 59).

It is surely strange too, if he had Mark's Gospel before him, that he should seem to represent so differently the time of the women's visit to the tomb, the situation of the angel that appeared to them and the purpose for which they came (Matt., xxviii, 1–6; Mark, xvi, 1–6). Again, even when we admit that Matthew is grouping in chapters viii-ix, it is hard to see any satisfactory reason why, if he had Mark's Gospel before him, he should so deal with the Marcan account of Christ's earliest recorded miracles as not only to omit the first altogether, but to make the third and second with Mark respectively the first and third with himself (Matt., viii, 1–15; Mark, i, 23–31; 40–45). Allen indeed (op. cit., p. xv-xvi) attempts an explanation of this strange omission and inversion in the eighth chapter of Matthew, but it is not convincing. For other difficulties see Zahn, "Introd.", II, 616–617. On the whole, then, it appears premature to regard this theory of the priority of Mark as finally established, especially when we bear in mind that it is opposed to all the early evidence for the priority of Matthew. The question is still *sub judice*, and notwithstanding the immense labour bestowed upon it, further patient inquiry is needed.

It may possibly be that the solution of the peculiar relations between Matthew and Mark is to be found neither in the dependence of both upon oral tradition nor in the dependence of either upon the other, but in the use by one or both of previous documents. If we may suppose, and Luke, i, 1, gives ground for the supposition, that Matthew had access to a document written probably in Aramaic, embodying the Petrine tradition, he may have combined with it one or more

other documents, containing chiefly Christ's discourses, to form his Aramaic Gospel. But the same Petrine tradition, perhaps in a Greek form, might have been known to Mark also; for the early authorities hardly oblige us to hold that he made no use of pre-existing documents. Papias (apud Eus., "H. E." III, 39; P.G. XX, 297) speaks of him as writing down some things as he remembered them, and if Clement of Alexandria (ap. Eus., "H. E." VI, 14; P.G. XX, 552) represents the Romans as thinking that he could write everything from memory, it does not at all follow that he did. Let us suppose, then, that Matthew embodied the Petrine tradition in his Aramaic Gospel, and that Mark afterwards used it or rather a Greek form of it somewhat different, combining with it reminiscences of Peter's discourses. If, in addition to this, we suppose the Greek translator of Matthew to have made use of our present Mark for his phraseology, we have quite a possible means of accounting for the similarities and dissimilarities of our first two Gospels, and we are free at the same time to accept the traditional view in regard to the priority of Matthew. Luke might then be held to have used our present Mark or perhaps an earlier form of the Petrine tradition, combining with it a source or sources which it does not belong to the present article to consider.

Of course the existence of early documents, such as are here supposed, cannot be directly proved, unless the spade should chance to disclose them; but it is not at all improbable. It is reasonable to think that not many years elapsed after Christ's death before attempts were made to put into written form some account of His words and works. Luke tells us that many such attempts had been made before he wrote; and it needs no effort to believe that the Petrine form of the Gospel had been committed to writing before the Apostles separated; that it disappeared afterwards would not be wonderful, seeing that it was embodied in the Gospels. It is hardly necessary to add that the use of earlier documents by an inspired writer is quite intelligible. Grace does not dispense with nature nor, as a rule, inspiration with ordinary natural means. The writer of the Second Book of Machabees states distinctly that his book is an abridgment of an earlier work (II Mach., ii, 24, 27), and St. Luke tells us that before undertaking to write his Gospel he had inquired diligently into all things from the beginning (Luke, i, 1).

There is no reason, therefore, why Catholics should be timid about admitting, if necessary, the dependence of the inspired evangelists upon earlier documents, and, in view of the difficulties against the other theories, it is well to bear this possibility in mind in attempting to account for the puzzling relations of Mark to the other two synoptists.

Commentators. Among Catholics:—The earliest, if the work be indeed his, was VICTOR OF ANTIOCH (fifth—sixth century), see CRAMER, *Catenæ* (Oxford, 1840); next VEN. BEDE (eighth century in P.L. XCII; THEOPHYLACT (eleventh century) in *P.G.* CXXIII; EUTHYMIUS (twelfth century) in *P.G.* CXXIX; BRUNO ASTENSIS (twelfth century) in P.L. CLXV; ALBERTUS MAGNUS and ST. THOMAS (thirteenth century); MALDONATUS (sixteenth century); LUKE OF BRUGES (sixteenth century); JANSENIUS YPRENSIS (seventeenth century); A LAPIDE (seventeenth century); CALMET (eighteenth century) etc. Since the middle of the nineteenth century, commentaries by the following writers appeared at the dates indicated: PATRIZI (1862); BISPING (1868); SCHEGG (1870); MACEVILLY (1877); SCHANZ (1881); FILLION (1883); LIAGRE (1889); POLZL (1893); KNABENBAUER (1894); TIEFENTHAL (1894); CEULEMANS (1889); GUTJAHR (1904); ROSE (1904).

Among Protestants:—Some of the principal are, English: ALFORD (1849); COOK in *Speaker's Commentary* (1878); PLUMPTRE (1879); GOULD (1896); MENZIES (1901); HORT (1902); SWETE (1905). German: KLASTERMANN (1867); WEISS (1872); HOLTZMANN (1892).

Besides writers on Introduction to the N. T. such as ABERLE, KAULEN, CORNELY, TROCHON, LESÊTRE, SCHÆFER, BELSER, JACQUIER, HOLTZMANN, GODET, ZAHN (Eng. ed. Edinburgh, 1909), JÜLICHER, SALMON, BACON and contributors to Biblical dictionaries of articles on the Second Gospel such as MANGENOT in *Dictionnaire de la Bible*, SALMOND in HASTINGS, *Dict. of the Bible*, MACLEAN in *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospel*, SCHMIEDEL in *Encyclopædia Biblica*, the following may be consulted:—BURGON, *The Last Twelve Verses of the Gospel acc. to St. Mark*; SCRIVENER, *Introd. to the Criticism of the N. T.*; WESTCOTT-HORT, *N. T. in Greek: Notes on Select Passages*; ZAHN, *Geschichte*, II, 910 sqq.; HARNACK, *Bruchstücke des ev. u der Apok. des Petrus*; MARTIN, *Introd. à la critique textuelle du N. T.*; ROHRBACH, *Der Schluss des Markusevangelium*.

On the relations of Mark to the other Synoptists: RUSHBROOKE, *Synopticon*; WRIGHT, *Synopsis of the Gospels in Greek, and some N. T. Problems*; HAWKINS, *Horæ Synopticæ*; WESTCOTT, *Canon of the N. T. and Introd. to the Study of the Four Gospels*; CAMPBELL, *First Three Gospels in Greek*; SALMON, *The Human Element in the Gospels*; ROSE, *Studies in the Gospels*; MENZIES, *The Earliest Gospel*; BARRY, *The Tradition of Scripture*; BURKITT, *The Gospel History and its Transmission*; ALLEN, *Introd. to Gospel acc. to Matthew*; JACKSON, *Cambridge Bibl. Essays*, XIII; ORR, *The Resurrection of Jesus*, ch. iii; STANTON, *The Gospels as Historical Documents* (Part II); WEISS, *Das älteste Evangelium*; WELLHAUSEN, *Einleit. in die drei ersten Evangeln.*; WENDLING, *Ur-Marcus*; NICOLARDOT, *Les Procédés de Rédaction des Trois Premiers Evangélistes*.

J. MACRORY.

Mark and Marcellian, SAINTS, martyred at Rome under Diocletian towards the end of the third century, most likely in 286. These martyrs, who were brothers, are mentioned in most of the ancient martyrologies on 18 June, and their martyrdom is known to us from the Acts of St. Sebastian, which, though in great part legendary, are nevertheless very ancient. Cast into prison for being Christians, they were visited by their father and mother, Tranquillinus and Martia, who, being still idolaters, implored them to return to the worship of the false gods to save their lives. But Sebastian, whose approaching martyrdom was to render him illustrious, having penetrated into their prison at the same time, exhorted them so earnestly not to abandon the Christian Faith, that he not only rendered their fidelity immovable, but also converted their parents and several of their friends who were present. The judge, before whom they were at length brought, not being able to induce them to apostatize, condemned them to death. They were buried in the Via Ardeatina, near the cemetery of Domitilla. Their bodies were translated at a later date (which is not quite certain, but probably in the ninth century) to the church of Sts. Cosmas and Damian, where they were rediscovered in 1583 in the reign of Gregory XIII. They still rest there in a tomb, near which may be seen an ancient painting wherein the two martyrs are represented with a third person who seems be the Blessed Virgin.

Gesta Beati Sebastiani in SURIUS, *De vitis SS.*, I (Venice, 1681), 137–42; BARONIUS, *Annales* (Lucca, 1738), ann. 284; *Acta SS.*, III, June (Antwerp, 1701), 568–71; MARUCCHI, *Le memorie dei santi Marco e Marcelliano nel cimitéro di Domitilla e probabile attribuzione a questi martiri di un carme del papa Damaso* in *Nuov. Bullet. di Archeol. crist.*, V (Rome, 1899), 5–19.

LÉON CLUGNET.

Mark of Lisbon (properly MARCOS DA SILVA), friar minor, historian, and Bishop of Oporto in Portugal, b. at Lisbon (date of birth uncertain); d. in 1591. While visiting the principal convents of the Franciscan Order in Spain, Italy, and France, at the instance of the minister general, Fr. Andrea Alvarez, he succeeded in collecting a number of original documents bearing upon the history of the order. Previous to this in 1532 the minister general, Father Paul Pisotti, had instructed all the provincials of the order to collect all documents they could find pertaining to the fifteenth century, for the purpose of continuing the "Conformities" of Bartholomew of Pisa. A great part of the material thus brought together was given to Mark of Lisbon; with the aid of which, and of the Chronicle of Marianus of Florence and what he had himself collected, he compiled in Portuguese his well-known "Chronicle of the Friars Minor", published at Lisbon in 1556–68. This work has gone through several editions; and has been translated into Italian, French, and Spanish, and partly into English. The Italian translation by Horatio Diola, bearing the title "Croniche degli Ordini instituti dal P. S. Francesco" (Venice, 1606) is perhaps the best known of these and the one most often quoted, because the most accessible.

The work is taken up almost completely with biographies of illustrious men of the order, the title being thus somewhat misleading. It is of great historical value, especially since the original sources to which the author had access, have entirely disappeared. It is worth recording that to Mark of Lisbon we are indebted for the first edition of a grammar of the Bicol language in the Philippine Islands.

WADDING, *Scriptores Ordinis Minorum* (Rome, 1907), 167; ROBINSON, *A Short Introduction to Franciscan Literature* (New York, 1907), 17, 42; LE MONNIER, *History of St. Francis* (London, 1894), 17–18.

STEPHEN M. DONOVAN.

Maroni, PAUL, missionary, b. 1 Nov., 1695. He entered the Austrian province of the Jesuits on 27 Oct., 1712, and, like many German and Austrian missionaries of that time, went in 1723 on the mission in Upper Marañon that belonged to the Quito province of the order. He worked for several years as professor of theology at Quito and then with great success as Indian missionary on the rivers Napo and Aguarico, converting a number of tribes to the Christian faith and founding a series of new reduciónes (i. e. settlements of converted Indians). At the same time he did great service in carefully exploring those regions, services which were duly acknowledged by the French geographer, La Condamine, (see "Journal des Savants", Paris, March, 1750, 183). Maroni left behind him a number of valuable works which have only recently been published. Two of them are: "Diario de la entrada que hizo el P. Pablo Maroni de la C. d. J. por el rio coriño ó Pastaza . . . el año 1737", published by P. Sanvicente, S. J. in "El Industrial" (Quito, 1895), año IV., num. 132, 133, 135; as also the "Noticias auténticas del famoso rio Marañon y misión apóstolica de la Compañia de Jesús de la provincia de Quito en los dilatados bosques de dicho rio escribilas por los años de 1738 un misionero de la misma compañia y las publicas ahora por primera vez Marcos Jimenez de la Espada (Madrid, 1889)", with maps drawn up by Maroni.

Neuer Welt-Bott, No. 210, 282, 333, 565; CHANTREY-HERERA, *Hist. de las Misiones de la Compañia de J. en el Marañón Español* (Madrid, 1901).

A. HUONDER.

Maronia, a titular see in the province of Rhodopis, suffragan of Trajanopolis. The town is an ancient one, said to have been founded by Maron, who was supposed to be the son of Dionysus (Euripides, "Cyclops", V, 100, 141) or companion of Osiris (Diodorus Siculus, I, 20). The probable origin of this legend is the fact that Maronia was noted for its Dionysiac worship, perhaps because of the famous wine grown in the neighbourhood and which was celebrated even in Homer's day (Odyssey, IX, 196; Nonnus, I, 12; XVII, 6; XIX, 11 etc.). It is mentioned in Herodotus (VII, 109), and referred to by Pliny under the name Ortagurea (Hist. Nat., IV, 11). The town derived some of its importance from its commanding position on the Thracian Sea, and from the colony from Chios which settled there about 560 B. C. It was taken by Philip V, King of Macedonia (200 B. C.), but straightway set free at the command of the Romans (Livy, XXXI, 16; XXXIX, 24; Polybius, XXII, 6, 13; XXIII, 11, 13). By the Romans it was given to Attalus, King of Pergamos, but the gift was revoked and the town retained its freedom (Polybius, XXX, 3). Lequien (Oriens Christ., I, 1195–1198) mentions many of its Greek bishops, but none of them was remarkable in any way. Eubel (Hierarchia Catholica medii ævi, I, 341; II, 205) mentions two titular Latin bishops in 1317 and 1449. Originally suffragan of Trajanopolis, Maronia, about 640, became an autocephalous archdiocese, and was raised to metropolitan rank in the thirteenth century under Andronicus II. In our own times, Maronia continues to be a Greek metropolitan see, but its titular resides at Gumuldjina, the chief town of the sandjak. The ancient town on the sea coast has been abandoned, and the name is now given to a village of 2000 inhabitants about three-quarters of an hour inland.

Bulletin de correspondance hellénique (Paris), V, 87–95; CHRISTODOULOU, *La Thrace et Quarante-Eglises*, 1897 [this work is written in Greek]; MELIRRHYTOS, *Historical and geographical description of the Diocese of Maronia* [in Greek], 1871.

S. VAILHÉ.

Maronites.—This article will give first the present state of the Maronite nation and Church; after which their history will be studied, with a special examination of the much discussed problem of the origin of the Church and the nation and their unvarying orthodoxy.

I. PRESENT STATE OF THE MARONITES.—A. *Ethnographical and Political.*—The Maronites (Syriac *Marunôyê;* Arabic *Mawarinah*) number about 300,000 souls, distributed in Syria, Palestine, Cyprus, and Egypt. Of this number about 230,000 inhabit the Lebanon, forming nearly five-eighths of the population of that vilayet and the main constituent of the population in four out of seven kaïmakats, viz., those of Batrun, Kasrawan, Meten, and Gizzin (the Orthodox Greeks predominating in Koura, the Catholic Greeks in Tahlé, and the Druses in Shûf). They are of Syrian race, but for many centuries have spoken only Arabic, though in a dialect which must have retained many Syriac peculiarities. In the mountain districts manners are very simple, and the Maronites are occupied with tillage and cattle-grazing, or the silk industry; in the towns they are engaged in commerce. Bloody vendettas, due to family and clan rivalries, are still kept up in the mountain districts. The population increases very rapidly, and numbers of Maronites emigrate to the different provinces of the Ottoman Empire, to Europe, particularly France, to the French colonies, but most of all to the United States. The emigrants return with their fortunes made, and too often bring with them a taste for luxury and pleasure, sometimes also a decided indifference to religion which in some instances, degenerates into hostility.

For many centuries the Maronite mountaineers have been able to keep themselves half independent of the Ottoman Empire. At the opening of the nineteenth century their organization was entirely feudal. The aristocratic families—who, especially when they travelled in Europe, affected princely rank—elected the emir. The power of the Maronite emir preponderated in the Lebanon, especially when the Syrian family of Benî Shibâb forsook Islam for Christianity. The famous emir Beshîr, ostensibly a Mussulman, was really a Maronite; but after his fall the condition of the Maronites changed for the worse. A merciless struggle against the Druses, commencing in 1845, devastated the whole Lebanon. Two emirs were then created, a Maronite and a Druse, both bearing the title of Kaïmakam, and they were held responsible to the Pasha of Saïda. In 1860 the Druses, impelled by fanaticism, massacred a large number of Maronites at Damascus and in the Lebanon. As the Turkish Government looked on supinely at this process of extermination, France intervened: an expedition led by General de Beaufort d'Hautpoult restored order. In 1861 the present system, with a single governor for all the Lebanon, was inaugurated. This governor is appointed by the Turkish Government for five years. There are no more feudal rights; all are equal before the law, without distinction of race; each nation has its *sheik*, or mayor, who takes cognizance of communal affairs, and is a judge in the provincial council. Every Maronite between the ages of fifteen and sixty pays taxes, with the exception of the clergy, though contributions are levied on monastic property. In contrast to the rule among the other rites, the Maronite patriarch is not obliged to solicit his firman of investiture from the sultan; but, on the other hand, he

is not the temporal head of his nation, and has no agent at the Sublime Porte, the Maronites being, together with the other Uniat communities, represented by the Vakeel of the Latins. Outside of the Lebanon they are entirely subject to the Turks; in these regions the bishops—e. g. the Archbishop of Beirut—must obtain their *bérat*, in default of which they would have no standing with the civil government, and could not sit in the provincial council.

Like the other Catholic communities of the Turkish Empire, the Maronites are under the protection of France, but in their case the protectorate is combined with more cordial relations dating from the connexion between this people and the French as early as the twelfth century. This cordiality has been strengthened by numerous French interventions, from the Capitulations of Francis I to the campaign of 1861, and by the wide diffusion of the French language and French culture, thanks to the numerous establishments in the Lebanon under the direction of French missionaries—Jesuits, Lazarists, and religious women of different orders. It is impossible to foresee what changes will be wrought in the situation of the Maronites, national and international, by the accession to power of the "Young Turks".

B. *The Maronite Church.*—The Maronite Church is divided into nine dioceses: Gibail and Batrun (60,000 souls); Beirut and one part of the Lebanon (50,000); Tyre and Sidon (47,000); Baalbek and Kesraouan (40,000); Tripoli (35,000), Cyprus and another part of the Lebanon (30,000); Damascus and Hauran (26,000); Aleppo and Cilicia (5000); Egypt (7000). The last-named diocese is under a vicar patriarchal, who also has charge of the Maronite communities in foreign parts—Leghorn, Marseilles, Paris—and particularly those in America.

(1) The Patriarch.—The official title is *Patriarcha Antiochenus Maronitarum*. The Maronite patriarch shares the title of Antioch with three other Catholic patriarchs—the Melchite, the Syrian Catholic, and the Latin (titular)—one schismatical (Orthodox), and one heretical (Syrian Jacobite). The question will be considered later on, whether, apart from the concession of the Holy See, the Maronite patriarch can allege historical right to the title of Antioch. Since the fifteenth century his traditional residence has been the cloister of St. Mary of Kanôbin, where are the tombs of the patriarchs. In winter he resides at Bkerke, below Beirut, in the district of Kesraouan. He himself administers the Diocese of Gibail-Batrun, but with the assistance of the titular Bishops of St-Jean d'Acre, Tarsus, and Nazareth, who also assist him in the general administration of the patriarchate. He has the right to nominate others, and there are also several patriarchal vicars who are not bishops. The patriarch is elected by the Maronite bishops, usually on the ninth day after the see has been declared vacant. He must be not less than forty years of age, and two-thirds of the whole number of votes are required to elect him. On the next day the enthronization takes place, and then the solemn benediction of the newly elected patriarch. The proceedings of the assembly are transmitted to Rome; the pope may either approve or disapprove the election; if he approves, he sends the pallium to the new patriarch; if not, he quashes the acts of the assembly and is free to name a candidate of his own choice. The chief prerogatives of the patriarch are: to convoke national councils; to choose and consecrate bishops; to hear and judge charges against bishops; to visit dioceses other than his own once in every three years. He blesses the holy oils and distributes them to the clergy and laity; he grants indulgences, receives the tithes and the taxes for dispensations, and may accept legacies, whether personal or for the Church. Before 1736 he received fees for ordinations and the blessing of holy oils; this privilege being suppressed, Benedict XIV substituted for it permission to receive a *subsidium caritativum*. The distinctive insignia of the patriarch are the *masnaftô* (a form of head-dress), the *phainô* (a kind of cape or cope), the *orarion* (a kind of pallium), the tiara, or mitre (other bishops wear only the orarion and the mitre), the pastoral staff surmounted with a cross, and, in the Latin fashion, the pastoral ring and the pectoral cross. To sum up, the Maronite patriarch exercises over his subjects, virtually, the authority of a metropolitan. He himself is accountable only to the pope and the Congregation of Propaganda; he is bound to make his visit *ad limina* only once in every ten years. The present (1910) occupant of the patriarchal throne is Mgr. Elias Hoysk, elected in 1899.

(2) The Episcopate.—The bishops are nominated by the patriarch. The title of *Archbishop* (metropolitan), attached to the Sees of Aleppo, Beirut, Damascus, Tyre and Sidon, and Tripoli, is purely honorary. A bishop without a diocese resides at Ehden. It has been said above that the patriarch nominates a certain number of titular bishops. The bishop, besides his spiritual functions, exercises, especially outside of the Vilayet of the Lebanon, a judicial and civil jurisdiction.

The bishops are assisted by chorepiscopi, archdeacons, economi, and periodeutes (*bardût*). The chorepiscopus visits, and can also consecrate, churches. The chorepiscopus of the episcopal residence occupies the first place in the cathedral in the absence of the bishop. The periodeutes, as his name indicates, is a kind of vicar forane who acts for the bishop in the inspection of the rural clergy. The economus is the bishop's coadjutor for the administration of church property and the episcopal mensa.

(3) The Clergy.—Of the 300 parishes some are given by the bishops to regulars, others to seculars. Priests without parishes are celibate and dependent on the patriarch. The others are married—that is to say, they marry while in minor orders, but cannot marry a second time. There are about 1100 secular priests and 800 regulars. The education of the clergy is carried on in five patriarchal and nine diocesian seminaries. Many study at Rome, and a great number in France, thanks to the "Œuvre de St Louis" and the burses supported by the French Government. The intellectual standard of the Maronite clergy is decidedly higher than that of the schismatical and heretical clergy who surround them. The married priests of the rural parishes are often very simple men, still more often they are far from well-to-do, living almost exclusively on the *honoraria* received for Masses and the presents of farm produce given them by the country people. Most of them have to eke out these resources by cultivating their little portions of land or engaging in some modest industry.

(4) The Religious.—These number about 2000, of whom 800 are priests. They all observe the rule known as that of St. Anthony, but are divided into three congregations: the oldest, that of St. Anthony, or of Eliseus, was approved in 1732. It was afterwards divided into Aleppines and peasants, or Baladites, a division approved by Clement XIV in 1770. In the meantime another Antonian congregation had been founded, under the patronage of Isaias, and approved in 1740. The Aleppines have 6 monasteries; the Isaians, 13 or 14; the Baladites, 25. The Aleppines have a procurator at Rome, residing near S. Pietro in Vincoli. The lay brothers give themselves up to manual labour; the priests, to intellectual, with the care of souls, having charge of a great many parishes. The monastic habit consists of a black tunic and a girdle of leather, a cowl, mantle, and sandals.—There are also seven monasteries, containing about 200 religious, under a rule founded by a former Bishop of Aleppo. At Aintoura, also, there are some Maronite sisters following the Salesian Rule.

(5) The Liturgy.—The Maronite is a Syrian Rite,

Syriac being the liturgical language, though the Gospel is read in Arabic for the benefit of the people. Many of the priests, who are not sufficiently learned to perform the Liturgy in Syriac, use Arabic instead, but Arabic written in Syriac characters (*Karshuni*). The Liturgy is of the Syrian type, i. e., the Liturgy of St. James, but much disfigured by attempts to adapt it to Roman usages. Adaptation, often useless and servile, to Roman usages is the distinguishing characteristic of the Maronite among Oriental Rites. This appears, not only in the Liturgy, but also in the administration of all the Sacraments. The Maronites consecrate unleavened bread, they do not mingle warm water in the Chalice, and they celebrate many Masses at the same altar. Communion under both kinds was discouraged by Gregory XIII and at last formally forbidden in 1736, though it is still permitted for the deacon at high Mass. Benedict XIV forbade the communicating of newly baptized infants. Baptism is administered in the Latin manner, and since 1736 confirmation, which is reserved to the bishop, has been given separately. The formula of absolution is not deprecative, as it is in other Eastern Rites, but indicative, as in the Latin, and Maronite priests can validly absolve Catholics of all rites. The orders are: tonsure, *psalte*, or chanter, lector, sub-deacon, deacon, priest. Ordination as *psalte* may be received at the age of seven; as deacon, at twenty-one; as priest, at thirty, or, with a dispensation, at twenty-five. Wednesday and Friday of every week are days of abstinence; a fast lasts until midday, and the abstinence is from meat and eggs. Lent lasts for seven weeks, beginning at Quinquagesima; the fast is observed every day except Saturdays, Sundays, and certain feast days; fish is allowed. There are neither ember days nor vigils, but there is abstinence during twenty days of Advent and fourteen days preceding the feast of Sts. Peter and Paul. Latin devotional practices are more customary among the Maronites than in any other Uniat Eastern Church—benediction of the Blessed Sacrament, the Way of the Cross, the Rosary, the devotion to the Sacred Heart, etc.

(6) The Faithful.—In the interior of the country the faithful are strongly attached to their faith and very respectful to the monks and the other clergy. Surrounded by Mussulmans, schismatics, and heretics, they are proud to call themselves Roman Catholics; but education is as yet but little developed, despite the laudable efforts of some of the bishops, and although schools have been established, largely through the efforts of the Latin missionaries and the support of the society of the Ecoles d'Orient, besides the Collège de la Sagesse at Beirut. Returning emigrants do nothing to raise the moral and religious standard. The influence of the Western press is outrageously bad. Wealthy Maronites, too often indifferent, if not worse, do not concern themselves about this state of affairs, which is a serious cause of anxiety to the more intelligent and enlightened among the clergy. But the Maronite nation as a whole remains faithful to its traditions. If they are not exactly the most important community of Eastern Uniats in point of numbers, it is at least true to say that they form the most effective fulcrum for the exertion of a Catholic propaganda in the Lebanon and on the Syrian coast.

II. History of the Maronites.—All competent authorities agree as to the history of the Maronites as far back as the sixteenth century, but beyond that period the unanimity ceases. They themselves assert at once the high antiquity and the perpetual orthodoxy of their nation; but both of these pretensions have constantly been denied by their Christian—even Catholic—rivals in Syria, the Melchites, whether Catholic or Orthodox, the Jacobite Syrians, and the Catholic Syrians. Some European scholars accept the Maronite view; the majority reject it. So many points in the primitive history of the nation are still obscure that we can here only set forth the arguments advanced on either side, without drawing any conclusion.

The whole discussion gravitates around a text of the twelfth century. William of Tyre (De Bello Sacro, XX, viii) relates the conversion of 40,000 Maronites in the year 1182. The substance of the leading text is as follows: "After they [the nation that had been converted, in the vicinity of Byblos] had for five hundred years adhered to the false teaching of an heresiarch named Maro, so that they took from him the name of Maronites, and, being separated from the true Church had been following their own peculiar liturgy [ab ecclesia fidelium sequestrati seorsim sacramenta conficerent sua], they came to the Patriarch of Antioch, Aymery, the third of the Latin patriarchs, and, having abjured their error, were, with their patriarch and some bishops, reunited to the true Church. They declared themselves ready to accept and observe the prescriptions of the Roman Church. There were more than 40,000 of them, occupying the whole region of the Lebanon, and they were of great use to the Latins in the war against the Saracens. The error of Maro and his adherents is and was, as may be read in the Sixth Council, that in Jesus Christ there was, and had been since the beginning, only one will and one energy. And after their separation they had embraced still other pernicious doctrines."

We proceed to consider the various interpretations given to this text.

A. *The Maronite Position.*—Maro, a Syrian monk, who died in the fifth century and is noticed by Theodoret (Religionis Historia, xvi), had gathered together some disciples on the banks of the Orontes, between Emesa and Apamea. After his death the faithful built, at the place where he had lived, a monastery which they named after him. When Syria was divided by heresies, the monks of Blit-Marun remained invariably faithful to the cause of orthodoxy, and rallied to it the neighbouring inhabitants. This was the cradle of the Maronite nation. The Jacobite chroniclers bear witness that these populations aided the Emperor Heraclius in the struggle against Monophysitism even by force (c. 630). Moreover, thirty years later when Mu'awyah, the future caliph, was governor of Damascus (658–59), they disputed with the Jacobites in his presence, and the Jacobites, being worsted, had to pay a large penalty. The Emperor Heraclius and his successors having meanwhile succumbed to the Monothelite heresy, which was afterwards condemned in the Council of 681, the Maronites, who until then had been partisans of the Byzantine emperor (Melchites), broke with him, so as not to be in communion with a heretic. From this event dates the national independence of the Maronites. Justinian II (Rhinotmetes) wished to reduce them to subjection: in 694 his forces attacked the monastery, destroyed it, and marched over the mountain towards Tripoli, to complete their conquest. But the Maronites, with the Catholic Patriarch of Antioch, St. John Maro, at their head, routed the Greeks near Amiun, and saved that autonomy which they were able to maintain through succeeding ages. They are to be identified with the Mardaïtes of Syria, who, in the Lebanon, on the frontier of the Empire, successfully struggled with the Byzantines and the Arabs. There the Crusaders found them, and formed very close relations with them. William of Tyre relates that, in 1182, the Maronites to the number of 40,000, were converted from Monothelitism; but either this is an error of information, due to William's having copied, without critically examining, the Annals of Eutychius, an Egyptian Melchite who calumniated the Maronites, or else these 40,000 were only a very small part of the nation who had, through ignorance, allowed themselves to be led astray by the Monothelite propaganda of a bishop named Thomas of Kfar-tas. Besides, the Maronites can show an unbroken list of patriarchs be-

tween the time of St. John Maro and that of Pope Innocent III: these patriarchs, never having erred in faith, or strayed into schism, are the only legitimate heirs of the Patriarchate of Antioch, or at least they have a claim to that title certainly not inferior to the claim of any rival.—Such is the case frequently presented by Maronites, and in the last place by Mgr. Debs, Archbishop of Beirut (Perpétuelle orthodoxie des Maronites).

B. *Criticism of the Maronite Position.* (1) The Monastery of St. Maro before the Monothelite Controversy. —The existence since the sixth century of a convent of St. Maro, or of Beit-Marun, between Apamea and Emesa, on the right bank of the Orontes, is an established fact, and it may very well have been built on the spot where Maro the solitary dwelt, of whom Theodoret speaks. This convent suffered for its devotion to the true faith, as is strikingly evident from an address presented by its monks to the Metropolitan of Apamea in 517, and to Pope Hormisdas, complaining of the Monophysites, who had massacred 350 monks for siding with the Council of Chalcedon. In 536 the apocrisarius Paul appears at Constantinople subscribing the Acts of the Fourth Œcumenical Council in the name of the monks of St. Maro. In 553, this same convent is represented at the Fifth Œcumenical Council by the priest John and the deacon Paul. The orthodox emperors, particularly Justinian (Procopius, "De Ædific.", V, ix) and Heraclius, gave liberal tokens of their regard for the monastery. The part played by the monks of St. Maro, isolated in the midst of an almost entirely Monophysite population, should not be underrated. But it will be observed that in the texts cited there is mention of a single convent, and not by any means of a population such as could possibly have originated the Maronite nation of later times.

(2) St. John Maro.—The true founder of the Maronite nation, the patriarch St. John Maro, would have lived towards the close of the seventh century, but, unfortunately, his very existence is extremely doubtful. All the Syriac authors and the Byzantine priest Timotheus derive the name *Maronite* from that of the convent Beit-Marun. The words of Timotheus are: *Μαρωνῖται δὲ κέκληνται ἀπὸ τοῦ μοναστηρίου αὐτῶν Μαρὼ καλουμένου ἐν Συρίᾳ* (in P. G. LXXXVI, 65 and note 53). Renaudot absolutely denies the existence of John Maro. But, supposing that he did exist, as may be inferred from the testimony of the tenth-century Melchite Patriarch Eutychius (the earliest text bearing on the point), his identity has baffled all researches. His name is not to be found in any list of Melchite Patriarchs of Antioch, whether Greek or Syriac. As the patriarchs of the seventh and eighth centuries were orthodox, there was no reason why St. John Maro should have been placed at the head of an alleged orthodox branch of the Church of Antioch. The episcopal records of Antioch for the period in question may be summarized as follows: 685, election of Theophanes; 686, probable election of Alexander; 692, George assists at the Trullan Council; 702–42, vacancy of the See of Antioch on account of Mussulman persecutions; 742, election of Stephen. But, according to Mgr Debs, the latest Maronite historian, St. John Maro would have occupied the patriarchal See of Antioch from 685 to 707.

The Maronites insist, affirming that St. John Maro must have been Patriarch of Antioch because his works present him under that title. The works of John Maro referred to are an exposition of the Liturgy of St. James and a treatise on the Faith. The former is published by Joseph Aloysius Assemani in his "Codex Liturgicus" and certainly bears the name of John Maro, but the present writer has elsewhere shown that this alleged commentary of St. John Maro is no other than the famous commentary of Dionysius bar Salibi, a Monophysite author of the twelfth century, with mutilations, additions, and accommodations to suit the changes by which the Maronites have endeavoured to make the Syriac Liturgy resemble the Roman (Dionysius Bar Salibi, expositio liturgiæ", ed. Labourt, pref.). The treatise on the Faith is not likely to be any more authentic than the liturgical work: it bears a remarkable resemblance to a theological treatise of Leontius of Byzantium, and should therefore, very probably, be referred to the second half of the sixth century and the first half of the seventh—a period much earlier than that which the Maronites assign to St. John Maro. Besides, it contains nothing about Monothelitism—which, in fact, did not yet exist. John Maro, we must therefore conclude, is a very problematic personality; if he existed at all, it was as a simple monk, not by any means as a Melchite Patriarch of Antioch.

(3) Uninterrupted Orthodoxy of the Maronites.—It is to be remembered that, before the rise of Monothelitism, the monks of St. Maro, to whom the Maronites trace their origin, were faithful to the Council of Chalcedon as accepted by the Byzantine emperors; they were Melchites in the full sense of the term—i. e., Imperialists, representing the Byzantine creed among populations which had abandoned it, and, we may add, representing the Byzantine language and Byzantine culture among peoples whose speech and manners were those of Syria. There is no reason to think that, when the Byzantine emperors, by way of one last effort at union with their Jacobite subjects, Syrian and Egyptian, endeavoured to secure the triumph of Monothelitism—a sort of compromise between Monophysitism and Chalcedonian orthodoxy—the monks of St. Maro abandoned the Imperialist party and faithfully adhered to orthodoxy. On the contrary, all the documents suggest that the monks of Beit-Marun embraced Monothelitism, and still adhered to that heresy even after the Council of 681, when the emperors had abjured it. It is not very difficult to produce evidence of this in a text of Dionysius of Tell-Mahré (d. 845) preserved to us in the chronicle of Michael the Syrian, which shows Heraclius forcing most of the Syrian monks to accept his Ecthesis, and those of Beit-Marun are counted among the staunchest partisans of the emperor. One very instructive passage in this same chronicle, referring to the year 727, recounts at length a quarrel between the two branches of the Chalcedonians, the orthodox and the Monothelites, where the former are called Maximists, after St. Maximus the confessor, the uncompromising adversary of the Monothelites, while the latter are described as the "party of Beit-Marun" and "monks of Beit-Marun". We are here told how the monks of St. Maro have a bishop in their monastery, how they convert most of the Melchites of the country districts to Monothelitism and even successfully contend with the Maximists (i. e., the Catholics) for the possession of a church at Aleppo. From that time on, being cut off from communion with the Melchite (Catholic) Patriarch of Antioch, they do as the Jacobites did before them, and for the same reasons: they set up a separate Church, eschewing, however, with equal horror the Monophysites, who reject the Council of Chalcedon, and the Catholics who condemn the Monothelite Ecthesis of Heraclius and accept the Sixth Œcumenical Council. Why the monks of Beit-Marun, hitherto so faithful to the Byzantine emperors, should have deserted them when they returned to orthodoxy, we do not know; but it is certain that in this defection the Maronite Church and nation had its origin, and that the name *Maronite* thenceforward becomes a synonym for *Monothelite*, as well with Byzantine as with Nestorian or Monophysite writers. Says the Chronicle of Michael the Syrian, referring to this period: "The Maronites remained as they are now. They ordain a patriarch and bishops from their convent. They are separated from Maximus, in that they confess only one will in Christ, and say: 'Who was crucified for us'. But they accept the Synod of Chalcedon." St. Germanus of Con-

stantinople, in his treatise "De Hæresibus et Synodis" (about the year 735), writes: "There are some heretics who, rejecting the Fifth and Sixth Councils, nevertheless contend against the Jacobites. The latter treat them as men without sense, because, while accepting the Fourth Council, they try to reject the next two. Such are the Maronites, whose monastery is situated in the very mountains of Syria." (The Fourth Council was that of Chalcedon.) St. John Damascene, a Doctor of the Church (d. 749), also considered the Maronites heretics. He reproaches them, among other things, with continuing to add the words σταυρωθεις δι ημας (Who didst suffer for us on the Cross) to the Trisagion, an addition susceptible of an orthodox sense, but which had eventually been prohibited in order to prevent misunderstanding [μαρωνίσομεν προσθέμενοι τῷ τρισαγίῳ τὴν σταύρωσιν ("We shall be following Maro, if we join the Crucifixion to our Trisagion"—"De Hymno Trisagio", ch. v). Cf. περὶ ὀρθοῦ φρονηματος, ch. v.]. A little later, Timotheus I, Patriarch of the Nestorians, receives a letter from the Maronites, proposing that he should admit them to his communion. His reply is extant, though as yet unpublished, in which he felicitates them on rejecting, as he himself does, the idea of more than one energy and one will in Christ (Monothelitism), but lays down certain conditions which amount to an acceptance of his Nestorianism, though in a mitigated form. Analogous testimony may be found in the works of the Melchite controversialist Theodore Abukara (d. c. 820) and the Jacobite theologian Habib Abu-Raïta (about the same period), as also in the treatise "De Receptione Hareticorum" attributed to the priest Timotheus (P. G., 86, 65). Thus, in the eighth century there exists a Maronite Church distinct from the Catholic Church and from the Monophysite Church; this Church extends far into the plain of Syria and prevails especially in the mountain regions about the monastery of Beit-Marun. In the ninth century this Church was probably confined to the mountain regions. The destruction of the monastery of Beit-Marun did not put an end to it; it completed its organization by setting up a patriarch, the first known Maronite patriarch dating from 1121, though there may have been others before him. The Maronite mountaineers preserved a relative autonomy between the Byzantine emperors, on the one hand, who reconquered Antioch in the tenth century, and, on the other hand, the Mussulmans. The Crusaders entered into relations with them. In 1182, almost the entire nation—40,000 of them—were converted. From the moment when their influence ceased to extend over the hellenized lowlands of Syria, the Maronites ceased to speak any language but Syriac, and used no other in their liturgy. It is impossible to assign a date to this disappearance of hellenism among them. At the end of the eighth century the Maronite Theophilus of Edessa knew enough Greek to translate and comment on the Homeric poems. It is very likely that Greek was the chief language used in the monastery of Beit-Marun, at least until the ninth century; that monastery having been destroyed, there remained only country and mountain villages where nothing but Syriac had ever been used either colloquially or in the liturgy.

It would be pleasant to be able at least to say that the orthodoxy of the Maronites has been constant since 1182, but, unfortunately, even this cannot be asserted. There have been at least partial defections among them. No doubt the patriarch Jeremias al Amshîti visited Innocent III at Rome in 1215, and he is known to have taken home with him some projects of liturgical reform. But in 1445, after the Council of Florence, the Maronites of Cyprus return to Catholicism (Hefele, "Histoire des conciles", tr. Delare, XI, 540). In 1461, Pius II, in his letter to Mahomet II, still ranks them among the heretics. Gryphone, an illustrious Flemish Franciscan of the end of the fifteenth century, converted a large number of them, receiving several into the Order of St. Francis, and one of them, Gabriel Glaï (Barclaïus, or Benclaïus), whom he had caused to be consecrated Bishop of Lefkosia in Cyprus, was the first Maronite scholar to attempt to establish his nation's claim to unvarying orthodoxy: in a letter written in 1495 he gives what purports to be a list of eighteen Maronite patriarchs in succession, from the beginning of their Church down to his own time, taken from documents which he assumes to come down from the year 1315.—It is obvious to remark how recent all this is.—The Franciscan Suriano ("Il trattato di Terra Santa e dell' Oriente di fr. Fr. Suriano", ed. Golubovitch), who was delegated to the Maronites by Leo X, in1515, points out many traits of ignorance and many abuses among them, and regards Maro as a Monothelite. However, it may be asserted that the Maronites never relapsed into Monothelitism after Gryphone's mission. Since James of Hadat (1439–58) all their patriarchs have been strictly orthodox.

C. *The Maronite Church since the Sixteenth Century.*—The Lateran Council of 1516 was the beginning of a new era, which has also been the most brilliant, in Maronite history. The letters of the patriarch Simon Peter and of his bishops may be found in the eleventh session of that council (19 Dec., 1516). From that time the Maronites were to be in permanent and uninterrupted contact with Rome. Moses of Akkar (1526–67) received a letter from Pius IV. The patriarch Michael sought the intervention of Gregory XIII and received the pallium from him. That great pontiff was the most distinguished benefactor of the Maronite Church: he established at Rome a hospital for them, and then the Maronite College to which the bishops could send six of their subjects. Many famous *savants* have gone out of this college: George Amira, the grammarian, who died patriarch in 1633; Isaac of Schadrê; Gabriel Siouni, professor at the Sapienza, afterwards interpreter to King Louis XIII and collaborator in the Polyglot Bible (d. 1648); Abraham of Ḥakel (Ecchelensis), a very prolific writer, professor at Rome and afterwards at Paris, and collaborator in the Polyglot Bible; above all, the Assemani —Joseph Simeon, editor of the "Bibliotheca Orientalis", Stephanus Evodius, and Joseph Aloysius. Another Maronite college was founded at Ravenna by Innocent X, but was amalgamated with that at Rome in 1665. After the French Revolution the Maronite College was attached to the Congregation of Propaganda.

In the patriarchate of Sergius Risius, the successor of Michael, the Jesuit Jerome Dandini, by order of Clement VIII, directed a general council of the Maronites at Kannobin in 1616, which enacted twenty-one canons, correcting abuses and effecting reforms in liturgical matters; the liturgical reforms of the council of 1596, however, were extremely moderate. Other patriarchs were: Joseph II Risius, who, in 1606, introduced the Gregorian Calendar; John XI (d. 1633), to whom Paul V sent the pallium in 1610; Gregory Amira (1633–44); Joseph III of Akur (1644–47); John XII of Soffra (d. 1656). The last two of these prelates converted a great many Jacobites. Stephen of Ehden (d. 1704) composed a history of his predecessors from 1095 to 1699. Peter James II was deposed in 1705, but Joseph Mubarak, who was elected in his place, was not recognized by Clement XI, and, through the intervention of Propaganda, which demanded the holding of another council, Peter James II was restored in 1713.

Under Joseph IV (1733–42) was held a second national council, which is of the highest importance. Pope Clement XII delegated Joseph Simeon Assemani, who was assisted by his nephew Stephanus Evodius, with an express mandate to cause the Council of Trent to be promulgated in the Lebanon. The Jesuit Fro-

mage was appointed synodal orator. According to the letter which he sent to his superiors (published at the beginning of Mansi's thirty-eighth volume), the chief abuses to be corrected by the ablegate were: (1) The Maronite bishops, in virtue of an ancient custom, had in their households a certain number of religious women, whose lodgings were, as a rule, separated from the bishop's only by a door of communication. (2) The patriarch had reserved to himself exclusively the right to consecrate the holy oils and distribute them among the bishops and clergy in consideration of money payments. (3) Marriage dispensations were sold for a money price. (4) The Blessed Sacrament was not reserved in most of the country churches, and was seldom to be found except in the churches of religious communities. (5) Married priests were permitted to remarry. (6) Churches lacked their becoming ornaments, and "the members of Jesus Christ, necessary succour", while, on the other hand, there were too many bishops—fifteen to one hundred and fifty parishes. (7) The Maronites of Aleppo had, for ten or twelve years past, been singing the Liturgy in Arabic only.

With great difficulty, J. S. Assemani overcame the ill will of the patriarch and the intrigues of the bishops: the Council of the Lebanon at last convened in the monastery of St. Mary of Luweïza, fourteen Maronite bishops, one Syrian, and one Armenian assisting. The abuses enumerated above were reformed, and measures were taken to combat ignorance by establishing schools. The following decisions were also taken: the Filioque was introduced into the Creed; in the Synaxary, not only the first six councils were to be mentioned, but also the Seventh (Nicæa, 787), the Eighth (Constantinople, 869), the Council of Florence (1439), and the Council of Trent; the pope was to be named in the Mass and in other parts of the liturgy; confirmation was reserved to the bishop; the consecration of the holy chrism and the holy oils was set for Holy Thursday; the altar bread was to take the circular form in use at Rome, must be composed only of flour and water, and must contain no oil or salt, after the Syrian tradition; the wine must be mixed with a little water; communion under both species was no longer permitted except to priests and deacons; the ecclesiastical hierarchy was definitely organized, and the ceremonial of ordination fixed; the number of bishoprics was reduced to eight.

The publication of the decrees of this council did not, of course, completely transform Maronite manners and customs. In 1743, two candidates for the patriarchate were chosen. Clement XIV was obliged to annul the election; he chose Simon Euodius, Archbishop of Damascus (d. 1756), who was succeeded by Tobias Peter (1756–66). In the next patriarchal reign, that of Joseph Peter Stefani, a certain Anna Agsmi founded a congregation of religious women of the Sacred Heart; the Holy See suppressed the congregation and condemned its foundress, who, by means of her reputation for sanctity, was disseminating grave errors. Joseph Peter, who defended her in spite of everything, was placed under interdict in 1779, but was reconciled some years later. After him came Michael Fadl (d. 1795), Peter Gemaïl (d. 1797), Peter Thian (1797–1809), and Joseph Dolci (1809–23). The last, in 1818, abolished, by the action of a synod, the custom by which, in many places, there were pairs of monasteries, one for men, the other for women. Under Joseph Habaïsch the struggles with the Druses (see I, above) began, continuing under his successor, Joseph Ghazm (1846–55). Peter Paul Massaad (1855–90) during his long and fruitful term on the patriarchal throne witnessed events of extreme gravity—the revolt of the people against the sheiks and the massacres of 1860. The Maronite Church owes much to him: his firmness of character and the loftiness of his aims had the utmost possible effect in lessening the evil consequences and breaking the shock of these conflicts. The immediate predecessor of the present (1910) patriarch, Mgr. Hoyek, was John Peter Hadj (1890–99).

I. For the councils of 1596 and 1736 see MANSI, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio* (Florence and Venice, 1759–98). For the history of the Maronites, MICHAEL THE SYRIAN, *Chronicle*, ed. NAU in *Opuscules Maronites* in *Revue de l'Orient Chrétien*, IV.

II. ANCIENT WORKS.—Maronite: NAÏRONI, *Dissertatio de origine nomine ac religione Maronitarum* (Rome, 1679); IDEM, *Evoplia fidei* (Rome, 1694); J. S. ASSEMANI, *Bibliotheca orientalis*, I (Rome, 1719), 496 sqq. Western: DANDINI, *Missione apostolica al Patriarca e Maroniti* (Cesena, 1656), French tr., SIMON, *Voyage du Mont. Liban* (Paris, 1685); LE QUIEN, *Oriens Christianus*, III: *Ecclesia Maronitarum de Monte Libano*, 1–100. See also the works of the travellers and missionaries among the Maronites; the chief, besides WILLIAM OF TYRE, are JACQUES DE VITRY; LUDOLF OF SUCHEN, *De itinere hierosolymitano;* GRYPHONE, SURIANO, FROMAGE.

III. MODERN WORKS.—Maronite: DEBS, *La perpétuelle orthodoxie des Maronites* (Beirut, s. d.); CHEBLI, *Le patriarcat Maronite d'Antioche* in *Revue de l'Or. Chrét.*, VIII, 133 sqq.; for the Maronite theory, NAU, *Opuscules maronites* in *Rev. de l'Or. chrét.*, IV. Western: LAMMENS, *Fr. Gryphon et le Liban au XVI^e siècle* in *Revue de l'Or. Chrét.*, IV, 68 sqq.; and especially the articles of VAILHÉ in *Echos d'Orient, Origines religieuses des Maronites*, IV, 96, 154; V, 281; *Melchites et Maronites*, VI, 271; *Fra Suriano et la perpétuelle orthodoxie des Maronites*, VII, 99; *Le monothélisme des Maronites d'après les auteurs Melchites*, IX, 91; *L'Eglise Maronite du V^e au IX^e siècle*, IX, 257, 344; also NEHER in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v. *Maroniten;* KESSLER in *Realencyc. für prot. theol.*, s. v. *Maroniten.*

J. LABOURT.

Marquesas Islands, VICARIATE APOSTOLIC OF (INSULARUM MARCHESI), in Polynesia, includes all the Marquesas Islands, eleven in number, lying between 7° 50′ and 10° 30′ S. lat. and between 138° and 141° W. long. The area comprises 480 sq. miles. The islands are mountainous and rocky, but have fertile plains. The aborigines are cannibals who live mainly by fishing, and dwell in huts of wattles and branches. The chief products are the bread-fruit tree, the coconut, the banana, orange, and sugar-cane. Horses, pigs, sheep, cotton, and tobacco have been introduced by the missionaries. The islands were discovered in 1595 by Mendana and named Marquesas after the Marquess de Mendoza, at that time Viceroy of Peru, from which country the expedition had sailed. The first Mass was said there 28 July, 1595. In 1791 the northern islands were visited by Ingraham, an American, and by Marchand, a Frenchman, who took possession of the group in the name of France. On 4 August, 1836, three missionaries of the Congregation of Picpus entered the Bay of Vaithu, Fathers Desvault and Borgella, and Brother Nil. They found the natives given to tattooing, cruel and defective in morals. In 1774 some whaling vessels left the dread disease, phthisis, among the natives, and it has continued to work havoc there. The population in 1804 was reckoned at 17,700; in 1830 it had shrunk to 8000; at the present time it is about half that number. Between 1838 and 1848 there were 216 baptisms of adults; between 1848 and 1856, 986 baptisms. In 1858 the missionaries opened schools at Taiohaé, and in 1900 these schools were instructing 300 children. In 1894 the use of opium by natives was prohibited; in 1895 the selling or possessing of alcohol was made a criminal offence, and in 1896 attendance at school was made obligatory. In 1900, however, in consequence of the passing of the Associations Law in France the schools were closed by the Government. Efforts of the missionaries to enforce attendance at their private schools met with limited success. The present Vicar Apostolic, Mgr. Martin, of the Picpus Congregation, titular Bishop of Uranopolis, arrived in 1890 and took up his residence at Antouna on Hiva-Oa. The residence of the civil governor is at Taiohal on Noukouhiva.

STATISTICS.—1 Vicar-Apostolic; 9 priests, 5 brothers of the Picpus congregation; 4 brothers of Ploermel; 9 sisters of St. Joseph of Cluny; 10 native catechists; 40 stations scattered over 6 islands; 1 hospital which cares for 160 lepers. Present population, 3300 Catho-

lics, 150 Protestants, about 300 pagans. The Marquesas Islands have been a Vicariate Apostolic since 15 April, 1848.

PIOLET, *Les Missions* (Paris, s. d.); *Gerarchia* (1910); *Missiones Catholicæ* (Rome, 1907); WERNER, *Orbis terrarum Catholicus* (Freiburg, 1890); STREET, *Atlas des Missions Cath.* (Steyl, 1906); HAURIGOT, *Les établissements français en Océanie* (Paris, 1891); TOLNA, *Chez les Cannibals* (Paris, 1903); MARIN, *Au Loin: souvenirs des Iles Marquises* (Paris, 1891).

J. C. GREY.

Marquette (SAULT STE. MARIE and MARQUETTE), DIOCESE OF (MARIANOPOLITANA ET MARQUETTENSIS), comprises the upper peninsula and the adjacent islands of the State of Michigan, U. S. A. The Jesuit Fathers, Raymbault and Jogues, were the first priests to step on Michigan soil at Sault Ste. Marie, 1641, but all they did was to plant a large cross on the bank of St. Marys River. Père René Ménard, on his way to Wisconsin, arrived in that region during October, 1660; overtaken by the cold weather he spent the winter at L'Anse amidst great hardships. His efforts at converting the resident Indians were crowned with little success and he departed in July, 1661. He perished afterwards in the wilds of Northern Wisconsin. On 1 September, 1665, Father Claude Allouez passed the Sault on his way to La Pointe du St. Esprit. After two years of incessant labour he returned to Quebec and pointed out to his superior the necessity of establishing a mission at Sault Ste. Marie, where Indian tribes were in the habit of gathering. The superior consented to the plan, appointing Father Marquette (q. v.) to the new mission. He left Montreal 21 April, 1668. With the help of willing hands, Indian and French, he erected a stockaded house and chapel. In 1669 Allouez came again to Quebec, this time asking permission to establish a mission at Green Bay, Wisconsin. To avoid further long journeys, the well-experienced missionary Father Claude Dablon was appointed superior of the western missions. Arriving at the Sault he sent Allouez to Green Bay and Marquette to La Pointe, while he himself remained at the Sault. The following year he spent the winter at Michillimackinac, building a chapel there. This chapel was built on the St. Ignace side where Father Marquette took up his residence in the summer of 1671, and remained in charge of the Indian tribes there until 17 May, 1673. He died 18 May, 1675. Two years later the Kiskakons brought his bones to St. Ignace, where they were reinterred beneath the floor of the new chapel, built in 1674 by Father Henry Nouvel and his associate, Father Philip Pierson. In 1683 Jean Enjalran became superior and Pierre Bailloquet his assistant. The French post, instead of protecting and helping the mission, became its ruin. Father Étienne de Carheil, who succeeded to the mission in 1686, raised his voice in vigorous protest to the Governor-General Frontenac against the greed and lust of the traders, the garrisons, and their commanders. The appointment as commander of the St. Ignace post of Sieur Antoine de la Motte Cadillac increased these evils. Comte de Frontenac died in 1698 and was succeeded by Louis Hector de Callières, who granted Cadillac permission to establish a fort at Detroit. In a short time he coaxed the greater number of the Indians to Detroit. The fathers saw that it was useless to expend their energies upon the very worst of the Indians and French. With the sanction of the superior, Carheil and his faithful companion Joseph Jacques Marest stripped the chapel of its portable ornaments and, to save it from desecration, reduced it to ashes (1703). Carheil returned to Quebec; Marest went to the Sioux. Besides these missionaries the following Jesuit Fathers laboured at the Sault and Mackinac prior to the abandonment of the two missions: Gabriel Druillettes, Louis André, Pierre Bailloquet, and Charles Albanel. The Sault mission was not revived until 1834.

ST. PETER'S CATHEDRAL, MARQUETTE



BARAGA SCHOOL, MARQUETTE

Cadillac was unable to hold the red man in the lower part of the state. As soon as he ceased to offer the Indians material inducements, they commenced to move back in small and large parties just as they had left. The government could not afford to leave them without any supervision, so they re-manned the fort and asked the Jesuits to take up their labours again. Father Marest was the first to return and take up his quarters in the old mission. Until 1741 only a temporary establishment was maintained. In 1712, under De Louvigny, the French built the fort across the Straits, in the neighbourhood of the present Mackinaw City. Gradually relations between the missionaries and the government again became normal. About the year 1741 a chapel and dwelling for the missionary were built within the stockaded fort. In 1761 the English succeeded the French. Their unpopularity brought on the Pontiac massacre, 2 June, 1763. In 1779 Major De Peyster commenced a substantial stone fort on Mackinac Island. The chapel in the old fort was taken down and hauled over the ice and re-erected. The island became a great trading post and the gateway to western civilization. Father Du Jaunay attended the mission for a quarter of a century, but with the removal of the church to the island the Jesuits seem to have given up the control of it. After that regular and secular priests had charge of it, at times they were stationary and then again only paid it an occasional visit. Among them were Père Guibault, 1775; Père Payet, 1787; Père Le Dru, 1794. Father Michael Levadoux, 1796, was the first to come under the jurisdiction of an American prelate, Bishop Carroll. By the treaty of Paris, 3 Sept., 1783, Mackinac became the possession of the United States. The British, however, did not evacuate till October, 1796. Major Henry Burbeck took possession of it. On 29 June, 1799, Father Gabriel Richard came to the island. He received his jurisdiction from the bishop of Baltimore, but 8 April, 1808, the Diocese of Bardstown was erected and Michigan came under the jurisdiction of Bishop Flaget. Again, when the Diocese of Cincinnati was established, 19 June, 1821, Michigan was included in its territory. Rt. Rev. Edward Fenwick was the first bishop to visit Upper Michigan. Upon the death of this saintly bishop, Detroit was created an episcopal see (1833) and Frederic Rézé became its first ordinary. During the first National Council in

May, 1852, the Fathers recommended that Upper Michigan be made a vicariate Apostolic. By a brief of 29 July, 1853, Pius IX disjoined the territory from Detroit and under the same date appointed Frederic Baraga its vicar apostolic with the title of Bishop of Amyzonia *in partibus*. He took up his residence in Sault Ste. Marie from which the vicariate and later the diocese took its name. Bishop Baraga found three churches and two priests in his vicariate, but after three years of administration his report showed not only an increase and permanency of missions but vast possibilities in development so that the Holy See did not hesitate to raise the vicariate to the dignity of a diocese, conferring at the same time upon Baraga the title of Bishop of Sault Ste. Marie. The city was at the extreme east end of the diocese, so that, when many important missions developed in the west end, the question of moving the see to a more accessible place naturally suggested itself. The choice fell upon the town of Marquette and the Holy See sanctioned the removal 23 October, 1865, enjoining that the old name be retained together with the new one, hence the name of the diocese: Sault Ste. Marie and Marquette. Since the elevation of Milwaukee to an archdiocese (1875) it has belonged to that province. The bishops of Detroit, Milwaukee, St. Paul, and Hamilton, Canada, had ceded jurisdiction to Bishop Baraga over the missions, mostly Indian, adjoining his territory. Thus the northern portion of Lower Michigan, the regions around Lake Superior throughout Wisconsin and Minnesota from Port Arthur to Michipicoten and the Sault, were attended by him and his missionaries while he ruled the diocese. Bishop Baraga died 19 January, 1868. (See BARAGA, FREDERIC.) His countryman Ignatius Mrak became his successor. He was consecrated 9 February, 1869, resigned in 1877, was transferred to Antinoe, *in partibus*, died 2 January, 1901. John Vertin became the third bishop. He was consecrated 14 September, 1879; died 26 February, 1899. The fourth bishop was chosen in the person of Frederick Eis. He was born 20 January, 1843, at Arbach, Diocese of Trier, Germany, the youngest of four children. In 1855 his parents emigrated to America and settled first at Calvary, Wisconsin, but later removed to Minnesota and from there went to Rockland, Michigan, where the diligence and talents of the future bishop attracted the attention of the pioneer missionary, Martin Fox, who at once took a lively interest in him. Civil war broke up most of the colleges and young Frederick went from St. Francis, Wis., to Joliet, Canada, to complete his studies. He was ordained by Bishop Mrak, 30 October, 1870. Filling various important pastorates, he was made, upon the death of Bishop Vertin, administrator of the diocese and Leo XIII raised him to the episcopate, 7 June, 1899. His consecration took place at Marquette 24 August, 1899.

EARLY MISSIONARIES.—Jean Dejean, Francis Vincent Badin, brother of Stephen Theodore Badin, the first priest ordained in the U. S., Samuel Mazzuchelli, Francis Pierz, Francis Haetscher, C.SS.R., F. J. Bonduel, Dominic Du Ranquet, S.J., August Kohler, S.J., G. B. Weikamp, O.S.F., Richard Baxter, S.J., Otto Skolla, O.S.F., Andrew Piret, P. Point, S.J., B. Pedelupe, S.J., Jean B. Menet, S.J., 1846, the first stationary Jesuit missionary since 1703, J. D. Chonne, S.J., Martin Fox, Edward Jacker, who discovered in St. Ignace the site of the old Jesuit chapel and Marquette's grave, John Cebul, Gerhard Terhorst, Honoratus Bourion, and John F. Chambon, S.J.

STATISTICS.—Bishop Baraga found in his diocese three churches and two priests. He left 15 priests, 21 churches, 16 stations, 4 religious institutions. Bishop Mrak left: 20 priests, 27 churches, 3 charitable institutions, 3 academies, 20,000 population. Bishop Vertin left: 62 priests, 56 churches with pastors, 24 mission churches, 64 stations, 3 chapels, 1 academy, 20 parochial schools with 5440 pupils, 1 orphan asylum, 4 hospitals, 60,000 population. Present status: 85 priests, 67 churches with pastors, 37 mission churches, 23 chapels, 104 stations, 1 academy, 24 parochial schools with 6650 pupils, 1 orphan asylum, 4 hospitals, 95,000 population.

RELIGIOUS COMMUNITIES.—Orders of men: Jesuits, Franciscans (3 houses), Premonstratensians. Orders of women: Sisters of St. Joseph (St. Louis, Mo.), 5 houses; Sisters of St. Francis (Peoria), 3 houses; Sisters of Notre Dame (Milwaukee), 3 houses; Sisters of St. Joseph (Concordia, Kans.), 2 houses; Sisters of St. Agnes (Fond du Lac, Wis.), 3 houses; Franciscan Sisters of Christian Charity (Alverno, Wis.), 2 houses; Sisters of Loretto (Toronto, Canada); Ursuline Nuns; Little Franciscan Sisters of Mary (Baie St. Paul, Quebec).

REZEK, *History of the Diocese of Sault Ste. Marie and Marquette* (Houghton, Mich., 1906); THWAITES, *The Jesuit Relations* (Cleveland, 1901); VERWYST, *Life of Bishop Baraga* (Milwaukee, 1900); KELTON, *Annals of Fort Mackinac* (Detroit, 1890); JACKER, *Am. Quarterly Review*, I, 1876; *History of the Upper Peninsula of Michigan* (Chicago, 1883); *Acta et Decreta, Collectio Lacensis*, III; *Berichte der Leopoldinen Stiftung im Kaiserthume Oesterreich* (Vienna, 1832–65); *Diocesan Archives, Marquette, Mich.; Catholic Directory.*

ANTOINE IVAN REZEK.

Marquette, JACQUES, S.J., Jesuit missionary and discoverer of the Mississippi River, b. in 1636, at Laon, a town in north central France; d. near Ludington, Michigan, 19 May, 1675. He came of an ancient family distinguished for its civic and military services. At the age of seventeen he entered the Society of Jesus, and after twelve years of study and teaching in the Jesuit colleges of France was sent by his superiors (1666) to labour upon the Indian missions in Canada. Arriving at Quebec he was at once assigned to Three Rivers on the Saint Lawrence, where he assisted Druillettes and, as preliminary to further work, devoted himself to the study of the Huron language. Such was his talent as a linguist that he learned to converse fluently in six different dialects. Recalled to Quebec in the spring of 1668 he repaired at once to Montreal, where he awaited the flotilla which was to bear him to his first mission in the west. After labouring for eighteen months with Father Dablon at Sault Ste. Marie (the Soo) he was given the more difficult task of instructing the tribes at the mission of the Holy Ghost at La Pointe, on the south-western shore of Lake Superior, near the present city of Ashland. Here we meet for the first time the account of the work of Marquette as told by himself and his first reference to the great river with which his name will be forever associated (Jesuit Relations, LII., 206). To this mission on the bleak bay of a northern lake came the Illinois Indians from their distant wigwams in the south. They brought strange tidings of a mighty river which flowed through their country and so far away to the south that no one knew into what ocean or gulf it emptied. Their own villages numbered eight thousand souls, and other populous tribes lived along the banks of this unknown stream. Would Marquette come and instruct them? Here was a call to which the young and enthusiastic missionary responded without delay. He would find the river, explore the country, and open up fields for other missionaries. The Hurons promised to build him a canoe; he would take with him a Frenchman and a young Illinois from whom he was learning the language. From information given by the visitors Marquette concluded that the Mississippi emptied into the Gulf of California; and on learning that the Indians along its banks wore glass beads he knew they had intercourse with the Europeans.

So far had he gone in his preparations for the trip that he sent presents to the neighbouring pagan tribes and obtained permission to pass through their country. However, before he could carry out his designs the Hurons were forced to abandon their village at La Pointe on account of a threatened attack of

the Dakotas. The missionary embarked with the entire tribe and followed the Indians back to their ancient abode on the north-west shore of the Straits of Mackinac. Here a rude chapel was built and the work of instructing the Indians went on. There is extant a long letter from his pen in which Marquette gives some interesting accounts of the piety and habits of the converted Hurons (Jesuit Relations, LVII, 249). But Marquette was yearning for other conquests among the tribes which inhabited the banks of the Mississippi. He concluded this letter with the joyful information that he had been chosen by his superiors to set out from Mackinac for the exploration which he had so long desired. In the meanwhile accounts of the Mississippi had reached Quebec, and while Marquette was preparing for the voyage and awaiting the season of navigation, Joliet came to join the expedition. On 17 May, 1673, with five other Frenchmen, in two canoes, Marquette and Joliet set forth on their voyage of discovery. Skirting along the northern shore of Lake Michigan and entering Green Bay, pushing up the twisting current of the Fox River, and crossing a short portage, the party reached the Wisconsin. This river, they were told, flowed into the great stream which they were seeking. The report proved true, and on the 17 June their canoes glided out into the broad, swift current of the Mississippi. Marquette drew a map of the country through which they passed and kept a diary of the voyage; this diary with its clear, concise style is one of the most important and interesting documents of American History (Jesuit Relations, LIX, 86, 164). He describes the villages and customs of the different tribes, the topography of the country, the tides of the lakes, the future commercial value of navigable streams, the nature and variety of the flowers and trees, of birds and animals. Down the river the party sailed, passing the mouth of the muddy Missouri and the Ohio until they reached the mouth of the Arkansas, and learned with certainty from the Indians that the river upon which they were navigating flowed into the Gulf of Mexico.

This was the information which they sought; and fearing danger from the Spaniards if they went further, they turned the prows of their canoes northward. "We considered", writes Marquette in his diary, "that we would expose ourselves to the risk of losing the fruits of the voyage if we were captured by the Spaniards, who would at least hold us captives; besides we were not prepared to resist the Indian allies of the Europeans, for these savages were expert in the use of fire-arms; lastly we had gathered all the information that could be desired from the expedition. After weighing all these reasons we resolved to return." On coming to the mouth of the Illinois they left the Mississippi and took what they learned from the Indians was a shorter route. Near the present city of Utica they came to a very large village of the Illinois who requested the missionary to return and instruct them. Reaching Lake Michigan (where Chicago now stands), and paddling along the western shore they came to the mission of Saint Francis Xavier at the head of Green Bay. Here Marquette remained while Joliet went on to Quebec to announce the tidings of the discovery. The results of this expedition were threefold: (1) it gave to Canada and Europe historical, ethnological, and geographical knowledge hitherto unknown; (2) it opened vast fields for missionary zeal and added impulse to colonization; (3) it determined the policy of France in fortifying the Mississippi and its eastern tributaries, thus placing an effective barrier to the further extension of the English colonies. A year later (1675) Marquette started for the village of the Illinois Indians whom he had met on his return voyage, but was overtaken by the cold and forced to spend the winter near the lake (Chicago). The following spring he reached the village and said Mass just opposite to the place later known to history as Starved Rock. Since the missionary's strength had been exhausted by his labours and travels, he felt that his end was fast approaching; he, therefore, left the Illinois after three weeks, being anxious to pass his remaining days at the mission at Mackinac. Coasting along the eastern shore of Lake Michigan, he reached the mouth of a small stream near the present city of Ludington, where he told his two companions, who had been with him throughout his entire trip, to carry him ashore. There he died at the age of thirty-nine. Two years later the Indians carried his bones to the Mission at Mackinac. In 1887 a bill was passed by the Assembly at Madison, Wisconsin, authorizing the state to place a statue of Marquette in the Hall of Fame at Washington. This statue of Marquette from the chisel of the Italian sculptor, S. Tretanove, is conceded to be one of the most artistic in the Capitol. Bronze replicas of this work have been erected at Marquette, Michigan, and at Mackinac Island. Thus have been verified the prophetic words of Bancroft, who wrote of Marquette: "The people of the West will build his monument."

THWAITES, *Father Marquette* (New York, 1904); HEDGES, *Father Marquette, Jesuit Missionary and Explorer* (New York, 1903); *The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents* (Cleveland, 1904), LII, 207; LVII, 249; LIX, 86, 164, 184; BANCROFT, *History of the U. S.*, III (Boston, 1870), 109; PARKMAN, *La Salle and the Discovery of the Great West* (Boston, 1899), 48; SHEA, *Discovery and Exploration of the Mississippi Valley* (New York, 1854). For grave of Marquette, see *Catholic World*, XXVI (New York), 267; statues of Marquette, cf. *Woodstock Letters* (Woodstock, Maryland), VI, 159, 171; XXV, 302, 467; XXVII, 387; De Soto and Marquette, cf. SPALDING, *Messenger of the Sacred Heart*, XXXV, 669; XXXVIII, 271; SPALDING, *U. S. Cath. Historical Records and Studies*, III (New York, 1904), 381.

HENRY S. SPALDING.

Marquette League, a society founded in New York, in May, 1904, by Rev. H. G. Ganss, of Lancaster, Pa., with a directorate of twenty-five members chosen at first from the councils of the St. Vincent de Paul Society, as a layman's movement to co-operate with the ecclesiastical authorities in helping to preserve the Faith among the Catholic Indians of the United States and convert those still living in paganism; to assist in the support of the mission schools; to supply funds for establishing new missions, building chapels and maintaining trained catechists; and to endeavour in every legitimate way to improve the condition, spiritual and material, of the American Indian. During the first six years of the League's existence (to 1910) it established mission chapels at Holy Rosary and St. Francis missions, South Dakota; for the Moquis Indians of Northern Arizona; for the Winnebagoes of Nebraska; and two chapels on the Fort Berthold Reservation, North Dakota. Several catechists were kept in the mission field, and many gifts of clothing and money were sent each year to the mission schools and almost daily offerings for Masses to the missionary priests, together with vestments and chalices for the different chapels built by the League. The League works in harmony with the Bureau of Catholic Indian Missions, Washington, and its work extends into almost every state in the union. The League is governed by a president and a board of directors, consisting of twenty-five men of New York and Brooklyn, membership in a St. Vincent de Paul Society being no longer a necessary qualification. The principal office is in New York, with organizations in Brooklyn, Washington, Philadelphia, and Worcester.

Annual Reports, Marquette League; Catholic News (New York), files; *Indian Sentinel* (Washington), files.

THOMAS F. MEEHAN.

Marriage, CIVIL.—"Marriage", says Bishop, "as distinguished from the agreement to marry and from the act of becoming married, is the civil status of one man and one woman legally united for life, with the rights and duties which, for the establishment of families and the multiplication and education of the

species, are, or from time to time may thereafter be, assigned by the law of matrimony." (I. Mar. and Div. Sec. 11.)

The municipal law deals with this status only as a civil institution. Though sometimes spoken of as a contract, marriage in the eyes of the municipal law is not a contract strictly speaking, but is a status resulting from the contract to marry. Justice Story speaks of it as "an institution of society founded upon the consent and contract of the parties". (Story, "Confl. Laws", Sec. 108. Note.) All competent persons may intermarry, and marriage being presumed to be for the interest of the State and of the highest public interest, is encouraged. It is held to be a union for life. The law does not permit it to be a subject of experimental or temporary arrangement, but a fixed and permanent status to be dissolved only by death, or, where statutes permit, by divorce. In England the solemnization of a marriage was required to be before a clergyman until the statute passed in 1836, and all other marriages excepting those of Quakers and Jews, were null. By that act civil marriages and those of dissenters from the Church of England are legalized and regulated. In order to constitute a valid marriage there must be a consent of the parties, and in some of the states of the Union no formality is necessary.

By the common law the age at which minors were capable of marrying, known as the age of consent, was fixed at fourteen years for males and twelve years for females. Marriages under the age of seven years for both were void, but between seven and the age of consent the parties could contract an imperfect marriage, which was voidable but not necessarily void. The marriage of parties who had attained the age of consent was valid even though they lacked parental consent, until in England the marriage act of 1753 declared such marriages void. This act, however, has never been the law in the United States. In England under the statute of 32 Henry VIII, c. 38, all marriages were made lawful between parties not within the Levitical degrees of relationship; this was interpreted to mean all marriages excepting those between relatives in the direct line and in the collateral line to the third degree, according to the rules of the Civil Law, including both the whole and the half blood. In the United States, in the absence of statutes to the contrary, marriages are unlawful only in the direct ascending and descending line of consanguinity and between brothers and sisters. In most, if not all, of the States, however, there are statutes covering this subject, and in a number of them marriages between first cousins are forbidden. Marriages that are made without formalities, but by the mere consent of the parties, are known as common law marriages. In order to make such marriages effective, there must be a present intention to make the contract and it must be expressed accordingly,—in other words, "per verba de præsenti". Words expressing a future intention do not give the necessary consent, but when words are used with the future intention apparently, followed by consummation, or, as it is said, "per verba de futuro cum copula", a marriage is constituted, the future promise having been converted by action into an actual marriage. Marriages contracted without conforming to statutory regulations are valid in a number of states and not in others. Formal solemnization is unnecessary. Where no penalty for disobedience of statutory formalities is provided, their omission does not invalidate the marriage.

The requirement of a license to marry was first brought into England by Lord Hardwicke's Marriage Act of 1753. It is not part of the common law of the United States, but very generally licenses are required in the states, though not to the extent of making marriages invalid where they have not been granted. The Society of Friends or Quakers is excepted from the requirement in some of the states, and in others the parties may have recourse to the publication of banns instead of securing a license. Parental consent is required in almost all of the states, the age for males being from sixteen to twenty-one and for females from eighteen to twenty-one. In nearly all of the states, if either of the parties has been continuously absent for a number of years and has not been known to be living during that time, the other party may contract a new marriage. The general doctrine of the law on the subject of foreign marriages is that a marriage valid where celebrated is valid everywhere. Exceptions are made in a number of states where citizens go to another jurisdiction in order to evade the laws of the home domicile. In some of the states marriages between persons of different races are made void. If either of the parties is not of sound mind at the time of entering into the marriage, it is void unless confirmed when sanity is regained. Where a physical incapacity exists the marriage may be made void on the application of the other party who was ignorant of the fact. Under the common law a marriage can be annulled for mistake as to identity or fraud. There are certain kinds of fraud where an ordinary contract would be declared void, which do not affect a marriage contract because of public policy. In some of the United States annulment would be allowed for deception as to chastity, but not, it is said, in England. Duress sufficient to overcome the will of the consenting party is a cause for annulment unless subsequently ratified. As in England, so in all of the United States there are statutes regulating the formalities in connection with marriages other than common law marriages, and in addition to ministers of the various churches, who for the purpose are looked upon as civil officers, other designated officials are authorized to perform the marriage ceremony, excepting in a few of the states. Marriages may be proved both by direct and circumstantial evidence, the presumption being in favor of a former marriage where there has been cohabitation and reputation.

Where marriages are annulled, the decree relates back to the date of the marriage, while divorce relates only to the date of its own decree (see DIVORCE). Penalties are usually prescribed for violation of statutory regulations relating to marriage by ministers or other persons authorized to perform the ceremony. Marriage of itself gives to the husband and wife certain interests in the property of the other, both real and personal, which by modern legislation have been largely modified. Formerly the husband was to all intents and purposes owner of his wife's property, but now she has absolute control of it in England and in the United States, reserving to the husband certain rights which become effective after her death. In England under the common law, the marriage of parents after the birth of children does not legitimate them, but in most of the American states and in European continental countries it is sought to encourage marriage by providing that illegitimate children may thus be legitimated. The laws of most foreign countries make strict requirements as to mental capacity, and establish certain degrees of consanguinity and affinity within which marriage cannot be contracted. There are certain impediments, not known in the United States, imposing a period of delay in connexion with military service, and providing a time within which a woman may not contract marriage after the dissolution of a previous one. The tendency in continental countries is to establish civil marriage as the only form recognized by the State. This is the law in Belgium, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, the Netherlands, Rumania, and Switzerland, where the civil ceremony alone is recognized in the eyes of the law, and in most of these countries clergymen are prohibited under severe penalties from performing the religious ceremony before the civil marriage has taken place. A

civil ceremony is required in Austria when both parties belong to no legally recognized Faith. There are similar provisions in Denmark, Norway and Sweden. Bulgaria, Finland, Croatia, Slavonia, and Servia recognize the religious ceremony alone.

In Japan a marriage code which became effective in 1898, contains sections dealing with the laws of family and of succession. The form of ceremony is not regulated, but the marriage itself is valid only under certain conditions. The laws of countries other than the United States provide in a number of instances for the consent of parents or guardians after the parties have attained the age of twenty-one years. Thus in Austria parties between the age of fourteen and twenty-four years are incapable of contracting a valid marriage without the consent of their father or, if he be dead or incapable of acting, both of their guardian and of the court. Even for those who have attained the age of twenty-four, but who for any reason are incapable of entering into a valid obligation, e. g. if they have been legally declared spendthrifts, such consent is necessary. In the case of minors of illegitimate birth, the consent both of the guardian and of the court is requisite. In general, persons in military service cannot contract a valid marriage without the written permission of their superiors. A law of 1889 provides that a man shall not be permitted to marry before reaching the age of military service, or before leaving the third age class, i. e., at the age of twenty-three years. In France the man must be at least eighteen years of age and the woman fifteen to contract a valid marriage, unless the President of the Republic grants a special dispensation. By a law dated 25 June, 1907, parental consent is no longer required for men and women over twenty-one years of age, but both men and women under thirty must ask for it and serve upon the dissenting parent or parents an instrument requesting it. The parties may marry three days after service has been made. Under the law previous to that date, men under the age of twenty-five and women under the age of twenty-one could not marry without the consent of their parents, or the survivor if one of them was dead.

In England the common law rule of fourteen for males and twelve for females governs the marriage age. Consent of parents is necessary for persons under twenty-one, except for a widow or widower. The proper person to give consent is the father or, if he be dead, the mother, if unmarried, or finally a guardian appointed by the Court. Soldiers must get the consent of their commander. Violation of these provisions does not, however, invalidate the marriage; but in case of soldiers the woman is not recognized as having a military status. In Scotland the impediments are the same as in England, but no consent of parents or guardian is required. Regular marriages are celebrated by some minister of religion in the presence of at least two witnesses, after the publication of banns or issuance of registrar's certificate. Irregular marriages are clandestine marriages, celebrated without publication of banns or notice to the registrar. Such marriages may be made by mere consent without a clergyman and are valid. In Ireland provisions are made for marriages by Episcopalians, Catholics, and Presbyterians, by ministers of other denominations, and by the civil registrars. The impediments to marriage are substantially the same as in England.

In Germany a man may not marry, except in unusual cases, under the age of twenty-one or a woman under the age of sixteen. A legitimate child under the age of twenty-one must obtain the consent of the father or, if he be dead, of the mother; an illegitimate child, the consent of the mother; an adopted child, the consent of the foster parent. Military men, public officials, and foreigners, before marriage, must obtain a special permit, and military men in active service must also obtain the consent of their officers.

In Italy the consent of the parents or next of kin is required for men under twenty-five years of age and for women under twenty-one years. In case of refusal of consent, provision is made for an appeal to a court. Foreigners desiring to marry in Italy must present a certificate from a competent authority that they have satisfied the requirements of the laws of their own country. Foreigners ordinarily residing in Italy are subject to the requirements of the Italian law. Military officials cannot marry without the royal permission, which is not given unless they have an assured income of about eight hundred dollars at least, and have made a settlement for the benefit of the bride. Somewhat similar regulations are made for lower officers and privates in revenue service.

In the Netherlands the consent of parents is required of an individual under thirty years of age. The marriageable age begins with men at eighteen and women at sixteen. If both parents are dead or incapacitated, an individual under twenty-one requires the consent of a grandparent or, in default of a grandparent, of a guardian and second guardian. Officers of the army and navy require the consent of the sovereign before they can marry, and no man between the ages of eighteen and forty may marry unless he has proved he has performed military service or has been excused from it.

In Switzerland the consent of parents is required of all persons under twenty years of age. The consent of parents is required also in Belgium of all persons under the age of twenty-five, the law being somewhat similar to that of France.

In Russia children must obtain the consent of their parents if living, without regard to their age, a man attaining the marriageable age at eighteen and a woman at sixteen.

In Denmark the marriageable age is twenty for men and sixteen for women, and consent of parents must be obtained by minors under the age of twenty-five.

In Sweden females under the age of twenty-one require the consent of a marriage guardian, usually her father or brother or some other male relative. Men require no parental consent. Men may marry at the age of twenty-one or over, and women at the age of seventeen or over.

In Norway the marriageable age for men is twenty and for women sixteen. Parental consent is necessary for both parties under the age of eighteen.

Parental consent appears to be necessary, under certain conditions, in all European countries where the parties are under the age of twenty-one and in many where they are liable to military service. In Japan the consent of parents or of the family council is essential to the marriage of a man under thirty and of a woman under twenty-five. The marriage laws of the different Canadian provinces are not uniform but are quite similar. The minimum age for marriage in the Province of Quebec is fourteen for males and twelve for females. Parental consent is necessary for any one under twenty-one years of age. In Quebec alone of the Canadian Provinces illegitimate children are legitimated by the marriage of their parents. The laws of Australia and New Zealand are based upon the English statutes and common law.

BISHOP, *Marriage, Divorce and Separation* (Chicago, 1891); *Am. and Eng. Enc. of Law*, s. v. *Marriage;* BOUVIER, *Law Dictionary;* special reports of the Census Office (Washington, 1867–1906, Part I), with a valuable summary of the marriage and divorce laws of all modern States, from which the foregoing facts in relation to foreign countries have been derived.

WALTER GEORGE SMITH.

Marriage, HISTORY OF.—The word marriage may be taken to denote the action, contract, formality, or ceremony by which the conjugal union is formed, or the union itself as an enduring condition. In this article we deal for the most part with marriage as a condition, and with its moral and social aspects. It is

usually defined as the legitimate union between husband and wife. "Legitimate" indicates the sanction of some kind of law, natural, evangelical, or civil, while the phrase, "husband and wife", implies mutual rights of sexual intercourse, life in common, and an enduring union. The last two characters distinguish marriage, respectively, from concubinage and fornication. The definition, however, is broad enough to comprehend polygamous and polyandrous unions when they are permitted by the civil law; for in such relationships there are as many marriages as there are individuals of the numerically larger sex. Whether promiscuity, the condition in which all the men of a group maintain relations and live indiscriminately with all the women, can be properly called marriage, may well be doubted. In such a relation cohabitation and domestic life are devoid of that exclusiveness which is commonly associated with the idea of conjugal union.

(1) *The Theory of Primitive Promiscuity.*—All authorities agree that during historical times promiscuity has been either non-existent or confined to a few small groups. Did it prevail to any extent during the prehistoric period of the race? Writing between 1860 and 1890, a considerable number of anthropologists, such as Bachofen, Morgan, McLennan, Lubbock, and Giraud-Teulon, maintained that this was the original relationship between the sexes among practically all peoples. So rapidly did the theory win favour that in 1891 it was, according to Westermarck, "treated by many writers as a demonstrated truth" (History of Human Marriage, p. 51). It appealed strongly to those believers in organic evolution who assumed that the social customs of primitive man, including sex relations, must have differed but slightly from the corresponding usages among the brutes. It has been eagerly adopted by the Marxian Socialists, on account of its agreement with their theories of primitive common property and of economic determinism. According to the latter hypothesis, all other social institutions are, and have ever been, determined by the underlying economic institutions; hence in the original condition of common property, wives and husbands must likewise have been held in common (see Engels, "The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State", tr. from German, Chicago, 1902). Indeed, the vogue which the theory of promiscuity for a time enjoyed seems to have been due far more to a priori considerations of the kind just mentioned, and to the wish to believe in it, than to positive evidence.

About the only direct testimony in its favour is found in the fragmentary statements of some ancient writers, such as Herodotus and Strabo, concerning a few unimportant peoples, and in the accounts of some modern travellers regarding some uncivilized tribes of the present day. Neither of these classes of testimony clearly shows that the peoples to which they refer practised promiscuity, and both are entirely too few to justify the generalization that all peoples lived originally in the conditions which they describe. As for the indirect evidence in favour of the theory, consisting of inferences from such social customs as the tracing of kinship through the mother, religious prostitution, unrestrained sexual intercourse previous to marriage among some savage peoples, and primitive community of goods,—none of these conditions can be proved to have been universal at any stage of human development, and every one of them can be explained more easily and more naturally on other grounds than on the assumption of promiscuity. We may say that the positive arguments in favour of the theory of primitive promiscuity seem insufficient to give it any degree of probability, while the biological, economic, psychological, and historical arguments brought against it by many recent writers, e. g. Westermarck (op. cit., iv–vi) seem to render it unworthy of serious consideration. The attitude of contemporary scholars is thus described by Howard: "The researches of several recent writers, notably those of Starcke and Westermarck, confirming in part and further developing the earlier conclusions of Darwin and Spencer, have established a probability that marriage or pairing between one man and one woman, though the union be often transitory and the rule frequently violated, is the typical form of sexual union from the infancy of the human race" (History of Matrimonial Institutions, I, pp. 90, 91).

(2) *Polyandry and Polygamy.*—One deviation from the typical form of sexual union which, however, is also called marriage, is polyandry, the union of several husbands with one wife. It has been practised at various times by a considerable number of peoples or tribes. It existed among the ancient Britons, the primitive Arabs, the inhabitants of the Canary Islands, the Aborigines of America, the Hottentots, the inhabitants of India, Ceylon, Thibet, Malabar, and New Zealand. In the great majority of these instances polyandry was the exceptional form of conjugal union. Monogamy and even polygamy were much more prevalent. The greater number of the polyandrous unions seem to have been of the kind called fraternal; that is, the husbands in each conjugal group were all brothers. Frequently, if not generally, the first husband enjoyed conjugal and domestic rights superior to the others, was, in fact, the chief husband. The others were husbands only in a secondary and limited sense. Both these circumstances show that even in the comparatively few cases in which polyandry existed it was softened in the direction of monogamy; for the wife belonged not to several entirely independent men, but to a group united by the closest ties of blood; she was married to one family rather than to one person. And the fact that one of her consorts possessed superior marital privileges shows that she had only one husband in the full sense of the term. Some writers, e. g. McLennan (Studies in Ancient History, pp. 112, sq.) have asserted that the Levirate, the custom which compelled the brother of a deceased husband to marry his widow, had its origin in polyandry. But the Levirate can be explained without any such hypothesis. In many cases it merely indicated that the wife, as the property of her husband, was inherited by his nearest heir, i. e. his brother; in other instances, as among the ancient Hebrews, it was evidently a means of continuing the name, family, and individuality of the deceased husband. If the Levirate pointed in all cases to a previous condition of polyandry, the latter practice must have been much more common than it is shown to have been by direct evidence. It is certain that the Levirate existed among the New Caledonians, the Redskins, the Mongols, Afghans, Hindoos, Hebrews, and Abyssinians; yet none of these peoples shows any trace of polyandry. The principal causes of polyandry were the scarcity of women, due to female infanticide and to the appropriation of many women by polygamous chiefs and strong men in a tribe, and to the scarcity of the food supply, which made it impossible for every male member of a family to support a wife alone. Even to-day polyandry is not entirely unknown. It is found to some extent in Thibet, in the Aleutian Islands, among the Hottentots, and the Zaporogian Cossacks.

Polygamy (many marriages) or, more correctly, polygyny (many wives) has been, and is still, much more common than polyandry. It existed among most of the ancient peoples known to history, and occurs at present in some civilized nations and in the majority of savage tribes. About the only important peoples of ancient times that showed little or no traces of it were the Greeks and the Romans. Nevertheless, concubinage, which may be regarded as a higher form of polygamy, or at least as nearer to pure monogamy, was for many centuries recognized by the customs and even by the legislation of these two nations (see Con-

CUBINAGE). The principal peoples among whom the practice still exists are those under the sway of Mohammedanism, as those of Arabia, Turkey, and some of the peoples of India. Its chief home among uncivilized races is Africa. However widespread polygamy has been territorially, it has never been practised by more than a small minority of any people. Even where it has been sanctioned by custom or the civil law, the vast majority of the population have been monogamous. The reasons are obvious: there are not sufficient women to provide every man with several wives, nor are the majority of men able to support more than one. Hence polygamous marriages are found for the most part among the kings, chiefs, strong men, and rich men of the community; and its prevailing form seems to have been bigamy. Moreover, polygamous unions are, as a rule, modified in the direction of monogamy, inasmuch as one of the wives, usually the first married, occupies a higher place in the household than the others, or one of them is the favourite, and has exceptional privileges of intercourse with the common husband.

Among the principal causes of polygamy are: the relative scarcity of males, arising sometimes from numerous destructive wars, and sometimes from an excess of female births; the unwillingness of the husband to remain continent when intercourse with one wife is undesirable or impossible; and unrestrained lustful cravings. Still another cause, or more properly, a condition, is a certain degree of economic advancement in a people, and a certain amount of wealth accumulated by some individuals. In the rudest societies polygamy is almost unknown, because hunting and fishing are the chief means of livelihood, and female labour has not the value that attaches to it when a man's wives can be employed in tending flocks, cultivating fields, or exercising useful handicrafts. Before the pastoral stage of industry has been reached scarcely any man can afford to support several women. When, however, some accumulation of wealth has taken place, polygamy becomes possible for the more wealthy, and for those who can utilize the productive labour of their wives. Hence the practice has been more frequent among the higher savages and barbarians than among the very lowest races. At a still higher stage it tends to give way to monogamy.

We may now sum up the whole historical situation concerning the forms of sexual union and of marriage in the words of one of the ablest living authorities in this field of investigation: "It is not, of course, impossible that, among some peoples, intercourse between the sexes may have been almost promiscuous. But there is not a shred of genuine evidence for the notion that promiscuity ever formed a general stage in the history of mankind . . . although polygamy occurs among most existing peoples, and polyandry among some, monogamy is by far the most common form of human marriage. It was so among the ancient peoples of whom we have any direct knowledge. Monogamy is the form which is generally recognized and permitted. The great majority of peoples are, as a rule, monogamous, and the other forms of marriage are usually modified in a monogamous direction. We may without hesitation assert that, if mankind advance in the same direction as hitherto; if, consequently, the causes to which monogamy in the most progressive societies owes its origin continue to operate with constantly growing force; if, especially, altruism increases, and the feeling of love becomes more refined, and more exclusively directed to one,—the laws of monogamy can never be changed, but must be followed much more strictly than they are now" (Westermarck, op. cit., pp. 133, 459, 510).

The experience of the race, particularly in its movement toward and its progress in civilization, has approved monogamy for the simple reason that monogamy is in harmony with the essential and immutable elements of human nature. Taking the word natural in its full sense, we may unhesitatingly affirm that monogamy is the only natural form of marriage. While promiscuity responds to certain elemental passions and temporarily satisfies certain superficial wants, it contradicts the parental instinct, the welfare of children and of the race, and the overpowering forces of jealousy and individual preference in both men and women. While polyandry satisfied in some measure the temporary and exceptional wants arising from scarcity of food or scarcity of women, it finds an insuperable barrier in male jealousy, in the male sense of proprietorship, and is directly opposed to the welfare of the wife, and fatal to the fecundity of the race. While polygamy has prevailed among so many peoples and over so long a period of history as to suggest that it is in some sense natural, and while it does seem to furnish a means of satisfying the stronger and more frequently recurring desires of the male, it conflicts with the numerical equality of the sexes, with the jealousy, sense of proprietorship, equality, dignity, and general welfare of the wife, and with the best interests of the offspring.

In all those regions in which polygamy has existed or still exists, the status of woman is extremely low; she is treated as man's property, not as his companion; her life is invariably one of great hardship, while her moral, spiritual, and intellectual qualities are almost utterly neglected. Even the male human being is in the highest sense of the phrase naturally monogamous. His moral, spiritual, and æsthetic faculties can obtain normal development only when his sexual relations are confined to one woman in the common life and enduring association provided by monogamy. The welfare of the children, and, therefore, of the race, obviously demands that the offspring of each pair shall have the undivided attention and care of both their parents. When we speak of the naturalness of any social institution, we necessarily take as our standard, not nature in a superficial or one-sided sense, or in its savage state, or as exemplified in a few individuals or in a single generation, but nature adequately considered, in all its needs and powers, in all the members of the present and of future generations, and as it appears in those tendencies which lead toward its highest development. The verdict of experience and the voice of nature reinforce, consequently, the Christian teaching on the unity of marriage. Moreover, the progress of the race toward monogamy, as well as toward a purer monogamy, during the last two thousand years, owes more to the influence of Christianity than to all other forces combined. Christianity has not only abolished or diminished polyandry and polygamy among the savage and barbarous peoples which it has converted, but it has preserved Europe from the polygamous civilization of Mohammedanism, has kept before the eyes of the more enlightened peoples the ideal of an unadulterated monogamy, and has given to the world its highest conception of the equality that should exist between the two parties in the marriage relation. And its influence on behalf of monogamy has extended, and continues to extend, far beyond the confines of those countries that call themselves Christian.

(3) *Deviations from Marriage.*—Our discussion of the various forms of marriage would be incomplete without some reference to those practices that have been more or less prevalent, and yet that are a transgression of every form of marriage. Sexual license amounting almost to promiscuity seems to have prevailed among a few peoples or tribes. Among some ancient peoples the women, especially the unmarried, practised prostitution as an act of religion. Some tribes, both ancient and relatively modern, have maintained the custom of yielding the newly married bride to the relatives and guests of the bridegroom. Unlimited sexual intercourse before marriage has been sanc-

tioned by the customs of some uncivilized peoples. Among some savage tribes the husband permits his guests to have intercourse with his wife, or loans her for hire. Certain uncivilized peoples are known to have practised trial marriages, marriages that were binding only until the birth of a child, and marriages that bound the parties only for certain days of the week. Although any general exercise of the so-called *jus primæ noctis* has no historical basis, and is now admitted to be an invention of the encyclopedists, at times serf women were required to submit to their overlords before assuming marital relations with their husbands (Schmidt, Karl, "Jus Primæ Noctis, a historical examination"). Japanese maidens of the poorer classes frequently spend a portion of their youth as prostitutes, with the consent of their parents and the sanction of public opinion.

Concubinage, the practice of forming a somewhat enduring union with some other woman than the wife, or such union between two unmarried persons, has prevailed to some extent among most peoples, even among some that had attained a high degree of civilization, as the Greeks and Romans (for detailed proof of the foregoing statements, see Westermarck, op. cit., *passim*). In a word, fornication and adultery have been sufficiently common at all stages of the world's history and among almost all peoples, to arouse the anxiety of the moralist, the statesman, and the sociologist. Owing to the growth of cities, the changed relations between the sexes in social and industrial life, the decay of religion, and the relaxation of parental control, these evils have increased very greatly within the last one hundred years. The extent to which prostitution and venereal disease are sapping the mental, moral, and physical health of the nations, is of itself abundant proof that the strict and lofty standards of purity set up by the Catholic Church, both within and without the marriage relation, constitute the only adequate safeguard of society.

(4) *Divorce.*—This is a modification of monogamy that seems to be no less opposed to its spirit than polyandry, polygamy, or adultery. It requires, indeed, that the parties should await a certain time or a certain contingency before severing the unity of marriage, but it is essentially a violation of monogamy, of the enduring union of husband and wife. Yet it has obtained among practically all peoples, savage and civilized. About the only people that seem never to have practised or recognized it are the inhabitants of the Andaman Islands, some of the Papuans of New Guinea, some tribes of the Indian Archipelago, and the Veddahs of Ceylon. Among the majority of uncivilized peoples the marital unions that endured until the death of one of the parties seem to have been in the minority. It is substantially true to say that the majority of savage races authorized the husband to divorce his wife whenever he felt so inclined. A majority of even the more advanced peoples who remained outside the pale of Christianity restrict the right of divorce to the husband, although the reasons for which he could put away his wife are, as a rule, not so numerous as among the uncivilized races. In all those countries that adopted the Catholic religion, however, divorce was very soon abolished, and continued to be forbidden as long as that religion was recognized by the State. The early Christian emperors, as Constantine, Theodosius, and Justinian, did, indeed, legalize the practice, but before the tenth century the Catholic teaching on the indissolubility of marriage had become embodied in the civil legislation of every Catholic country (see DIVORCE). The Oriental Churches separated from Rome, including the Greek Orthodox Church, and all the Protestant sects, permit divorce in varying degrees, and the practice prevails in every country in which any of these Churches exercise a considerable influence. In some of the non-Catholic countries divorce is extremely easy and scandalously frequent. Between 1890 and 1900 the divorces granted in the United States averaged 73 per 100,000 of the population annually. This was more than twice the rate in any other Western nation. The proportion in Switzerland was 32; in France, 23; in Saxony, 29; and in the majority of European countries, less than 15. So far as we are informed by statistics, only one country in the world, namely, Japan, had a worse record than the United States, the rate per 100,000 of the population in the Flowery Kingdom being 215. In most of the civilized countries the divorce rate is increasing, slowly in some, very rapidly in others. Relatively to the population, about two and one half times as many divorces are granted now in the United States as were issued forty years ago.

But the practice of attempting to dissolve the bond of marriage by law, is not confined to Protestant, schismatic, and pagan countries. It obtains to some extent in all the Catholic lands of Europe, except Italy, Portugal, and Spain. South America is freer from it than any other continent. The majority of the countries in this geographical division do not grant absolute divorce. A notable fact in the history of divorce is that those countries which have never been Christianized, and those which remained faithful to the Christian teaching for only a short time (e. g., the regions that fell under the sway of Mohammedanism) conducted the practice on terms more favourable to the husband than to the wife. About the only important exception to this rule was pagan Rome in the later centuries of her existence. In modern countries which permit divorce, and yet call themselves Christian, the wife can take advantage of the practice about as easily as the husband; but this is undoubtedly due to the previous influence of Christianity in raising the civil and social status of woman during the long period in which divorce was forbidden. In the long run divorce must inevitably be more injurious to women than to men. If the divorced woman remains single she generally has greater difficulty in supporting herself than the divorced man; if she is young her opportunities of marrying again may, indeed, be about as good as those of the divorced man who is young; but if she is at or beyond middle age the probability that she will find a suitable spouse is decidedly smaller than in the case of her separated husband.

The fact that in the United States more women than men apply for divorces proves nothing as yet against the statements just set down; for we do not know whether these women have generally found it easy to get other husbands, or whether their new condition was better than the old. The frequent appeal to the divorce courts by American women is a comparatively recent phenomenon, and is undoubtedly due more to emotion, imaginary hopes, and a hasty use of newly acquired freedom, than to calm and adequate study of the experiences of other divorced women. If the present facility of divorce should continue fifty years longer, the disproportionate hardship to women from the practice will probably have become so evident that the number of them taking advantage of it, or approving it, will be much smaller than to-day.

The social evils of easy divorce are so obvious that the majority of Americans undoubtedly are in favour of a stricter policy. One of the most far-reaching of these evils is the encouragement of lower conceptions of conjugal fidelity; for when a person regards the taking of a new spouse as entirely lawful for a multitude of more or less slight reasons, his sense of obligation toward his present partner cannot be very strong or very deep. Simultaneous cannot seem much worse than successive plurality of sexual relations. The average husband and wife who become divorced for a trivial cause are less faithful to each other during their temporary union than the average couple who do not believe in divorce.

Similarly, easy divorce gives an impetus to illicit relations between the unmarried, inasmuch as it tends to destroy the association in the popular consciousness between sexual intercourse and the enduring union of one man with one woman. Another evil is the increase in the number of hasty and unfortunate marriages among persons who look forward to divorce as an easy remedy for present mistakes. Inasmuch as the children of a divorced couple are deprived of their normal heritage, which is education and care by both father and mother in the same household, they almost always suffer grave and varied disadvantages. Finally, there is the injury done to the moral character generally. Indissoluble marriage is one of the most effective means of developing self-control and mutual self-sacrifice. Many salutary inconveniences are endured because they cannot be avoided, and many imperfections of temper and character are corrected because the husband and wife realize that thus only is conjugal happiness possible. On the other hand, when divorce is easily obtained there is no sufficient motive for undergoing those inconveniences which are so essential to self-discipline, self-development, and the practice of altruism.

All the objections just noted are valid against frequent divorce, against the abuse of divorce, but not against divorce so far as it implies separation from bed and board without the right to contract another marriage. The Church permits limited separation in certain cases, chiefly, when one of the parties has been guilty of adultery, and when further cohabitation would cause grave injury to soul or body. If divorce were restricted to these two cases some pretend that it would be socially preferable to mere separation without the right to remarry, at least for the innocent spouse. But it would surely be less advantageous to society than a regime of no divorce. Where mere separation is permitted, it will in a considerable proportion of instances need to be only temporary, and the welfare of parents and children will be better promoted by reconciliation than if one of the parties formed another matrimonial union. When there is no hope of another marriage, the offences that justify separation are less likely to be provoked or committed by either party, and separation is less likely to be sought on insufficient grounds, or obtained through fraudulent methods. Moreover, experience shows that when divorce is permitted for a few causes, there is an almost irresistible tendency to increase the number of legal grounds, and to make the administration of the law less strict. Finally, the absolute prohibition of divorce has certain moral effects which contribute in a fundamental and far-reaching way to the social welfare. The popular mind is impressed with the thought that marriage is an exclusive relation between two persons, and that sexual intercourse of itself and normally calls for a lifelong union of the persons entering upon such intercourse.

The obligation of self-control, and of subordinating the animal in human nature to the reason and the spirit, as well as the possibility of fulfilling this obligation, are likewise taught in a most striking and practical manner. Humanity is thus aided and encouraged to reach a higher moral plane. In the matter of the indissolubility, as well as in that of the unity of marriage, therefore, the Christian teaching is in harmony with nature at her best, and with the deepest needs of civilization. "There is abundant evidence", says Westermarck, "that marriage has, upon the whole, become more durable in proportion as the human race has risen to higher degrees of civilization, and that a certain amount of civilization is an essential condition of the formation of lifelong unions" (op. cit., p. 535). This statement suggests two tolerably safe generalizations: first, that the prohibition of divorce during many centuries has been a cause as well as an effect of those "higher degrees of civilization" that have been already attained; and, second, that the same policy will be found essential to the highest degree of civilization.

(5) *Abstention from Marriage.*—With a very few unimportant exceptions all peoples, savage and civilized, that have not accepted the Catholic religion, have looked with some disdain upon celibacy. Savage races marry much earlier, and have a smaller proportion of celibates than civilized nations. During the last century the proportion of unmarried persons has increased in the United States and in Europe. The causes of this change are partly economic, inasmuch as it has become more difficult to support a family in accordance with contemporary standards of living; partly social, inasmuch as the increased social pleasure and opportunities have displaced to some degree domestic desires and interests; and partly moral, inasmuch as laxer notions of chastity have increased the number of those who satisfy their sexual desires outside of marriage. From the viewpoint of social morality and social welfare, this modern celibacy is an almost unmixed evil. On the other hand, the religious celibacy taught and encouraged by the Church is socially beneficial, since it shows that continence is practicable, and since religious celibates exemplify a higher degree of altruism than any other section of society. The assertion that celibacy tends to make the married state seem low or unworthy, is contradicted by the public opinion and practice of every country in which celibacy is held in highest honour. For it is precisely in such places that the marriage relation, and the relations between the sexes generally, are purest (see CELIBACY).

(6) *Marriage as a Ceremony or Contract.*—The act, formality, or ceremony by which the marriage union is created, has differed widely at different times and among different peoples. One of the earliest and most frequent customs associated with the entrance into marriage was the capture of the woman by her intended husband, usually from another tribe than that to which he himself belonged. Among most primitive peoples this act seems to have been regarded rather as a means of getting a wife, than as the formation of the marriage union itself. The latter was subsequent to the capture, and was generally devoid of any formality whatever, beyond mere cohabitation. But the symbolic seizure of wives continued in many places long after the reality had ceased. It still exists among some of the lower races, and until quite recently was not unknown in some parts of Eastern Europe. After the practice had become simulated instead of actual, it was frequently looked upon as either the whole of the marriage ceremony or an essential accompaniment of the marriage. Symbolic capture has largely given way to wife purchase, which seems to prevail among most uncivilized peoples to-day. It has assumed various forms. Sometimes the man desiring a wife gave one of his kinswomen in exchange; sometimes he served for a period his intended bride's father, which was a frequent custom among the ancient Hebrews; but most often the bride was paid for in money or some form of property. Like capture, purchase became after a time among many peoples a symbol to signify the taking of a wife and the formation of the marriage union. Sometimes, however, it was merely an accompanying ceremony. Various other ceremonial forms have accompanied or constituted the entrance upon the marriage relation, the most common of which was some kind of feast; yet among many uncivilized peoples marriage has taken place, and still takes place, without any formal ceremony whatever.

By many uncivilized races, and by most civilized ones, the marriage ceremony is regarded as a religious rite or includes religious features, although the religious element is not always regarded as necessary to the validity of the union. Under the Christian dispensation marriage is a religious act of the very highest

kind, namely, one of the seven sacraments. Although Luther declared that marriage was not a sacrament but "a worldly thing", all the Protestant sects have continued to regard it as religious in the sense that it ought normally to be contracted in the presence of a clergyman. Owing to the influence of the Lutheran view and of the French Revolution, civil marriage has been instituted in almost all the countries of Europe and North America, as well as in some of the states of South America. In some countries it is essential to the validity of the union before the civil law, while in others, e. g., in the United States, it is merely one of the ways in which marriage may be contracted. Civil marriage is not, however, a post-Reformation institution, for it existed among the ancient Peruvians, and among the Aborigines of North America.

Whether as a state or as a contract, whether from the viewpoint of religion and morals or from that of social welfare, marriage appears in its highest form in the teaching and practice of the Catholic Church. The fact that the contract is a sacrament impresses the popular mind with the importance and sacredness of the relation thus begun. The fact that the union is indissoluble and monogamous promotes in the highest degree the welfare of parents and children, and stimulates in the whole community the practice of those qualities of self-restraint and altruism which are essential to social well-being, physical, mental, and moral (see FAMILY; DIVORCE; CELIBACY).

DEVAS, *Studies in Family Life* (London, 1886); WESTERMARCK, *The History of Human Marriage* (London, 1891); LETOURNEAU, *The Evolution of Marriage and of the Family* (New York, 1891); MORGAN, *Ancient Society* (London, 1877); MCLENNAN, *Studies in Ancient History* (London, 1886); *United States Census, Marriage and Divorce* (Washington, 1909); HOWARD, *History of Matrimonial Institutions* (Chicago, 1904); IDEM (and others) in *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. XIV; BLISS, *New Encyclopedia of Social Reform*, s.v. *Marriage, Family;* BACHOFEN, *Das Mutterrecht* (Stuttgart, 1861); GIRAUD-TEULON, *Les origines du mariage et de la famille* (Paris, 1884); CATHREIN, *Moralphilosophie* (Freiburg, 1904); VEUILLOT, *Le Droit du Seigneur du Moyen Age* (Paris, 1854; 3rd ed., 1878); PERRONE, *De Matrimonio Christiano* (Liége, 1862); LEO XIII, *Encyclical, 'Arcanum Divinæ'* (1880).

JOHN A. RYAN.

Marriage, MIXED (Lat. *Matrimonia mixta*), technically marriages between Catholics and non-Catholics, when the latter have been baptized in some Christian sect. The term is also frequently employed to designate unions between Catholics and infidels. From the very beginning of its existence the Church of Christ has been opposed to such unions. As Christ raised wedlock to the dignity of a Sacrament, a marriage between a Catholic and a non-Catholic was rightly looked upon as degrading the holy character of matrimony, involving as it did a communion in sacred things with those outside the fold. The Apostle St. Paul insists strongly on Christian marriage being a symbol of the union between Christ and His Church, and hence sacred. The very intimacy of the union necessarily established between those joined in wedlock requires a concordance above all in their religious sentiments. Holding this doctrine, it was but natural and logical for the Church to do all in her power to hinder her children from contracting marriage with those outside her pale, who did not recognize the sacramental character of the union on which they were entering (see MARRIAGE). Hence arose the impediments to a marriage with a heretic (*mixta religio*) and with an infidel (*disparitas cultus*). As regards marriage with an infidel, the early Church did not consider such unions invalid, especially when a person had been converted to the faith after such marriage. It was hoped that the converted wife or husband would be the means of bringing the other party to the knowledge of the true faith, or at least of safeguarding the Catholic upbringing of the children of the union. This held even for Jews, though the Church was naturally more opposed to wedlock between them and Christians, even than with pagans, owing to the intense Jewish hatred for the sacred name of Christ. By degrees, however, the objection to a marriage between a Catholic and an infidel grew stronger as the necessity for such unions decreased, and so in the course of time, more by custom than by positive enactment, the impediment *disparitas cultus* making such marriages null and void began to have force. When the *Decretum* of Gratian was published in the twelfth century, this impediment was recognized as a diriment one and it became part of the canon law of the Church. (Decretum Grat., c. 28, q. 1.) From that time forward, all marriages contracted between Catholics and infidels were held to be invalid unless a dispensation for such union had been obtained from the ecclesiastical authority. Marriages, however, between Catholics and heretics were not subject to the same impediment. They were held as valid, though illicit if a dispensation *mixtæ religionis* had not been obtained. The opposition of the Church to such unions is, however, very ancient, and early councils legislated against marriages of this character. Such enactments are found in the fourth century Councils of Elvira (can. 16) and of Laodicea (can. 10, 31.). The General Council of Chalcedon (can. 14) prohibits such unions especially between members of the lower ecclesiastical grades and heretical women. While the Western Church forbade these marriages, it did not declare them invalid. In the Eastern Church, however, the seventh century Council in Trullo, declared marriages between Catholics and heretics null and void (can. 72), and this discipline has since been maintained in the Greek Schismatical Church. The latter has also shown itself opposed to marriages between members of the Orthodox Church and Catholics, and in Russia various laws were passed ordering that such marriages be not permitted unless the children of the union are to be brought up as schismatics.

The advent of Protestantism in the sixteenth century renewed the problem of mixed marriages in a heightened degree. The danger of perversion for the Catholic party or for the children, and the almost certain unhappiness awaiting the members of such unions caused more stringent legislation on the part of the Church. This was emphasized by the impediment of clandestinity enacted by the Council of Trent. We say enacted by the Council of Trent, because from the twelfth century the validity of clandestine marriages had been recognized by the Church. This was not, however, the original discipline, for it had anciently been looked on as proper for Christians to contract marriages only *in facie Ecclesiæ* (Tertullian, De Pudic. c. 4). Marriages contracted otherwise were held as null and void by various decrees of the Roman Emperors of the East and capitularies of French Kings, and the same is evident from the False Decretals. The Council of Trent therefore in declaring all matrimonial unions between Catholics and non-Catholics null and void, unless entered into before the ecclesiastical authority, was rather inaugurating a return to the old discipline existent before the twelfth century than making an entirely new law. By its decree the Council requires the contract to be entered into before the parish priest or some other priest delegated by him, and in the presence of two or three witnesses under penalty of invalidity. Marriages otherwise contracted are called clandestine marriages. The Church did not find it possible, however, to insist on the rigour of this legislation in all countries owing to strong Protestant opposition. Indeed, in many countries, it was not found advisable to promulgate the decrees of the Council of Trent at all, and in such countries the impediment of clandestinity did not obtain. Even in countries where the *Tametsi* (q. v.) decree had been published, serious difficulties arose. As a consequence Pope Benedict XIV, choosing the lesser of two evils, issued a declaration concerning marriages in Holland and Belgium (Nov. 4, 1741), in which he declared

mixed unions to be valid, provided they were according to the civil laws, even if the Tridentine prescriptions had not been observed. A similar declaration was made concerning mixed marriages in Ireland by Pope Pius, in 1785, and gradually the "Benedictine dispensation" was extended to various localities. The object of the Council of Trent in issuing its decree had been partly to deter Catholics from such marriages altogether, and partly to hinder any communion in sacred things with heretics. By degrees, however, the Popes felt constrained to make various concessions for mixed marriages, though they were always careful to guard the essential principles on which the Church founds her objections to such unions. Thus Pius VI allowed mixed marriages in Austria to take place in presence of a priest, provided no religious solemnity was employed, and with the omission of public banns, as evidence of the unwillingness of the Church to sanction such unions. Similar concessions were later made, first for various states of Germany, and then for other countries.

Another serious difficulty arose for the Church where the civil laws prescribed that in mixed marriages the boys born of the union should follow the religion of the father and the girls that of the mother. Without betraying their sacred trust, the popes could never sanction such legislation, but in order to avoid greater evils they permitted in some states of Germany a passive assistance on the part of the parish priest at marriages entered into under such conditions. As to a mixed marriage contracted before a non-Catholic minister, Pope Pius IX issued an instruction, 17 Feb., 1864. He declared that in places where the heretical preacher occupied the position of a civil magistrate and the laws of the country required marriages to be entered into before him in order that certain legal effects may follow, it is permitted to the Catholic party to appear before him either before or after the marriage has taken place in presence of the parish priest. If, however, the heretical minister is held to be discharging a religious duty in such witnessing of a marriage, then it is unlawful for a Catholic to renew consent before him as this would be a communion in sacred things and an implicit yielding to heresy. Parish priests are also reminded that it is their strict duty to tell Catholics who ask for information that such going before a minister in a religious capacity is unlawful and that they thereby subject themselves to ecclesiastical censure. Where, however, the priest is not asked, and he has reason to fear that his admonitions will prove unavailing, he may keep his peace provided there be no scandal and the other conditions required by the Church be fulfilled. When a Catholic party has gone before an heretical minister before coming to the parish priest, the latter cannot be present at the marriage until full reparation has been made. For the issuing of a dispensation for a mixed marriage, the Church requires three conditions; that the Catholic party be allowed free exercise of religion, that all the offspring are to be brought up Catholics and that the Catholic party promise to do all that is possible to convert the non-Catholic. It is not to be supposed, however, that even when these precautions have been taken, this is all that suffices for the issuance of a dispensation. In an instruction to the Bishops of England, 25 March, 1868, the Congregation of the Propaganda declared that the above conditions are exacted by the natural and divine law to remove the intrinsic dangers in mixed marriages, but that in addition there must be some grave necessity, which cannot otherwise be avoided, for allowing the faithful to expose themselves to the grave dangers inherent in these unions, even when the prescribed conditions have been fulfilled. The bishops are therefore to warn Catholics against such marriages and not to grant dispensations for them except for weighty reasons and not at the mere will of the petitioner. The latest legislation affecting mixed marriages is that of the decree *Ne temere* which went into effect 18 April, 1908. By this decree all marriages everywhere in the Latin Church between Catholics and non-Catholics are invalid unless they take place in the presence of an accredited priest and two witnesses, and this even in countries where the Tridentine law was not binding. By a later decree, *Provida*, the Holy See exempted Germany from the new legislation. (See CLANDESTINITY; DISPARITY OF WORSHIP; DISPENSATION; MARRIAGE, SACRAMENT OF).

TAUNTON, *The Law of the Church*, s. v. *Mixed Marriages* (London, 1906); FERRARIS, *Bibl. Canon*, s. v. *Matrimonium* (Rome, 1889); BARRET, *Decretum "Ne Temere"* (Suppl. to *Theol. Mor.*) (New York, 1909); MCNICHOLS, *The New Marriage Legislation* (Philadelphia, 1908). For the evils of mixed marriages see the moralists generally, particularly the more recent ones, also the abundant recent sermon-literature, and such works as DEVINE, *The Law of Christian Marriage* (New York, 1908); GIRARDEY, *Popular Instructions on Marriage* (New York); FARRELL, *The Christian Home*, etc.

W. FANNING.

Marriage, MORAL AND CANONICAL ASPECT OF.—Marriage is that individual union through which man and woman by their reciprocal rights form one principle of generation. It is effected by their mutual consent to give and accept each other for the purpose of propagating the human race, of educating their offspring, of sharing life in common, of supporting each other in undivided conjugal affection by a lasting union.

I. MARRIAGE INSTITUTED BY GOD.—Marriage is a contract and is by its very nature above human law. It was instituted by God, is subject to the Divine law, and cannot for that reason be rescinded by human law. Those who contract marriage do so indeed by their own free wills, but they must assume the contract and its obligations unconditionally. Marriage is natural in purpose, but Divine in origin. It is sacred, being intended primarily by the Author of life to perpetuate His creative act and to beget children of God; its secondary ends are mutual society and help, and a lawful remedy for concupiscence. Human law certainly takes cognizance of marriage, but marriage not having been established by man, its essential properties cannot be annulled by such law. Marriage is monogamic and indissoluble; death alone dissolves the union when consummated.

When men pretend to be the final arbiters of the marriage contract, they base their claim on the assumption that this contract is merely of human institution and is subject to no laws above those of man. But human society, both in its primitive and organized form, originated by marriage, not marriage by human society. Marriage was intended by the Creator for the propagation of the human race and for the mutual help of husband and wife. The monogamic and indissoluble properties of marriage were for a time dispensed by Divine permission. Thus in the patriarchal times of the Old Testament polygamous marriage was tolerated. The right of dismissal also by the bill of divorce was legal (Deut., xxiv sqq.; Matt., xix, 3–12). Still, marriage never lost its sacred character in the Old Dispensation. It continued a type and figure of marriage in the New Law. Other nations besides the Jews treated marriage with such regard and ceremony as betoken their belief in its superhuman character. Evolutionists, indeed, account for marriage by the gregarious habits of human beings. They consider it a developed social instinct, a matter of utility, convenience, and decency, a consequence of sexual intercourse, which human society decided to regulate by law, and thus encourage a state of affairs conducive to the peace and happiness of the race. They do not deny that the religious feeling latent in the human heart regarding marriage and the religious ceremonies attendant on its celebration have their utility, but they insist that marriage is entirely a natural thing. Socialists entertain this same view of marriage; they deprecate excessive state control of the

marriage contract, but would impose the duty of providing for, and educating, children on the State. The ethical value of marriage is certainly lowered by such views. Marriage, though contracted to preserve order, would still remain subject to human caprice. It would not bind the couple to an inseparable union. It would exclude polyandry, but not polygamy or divorce. By principles borrowed from Christian tradition, polygamy, strange to say, is proscribed even by those whose ethics of marriage are naturalistic, evolutionary and socialistic.

II. Marriage in the Christian Dispensation.— Christ revoked the dispensation granted in the Mosaic law. He promulgated the original Divine law of monogamic and indissoluble marriage; in addition, He raised marriage to the dignity of a sacrament (Gen., ii, 24; Matt., xix, 3 sqq.; Luke, xvi, 15 sqq.; Mark, x, 11 sqq.; I Cor., vii, 2 sqq.). "If any one should say, matrimony is not truly and properly one of the seven sacraments of the Gospel law, instituted by Christ, but an invention of man, not conferring grace, let him be anathema" (Council of Trent, Sess. XXI, can. 1). Under the Christian law, therefore, the marriage contract and the sacrament are inseparable and indivisible; for, in virtue of Christ's legislative act, the consent in marriage produces, besides sanctifying grace, its peculiar sacramental grace. Whenever the marriage contract is duly made, the sacrament is truly effected. That is undoubtedly the case when both parties to marriage are by baptism members of the mystical body of Christ, for "This is a great sacrament; but I speak in Christ and in the church" (Ephes., v, 32). Hence the moral and canonical aspect of matrimony in the Christian dispensation is necessarily determined by the sacramental character of the marriage contract.

A. The Church being the Divinely appointed custodian of all sacraments, it belongs to her jurisdiction to interpret and apply the Divine law of marriage. She cannot repeal or change that law. Marriage is, in its essential requirements, ever the same, monogamic and indissoluble. The contract validly made and consummated is dissolved by death alone. However, the Church must determine what is required for a valid and licit marriage contract. Doubt in so grave a matter, or uncertainty as to the form and duties of marriage, would be disastrous for the temporal and spiritual good of individuals and of society. The Church safeguards the sacramental contract by unremitting solicitude and directs the consciences and conduct of those who marry by moral teaching and canonical legislation. The procedure of her courts in cases where the validity or legality of a marriage is involved, is ordered by admirable insight. The Church derives her power to legislate in matrimonial affairs, not from the State, but from Christ; and acts, not on sufferance, but by Divine right. She recognizes the duty of the State to take cognizance of Christian marriage, in order to insure certain civic effects, but her jurisdiction is superior and of Divine origin.

B. The laws of the Church governing Christian marriage are fundamental and unchangeable laws; or accidental, circumstantial, and changeable laws. The natural law, Divine revealed law, and the Apostolic law of marriage are interpreted by the Church, but never repealed or dispensed from. Circumstantial laws are enacted by the Church, and may vary or be repealed. Hence disciplinary laws, regulating solemnities to be observed in marriage, and laws defining qualifications of parties to marry, are not so rigid as to admit of no change, if the Church sees fit to change them, owing to difference of time and place; the change too may affect the validity or the legality of a marriage. The Church, therefore, has laid down the conditions requisite for the validity of the matrimonial consent on the part of those who marry, and has legislated on their respective rights and duties. The marriage bond is sacred; married life symbolizes the union between Christ and His Church (Ephes., v, 22 sqq.), and the Church protects both by such rules as will maintain their Christian characteristics under all circumstances.

C. The moral law looks to the conduct of those who marry; canon law regulates matrimonial courts of the Church. There is no marked point of difference between them; they rather form a complete system of legislation concerning the Sacrament of Marriage. Of course baptized persons alone receive the sacraments. Some theologians regard a marriage in which only one party is baptized as a sacrament. Whether those who have been baptized, but are not members of the body of the Church, or unbaptized persons are exempt from all purely Church matrimonial law is a disputed question.

D. As citizens of the State, Christians should certainly comply with the civil laws regulating marriage for certain civil effects, though they must not consider the marriage contract as something distinct from the sacrament, for the two are inseparable. One result of the defection from the Church in the sixteenth century was a belief that marriage is a civil ceremony. The opinion of several canonists, who, wishing to justify this view, taught that the contract of marriage might possibly be separated from the sacrament, was condemned in the syllabus of Pius IX in 1864 (numbers 65 and 66). It is likewise erroneous to consider the priest the minister of the sacrament; he is the authorized witness of the Church to the contract. The parties contracting really administer the sacrament to themselves.

E. It is historical fact that the Church always recognized the right of the State to legislate in certain respects concerning marriage, on account of its civil effects. The enactment of laws fixing the dowry, the right of succession, alimony and other like matters, belongs to the secular authorities, according to the common teaching of canonists. When, however, the State enacts laws inimical to the marriage laws of the Church, practically denying her right to protect the sacred character of matrimony, she cannot allow her children to submit to such enactments. She respects the requirements of the State for the marriages of its citizens as long as those requirements are for the common good, and in keeping with the dignity and Divine purpose of marriage. Thus, for instance, she recognizes that a defect of mind or a lack of proper discretion is an impediment to matrimony. Certain defects of body, particularly impotency, disqualify likewise. The Church, on the other hand, justly expects the State to treat her laws, such as those of celibacy, with respect (see Schmalzgrüber, vol. IV, part I, sect. 2; and vol. IX, part II, title 22, for obsolete canonical rules). A marriage is said to be canonical or civil: canonical, when contracted in accordance with Church law; civil, if the ordinances of civil law are observed. In addition, we sometimes speak of a secret marriage, or a marriage of conscience, that is, a marriage of which the banns have not been published, celebrated by the parish priest and witnesses under bond of secrecy, with the bishop's permission. A true marriage is one duly contracted and capable of being proved in the ordinary way; a presumptive marriage, when the law presumes a marriage to exist; a putative marriage, when it is believed to be valid, but is in reality null and void, owing to the existence of a hidden diriment impediment.

There is, again, a special kind of marriage which needs explanation here. When a prince or a member of a ruling house weds a woman of inferior rank, especially if her family is plebeian, the marriage is generally known as a morganatic marriage. In this case it is as valid and licit before the Church as any other lawful marriage, but there are certain civil disabilities. First, the children born in such wedlock

have no right to the title or crown of their father, since those who are to succeed him ought not to suffer from the social disadvantages arising from the inferior rank of their father's morganatic wife. In some countries, however, the law concedes a hope of succession to such children if all the direct heirs should die. The morganatic wife and her children receive, by agreement or stipulation, a dowry and means of support, the amount being in some countries at the discretion of the king or prince, in others fixed by law.

III. Matrimonial Courts in the Church.—Doubtful marriage cases are decided in courts provided by the canon law for that purpose. The doubt may arise from a supposed hidden or occult impediment or from a public impediment. In the former case (occult impediment) the question is decided *pro foro interno* in the tribunal of penance or by the penitentiary Apostolic at Rome. In such cases strict secrecy, similar to that of the confessional, is observed, particularly with regard to names and places of residence. In the latter case (public impediment) the doubt has always to be settled *pro foro externo* in the matrimonial courts; for no general laws can be made to cover all possible circumstances, and the practical application of the canonical and moral laws of marriage to actual cases, just as happens with civil laws, involves at times questions *de jure* and *de facto*, which must be settled by competent judges. In every diocese presided over by a bishop and especially in every metropolitan see, the canon law requires a matrimonial court. Such a court has no power to legislate, but adjudicates according to the laws and the precedents of the Roman courts. Bishops of dioceses, national and provincial councils may, however, enforce stricter observance of the general laws in their respective jurisdictions; if peculiar circumstances require it, they can legislate against abuses and insist on special points of law; for instance, they may demand certain qualifications in witnesses to marriage, and prescribe certain preliminaries for mixed marriages, binding on priest and people under pain of sin. From the decisions of the diocesan and the metropolitan courts, particularly in questions involving nullity of marriage, appeal can be taken to the courts of the Holy See. The decisions of these courts are final, especially when the Holy Father approves them. In rare cases a reopening is allowed, and then, usually, because new evidence is offered. Since Pius X reorganized the Roman Curia by the Constitution "Sapienti consilio" (29 June, 1908), such appeals must be made to the congregation, tribunal or office specified in that Constitution to deal with them: "For the future every question regarding mixed marriages is to be brought before the Congregation of the Holy Office; likewise, all points which either directly or indirectly, in fact or in law, refer to the Pauline Privilege" (Answer of the Congregation of the Consistory to letter of Holy Office, 27 March, 1909). (For the procedure in case of appeals from countries under the jurisdiction of Propaganda, see Propaganda.)

IV. The New Marriage Legislation.—The marriage law, known by its initial words, "Ne temere", went into force on Easter Sunday, 18 April, 1908. The principal changes it made in the Church's matrimonial legislation relate to clandestine marriages (which it makes null and void for all Catholics of the Latin Rite) and to questions incidental thereto. The law enacts that a marriage of Catholics of the Latin Rite is licit and valid only if contracted in the presence of the ordinary, or the parish priest, or a priest delegated by either, and at least two witnesses. Any priest may revalidate a sinful or an invalid marriage of those who, through sickness, are in serious danger of death, unless their case is such as admits of no revalidation—as for instance, if they are in holy orders. Again, in the case of those who live in districts where no priest resides, and who cannot without serious hardship go to one, the new law provides that, if such condition has lasted a month, they may marry without a priest, but in the presence of two witnesses, the record of their marriage being properly made as prescribed. The law makes no exception in favour of mixed marriages, not even when one party is a Catholic of an Eastern Rite. By a special dispensation, mixed marriages—i. e., both parties being baptized, one a Protestant, the other a Catholic—of Germans marrying within the boundaries of the German Empire are valid, though clandestinely contracted. A like dispensation has been granted to Hungarians marrying within the boundaries of Hungary; and according to the Secretary of the S. Congregation of Sacraments (18 March, 1909), Croatians, Slavonians, inhabitants of Transylvania, and of Fiume enjoy a similar dispensation. Catholics of the various Eastern rites, who are in union with the Holy See, are exempt from the law; likewise all non-Catholics, except those who have been baptized in the Church, but have fallen away.

The law is not retroactive. Marriages contracted before its promulgation will be adjudicated, in case of doubt, according to the laws in force at the time and place of marriage. It simplifies procedure. Former difficulties arising from quasi-domicile are done away with by a month's residence, even when taken *in fraudem legis;* the ordinary or the parish priest is the authorized witness of the Church, and he or a priest delegated by him by name, can assist validly at any marriage within his territory, even though the parties come from without it; though, of course, such ordinary or parish priest needs, and should ask for, letters of permission from the proper authority to assist licitly at such a marriage. The local authorities may increase the punishment assigned in the text of the law for any infraction of this provision. By a decree of the Sacred Congregation of the Sacraments (7 March, 1910), the power to dispense kings or royal princes from impediments, diriment or impedient, is henceforth reserved in a special manner to the Holy See, and all faculties granted heretofore in such cases to certain ordinaries are revoked. In the peculiar circumstances of certain Indian dioceses (see India, *Double Jurisdiction*), the question has been asked: Whether for persons residing in India within a double jurisdiction, it is sufficient, in order to a valid and licit marriage, to stand before the personal parish priest of one or both; or whether they must also stand before the territorial parish priest. The question having been referred to the Holy Father, the Congregation of the Sacraments replied, with the approbation of His Holiness, in view of the peculiar circumstances, affirmatively to the first part; negatively to the second part.

V. Marriage Indissoluble Except by Death.—It must again be repeated here that the Church teaches, and has always taught, that death alone can dissolve a ratified and consummated Christian marriage. When the death of either party is not proved by such evidence as is required by canon law, there is no permission to re-marry. The instruction "Matrimonii vinculo" (1868) is still strictly followed, as appears from an answer of the Sacred Congregation of the Sacraments to cases that arose in the earthquake district in Southern Italy in March, 1910. Marriages ratified but not consummated by sexual intercourse are sometimes dissolved by the Roman Pontiff in virtue of his supreme power; sometimes they are dissolved by entrance into the religious life and by actual profession of solemn vows. Such dissolutions of marriages that are merely ratified are in no sense subversive of "what God hath joined let no man put asunder" (Matt., xix, 6). Again the matrimonial courts may find on the evidence adduced that a marriage is null and void; there may have been a known or a hidden diriment impediment when the marriage was contracted. In some instances such a marriage is revalidated after securing the required dispensation, if such

be possible, by a renewal of consent in proper form, or, accepting the previous consent, which was never actually retracted, by remedying the defect *in radice*. In other instances, the marriage being by juridical sentence declared null and void, the parties to it are free to enter new alliances. But that is quite different from granting a divorce in the case of a valid consummated marriage.

VI. Matrimonial Consent.—Those who marry do so by signifying their consent to be man and wife. Consent is of the very essence of marriage, and it is in consequence of their free, deliberate consent that a man and a woman become husband and wife. Marriage being a contract forming essentially an indissoluble union, it is important to know whether the consent can be so defective as to make a marriage morally and canonically invalid.

A. (1) The act of being married is the mutual consenting of the parties, the giving and accepting of each other. "Thus the wife hath not power of her own body, but the husband. And in like manner the husband also hath not power of his own body, but the wife" (I Cor., vii, 4). It is not sufficient to give the consent internally only, it must be signified by some outward sign. Canon law does not absolutely require the personal presence of both parties to marriage; but, one being present, giving his consent to marry the absent party, the absent party must signify her consent by proxy or by letter. The Sacred Congregation of the Rota recently decided a marriage to be valid at which the consent of one party was given verbally, and that of the other by letter. "Now although matrimony was raised to the dignity of a sacrament by Christ, it did not lose the nature of a contract; hence, like other contracts, it is perfected by consent of both parties. There is no obstacle, consequently, to contracting marriage by letter" (see Acta Apostolicæ Sedis, year 2, vol. II, n° 7, 30 April, 1910, p. 300). The consent, however, must be signified in such a manner as to make the consent of both parties clear and unmistakable to the priest and witnesses. The nature of the contract as well as its consequent duties and properties are independent of the will of the parties contracting. Hence, if by any implied or expressed condition one or both parties qualify the contract in its essentials, the contract itself would be vitiated and nullified.

(2) The consent must be free and deliberate. Violence or coercion by fear in a degree so great as to deprive either party of his freedom to dissent would invalidate the consent given. The motives that prompt consent may be improper, but still they are compatible with the freedom required, and hence do not nullify the contract. The fear need not be absolute, but if it be relatively so strong as to prompt external consent while the party dissents internally, canon law considers the requisite freedom wanting, and the contract null and void (see "Acta Apostolicæ Sedis", vol. II, n° 8, p. 348, 26 Feb., 1910).

(3) The party or parties giving consent in the act of marriage might be in error as to the person or quality of person whom they are actually marrying. An error is an impediment based on natural law. Natural law protects the marriage contract; it requires that the object of the consent shall be, not only naturally capable of the contract, but personally intended. The marriage contract requires that the persons contracting should be definite. Ecclesiastical law confirms this, and even extends its natural limits: if the error is as to the person, the contract is null and void—e. g., if, instead of the girl he consents to marry, her sister were given in marriage by some accident or fraud. If the error is as to a personal quality, then the law, to recognize a plea of non-consent, requires that the quality should have been absolutely intended by the party contracting, and it must be shown that such quality was a condition *sine qua non* of the marriage. Thus, in ancient canon law, if a freeman married a woman whom he believed to be free while in fact she was a bondwoman, his marriage was null and void, unless, after discovering his error, he continued to live and cohabit with her.

B. A condition expressed or implied in the marriage contract may regard the past, the present, or the future. It must be noted, however, that canon law, *in foro externo*, takes into account such conditions only as are definitely expressed—"De internis non judicat". Conditions or intentions implied by both or either party consenting in marriage may establish a case of conscience to be settled in the tribunal of conscience; but the courts take no cognizance of it. Before the law a marriage is valid until the vitiating condition or intention is established by certain proof. Hence a possible anomaly: a marriage invalid in reality, yet valid before the law. In general, conditional consent in marriage is forbidden. A parish priest may not permit it on his own authority. Parties to a marriage, however, might, when they make the compact, put conditions, implied or expressed. Would that vitiate the contract of marriage? If the condition concern the past or the present, the contract is valid if the condition is verified at that moment, thus: "I take you for my husband, if you are the man to whom I was betrothed." If the condition regard the future, it must be noted that, if it frustrates any essential property of marriage, it nullifies the act of marriage; if it postulates an act against the very nature of marriage, the marriage is null. Again, the mutual rights acquired and given in marriage being exclusive and perpetual, any condition added by both or one party to frustrate marriage in its natural consequences nullifies the contracts. A resolve or intention, however, to sin against the nature of marriage, or to prove unfaithful, is, of course, no such condition. But a consent in marriage qualified by conditions such as to avoid procreation or birth of children, to have other wives or husbands—conditions excluding conjugal fidelity, denying the sacrament or perpetuity of the marriage bond—is a radically vitiated consent, and consequently of no value. Thus: "I marry, but you must avoid having children"; or, "I marry you until I find someone to suit me better." The condition must be actual, predominant in the will of one or both, denying perpetual union or interchange of conjugal rights, or at least limiting them, to make the marriage null and void (Decretals, IV, tit. v, 7).

There might be a sinful agreement between those contracting marriage which likewise nullifies their marriage—e. g., not to have more than one or two children, or not to have any children at all, until, in the judgment of the contracting parties, circumstances shall enable them to be provided for; or to divorce and marry someone else whenever they grow tired of each other. Such an agreement or condition denies the perpetual duties of matrimony, limits matrimonial rights, suspends the duty consequent on the use and exercise of those rights; if really made a *sine qua non* of marriage, it necessarily annuls it; the parties would wish to enjoy connubial intercourse, but evade its consequences. The agreement to abstain from the use of conjugal rights is, however, quite different, and does not nullify the marriage contract. The parties to the marriage fully consent to transfer to each other the conjugal rights, but, by agreement or vow, oblige themselves to abstain from the actual use of those rights. Now, if, contrary to their agreement or vow, either party should demand the actual use of his or her right, it would not be fornication, though a breach of promise or vow. Such a condition, though possible, is not frequent nor even permissible except in cases of rare virtue.

Again, Christian marriage being a sacrament as well as a contract, can matrimonial consent be such as to exclude the sacrament and intend only the contract?

Christian marriage being essentially a sacrament, as we have seen, any condition made to exclude the sacrament from the contract would nullify the latter.

Besides innumerable Latin text-books on moral and canon law in which marriage is discussed, and many treatises in other languages on the same subject, the following are mentioned as being more accessible to English and American readers: SLATER, *A Manual of Moral Theology*, with notes by MARTIN on American legislation. II (New York, Cincinnati, Chicago, 1909), v, vii, xii; DEVINE, *The Law of Christian Marriage* (New York, 1908), 47–127; CONIN, *The New Matrimonial Legislation;* LECKY, *History of European Morals*, II (London, 1877); BISHOP, *Commentaries on the Law of Marriage and Divorce*, I (Boston, 1881); AMRAN, *The Jewish Law of Divorce according to Bible and Talmud;* BEBEL, *Die Frau und Sozialismus* (50th ed.).

JOS. SELINGER.

Marriage, MYSTICAL.—In the Old and the New Testament, the love of God for man, and, in particular His relations with His chosen people (whether of the Synagogue or of the Church), are frequently typified under the form of the relations between bridegroom and bride. In like manner, Christian virginity has been considered from the earliest centuries as a special offering made by the soul to its spouse, Christ. Nothing else seems to have been meant in speaking of the mystical nuptials of St. Agnes and of St. Catherine of Alexandria. These primitive notions were afterwards developed more completely, and the phrase *mystical marriage* has been taken in two different senses, the one wide and the other more restricted.

MARRIAGE OF ST. CATHERINE
Murillo, Vatican, Rome

(1) In many of the lives of the saints, the wide sense is intended. Here the mystical marriage consists in a vision in which Christ tells a soul that He takes it for His bride, presenting it with the customary ring, and the apparition is accompanied by a ceremony; the Blessed Virgin, saints, and angels are present. This festivity is but the accompaniment and symbol of a purely spiritual grace; hagiographers do not make clear what this grace is, but it may at least be said that the soul receives a sudden augmentation of charity and of familiarity with God, and that He will thereafter take more special care of it. All this, indeed, is involved in the notion of marriage. Moreover, as a wife should share in the life of her husband, and as Christ suffered for the redemption of mankind, the mystical spouse enters into a more intimate participation in His sufferings. Accordingly, in three cases out of every four, the mystical marriage has been granted to stigmatics. It has been estimated by Dr. Imbert that, from the earliest times to the present, history has recorded seventy-seven mystical marriages; they are mentioned in connexion with female saints, *beatæ*, and *venerabiles*—e. g. Blessed Angela of Foligno, St. Catherine of Siena, St. Colette, St. Teresa, St. Catherine of Ricci, Venerable Marina d'Escobar, St. Mary Magdalen de' Pazzi, St. Veronica Giuliani, Venerable Maria de Agreda. Religious art has exercised its resources upon mystical marriage, considered as a festive celebration. That of St. Catherine of Alexandria is the subject of Memling's masterpiece (in the Hospital St. Jean, Bruges), as also of paintings by Jordaens (Madrid), Correggio (Naples and the Louvre), and others. Fra Bartolommeo has done as much for St. Catherine of Siena.

(2) In a more restricted sense, the term *mystical marriage* is employed by St. Teresa and St. John of the Cross to designate that mystical union with God which is the most exalted condition attainable by the soul in this life. It is also called a "transforming union", "consummate union", and "deification". St. Teresa likewise calls it "the seventh resting-place" of the "interior castle"; she speaks of it only in that last treatise which she composed five years before her death, when she had been but recently raised to this degree. This state comprises three elements: (a) The first is an almost continual sense of the presence of God, even in the midst of external occupations. This favour does not of itself produce an alienation of the senses; ecstasies are more rare. Nor does this permanent sense of God's presence suffice to constitute the spiritual marriage, but is only a state somewhat near to it. (b) The second element is a transformation of the higher faculties in respect to their mode of operation: hence the name "transforming union"; it is the essential note of the state. The soul is conscious that in its supernatural acts of intellect and of will, it participates in the Divine life and the analogous acts in God. To understand what is meant by this, it must be remembered that in heaven we are not only to enjoy the vision of God, but to feel our participation in His nature. Mystical writers have sometimes exaggerated in describing this grace; it has been said that we think by the eternal thought of God, love by His infinite love, and will by His will. Thus, they appear to confound the two natures, the Divine and the human. They are describing what they believe they feel; like the astronomers, they speak the language of appearances, which we find easier to understand. Here, as in human marriage, there is a fusion of two lives. (c) The third element consists in an habitual intellectual vision of the Blessed Trinity or of some Divine attribute. This grace is sometimes accorded before the transforming union. Certain authors appear to hold that in the transforming union there is produced a union with the Divine Word more special than that with the other two Divine Persons; but there is no proof that this is so in all cases. St. Teresa gives the name of "spiritual betrothal" to passing foretastes of the transforming union, such as occur in raptures.

ST. TERESA, *El Castillo Interior* (1557); ST. JOHN OF THE CROSS, *Cantico espiritual;* IDEM, *Llama de amor viva;* SCARAMELLI, *Direttorio mistico* (Venice, 1754); RIBET, *La mystique divine* (Paris, 1895); POULAIN, *Des Grâces d'oraison* (Paris, 1906), tr. *The Graces of Interior Prayer* (London, 1910); IMBERT, *La Stigmatisation* (Paris, 1894).

AUG. POULAIN.

Marriage, RITUAL OF.—The form for the celebration of the Sacrament of Matrimony, as it stands in the "Rituale Romanum" of the present day, is remarkably simple. It consists of the following elements: (1) A declaration of consent made by both parties and

formally ratified by the priest in the words: "Ego conjungo vos in matrimonium in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti. Amen" (I unite you in wedlock in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen). (2) A form for the blessing of the ring which the bridegroom receives back from the hand of the priest to place it upon the ring finger of the bride's left hand. (3) Certain short versicles and a final benedictory prayer. This ceremony according to the intention of the Church should be followed by (4) the Nuptial Mass, in which there are Collects for the married couple, as well as a solemn blessing after the Pater Noster and another shorter one before the priest's benediction at the close. At this Mass also it is recommended that the bride and bridegroom should communicate. But although here as elsewhere the "Rituale Romanum" may be regarded as providing the form of the Church's ceremonial, in treating of the Sacrament of Matrimony a special rubric is inserted in the following terms: "If, however, in any provinces, other laudable customs and ceremonies are in use besides the foregoing in the celebration of the Sacrament of Matrimony, the holy Council of Trent desires that they should be retained" (see Decreta Conc. Trid., Sess. XXIV, De Reformatione, cap. 1).

The reason of this exceptional tolerance here shown towards diversity of ritual is not very far to seek. Matrimony being a sacrament in which the contracting parties themselves are the ministers, it is plain that its essential forms must be expressed not in Latin but in the vernacular, and this fact alone at once introduces a certain element of divergence. Moreover, change of established tradition in such matters is always disconcerting to the minds of the imperfectly educated. Hence the Church's wisdom is apparent in refraining from interference in those countries where certain rites and ceremonies, in themselves free from abuse, have been immemorially associated with this solemn contract. The effect of this tolerance is particularly noticeable in the British Isles. Before the Reformation a considerable variety of local usages prevailed in England, as elsewhere, affecting the ceremonial even of the Mass itself, as well as other ecclesiastical functions. The divergences of the "Use" of Sarum, or of York or of Hereford etc., from the practice of Rome or Augsburg or Lyons were not inconsiderable. When however through the Elizabethan persecution the clergy were forced to go abroad for their ecclesiastical training, the distinctively English customs of Sarum or York gradually became unfamiliar. No attempt or hardly any was made to print new Missals or Breviaries according to the English rite, and Roman usages were thus everywhere adopted by the missionary clergy. But in one respect an exception was made. The Catholic laity who lived on at home knew no other marriage service than that of their forefathers. Hence the Sarum form was in substance retained and in 1604 and again in 1610 in the English "Rituale" printed at Douai, under the title "Sacra Institutio Baptizandi, Matrimonium celebrandi etc.", the old Sarum text was reprinted unchanged, though at a later date, e. g. in the book of 1626 (? printed at Antwerp), certain modifications were introduced, The form thus modified remains in force for England, Scotland and Ireland down to the present day. Seeing that the Anglican marriage service has also retained a great deal of the primitive Sarum rite, we find ourselves confronted by the curious anomaly that in the British Isles the Catholic marriage service resembles the Anglican service more nearly than it does the form provided in the "Rituale Romanum".

Origin of Ecclesiastical Ceremonial.—Turning to the historical development of the ritual for matrimony we may say that the Church from the beginning realized that Matrimony was in its essence a contract between individuals. So far as regarded the external forms which gave validity to that contract, the Church was ready to approve all that was seemly and in accordance with national custom, recognizing that an engagement thus lawfully entered upon between two baptized Christians was elevated by Christ's institution to the dignity of a sacrament. Duchesne is thus probably right in connecting those broader outlines of a religious service, which we can trace amid the diversities of the different medieval rituals, with the pagan form of marriage which had prevailed at an earlier date in Rome and throughout the Roman empire. Tertullian expatiates upon the happiness of "that marriage which is made by the Church, confirmed by the Holy Sacrifice (*oblatio*), sealed by the blessing, which the angels proclaim and which is ratified by our Father in heaven" (Ad Uxor., ii, 9); while elsewhere he speaks of the crown, the veil and the joining of hands ("De Corona" xiii, "De Virg. vel.", ii). We can hardly doubt, then, that the Church accepted the leading features of that ceremony of marriage which was most in honour in pagan Rome, i. e. the *confarreatio*, and that it blessed these rites, substituting in particular the holy Sacrifice of the Mass for the libations and sacrifices to the gods with which the profane ceremonies were solemnized.

The matter is not entirely clear, and Freisen is tempted to look rather to Jewish prototypes, especially the blessing, for the outlines of the earliest ritual of Christian marriage (see "Archiv. f. Kathol. Kirchenrecht", LIII, 369 seq., 1885). Remembering, however, the details given by Pope Nicholas I (c. 866) in his answer to the Bulgars, and regarding this description as the type of Christian marriage then recognized in Rome, we find that the whole ceremonial of Christian Matrimony falls into two clearly defined parts. We have first the preliminaries constituting the betrothal (*sponsalia*) in its broader sense. Under this head we may reckon primarily the betrothal strictly so called, i. e. the expression of the consent of the couple to be married and of their parents to the projected union. But this is supplemented by (1) the *subarrhatio*, i, e. the delivery of the *arrhæ* or pledges, ordinarily represented by the giving of a ring, which Nicholas I calls *annulus fidei* (the ring of fidelity), and (2) by the handing over of the dowry, secured by some legal document and delivered in the presence of witnesses. The second act, which may follow the sponsalia immediately or after some interval, comprises (i) the celebration of Mass, at which the bride and bridegroom communicate, (ii) the solemn benediction which Pope Nicholas associates with the veil (*velamen*) held over the married pair, and (iii) the wearing of crowns as they leave the church.

Although it is extremely difficult to determine in what precise measure the Roman and Teutonic marriage usages influenced each other from the time when the Goths and the Lombards made their power felt in Italy, there seems to be nothing here which may not be of purely Roman origin. Long before the birth of Jesus Christ, Roman custom drew a clear distinction between the sponsalia, or preliminaries, and the marriage itself, which latter culminated in the conducting of the bride to her husband's house (*in domum deductio*). The sponsalia usually consisted of a promise ratified by the giving of a ring as a pledge. The actual nuptials, especially the confarreatio, were marked by the offering of a bloodless sacrifice (a cake of spelt) to Jupiter; the bride always wore a flame-coloured veil (*flammeum*) and a crown encircled the brow of both bride and bridegroom. On the other hand some of these features, for example the clear distinction between the betrothal and the marriage, and the use of the wedding ring in the former ceremony, were also known among various Teutonic peoples at a very early date (see Sohm, "Recht der Eheschliessung", 55, and for Spanish usage, Férotin in "Monumenta Liturgica", V, 434 seq.) and seeing that other ancient

Teutonic usages were undoubtedly retained in a service which in the end became purely religious and was conducted by the priest, it is not always easy to disentangle the elements of the later ritual and to assign the exact origin to each.

Development of the Marriage Ritual.—Probably we shall be right in assuming that the first effort everywhere made by the Church to impart a religious character to the contract of marriage was by requiring or urging the married pair to be present at a special Nuptial Mass (q. v.). The Mass itself constitutes the highest form of consecration and the available evidence points strongly to the conclusion that in such very different matters as the dedication of a church or the burial of the dead, the Christians of the first few centuries had no special ritual adapted for such occasions but were content to offer the holy Sacrifice with appropriate collects. Looking at our actual Nuptial Mass which has retained the essential features of that found in the Sacramentary ascribed to St. Leo, the earliest collection preserved to us of Roman origin, we find that the prayers themselves constitute a blessing of the married pair while the eucharistic benediction which is headed "Velatio nuptialis" is in effect a consecration of the bride alone to the estate of marriage, a point of view which vividly recalls the Roman conception of matrimony as the veiling of the woman for the special behoof of her husband. This velatio nuptialis spread in slightly varying forms to every part of Western Christendom which received the Roman Mass Book. Down to the present day the same nuptial benediction, specially devoted to the bride and introduced at an unwonted position (immediately after the Pater Noster of the Mass), remains the highest form of sanction which the Church can give to the union of man and woman. By a law of ancient date which is still in force, this special benediction is withheld in all cases in which the bride has been previously married. Further, though in the early Middle Ages the Nuptial Mass seems sometimes to have been celebrated on the day after the first cohabitation of the pair (see Friedberg, "Eheschliessung", 82–84 and Sohm, "Recht der Eheschliessung", 159), these solemnities seem always to have been associated with the marriage itself as distinct from the espousals.

For a long time, undoubtedly, the espousals and the actual nuptials remained distinct ceremonies throughout the greater part of the Western world, and except for the subsequent bringing of the parties before the altar for the celebration of the Mass, the Church seems to have had little directly to do with either function. Nevertheless a negative approval of such ceremonies as containing nothing unbefitting the Christian character may be presumed. Indeed this seems to be required even at the beginning of the second century by the epistle of St. Ignatius to St. Polycarp: "It becometh men and women, when they wed, to marry with the consent of the bishop, that the marriage may be after the Lord and not after concupiscence". (Cf. Ephes., v, 32, and the Didache, xi.) Moreover at Rome, Pope Siricius (A. D. 385), in a letter accepted as genuine by Jaffé-Wattenbach (Regesta, n. 255), speaks clearly of the blessing pronounced by the priest at the ceremony of the betrothal (illa benedictio quam nupturæ sacerdos imponit) where the context seems to make it evident that the actual marriage is not meant. We may believe, though the point is contested, that in some places the Church by degrees came to take a part both in the betrothal and in that "gifta" or handing over of the bride in which our Teutonic forefathers seem to have seen the essence of the nuptial contract. This eventually successful effort of the Church everywhere to bring the solemnization of matrimony more immediately under her influence, is well summed up in the following Anglo-Saxon ordinance: "At the nuptials there shall be a Mass-priest by law who shall with God's blessing bind their union to all prosperity" (Liebermann, "Gesetze der Angel-Sachsen", I, 422).

The great authority of Charlemagne was exerted in the same direction. Many times in his "Capitularies" it is enjoined that marriages should not be celebrated without the blessing of the priest (see Beauchet in "Nouvelle Revue de Droit Français", VI, 381–383). He even declared that without this blessing marriages should not be held valid, but this view was not supported by later pronouncements of the Holy See. From about this period too the ring seems to have received an ecclesiastical blessing, one of the earliest known instances occurring in the marriage of Judith of France in 856 to the English King Ethelwulf, the father of Alfred the Great (see the whole ritual in M. G. H., Legum, I, 450). With this exception the oldest *ordines* of a marriage service conducted by ecclesiastical authority are several centuries later in date, and those that bear a distinctly religious character almost always show the betrothal and the nuptial ceremony amalgamated into one. This is conspicuously the case in the "Ordinals" of Sarum and York and in the modern English Catholic service which is derived from them. Indeed it has been disputed whether the Church originally made any claim to bless the betrothal as distinct from the nuptials (see Freisen, "Geschichte des can. Eherechts", 131–134, and 160). But some ecclesiastical control of the betrothal ceremony seems in itself highly probable, especially when we take into account the analogy of the Oriental rituals; while the clearly marked division in the earliest Spanish Ordines between the "Ordo Arrharum" and the "Ordo ad benedicendum" (Férotin in "Monumenta Liturgica", V, 434 seq.) equally presupposes a double intervention of the priest.

Indeed the Spanish rituals, especially that of Toledo, even down to modern times, recognize a double ceremony. In the first, after a solemn admonition to disclose any impediment that may exist, the parties give their consent "per verba de præsenti", and the priest, at least in the later forms (see "Manuale Toletanum", Antwerp, 1680, 457) pronounces the words: "I on the part of God Almighty join you in wedlock", etc. None the less the priest is directed in the rubric which immediately follows to warn the parties that "they must not dwell together in the same house before receiving the blessing of the priest and the Church". Then follows under quite a separate heading the "Order for the Nuptial Benediction", which begins with the blessing of the rings and arrhæ in the church porch and is completed by the celebration of the Nuptial Mass. No doubt the contract of marriage and the nuptial benediction are distinct things in themselves and are neither of them identical with the betrothal, but it seems highly probable that the traces of duality which may be observed in so many of the older marriage rituals are primarily to be attributed to some confused and vague perpetuation of the betrothal and the nuptials as distinct ceremonies, as was the case both in Rome and among the Teutons.

In the Sarum "Ordo ad faciendum Sponsalia" two points may be noticed which illustrate this duality. First, the celebration of the earlier part of the ceremony in the church porch; a feature which indeed was common to all Western Christendom. Thus Chaucer writes of the Wife of Bath:

"She was a worthy woman all hir live,
Housebondes at the chirche dore had she had five."

The change of scene from the porch to the altar for the celebration of Mass is a marked feature in all early rituals. Secondly, we may note the italicized words in the following form for plighting troth, still retained in the English Catholic marriage service and closely reproducing the old Sarum Text: "I, N.

take thee, N. for my wedded wife, to have and to hold, from this day forward, for better for worse, for richer for poorer, in sickness and in health, till death do us part, *if Holy Church will it permit*, and thereto I plight thee my troth." It is tolerably clear that this troth-plighting originally formed part of a betrothal ceremonial and recognized the possibility that the Church might still refuse to confirm and bless the union thus initiated. But as the words occur in the modern service, where the parties have already given their consent, where the marriage is consequently an accomplished fact and the priest has said "ego conjungo vos in matrimonium", they may readily cause a difficulty. Needless to say that this particular clause has been omitted in the Anglican "Book of Common Prayer".

Ancient Observances surviving in later Rituals.—The traces of the old betrothal ceremony in the modern nuptial Ordinals of different countries are many and varied. First the wedding ring itself, in accordance with the old Roman custom, seems to have been originally a pledge or arrha given at the sponsalia by the bridegroom as the earnest of the future fulfilment of his share in the contract. At a later date however it probably became confused with certain German customs of "morning gifts" after marriage and consequently was transferred to the nuptials proper. Further in many places it ultimately became and still remains the custom for bride and bridegroom to present each other mutually with rings as a pledge of fidelity, and this is in fact the symbolical meaning attached to the ring in the modern ritual of the Church, as the form for its blessing plainly signifies. Perhaps the first trace of the use of two rings occurs in the early Spanish Ordines. Furthermore, while the use of the wedding ring has been retained among most, though not quite all, the rituals of the West, the manner of putting it on varies considerably. The English custom that the bridegroom should place it, first, on the bride's thumb with the words "in the name of the Father"—then on the index finger—"and of the Son" —then on the middle finger—"and of the Holy Ghost"— and finally on the fourth finger—"Amen" —is found in medieval ceremonials in places as far separated as Spain and Norway, but it was by no means universal. In some places the priest puts on the ring, and elsewhere it was customary to place the ring on the bride's right hand. This was the case in the Sarum rite and it was retained among English Catholics until the middle of the eighteenth century. The reason so frequently assigned for the choice of the fourth, or ring, finger, viz. that a vein runs from that finger to the heart, is found in early non-Christian writers like Pliny and Macrobius.

A second survival which appears even in the concise Roman Ritual, is the hand-clasp of the married pair. This was a custom also in the pagan marriage ceremonial of Rome, and it is hard to say whether it comes to us through Roman or Teutonic traditions. Certain it is that the "hand-fast" constituted a sort of oath among most Germanic peoples and was used for the solemn ratification of all kinds of contracts (see Friedberg, "Eheschliessung", pp. 39–42). In many, and especially the German rituals, the priest was directed to wrap his stole around the clasped hands of the bride and bridegroom while he pronounced some words of ratification. This ceremony may often be noticed in medieval pictures of a marriage, e. g. the "Espousals of St. Joseph and our Lady". This also is quite probably of heathen origin for we find a reference to something very similar in Arbeo's "Life of St. Emmeram", written before the year 800. It contains an account of a pagan woman summarily given in marriage to a Christian, her hand wrapped round with a cloak "as is the custom in espousals". A most elaborate ceremony of this kind is prescribed in the "Rituale" compiled for the Christians of Japan in 1605. It was noticed above that the "gifta", or formal surrender of the bride, who thus passed from the "mund" of her father or guardian to that of her husband, was regarded as the most essential feature of Anglo-Saxon nuptials. This left its mark in the Sarum rite, and something of it still survives both in the Anglican and the Catholic ceremonial. In the former the minister asks "Who giveth this woman to be married to this man"; in the latter no question is put, but the rubric still stands "Then let the woman be given away by her father or by her friends".

Most remarkable of all perhaps is the giving of gold and silver by the bridegroom to the bride. This has been much modified in the Anglican "Book of Common Prayer" which speaks only of "laying the ring upon a book with the accustomed duty to the priest and clerk"; but the Catholic rite, more closely following the Sarum, directs that gold and silver be placed with the ring and given to the bride while the bridegroom says: "With this ring I thee wed; this gold and silver I thee give, with my body I thee worship and with all my worldly goods I thee endow". This action takes us back to Tacitus's account of German marriage customs. "The wife", he says, "does not present a dower to her husband, but the husband to the wife" (Germania, xviii). Undoubtedly this is a trace of the primitive sale by which the bridegroom paid a sum of money for the transference to him of the "mund" or right of custody of the bride. Originally that money was paid to the father or guardian, but by successive stages it became a sort of dower for the bride and was represented by the symbolical payment to her of "arrhæ", the name by which the money thus given in the marriage ceremony is still designated. In certain branches of the Teutonic family, notably the Salians, this form of purchase of a bride was known as marriage "per solidum et denarium". See for example the account of the nuptials of Chlodwig and St. Clotilde in the history of the so-called Fredegarius (c. xviii). The solidus was a gold piece, the denarius a silver one, and in the time of Charlemagne and later the solidus was the equivalent in value of twelve denarii. When the custom of coining gold pieces was given up in the ninth century, it seems that the solidus and denarius were represented by their equivalent value, i. e. thirteen silver pieces. Certain it is, in any case, that in Spain and in some parts of France thirteen pieces of money, known in French as the "Treizain", are still blessed and given to the bride along with the ring. The ceremony was duly observed at the marriage of King Alfonso of Spain, in 1906 (see "The Messenger", 1906, 113–130).

To mention the many observances peculiar to particular provinces, for example the Hungarian custom of taking an oath of mutual fidelity upon relics at the dictation of the priest, or the York practice by which the bride threw herself at the feet of her husband if he gave her land as part of her dower—would here be impossible. We must not however omit to note the pallium or pall (French, *poêle*), which in a very large number of dioceses was held over the married pair, they in the meantime lying prone before the altar, while the nuptial benediction was pronounced in the Mass. The custom was retained until recently in many parts of France and is still observed in the more ceremonious weddings which follow the Toledan ritual. This and the "jugale", or parti-coloured yoke of ribbon binding together the married pair, are mentioned by St. Isidore of Seville, and it is not quite clear how far they are to be identified with the velum or flammeum of the bride in the Roman marriage. It is to be noted that according to certain rituals the pallium is completely to cover the bride but only the shoulders of the bridegroom. This seems clearly to be connected with the fact that, as already observed, the nuptial benediction is almost entirely devoted to the bride and consecrates her to her special responsibili-

ties. The parallel of this marriage ceremony is seen in the pall held over nuns while the consecratory preface is being said at their clothing or profession. It follows that the idea that this is a funeral pall and is symbolical of the death of the religious to the world is not historically justifiable.

The words of the priest, "Ego vos in matrimonium conjungo", which, though sanctioned by the Council of Trent, are apt to convey the false impression that the priest is the minister of the Sacrament, are not primitive, at any rate in this form, and are only to be found in Rituals of comparatively recent date. In the medieval Nuptial Mass, and in many places until long after the Reformation, the kiss of peace was given to the married pair. The bridegroom received it from the priest either directly or by means of the pax-board, or *instrumentum pacis*, and then *per osculum oris* conveyed it to the bride. The misconception, found in some modern writers, that the priest kissed the bride, is due to a misunderstanding of this piece of ritual, no such custom is recorded in manuals approved by ecclesiastical authority.

Oriental Marriage Rituals.—That of the Orthodox Greek Church may be conveniently taken as a model, for the others, e. g. the Syrian and Coptic rites, resemble it in many particulars. The most noteworthy feature in a Greek or Russian marriage is the fact that there are two quite distinct religious services. In the service of the betrothal a contract is entered upon and two rings are presented. A gold ring is given by the priest to the bridegroom and a silver one to the bride, but these are subsequently exchanged between the parties. The second ceremony is that of the nuptials proper and it is generally called the crowning. The service is one of considerable length in which the parties again solemnly express their consent to the union and towards the close of which a crown is placed by the priest on the head of each. The bridegroom and bride afterwards partake of a cup of wine previously blessed and exchange a kiss. Marriages in the Greek Church take place after the celebration of the Liturgy, and, as in the West, the season of Lent is a forbidden time. It may be noticed that some rituals of the Western Church retain more positive traces of the ancient ceremony of the crowning than is preserved in the wreath usually worn by the bride. Thus in a Latin ritual printed for Poland and Lithuania in 1691 it is directed that two rings be used, but if these are not forthcoming, then the priest is to bless two wreaths (*serta*) and present them to the married pair.

Duschesne, *Christian Worship* (tr., 3rd edition, London, 1910) 428–434; Freisen, *Geschichte des canonischen Eherechts* (Tübingen, 1888); Freisen, in *Archiv. f. Kath. Kirchenrecht* (Mainz, vol. LIII, 1885); Freisen, *Manuale Lincopense* (Paderborn, 1906); Gautier, *La Chevalerie* (Paris, 1891), 341–450; Maskell, *Monumenta Ritualia* (Oxford, 1882), vol. I; Hazeltine, *Zur Geschichte der Eheschliessung nach angelsächsischen Recht* (Berlin, 1905); Howard, *A History of Matrimonial Institutions*, I (Chicago, 1904), 291–363; Critchlow, *Forms of Betrothal*, &c. (Baltimore, 1903); Watkins, *Holy Matrimony* (London, 1895); Martène, *De Antiquis Ecclesiæ Ritibus*, II (Venice, 1788); Dieckhoff, *Die Kirchliche Trauung* (Rostock, 1878); Henderson, *The York Manuale*, publ. by Surtees Society (Durham, 1875); Lingard, *Anglo-Saxon Church*, II, cap i; Roeder, *Die Schoss oder Kniesetzung* (Göttingen, 1907); Sohm, *Trauung und Verlobung* (1876); Friedberg, *Das Recht der Eheschliessung* (Leipzig, 1865); Sohm, *Das Recht der Eheschliessung* (Weimar, 1875); Bingham, *Christian Marriage* (New York, 1900).

Herbert Thurston.

Marriage, Sacrament of.—That Christian marriage (i. e. marriage between baptized persons) is really a sacrament of the New Law in the strict sense of the word is for all Catholics an indubitable truth. According to the Council of Trent this dogma has always been taught by the Church, and is thus defined in canon i, Sess. XXIV: "If any one shall say that matrimony is not truly and properly one of the Seven Sacraments of the Evangelical Law, instituted by Christ our Lord, but was invented in the Church by men, and does not confer grace, let him be anathema." The occasion of this solemn declaration was the denial by the so-called Reformers of the sacramental character of marriage. Calvin in his "Institutions", IV, xix, 34, says: "Lastly, there is matrimony, which all admit was instituted by God, though no one before the time of Gregory regarded it as a sacrament. What man in his sober senses could so regard it? God's ordinance is good and holy; so also are agriculture, architecture, shoemaking, hair-cutting legitimate ordinances of God, but they are not sacraments". And Luther speaks in terms equally vigorous. In his German work, published at Wittenberg in 1530 under the title "Von den Ehesachen", he writes (p. 1): "No one indeed can deny that marriage is an external worldly thing, like clothes and food, house and home, subject to worldly authority, as shown by so many imperial laws governing it." In an earlier work (the original edition of "De captivitate Babylonica") he writes: "Not only is the sacramental character of matrimony without foundation in Scripture; but the very traditions, which claim such sacredness for it, are a mere jest"; and two pages further on: "Marriage may therefore be a figure of Christ and the Church; it is, however, no Divinely instituted sacrament, but the invention of men in the Church, arising from ignorance of the subject." The Fathers of the Council of Trent evidently had the latter passage in mind.

But the decision of Trent was not the first given by the Church. The Council of Florence, in the Decree for the Armenians, had already declared: "The seventh sacrament is matrimony, which is a figure of the union of Christ and the Church, according to the words of the Apostle: 'This is a great sacrament, but I speak in Christ and in the Church.'" And Innocent IV, in the profession of faith prescribed for the Waldensians (18 December, 1208), includes matrimony among the sacraments (Denziger-Bannwart, "Enchiridion", n. 424). The acceptance of the sacraments administered in the Church had been prescribed in general in the following words: "And we by no means reject the sacraments which are administered in it (the Roman Catholic Church), with the co-operation of the inestimable and invisible power of the Holy Ghost, even though they be administered by a sinful priest, provided the Church recognizes him", the formula then takes up each sacrament in particular, touching especially on those points which the Waldensians had denied: "Therefore we approve of baptism of children . . . confirmation administered by the bishop . . . the sacrifice of the Eucharist. . . . We believe that pardon is granted by God to penitent sinners . . . we hold in honour the anointing of the sick with consecrated oil . . . we do not deny that carnal marriages are to be contracted, according to the words of the Apostle." It is, therefore, historically certain that from the beginning of the thirteenth century the sacramental character of marriage was universally known and recognized as a dogma. Even the few theologians who minimized, or who seemed to minimize, the sacramental character of marriage, set down in the foremost place the proposition that marriage is a sacrament of the New Law in the strict sense of the word, and then sought to conform their further theses on the effect and nature of marriage to this fundamental truth, as will be evident from the quotations given below.

The reason why marriage was not expressly and formally included among the sacraments earlier and the denial of it branded as heresy, is to be found in the historical development of the doctrine regarding the sacraments; but the fact itself may be traced to Apostolic times. With regard to the several religious rites designated as "Sacraments of the New Law", there was always in the Church a profound conviction that they conferred interior Divine grace. But the grouping of them into one and the same category was left for a later period, when the dogmas of faith in general began

to be scientifically examined and systematically arranged. Furthermore, that the seven sacraments should be grouped in one category was by no means self-evident. For, though it was accepted that each of these rites conferred interior grace, yet, in contrast to their common invisible effect, the difference in external ceremony and even in the immediate purpose of the production of grace was so great that, for a long time, it hindered a uniform classification. Thus, there is a radical difference between the external form under which baptism, confirmation, and orders, on the one hand are administered, and, on the other hand, those that characterize penance and marriage. For while marriage is in the nature of a contract, and penance in the nature of a judicial process, the three first-mentioned take the form of a religious consecration of the recipients.

I. Proof of Sacramental Character of Christian Marriage.—In the proof of Apostolicity of the doctrine that marriage is a sacrament of the New Law, it will suffice to show that the Church has in fact always taught concerning marriage what belongs to the essence of a sacrament. The name sacrament cannot be cited as satisfactory evidence, since it did not acquire until a late period the exclusively technical meaning it has to-day; both in pre-Christian times and in the first centuries of the Christian Era it had a much broader and more indefinite signification. In this sense is to be understood the statement of Leo XIII in his Encyclical "Arcanum" (10 February, 1880): "To the teaching of the Apostles, indeed, are to be referrred the doctrines which our holy fathers, the councils, and the tradition of the Universal Church have always taught, namely that Christ Our Lord raised marriage to the dignity of a sacrament." The pope rightly emphasizes the importance of the tradition of the Universal Church. Without this it would be very difficult to get from the Scriptures and the Fathers clear and decisive proof for all, even the unlearned, that marriage is a sacrament in the strict sense of the word. The process of demonstration would be too long and would require a knowledge of theology which the ordinary faithful do not possess. In themselves, however, the direct testimonies of the Scriptures and of several of the Fathers are of sufficient weight to constitute a real proof, despite the denial of a few theologians past and present.

The classical Scriptural text is the declaration of the Apostle Paul (Eph., v, 22 sqq.), who emphatically declares that the relation between husband and wife should be as the relation between Christ and His Church: "Let women be subject to their husbands, as to the Lord: because the husband is the head of the wife, as Christ is the head of the Church. He is the saviour of his body. Therefore as the Church is subject to Christ, so also let the wives be to their husbands in all things. Husbands, love your wives, as Christ also loved the Church, and delivered Himself up for it: that He might sanctify it, cleansing it by the laver of water in the word of life; that He might present it to Himself a glorious church not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing; but that it should be holy, and without blemish. So also ought men to love their wives as their own bodies. He that loveth his wife, loveth himself. For no man ever hated his own flesh; but nourisheth it and cherisheth it, as also Christ doth the Church: because we are members of His body, of His flesh, and of His bones." After this exhortation the Apostle alludes to the Divine institution of marriage in the prophetical words proclaimed by God through Adam: "For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother and shall cleave to his wife, and they shall be two in one flesh." He then concludes with the significant words in which he characterizes Christian marriage: "This is a great sacrament; but I speak in Christ and in the Church."

It would be rash, of course, to infer immediately from the expression, "This is a great sacrament", that marriage is a sacrament of the New Law in the strict sense, for the meaning of the word sacrament, as already remarked, is too indefinite. But considering the expression in its relation to the preceding words, we are led to the conclusion that it is to be taken in the strict sense of a sacrament of the New Law. The love of Christian spouses for each other should be modelled on the love between Christ and the Church, because Christian marriage, as a copy and token of the union of Christ with the Church, is a great mystery or sacrament. It would not be a solemn, mysterious symbol of the union of Christ with the Church, which takes concrete form in the individual members of the Church, unless it efficaciously represented this union, i. e. not merely by signifying the supernatural life-union of Christ with the Church, but also by causing that union to be realized in the individual members; or, in other words, by conferring the supernatural life of grace. The first marriage between Adam and Eve in Paradise was a symbol of this union; in fact, merely as a symbol, it surpassed individual Christian marriages, inasmuch as it was an antecedent type, whereas individual Christian marriages are subsequent representations. There would be no reason, therefore, why the Apostle should refer with such emphasis to Christian marriage as *so great* a sacrament, if the greatness of Christian marriage did not lie in the fact, that it is not a mere sign, but an efficacious sign of the life of grace. In fact, it would be entirely out of keeping with the economy of the New Testament if we possessed a sign of grace and salvation instituted by God which was only an empty sign, and not an efficacious one. Elsewhere (Gal., iv, 9), St. Paul emphasizes in a most significant fashion the difference between the Old and the New Testament, when he calls the religious rites of the former "weak and needy elements" which could not of themselves confer true sanctity, the effect of true justice and sanctity being reserved for the New Testament and its religious rites. If, therefore, he terms Christian marriage, as a religious act, a great sacrament, he means not to reduce it to the low plane of the Old Testament rites, to the plane of a "weak and needy element", but rather to show its importance as a sign of the life of grace, and, like the other sacraments, an efficacious sign. St. Paul, then, does not speak of marriage as a true sacrament in explicit and immediately apparent fashion, but only in such wise that the doctrine must be deduced from his words. Hence, the Council of Trent (Sess. XXIV), in the dogmatic chapter on marriage, says that the sacramental effect of grace in marriage is "intimated" by the Apostle in the Epistle to the Ephesians (*quod Paulus Apostolus innuit*).

For further confirmation of the doctrine that marriage under the New Law confers grace and is therefore included among the true sacraments, the Council of Trent refers to the Holy Fathers, the earlier councils, and the ever manifest tradition of the universal Church. The teaching of the Fathers and the constant tradition of the Church, as already remarked, set forth the dogma of Christian marriage as a sacrament, not in the scientific, theological terminology of later times, but only in substance. Substantially, the following elements belong to a sacrament of the New Law: (1) it must be a sacred religious rite instituted by Christ; (2) this rite must be a sign of interior sanctification; (3) it must confer this interior sanctification or Divine grace; (4) this effect of Divine grace must be produced, not only in conjunction with the respective religious act, but through it. Hence, whoever attributes these elements to Christian marriage, thereby declares it a true sacrament in the strict sense of the word.

Testimony to this effect is to be found from the earliest Christian times onward. The clearest is that of St. Augustine in his works "De bono conjugii" and

"De nuptiis et concupiscentia". In the former work (chap. xxiv in P. L., XL, 394), he says, "Among all people and all men the good that is secured by marriage consists in the offspring and in the chastity of married fidelity; but, in the case of God's people [the Christians], it consists moreover in the holiness of the sacrament, by reason of which it is forbidden, even after a separation has taken place, to marry another as long as the first partner lives . . . just as priests are ordained to draw together a Christian community, and even though no such community be formed, the Sacrament of Orders still abides in those ordained, or just as the Sacrament of the Lord, once it is conferred, abides even in one who is dismissed from his office on account of guilt, although in such a one it abides unto judgment." In the other work (I, x, in P. L., XLIV, 420), the holy Doctor says: "Undoubtedly it belongs to the essence of this sacrament that, when man and wife are once united by marriage, this bond remains indissoluble throughout their lives. As long as both live, there remains a something attached to the marriage, which neither mutual separation nor union with a third can remove; in such cases, indeed, it remains for the aggravation of the guilt of their crime, not for the strengthening of the union. Just as the soul of an apostate, which was once similarly wedded unto Christ and now separates itself from Him, does not, in spite of its loss of faith, lose the Sacrament of Faith, which it has received in the waters of regeneration." In these words, St. Augustine places marriage, which he names a sacrament, on the same level with Baptism and Holy Orders. Thus, as Baptism and Holy Orders are sacraments in the strict sense and are recognized as such by the Holy Doctor, he also considers the marriage of Christians a sacrament in the full and strict sense of the word.

Scarcely less clear is the testimony of St. Ambrose. In his letter to Siricius (Ep. xlii, 3, in P. L., XVI, 1124), he states: "We also do not deny that marriage was sanctified by Christ"; and to Vigilius he writes (Ep. xix, 7, in P. L., XVI, 984): "Since the contracting of marriage must be sanctified by the veiling and the blessing of the priest, how can there be any mention of a marriage, when unity of faith is wanting?" Of what kind this sanctification is, the saint tells us clearly in his work "De Abraham" (I, vii, in P. L., XIV, 443): "We know that God is the Head and Protector, who does not permit that another's marriage-bed be defiled; and further that one guilty of such a crime sins against God, whose command he contravenes and whose bond of grace he loosens. Therefore, since he has sinned against God, he now loses his participation in the heavenly sacrament." According to Ambrose, therefore, Christian marriage is a heavenly sacrament, which binds one with God by the bonds of grace until these bonds are sundered by subsequent sin—that is, it is a sacrament in the strict and complete sense of the word. The value of this testimony might be weakened only by supposing that Ambrose, in referring to the "participation in the heavenly sacrament" which he declares forfeited by adulterers, was really thinking of Holy Communion. But of the latter there is in the present instance not the slightest question; consequently, he must here mean the loss of all share in the grace of the Sacrament of Marriage. This production of grace through marriage, and therefore its character as a perfect sacrament, was emphasized also by Innocent I in his letter to Probus (Ep. ix, in P. L., XX, 602). He declares a second marriage during the lifetime of the first partner invalid, and adds: "Supported by the Catholic Faith, we declare that the true marriage is that which is originally founded on Divine grace."

As early as the second century we have the valuable testimony of Tertullian. While still a Catholic, he writes ("Ad Uxorem", II, vii, in P. L., I, 1299): "If therefore such a marriage is pleasing to God, wherefore should it not turn out happily, so that it will not be troubled by afflictions and needs and obstacles and contaminations, since it enjoys the protection of the Divine grace?" But if Divine grace and its protection are, as Tertullian asserts, given with marriage, we have therein the distinctive moment which constitutes a religious action (already known for other reasons as a sign of Divine grace) an efficacious sign of grace, that is, a true Sacrament of the New Dispensation. It is only on this hypothesis that we can rightly understand another passage from the same work of Tertullian (II, ix, in P. L., I, 1302): "How can we describe the happiness of those marriages which the Church ratifies, the sacrifice strengthens, the blessing seals, the angels publish, the Heavenly Father propitiously beholds?"

Weightier, if anything, than the testimony of the Fathers as to the sacramental character of Christian marriage is that of the liturgical books and sacramentaries of the different Churches, Eastern and Western, recording the liturgical prayers and rites handed down from the very earliest times. These, it is true, differ in many unimportant details, but their essential features must be traced back to Apostolic ordinances. In all these rituals and liturgical collections, marriage, contracted before the priest during the celebration of Mass, is accompanied by ceremonies and prayers similar to those used in connexion with the other sacraments; in fact several of these rituals expressly call marriage a sacrament, and, because it is a "sacrament of the living", require contrition for sin and the reception of the Sacrament of Penance before marriage is contracted (cf. Martène, "De antiquis ecclesiæ ritibus", I, ix). But the venerable age, in fact the apostolicity, of the ecclesiastical tradition concerning marriage is still more clearly revealed by the circumstance that the rituals or liturgical books of the Oriental Churches and sects, even of those that separated from the Catholic Church in the first centuries, treat the contracting of marriage as a sacrament, and surround it with significant and impressive ceremonies and prayers. The Nestorians, Monophysites, Copts, Jacobites etc., all agree in this point (cf. J. S. Assemani, "Bibliotheca orientalis", III, i, 356; ii, 319 sqq.; Schelstrate, "Acta oriental. eccl.", I, 150 sqq.; Denzinger, "Ritus orientalium", I, 150 sqq.; II, 364 sqq.). The numerous prayers which are used throughout the ceremony refer to a special grace which is to be granted to the newly-married persons, and occasional commentaries show that this grace was regarded as sacramental. Thus, the Nestorian patriarch, Timotheus II, in his work "De septem causis sacramentorum" mentioned in Assemani (III, i, 579), deals with marriage among the other sacraments, and enumerates several religious ceremonies without which marriage is invalid. Evidently, therefore, he includes marriage among the sacraments, and considers the grace resulting from it a sacramental grace.

The doctrine that marriage is a sacrament of the New Law has never been a matter of dispute between the Roman Catholic and any of the Oriental Churches separated from it—a convincing proof that this doctrine has always been part of ecclesiastical tradition and is derived from the Apostles. The correspondence (1576–81) between the Tübingen professors, defenders of Protestantism, and the Greek patriarch, Jeremias, is well known. It terminated in the latter's indignantly scouting the suggestion that he could be won over to the doctrine of only two sacraments, and in his solemn recognition of the doctrine of seven sacraments, including marriage, as the constant teaching of the Oriental Church. More than half a century later the Patriarch Cyril Lucar, who had adopted the Calvinistic doctrine of only two sacraments, was for that reason publicly declared a heretic by the Synods of Constantinople in 1638 and 1642 and that of Jerusalem in 1672—so firmly has the doctrine of seven sacraments and of marriage as a sacrament been main-

tained by the Greek and by Oriental theologians in general.

Doubts as to the thoroughly sacramental character of marriage arose in a very few isolated cases, when the attempt was made to formulate, according to speculative science, the definition of the sacraments and to determine exactly their effects. Only one prominent theologian can be named who denied that marriage confers sanctifying grace, and consequently that it is a sacrament of the New Law in the strict sense of the word—Durandus of St. Pourçain, afterwards Bishop of Meaux. Even he admitted that marriage in some way produces grace, and therefore that it should be called a sacrament; but it was only the actual help of grace in subduing passion, which he deduced from marriage as an effect, not *ex opere operato*, but *ex opere operantis* (cf. Perrone, "De matrimonio christiano", I, i, 1, 2). As authorities he could cite only a few jurists. Theologians with the greatest unanimity rejected this doctrine as new and opposed to the teaching of the Church, so that the celebrated theologian of the Council of Trent, Dominicus Soto, said of Durandus, that it was only with difficulty he had escaped the danger of being branded as a heretic. Many of the leading scholastics spoke indeed of marriage as a remedy against sensuality—e. g. Peter Lombard (whose fourth book of sentences was commentated by Durandus), and his most distinguished commentators St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Bonaventure, Petrus de Palude. But the conferring of sanctifying grace *ex opere operato* is not thereby excluded; on the contrary, it must be regarded as the foundation of that actual grace, and as the root from which springs the right to receive the Divine assistance as occasion requires. That this is the teaching of those great theologians is evident partly from their explicit declarations concerning the sacrament of marriage, and partly from what they defined as the essential element of the Sacraments of the New Law in general. It is sufficient here to give the references: St. Thomas, "In IV Sent.", dist. II, i, 4; II, ii, 1; XXVI, ii, 3; St. Bonaventure, "In IV Sent.", dist. II, iii; XXVI, ii.

The real reason why some jurists hesitated to call marriage a grace-giving sacrament was a religious one. It was certain that a sacrament and its grace could not be purchased. Yet such a transaction took place in marriage, as a dowry was ordinarily paid to the man. But this objection is baseless. For, although Christ has raised marriage or the marriage contract to the dignity of a sacrament (as will be shown below), yet marriage, even among Christians, has not thereby lost its natural significance. The dowry, the use of which devolves on the man, is given as a contribution towards bearing the natural burdens of marriage, i. e., the support of the family, and the education of the offspring, not as the price of the sacrament.

For a better understanding of the sacramental character of Christian as opposed to non-Christian marriage, we may briefly state the relations of the one to the other, especially as it cannot be denied that every marriage from the beginning has had, and has, the character of something holy and religious, and may therefore be designated as a sacrament in the broader sense of the word. In this connexion we cannot pass over the instructive encyclical of Leo XIII mentioned above. He says: "Marriage has God for its Author, and was from the very beginning a kind of foreshadowing of the Incarnation of the Divine Word; consequently, there abides in it a something holy and religious; not extraneous but innate; not derived from man, but implanted by nature. It was not, therefore, without good reason that our predecessors, Innocent III and Honorius III, affirmed that a 'certain sacrament of marriage' existed ever among the believers and unbelievers. We call to witness the monuments of antiquity, as also the manners and customs of those peoples who, being the most civilized, had a finer sense of equity and right. In the minds of all of them it was a deeply rooted conviction that marriage was to be regarded as something sacred. Hence, among these, marriages were commonly celebrated with religious ceremonies, under the authority of pontiffs, and with the ministry of priests—so great, even in the souls ignorant of heavenly doctrine, was the impression produced by the nature of marriage, by reflection on the history of mankind, and by the consciousness of the human race."

The term "sacrament", applied by the pope to all marriages, even those of infidels, is to be taken in its widest sense, and signifies nothing but a certain holiness inherent in marriage. Even among the Israelites marriage never had the importance of an Old Testament sacrament in the strict sense, since even such a sacrament produced a certain holiness (not indeed the interior holiness which is effected by the New Testament sacraments, but only an external legal purity), and even this was not connected with the marriage contract among the Jews. The sanctity of marriage in general is of another kind. The original marriage, and consequently marriage as it was conceived in the original plan of God before sin, was to be the means not merely of the natural propagation of the human race, but also the means by which personal supernatural sanctity should be transmitted to the individual descendants of our first parents. It was, therefore, a great mystery, intended not for the personal sanctification of those united by the marriage tie, but for the sanctification of others, i. e. of their offspring. But this Divinely ordered sanctity of marriage was destroyed by original sin. The effectual sanctification of the human race, or rather of individual men, had now to be accomplished in the way of redemption through the Promised Redeemer, the Son of God made Man. In place of its former sanctity, marriage retained only the significance of a type feebly representing the sanctity that was thenceforth to be acquired; it foreshadowed the Incarnation of the Son of God, and the close union which God was thereby to form with the human race. It was reserved for Christian marriage to symbolize this higher supernatural union with mankind, that is, with those who unite themselves to Christ in faith and love, and to be an efficacious sign of this union.

III. Minister of the Sacrament; Matter and Form.—Although the Church realized from the first the complete sacramentality of Christian marriage, yet for a time there was some uncertainty as to what in the marriage contract is the real essence of the sacrament; as to its matter and form, and its minister. From the earliest times this fundamental proposition has been upheld: *Matrimonium facit consensus*, i. e. Marriage is contracted through the mutual, expressed consent. Therein is contained implicitly the doctrine that the persons contracting marriage are themselves the agents or ministers of the sacrament. However, it has been likewise emphasized that marriage must be contracted with the blessing of the priest and the approbation of the Church, for otherwise it would be a source not of Divine grace, but of malediction. Hence it might easily be inferred that the sacerdotal blessing is the grace-giving element, or form of the sacrament, and that the priest is the minister. But this is a false conclusion. The first theologian to designate clearly and distinctly the priest as the minister of the Sacrament and his blessing as the sacramental form was apparently Melchior Canus (d. 1560). In his well-known work, "De locis theologicis", VIII, v, he sets forth the following propositions: (1) It is, indeed, a common opinion of the schools, but not their certain and settled doctrine, that a marriage contracted without a priest is a true and real sacrament; (2) the controversies on this point do not affect matters of faith and religion; (3) it would be erroneous to state that all theologians of the Catholic school defended that

opinion. In the course of the same chapter Canus defends, as a vital matter, the opinion that without the priest and his blessing a valid marriage may take place, but a sacramental form and valid sacrament are lacking. For this opinion he appeals to Petrus de Palude (In IV Sent., dist. V, ii) and also to St. Thomas ("In IV Sent.", dist. I, i, 3: "Summa contra gentiles", IV, lxxviii), as well as to a number of Fathers and popes of the earliest centuries, who compared a marriage contracted without sacerdotal blessing to an adulterous marriage, and therefore could not have recognized a sacrament therein.

The appeal, however, to the above authorities is unfortunate. St. Thomas Aquinas, in the first article cited by Canus, entitled "Utrum consistant sacramenta in verbis et rebus", raises the following difficulty: "Penance and marriage belong to the sacraments: but for their validity, words are unnecessary; therefore it is not true that words belong to all the sacraments." This difficulty he answers at the end of the article: "Marriage taken as a natural function and penance as an act of virtue have no form of words: but in so far as both belong to the sacraments, which are to be conferred by the ministers of the Church, words are employed in both; in marriage the words which express mutual consent, and also the blessings which were instituted by the Church, and in penance the words of absolution spoken by the priest." Although St. Thomas mentions the words of blessing along with the words of mutual consent, he expressly calls them an institution of the Church, and hence they do not constitute the essence of the sacrament instituted by Christ. Again, though he seems to understand that marriage, also, must be administered by the ministers of the Church, it cannot be denied that the contracting parties in Christian marriage must be guided by ecclesiastical regulations, and cannot act otherwise than as ministers subject to the Church or dispensers of the sacrament. If, however, St. Thomas in this passage attributes to the sacerdotal blessing too great an influence on the essence of the sacrament of marriage, he manifestly corrects himself in his later work, "Summa contra gentiles", in which he undoubtedly places the whole essence of the sacrament in the mutual consent of the contracting parties: "Marriage, therefore, inasmuch as it consists in the union of man and woman, who propose to beget and rear children for the glory of God, is a sacrament of the Church; therefore the contracting parties are blessed by the ministers of the Church. And as in the other sacraments something spiritual is signified by an external ceremony, so here in this sacrament the union of Christ and the Church is typified by the union of man and woman according to the Apostle: 'This is a great sacrament, but I speak in Christ and in the Church.' And as the sacraments effect what they signify, it is clear that the persons contracting marriage receive through this sacrament the grace by which they participate in the union of Christ and the Church." Hence the whole essence and grace-producing power of marriage consists, according to St. Thomas, in the union of man and woman (in presence of the priest), not in the additional blessing of the priest prescribed by the Church.

The same seems to be true of the passage from Petrus de Palude cited by Canus. As his work, "Commentarium in IV Librum Sententiarum" is not so readily accessible, we may state precisely the edition used here: It bears as a final note the comment: Explicit scriptum in quartum sententiarum Clarissimi et Acutissimi doctoris Petri de Palude patriarchæ Hierosolymitani, ordinis fratrum prædicatorum perquam diligentissime Impressum Venetiis per Bonettum Locatellum Bergomensem mandato Nobilis viri Octaviani Scoti Civis Modœtiensis Anno a natali partu Intemerate Virginis nonagesimotertio cum Quadringentesimo supra millesimum XII Kalendas Octobris." Here it says expressly in dist. V., Q. xi (fol. 124, col. 1): "It seems that one who contracts marriage in the state of sin does not sin although the essence of marriage consists in the mutual consent, which the parties mutually express; this consent confers the sacrament and not the priest by his blessing; he only confers a sacramental." Further on, in dist. XXVI, Q. iv (fol. 141, col. 4), he says: "Marriage is such that its efficacy is not based on the minister of the Church (the priest). Its essence, therefore, can exist without the priest, not because it is a necessary sacrament —though it is indeed necessary for human society, just as baptism is necessary for the individual—but because its efficacy does not come from the minister of the Church. Perhaps, however, it is not lawful to contract marriage except in the presence of the Church and before the priest, if this is possible." These passages are clear. It is hard to see why Melchior Canus tried to support his opinion by the opening words of the first quotation. He supposes that from the words "it seems that one who contracts marriage in the state of sin does not sin" the conclusion is to be drawn that de Palude means in this case a marriage which is not a sacrament; for to administer or receive a sacrament in a state of sin is a grave sin, a sacrilege. But on the other hand, it is to be noted that de Palude in unmistakable terms declares the mutual consent to be the conferring of the sacrament. The words, "it seems", merely introduce a difficulty: whether this expresses his own view, he does not make clear, in so far as the contracting of marriage means the reception of a sacrament; in so far as it is the administration of a sacrament, he regards it as probable that the administering of a sacrament in sin is an additional sin only in the case of ministers ordained for the administration of the sacraments, but the contracting parties in marriage are not such ministers.

The opinion of Canus finds but little support in the expressions of the Fathers or in papal letters, which state that marriage without the priest is declared unholy, wicked, or sacrilegious, that it does not bring the grace of God but provokes His wrath. This is nothing more than what the Council of Trent says in the chapter "Tametsi" (XXIV, i, de ref. Matr.), namely, that "the Holy Church of God has always detested and forbidden clandestine marriages". Such statements do not deny the sacramental character of marriage so contracted; but they do condemn as sacrilegious that reception of the sacrament which indeed lays open the source of grace, yet places an obstacle in the way of the sacrament's efficacy.

For a long time, nevertheless, the opinion of Canus had its defenders among the post-Tridentine theologians. Even Prosper Lambertini, as Benedict XIV, did not set aside his pronouncement, given in his work "De synodo diœcesana", VIII, xiii, that Canus's view was "valde probabilis", although in his capacity as pope he taught the opposite clearly and distinctly in his letter to the Archbishop of Goa. To-day it must be rejected by all Catholic theologians and branded at least as false. The inferences not contemplated by the originators of this opinion, but deduced later and used in practice against the rights of the Church, constrained succeeding popes repeatedly to condemn it formally. Subservient Catholics and court theologians especially found it useful as warranting the secular power in making laws concerning validity and invalidity, diriment impediments, and the like. For, if the sacrament consisted in the priestly blessing and the contract, as was never doubted, in the mutual consent of the parties, evidently then contract and sacrament must be separated; the former had to precede as a foundation; upon it, as matter, was founded the sacrament, which took place through the blessing of the priest. But contracts, which affect social and civil life, are subject to state authority, so that this can make such regulations and restrictions even as to their

validity, as it deems necessary for the public weal. This practical conclusion was drawn especially by Marcus Antonius de Dominis, Bishop of Spoleto, afterwards an apostate, in his work "De republica ecclesiastica" (V, xi, 22), and by Launoy in his work "Regia in matrimonio potestas" (I, ix sqq.). In the middle of the last century Nepomuk Nuytz, professor at the University of Turin, defended this opinion with renewed vigour in order to supply a juridical basis for civil legislation regarding marriage. Nuytz's work was thereupon expressly condemned by Pius IX in the Apostolical Letter of 22 Aug., 1851, in which the pope declared as false especially the following propositions: The sacrament of marriage is only something which is added to the contract of marriage and which can be separated from it; the sacrament consists only in the blessing of the marriage. These propositions are included in the "Syllabus" of 8 December, 1864, and must be rejected by all Catholics. In like manner Leo XIII expresses himself in the Encyclical "Arcanum" quoted above. He says: "It is certain that in Christian marriage the contract is inseparable from the sacrament; and that, for this reason, the contract cannot be true and legitimate without being a sacrament as well. For Christ our Lord added to marriage the dignity of a sacrament; but marriage is the contract itself, whenever that contract is lawfully made. . . . Hence it is clear that among Christians every true marriage is, in itself and by itself, a sacrament; and that nothing can be farther from the truth than to say that the sacrament is a certain added ornament, or external adjunct, which can be separated and torn away from the contract at the caprice of man."

As it is certain, therefore, from the point of view of the Church that marriage as a sacrament is fulfilled only through the mutual consent of the contracting parties, it is a matter of secondary consideration, how and in what sense the matter and form of this sacrament are to be taken. The view that most correctly explains this is perhaps the one that is generally prevalent to-day; in every contract two elements are to be distinguished, the offering of a right and the acceptance of it; the former is the foundation, the latter is the juridical completion. The same holds true of the sacramental contract of marriage; in so far, therefore, as an offering of the marriage right is contained in the mutual declaration of consent, we have the matter of the sacraments, and, in so far as a mutual acceptance is contained therein, we have the form.

To complete our inquiry concerning the essence of the Sacrament of Marriage, its matter and form, and its minister, we have still to mention a theory that was defended by a few jurists of the Middle Ages and has been revived by Dr. Jos. Freisen ("Geschichte des canonischen Eherechts", Tübingen, 1888). According to this marriage in the strict sense, and therefore marriage as a sacrament, is not accomplished until consummation of the marriage is added to the consent. It is the consummation, therefore, that constitutes the matter or the form. But as Freisen retracted this opinion which could not be harmonized with the Church's definitions, it is no longer of actual interest. This view was derived from the fact that marriage, according to Christ's command, is absolutely indissoluble. On the other hand, it is undeniably the teaching and practice of the Church that, in spite of mutual consent, marriage can be dissolved by religious profession or by the declaration of the pope; hence the conclusion seemed to be that there was no real marriage previous to the consummation, since admittedly neither religious profession nor papal declaration can afterwards effect a dissolution. The error lies in taking indissolubility in a sense that the Church has never held. In one case, it is true, according to earlier ecclesiastical law, the previous relation of mere espousal between man and woman became a lawful marriage (and therefore the Sacrament of Marriage), namely when a valid betrothal was followed by consummation. It was a legal presumption that in this case the betrothed parties wished to lessen the sinfulness of their action as much as possible, and therefore performed it with the intention of marriage and not of fornication. The efficient cause of the marriage contract, as well as of the sacrament, was even in this case the mutual intention of marriage, although expression was not given to it in the regular way. This legal presumption ceased on 5 Feb., 1892, by Decree of Leo XIII, as it had grown obsolete among the faithful and was no longer adapted to actual conditions.

IV. Difference Between the Sacrament of Marriage and the other Sacraments.—From all that has been said, it is clear that while marriage, inasmuch as it is an outward sign of grace and also produces interior grace, has the nature common to all the sacraments, still, viewed as an external sign, it is unique and very different from the other sacraments. The external sign is a contract; hence marriage, even as an effective sign or sacrament, has precisely the nature and quality of a contract, its validity depending on the rules for the validity of contracts. And, as we can distinguish between a contract in its origin and a contract in its continuance, so we can distinguish between the sacrament of marriage *in fieri* and *in facto esse*. The sacrament *in fieri* is the above-mentioned mutual declaration of consent; the sacrament *in facto esse* is the Divine bond which unites the married persons for life. In most of the other sacraments also there is this distinction between sacrament *in fieri* and *in facto esse;* but the continuance of the other sacraments is based mostly on the inamissible character which they impress upon the soul of the recipient. Not so with marriage; in the soul of the recipient there is a question of no new physical being or mode of being, but of a legal relationship which can as a rule be broken only by death, although in individual cases it may otherwise be rendered void, provided the marriage has not been consummated. In this respect, therefore, marriage, especially as a sacrament, differs from other contracts, since it is not subject to the free will of the individuals. Of course, the choice of a partner and especially the contracting or non-contracting of marriage are subject to the free will of the individuals; but any revocation or essential altering of the terms is beyond the power of the contracting parties; the essence of the contractual sacrament is Divinely regulated.

Of still greater importance is the contract aspect of the sacrament *in fieri*. In the other sacraments, the conditional administration is admissible only within narrow limits. There can only be questions of conditions of the present or past, which, according as they are verified or not verified in fact, there and then admit or prevent the valid administration of the sacrament. But generally even these conditions have no influence on the validity; they are made for the sake of greater reverence, so as to avoid even the appearance of regarding the sacramental procedure as useless. The Sacrament of Marriage, on the contrary, follows the nature of a contract in all these matters. It admits conditions not only of the past and present, but also future conditions which delay the production of the sacrament until the conditions are fulfilled. At the moment these are fulfilled the sacrament and its conferring of grace take place in virtue of the mutual consent previously expressed and still continuing. Only diriment conditions are opposed to the essence of the Sacrament of Marriage, because it consists in an indissoluble contract. Any such conditions, as well as all others that are opposed to the intrinsic nature of marriage, have as a result the invalidity of both the contract and the sacrament.

A further quality of the Sacrament of Marriage, not possessed by the other sacraments, is that it can be effected without the personal presence of the mutual

ministers and recipients. A consensual agreement can be made in writing as well as orally, and by proxy as well as in person. Hence these methods are not opposed to the validity of the sacrament. Of course, according to ecclesiastical law, the form prescribed for validity is, as a rule, the personal, mutual declaration of consent before witnesses; but that is a requirement added to the nature of marriage and to Divine law, which the Church can therefore set aside and from which she can dispense in individual cases. Even the contracting of marriage through authorized representatives is not absolutely excluded. In such a case, however, this representative could not be called the minister, much less the recipient of the sacrament, but merely the agent or intermediary. The declaration of consent made by him is valid only in so far as it represents and contains the consent of his principal; it is the latter which effects the contract and sacrament, hence the principal is the minister of the sacrament. It is the principal, and not the agent, who receives the consent of and marries the other party, and who therefore also receives the sacrament. It does not matter whether the principal, at the exact moment when the consent is expressed by his agent, has the use of reason, or consciousness, or is deprived of it (e. g. by sleep); as soon as the mutual consent is given, the sacrament comes into being with the contract, and the conferring of grace takes place at the same time, provided no obstacle is placed in the way of this effect. The actual use of reason is no more required for it than in the baptism of an infant or in extreme unction administered to an unconscious person. It may even happen in the case of marriage that the consent, which was given many years ago, only now takes effect. This occurs in the case of the so-called *sanatio in radice*. Through this an ecclesiastical impediment, hitherto invalidating the marriage, is removed by ecclesiastical authority, and the mutual consent previously given without knowledge of the impediment is accepted as legitimate, provided it is certain that this consent has habitually continued according to its original intent. At the moment of the ecclesiastical dispensation the original consent becomes the effective cause of the sacrament and the hitherto presumptive, but now real, spouses receive the sacramental effect in the increase of sanctifying grace, provided they place no obstacle in the way.

V. The Extent of Sacramental Marriage.—As we have several times emphasized, not even marriage is a true sacrament, but only marriages between Christians. One becomes and remains a Christian in the sense recognized here through valid baptism. Hence only one who has been validly baptized can contract a marriage which is a sacrament; but every one can contract it who has been validly baptized, whether he has remained true to the Christian faith, or become a heretic, or even an infidel. Such has always been the teaching and practice of the Church. Through baptism one "becomes a member of Christ and is incorporated in the body of the Church", as declared in the Florentine Decree for the Armenians; so far as law is concerned, he remains irrevocably subject to the Church, and is therefore, in legal questions, always to be considered a Christian. Hence it is a general principle that all baptized persons are subject to universal ecclesiastical laws, especially marriage laws, unless the Church makes an exception for individual cases or classes. Hence not only the marriage between Catholics, but also that contracted by members of the different sects which have retained baptism and validly baptize, is undoubtedly a sacrament. It matters not whether the non-Catholic considers marriage a sacrament or not, or whether he intends to effect a sacrament or not. Provided only he intends to contract a true marriage, and expresses the requisite consent, this intention and this expression are sufficient to constitute a sacrament. But if he is absolutely determined not to effect a sacrament, then, of course, the production of a sacrament would be excluded, but the marriage contract also would be null and void. By Divine ordinance it is essential to Christian marriage that it should be a sacrament; it is not in the power of the contracting parties to eliminate anything from its nature, and a person who has the intention of doing this invalidates the whole ceremony. It is certain, therefore, that marriage contracted between baptized persons is a sacrament, even the so-called mixed marriage between a Catholic and a non-Catholic, provided the non-Catholic has been validly baptized. It is equally certain that marriage between unbaptized persons is not a sacrament in the strict sense of the word.

There is, however, great uncertainty as to how those marriages are to be regarded which exist legitimately and validly between a baptized and an unbaptized person. Such marriages may occur in two ways. In the first place, a marriage may have been contracted between unbelievers, one of whom afterwards becomes a Christian, while the other remains an unbeliever. (Here believer and unbeliever are taken in the sense of baptized and unbaptized.) The marriage contracted validly while both were unbelievers continues to exist, and though under certain circumstances it is dissoluble, it is not rendered void simply because of the baptism of one of the parties, for, as Innocent III says (in IV, xix, 8), "through the sacrament of baptism marriage is not dissolved, but sins are forgiven", and St. Paul expressly states (I Cor., vii, 12 sq.): "If any brother hath a wife that believeth not, and she consent to dwell with him, let him not put her away. And if any woman hath a husband that believeth not, and he consent to dwell with her, let her not put away her husband." There is question here, therefore, of a marriage which subsequently has developed into a marriage between baptized and unbaptized. Secondly, there may be question of a marriage, which from the beginning was a mixed marriage, i. e. which was contracted between a believer and an unbeliever. By ecclesiastical law, such a marriage cannot take place without a dispensation from the Church, which has made disparity of worship between baptized and unbaptized a diriment impediment. In regard to both kinds of mixed marriage it may be asked whether they have the character of a sacrament, and whether they have the effect of imparting grace at least to the baptized party. As to the unbaptized party, there can clearly be no question of sacrament or sacramental grace, for baptism is the door to the other sacraments, none of which can be validly received before it.

The opinions of theologians on this point vary considerably. Some maintain that in both kinds of mixed marriages the baptized party receives the grace of the sacrament; others deny this in the case of a marriage contract contracted by unbelievers which subsequently becomes a mixed marriage, and affirm it in the case of a marriage contracted by a believer with an unbeliever in virtue of a dispensation from the Church; a third class again deny that there is a sacrament or sacramental grace in either case. The first view was held as probable by Palmieri (De matrimonio christiano, cap. ii, thes. ii, Append. q. 3), Rosset (De sacramento matrimonii, I, 350), and others; the second by the older authors, Soto, Tournely, Collet, and, among recent authors, especially by Perrone (De matrimonio christiano, I, 306–311); Sasse and Christian Pesch declare at least in favour of the sacramental character of a marriage contracted with ecclesiastical dispensation between a baptized and an unbaptized person, but express no opinion on the other case. The third opinion is upheld by Vasquez and Thomas Sanchez, and is at the present time vigorously defended by Billot (De sacramentis: II, De matrimonio, thesis xxxviii, sec. 3) and Wernz (Jus Decretalium, IV, v, 44).

No side brings convincing proof. Perhaps the weak-

est grounds are adduced for the opinion which, in regard to marriage contracted by unbelievers, claims sacramentality and the sacramental grace after baptism for the party who, subsequently to the marriage, is baptized. These grounds are mostly negative; for example, there is no reason why an unbaptized person should not administer a sacrament, as is clearly done in the case in baptism; or why the sacramental effect should not take place in one party which cannot take place in the other, as in the case of a marriage between baptized persons where one party is in the state of grace and the other is not, so that the sacrament of marriage confers grace on the former, but not on the latter. Besides, it is not fitting that the baptized person should be altogether deprived of grace. As against this view, there seems to be a weighty reason in the fact that such a marriage contracted in infidelity is still dissoluble, even after years of continuation, either through the Pauline Privilege or through the plenary authority of the Holy See. And yet it has always been a principle with theologians that a *matrimonium ratum et consummatum* (i. e. a marriage that bears the sacramental character and is afterwards consummated) is by Divine Law absolutely indissoluble, so that not even the Holy See can on any grounds whatsoever dissolve it. Hence, it seems to follow that the marriage in question is not a sacrament.

This argument reversed, together with the reason of fitness mentioned above, tells in favour of the sacramentality of a marriage contracted with ecclesiastical dispensation between a baptized and an unbaptized person. Such a marriage, once it is consummated, is absolutely indissoluble, just as a consummated marriage between two baptized persons; under no circumstances may recourse be had to the Pauline Privilege, nor will any other dissolution be granted by Rome (for documents see Lehmkuhl, "Theol. mor.", II, 928). A further reason is that the Church claims jurisdiction over such mixed marriages, institutes diriment impediments to them, and grants dispensations. This authority regarding marriages Pius VI bases on their sacramentality; hence it seems that the marriage in question should be included among marriages that are sacraments. The words of Pius VI in his letter to the Bishop of Mutila are as follows: "If, therefore, these matters (he is speaking of marriage) belong exclusively to the ecclesiastical forum for no other reason than that the marriage contract is truly and properly one of the seven sacraments of the Law of the Gospel, then, since this sacramental character is inherent in all marriage-matters, they must all be subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the Church."

However, these arguments likewise fail to carry conviction. In the first place, many deny that the mixed marriages in question pertain exclusively to the jurisdiction of the Church, but claim a certain right for the State as well; only in case of conflict the Church has the preference; the exclusive right of the Church is confined to marriages between two baptized persons. The Church also possesses some authority, no doubt, over all marriages contracted in infidelity, as soon as one party receives baptism, but this does not prove the sacramentality, after the conversion of one party, of a marriage contracted by infidels. Furthermore, it is uncertain whether matters affecting the nature of Christian marriage are subject to ecclesiastical authority for the sole reason that Christian marriage was raised to the dignity of a sacrament, or for the more general reason that it is a holy and religious thing. In the document cited above Pius VI gives no decision on the point. In case the latter reason is of itself sufficient, then the conclusion is all the more secure if, as Pius VI says, "the raising to the dignity of a sacrament" is taken as a reason. In fact the elevation of marriage to a sacrament can well serve as a ground for ecclesiastical authority, even in regard to a marriage which is only an inchoate sacrament.

As positive proof against the sacramentality of the mixed marriages with which we are dealing, the advocates of the third opinion emphasize the nature of marriage as a contract. Marriage is an indivisible contract which cannot be one thing for one party and another thing for the other party. If it cannot be a sacrament for one, then it cannot be a sacrament for the other. The contract *in facto esse* is not really an entity that exists in the parties, but rather a relation between them, and indeed a relation of the same sort on both sides. Now, this cannot be a sacrament *in facto esse*, if in one of the parties the basis of the relation has no sacramental character. But, if the contract *in facto esse* be no sacrament, then the actual contracting of marriage cannot be a sacrament *in fieri*. Were the opposite opinion correct, the contract would be rather lame, i. e. firmer in the believing party than in the unbaptized, since the greater constancy of Christian marriage arises precisely from its character as a sacrament. But such an uneven condition seems opposed to the nature of marriage. Should it be urged on the contrary that as a result in extraordinary cases these mixed marriages might be dissolved just as in the case of those contracted by two unbaptized persons, this inference is to be rejected. Apart from the question whether the inner constancy does not of itself exclude such a dissolution, it is quite certain that, externally, the most complete indissolubility is secured for such mixed marriages, or, in other words, that the Church, which by its approval has made them possible, also makes them by its laws indissoluble. A dissolution in virtue of the Pauline Privilege is thus not certainly available, since it might be utilized *in odium fidei*, instead of *in favorem fidei*. In any case, as to the application of this privilege, the Church is the authoritative interpreter and judge. These arguments, though not perhaps decisive, may serve to recommend the third opinion as the most probable and best founded.

There still remains the one question, on which also Catholic theologians are still to some extent divided, as to whether and at what moment marriages legitimately contracted between the unbaptized become a sacrament on the subsequent baptism of the two parties. That they never become a sacrament was taught in his day by Vasquez, and also by the canonists Weistner and Schmalzgrüber. This view may to-day be regarded as abandoned, and cannot be reconciled with the official decisions since given by the Holy See. The discussion must, therefore, be confined to the question, whether through the baptism alone (i. e. at the moment when the baptism of the later baptized of the two partners is completed) the marriage becomes a sacrament, or whether for this purpose the renewal of their mutual consent is necessary. Bellarmine, Laymann, and other theologians defended the latter view; the former, which was already maintained by Sanchez, is to-day generally accepted, and is followed by Sape, Rosset, Billot, Pesch, Wernz etc. This opinion is based on the ecclesiastical teaching which declares that among the baptized there can be no true marriage which is not also a sacrament. Now, immediately after the baptism of both partners, the already contracted marriage, which is not dissolved by baptism, becomes a "marriage of the baptized"; for were it not immediately a "sacrament", the abovementioned general principle, which Pius IX and Leo XIII proclaimed as incontestable doctrine, would be untrue. Consequently we must say that, through the baptism itself, the existing marriage passes into a sacrament. A difficulty may arise only in the determination as to where in such a case the matter and form of the sacrament are to be sought, and what act of the minister completes the sacrament. This problem, it would seem, is most readily solved by falling back on the virtually continuing mutual consent of the parties, which has been already formally given. This

virtual wish to be and to remain partners in marriage, which is not annulled by the reception of baptism, is an entity in the parties in which may be found the ministration of the sacrament.

SANCHEZ, *Disputatio de s. matrimonii Sacramento*, especially II; PERRONE, *De matrimonio christiano* (Rome, 1858), I; ROSSET, *De Sacramento Matrimonii tractatus dogmat., mor., canon., liturg., judiciarius* (1895), especially I; PALMIERI, *De matrimonio christiano* (Rome, 1880); WERNZ, *Jus Decretalium*, IV; *Jus Matrimoniale Eccl. cath.* (Rome, 1904); FREISEN, *Gesch. des kanon. Eherechts bis zum Verfall der Glossenlitteratur* (Tübingen, 1888); GIHR, *Die hl. Sakramente den kath. Kirche für die Seelsorger dogmatisch dargestellt*, II (Freiburg, 1899), vii. Also works containing treatises on the sacraments in general, such as those by SCHANZ; SASSE; PESCH, *Præl. dogmat.*, VII; BILLOT, etc.

AUG. LEHMKUHL.

Marryat, FLORENCE, novelist and actress, b. 9 July, 1838, at Brighton, England; d. 27 October, 1899, in London, England. She was the sixth daughter and tenth child of Captain Frederick Marryat, R. N., the celebrated novelist, and his wife, Catherine, second daughter of Sir Stephen Shairp of Houston, Linlithgow, Scotland, and for many years consul-general in Russia. Florence Marryat's brother Frank, author of "Borneo and the Indian Archipelago" and "Mountains and Molehills, or Recollections of a Burnt Journal", died in 1855. In 1854, when she was not quite sixteen, she married T. Ross Church, afterwards colonel of the Madras Staff Corps, with whom she travelled over the greater part of India, and to whom she bore eight children. To distract her mind while nursing some of her children through scarlet fever, she turned to novel writing, her three first works, "Love's Conflict", "Too Good for Him", and "Woman against Woman", appearing at London in 1865. Thereafter she was an indefatigable and rapid literary worker, and during the thirty-four years that intervened between that date and her death, she produced some ninety novels, many of which were republished in America and Germany, and translated into French, German, Russian, Flemish, and Swedish. She was also a frequent contributor to newspapers and magazines, and edited "London Society", a monthly publication, from 1872 to 1876. In 1872 she published in two volumes, "The Life and Letters of Captain Marryat". She had many other forms of activity, being a playwright, and appearing at different times as an operatic singer, as an actress in high-class comedy, and as a lecturer, dramatic reader and public entertainer. She also conducted a school of journalism. In 1881 she acted in "Her World", a drama of her own composition, produced in London. She married as her second husband Colonel Francis Lean of the Royal Marine Light Infantry. For many years she was much attracted to the subject of Spiritualism, and dealt with it in certain of her works, such as "There Is No Death" (1891); "The Spirit World" (1894); and "A Soul on Fire". "Tom Tiddler's Ground" (1886), a book of travel, is a somewhat frivolous account of the United States of America. Her last book, "The Folly of Alison", appeared just before her death. Although she had been a convert to Catholicity for a considerable period, the letters "R. I. P." appended to her obituary notices were the first intimation that a large section of the public received of the fact.

ALLIBONE, *Dict., Suppl.*, II; *The London Times* (28 Oct., 1899); *The Athenæum* (4 Nov., 1899); *The Tablet* (4 Nov., 1899); *Men and Women of the Time* (1899); LEE in *Dict. Nat. Biog., Suppl.*, s. v.

P. J. LENNOX.

Marseilles (MASSILIA), DIOCESE OF (MASSILIENSIS), suffragan of Aix, comprises the district of Marseilles in the Department of Bouches-du-Rhône. Founded about 600 B. C. by a colony of Phœnicians and taken by Cæsar in 49 B. C., Marseilles was captured by the Visigoths in A. D. 480; later it belonged to the Burgundians, afterwards, from 507–537, to the Ostrogoth Theodoric and his successors. In 537 it was ceded to the Franks under Childebert and annexed to the Kingdom of Paris. Later the city was divided between Sigebert of Austrasia and Gontran of Burgundy. It had various masters until Boson became King of Burgundy-Provence (879). The Marseilles of the Middle Ages owed allegiance to three sovereignties. The episcopal town, for which the bishop swore fealty only to the emperor, included the harbour of La Joliette, the fisherman's district, and three citadels (Château Babon, Roquebarbe, and the bishop's palace). The lower town belonged to the viscounts and became a republic in 1214; and the abbatial town, dependent on the Abbey of St. Victor, comprised a few market towns and châteaux south of the harbour. In 1246 Marseilles was subjugated by Charles of Anjou, Count of Provence. Finally, in 1481 it was annexed by Louis XI to the crown of France.

NOTRE-DAME-DE-LA-GARDE, MARSEILLES

Bishops of Marseilles.—Mgr Duchesne has proved that the traditions which make St. Lazarus the first Bishop of Marseilles do not antedate the thirteenth century. A document of the eleventh century relative to the consecration of the church of St. Victor by Benedict IX (1040) mentions the existence of relics of St. Lazarus at Marseilles but does not speak of him as a bishop. In the twelfth century it was believed at Autun that St. Lazarus was buried in their cathedral, dedicated to St. Nazarius; that St. Lazarus had been Bishop of Marseilles was yet unknown. The earliest Provençal text in which St. Lazarus is mentioned as Bishop of Marseilles is a passage of the "Otia Imperialia" of Gervase of Tilbury, dating from 1212. Christianity, however, was certainly preached at Marseilles at a very early date. The city was always a great commercial entrepôt, and must have been for Provence what Lyons was for Celtic Gaul, a centre from which Christianity radiated widely. The Christian Museum at Marseilles possesses among other sarcophagi one dating from 273. The epitaph of Volusianus and Fortunatus, two Christians who perished by fire, martyrs perhaps, is one of the oldest Christian inscriptions (Le Blant, "Inscriptions chrétiennes de la Gaule", Paris, 1856–65). The first historically known bishop is

Oresius who attended the Council of Arles in 314. Proculus (381–428) was celebrated for his quarrel with Patrocles, Bishop of Arles, as to the limits of their dioceses, and his differences with the bishops of the province of Narbonnensis Secunda concerning the metropolitan rights which Marseilles claimed over that entire region; the Council of Turin, about the year 400, theoretically decided in favour of Narbonne against Marseilles, but allowed Proculus to exercise metropolitan rights until his death. In 418 Pope Zosimus, influenced by Patrocles of Arles, was about to depose Proculus, but Zosimus died and the matter was dropped. To Bishop Venerius (431–452) we owe the so-called "Marseilles Breviary". The Bollandists question the existence of St. Cannat, and the "Gallia Christiana" does not count him among the

Cathedral, Marseilles

bishops of the see. Albanès maintains his existence, trusting to the eightieth chapter of the "De viris ill." of Gennadius, written towards the close of the sixth century; relying also on the veneration certainly paid to him at Marseilles since 1122, Albanès accepts him as bishop about 485.

Among the noteworthy bishops (following the chronology of Abbé Albanès) are:—Honoratus I (about 495) an ecclesiastical writer, approved by Pope Gelasius; St. Theodore (566–91), urged by St. Gregory the Great to use only persuasion with the Jews, and persecuted by King Gontran; St. Serenus (596–601) reproved by the same pope for removing from the churches and destroying certain pictures which the faithful were inclined to worship; St. Abdalong (eighth century); St. Maurontius (780), former Abbot of St. Victor; Honoratus II (948–976), who began the restoration of the Abbey of St. Victor; Pons II (1008–73); Pierre de Montlaur (1214–29), who founded in 1214 the first chapel of Notre-Dame-de-la-Garde; Cardinal William Sudre (1361–66), afterwards Bishop of Ostia, commissioned in 1368 by Urban V to crown the empress, wife of Charles IV, and in 1369 to receive the profession of faith of Johannes Palæologus, Emperor of Constantinople; Cardinal Philippe de Cabassole (1366–68), protector of Petrarch, author of a "Life of St. Mary Magdalen", protector of St. Delphine, governor under Urban V of the Comtat Venaissin, 1367-69: he died in 1372, while legate of Gregory XI at Rome; the preacher and ascetical writer Antoine Dufour (1506–09), confessor of Louis XII; Claude Seyssel (1509–1517), ambassador of Louis XII at the Lateran Council, 1513; Cardinal Innocent Cibò (1517–1530), grandson of Innocent VIII, nephew of Leo X and Clement VII; the preacher and controversialist Nicolas Coëffeteau (q. v.), 1621–23; the Oratorian Eustace Gault (1639–40) and his brother Jean-Baptiste Gault (1642–43) famed for his charity to the galley slaves; de Forbin-Janson (1668–79), sent by Louis XIV to the Diet of Poland (1674) which elected John Sobieski; Belsunce de Castelmoron (1710–55); Jean-Baptiste de Belloy (1755–1801), died almost a centenarian as Archbishop of Paris; Eugène de Mazenod (1837–61) who founded the Congregation of the Oblates of Mary Immaculate; Patrice Cruice (1861–65), of Irish descent, founder and director of the school of higher ecclesiastical studies established at Paris in the former monastery of the Carmelites (Carmes), and well known for his excellent edition of the so-called "Philosophoumena" (see Hippolytus). The moralist Guillaume du Vair, president of the Parlement of Aix, was named Bishop of Marseilles in 1603 by Henry IV, but the Provincial Estates entreated the king to retain him as head of the administration of justice.

Abbey of St. Victor.—About 415, Cassian (q. v.) founded the two monasteries of St. Victor, one for men, the other for women. In the crypt of St. Victor lay formerly the remains of Cassian, also those of Saints Maurice, Marcellinus, and Peter, the body of one of the Holy Innocents, and Bishop St. Mauront. The biography of St. Izarn, Abbot of St. Victor in the eleventh century (Acta SS., 24 Sept.), gives an interesting account of the first visit of St. Izarn to the crypt. All that now remains of the abbey is the Church of St. Victor dedicated by Benedict IX in 1040 and rebuilt in 1200. In the fifth century the Semi-pelagian heresy, that began with certain writings of Cassian, disturbed greatly the Abbey of St. Victor and the Church of Marseilles (see Cassian; Augustine; Hilary; Prosper of Aquitaine); from Marseilles the layman Hilary and St. Prosper of Aquitaine begged St. Augustine and Pope St. Celestine to suppress this heresy. After the devastations of the Saracens the Abbey of St. Victor was rebuilt in the first half of the eleventh century, through the efforts of Abbot St. Wiffred. From the middle of the eleventh century its renown was such that from all points of the South appeals were sent to the abbots of this church to restore the religious life in decadent monasteries. The abbey long kept in touch with the princes of Spain and Sardinia and even owned property in Syria. The polyptych of St. Victor, compiled in 814, the large chartulary, or collection of charters (end of the eleventh and beginning of the twelfth century), and the small chartulary (middle of the thirteenth century) edited by M. Guérard, and containing documents from 683 to 1336, enable the reader to grasp the important economic rôle of this great abbey in the Middle Ages. Blessed Bernard, Abbot of St. Victor 1064–1079 was one of the two ambassadors delegated by Gregory VII to the Diet of Forchheim, where the German princes deposed Emperor Henry IV. He was seized by one of the partisans of Henry IV and passed several months in prison. Gregory VII also sent him as legate to Spain and in reward for his services exempted St. Victor from all jurisdiction other than that of the Holy See.

Blessed William de Grimoard was made Abbot of St. Victor, 2 August, 1361, and became pope in 1362 as Urban V. He enlarged the church, surrounded the abbey with high crenelated walls, granted the abbot episcopal jurisdiction, and gave him as diocese the suburbs and villages south of the city. He visited Marseilles in October, 1365, consecrated the high altar of the church, returned to St. Victor in May, 1367, and held a consistory in the Abbey. What became of the library of St. Victor is still a problem. Its con-

tents are known through an inventory of the latter half of the twelfth century. It was extremely rich in ancient manuscripts, and must have been scattered in the latter half of the sixteenth century, probably between 1579 and 1591; M. Morhreuil conjectures that when Giuliano de' Medici was abbot (1570–88) he scattered the library to please Catherine de' Medici; it is very likely that all or many of the books became the property of the king. Mazarin was Abbot of St. Victor in 1655. Thomas le Fournier (1675–1745) monk of St. Victor, left numerous manuscripts which greatly aided the Maurists in their publications. The secularization of the Abbey of St. Victor was decreed by Clement XII, 17 December, 1739.

Councils were held at Marseilles in 533 (when sixteen bishops of Provence, under the presidency of St. Cæsarius of Arles, passed sentence on Contumeliosus, Bishop of Riez), also in 1040 and in 1103. Several saints belong in a particular way to Marseilles: the soldier St. Victor, martyr under Maximian; the soldier St. Defendens and his companions, martyrs at the same time; the martyrs St. Adrian, St. Clemens, and their twenty-eight companions (end of the third century); St. Cyprian, Bishop of Toulon (fifth–sixth centuries); St. Eutropius, Bishop of Orange, native of Marseilles, celebrated for his conflict with Arianism and Semipelagianism (fifth century); St. Bonet (Bonitus), prefect of Marseilles in the seventh century, brother of Avitus, Bishop of Clermont, and a short while Bishop of Clermont; St. Eusebia, abbess of the monastery of nuns founded by Cassian, and massacred by the Saracens with thirty-nine of her companions, (perhaps in 838); St. Tzarn, Abbot of St. Victor, d. in 1048, at whose instigation Raymond Béranger, Count of Barcelona, compelled the Moors to free the monks of Lérins; St. Louis, Bishop of Toulouse (1274–97), of the family of the counts of Provence and buried with the Friars Minor of Marseilles; St. Elziar de Sabran (1286–1323) a student of St. Victor's, and husband of St. Delphine of Sabran; Blessed Bertrand de Garrigue, (1230), one of the first disciples of St. Dominic, founder of the convent of Friars Preachers at Marseilles; Blessed Hugues de Digne, a Franciscan writer of the thirteenth century, buried at Marseilles (with his sister St. Douceline, foundress of the Béguines) after having founded near the city, about 1250, the Order of Friars of Penance of Jesus Christ. Hughes de Baux, Viscount of Marseilles induced St. John of Matha to found in Marseilles, in 1202, a house of Trinitarians for the redemption of captives; in this house the Trinitarians from Southern France, Spain, and Italy held annually their General Chapter. Near by was founded in 1306 a brotherhood of penitents who collected money in the city for the redemption of captives.

St. Vincent de Paul's first visit to Marseilles, in 1605, on a business matter ended with the saint's captivity in Tunis; his second visit in 1622, as chaplain general was marked by the pious and heroic fraud which led him to take the place of a galley slave. In 1643 he sent Lazarists to attend the hospital for convicts founded by Philippe Emmanuel de Gondi, Chevalier de la Costa, and Bishop Gault. The Jesuit College of St. Régis was founded in 1724, at Camp Major, for missionaries on their way to the East who studied there the various languages spoken in the commercial towns along the Mediterranean coast. The Jesuits also conducted the Royal Marine Observatory and a school of hydrography. The hospital of Marseilles, founded in 1188, is one of the oldest in France. Anne Magdaleine de Remusat (1696–1730), daughter of a rich merchant of Marseilles, who had entered the convent of the Visitation of St. Mary, 2 October, 1711, sent word to Mgr Belzunce that on 17 October, 1713, the twenty-third anniversary of the death of Margaret Mary Alacoque, she had received certain revelations from Christ; in consequence a confraternity of the Sacred Heart was founded, and enriched with indulgences by Clement XI (1717); Anne Magdaleine published in 1718 a small manual of devotion to the Sacred Heart. The Marseilles merchants carried this devotion to Constantinople and Cairo and the society soon comprised 30,000 members. At the time of the plague in Marseilles (39,152 victims out of 80,000 inhabitants), Belzunce, following new revelations received by Anne Magdaleine, instituted in the diocese the feast of the Sacred Heart (22 October, 1720); later, on 4 June, 1722 at his instigation the magistrates consecrated the city to the Sacred Heart, as the first act of consecration formulated to the Sacred Heart by a corporate body.

Marseilles plays also an important part in the history of the devotion to St. Joseph. As early as 1839 Bishop Mazenod decreed that Marseilles was to venerate St. Joseph as the patron of the diocese, and that wherever the churches admitted of three altars one should be dedicated to this saint. The church of Cabot near Marseilles was the first in the Christian world to be consecrated to St. Joseph as patron of the Universal Church. The pilgrimage of Notre-Dame-de-la-Garde dates from 1214. In 1544 a large church was built on the hill overlooking Marseilles; in 1837 a statue of the Madonna was blessed there, and in 1864 was inaugurated a new sanctuary visited daily by numerous pilgrims. In the church of St. Victor is the statue of Notre-Dame-des-Confessions or Notre-Dame-des-Martyrs, said to have been venerated at Marseilles since the end of the second century. The pilgrimage of Notre-Dame-du-Sacré-Cœur, at Château-Gonbert, gave rise to a confraternity which now has almost one million members.

Before the law of 1901 on associations the Diocese of Marseilles counted Benedictines, Capuchins, Jesuits, Dominicans, Franciscans, Lazarists, African Missionaries, White Fathers, Missionaries of the Sacred Heart, Oblates of Mary Immaculate, Redemptorists, Salesians, Brothers of Christian Doctrine of St. Gabriel, Little Brothers of Mary, Brothers of the Sacred Heart, Hospitaller Brothers of St. John of God, Clerks of St. Viateur, Fathers of the Sacred Heart of the Child Jesus. A number of religious congregations for women originated in the diocese; the Capuchins, and Nuns of the Visitation of Saint Mary, contemplative orders founded at Marseilles in 1623; Franciscan Sisters of the Holy Family, founded in 1851 under the name of Sœurs de l'Intérieur de Jésus et Marie; Sisters of Mary Immaculate, who take care of the dumb and the blind; Sisters of Our Lady of Compassion, a teaching order; Sisters of St. Joseph of the Apparition, devoted to nursing and teaching; Sisters of the Holy Names of Jesus and Mary, teachers (mother-houses of all the foregoing are in Marseilles); Sisters of the Holy Name of Jesus, a teaching order founded in 1832 (mother-house at La Ciotat), discalced Trinitarian Sisters, founded in 1845 by Abbé Margalhan-Ferrat, who attend to the sick at home, to hospitals, and until recently to schools (mother-house at Sainte-Marthe). At the beginning of the twentieth century the religious congregations had under their care 5 crèches, 38 day nurseries, 1 asylum for the blind, 3 boys' orphanages, 21 girls' orphanages, 7 industrial work rooms, 4 societies for the prevention of crime, 1 protectory, 1 dispensary, 1 general pharmacy for societies of mutual assistance, 4 houses of retreat and sanitariums, 4 houses for the care of the sick in their own homes, 1 insane asylum, 4 hospitals. In 1905 the Diocese of Marseilles (last year of the Concordat) counted 545,445 inhabitants, 11 parishes, 82 succursal parishes, 9 vicariates paid by the State.

Gallia Christiana I (nova, 1715), 1,627,678; *instrum.*, 106–118; Albanès and Chevalier, *Gallia Christiana novissima; Marseille* (Valence, 1899); Albanès, *Armorial et sigillographie des évêques de Marseille* (Marseilles, 1884); Belzunce, *L'antiquité de l'église de Marseille et la succession des évêques* (ibid., 1747–51); Biscard, *Les évêques de Marseille depuis St. Lazare*

(ibid., 1872); DE VIVIEN, *Les origines chrétiennes de la Gaule méridionale, légendes et traditions provençales* (Lyons, 1883); LE BLANT, *Catalogue des monuments chrétiens du musée de Marseille* (Paris, 1894); DE ROY, *Les saints de l'église de Marseille* (Marseilles, 1885); GUÉRARD, *Cartulaire de l'abbaye de S. Victor* (Paris, 1857); *Marseille à la fin de l'ancien régime*, the ecclesiastical chapters are by BÉRENGIER (Marseilles, 1896); G. DE REY, *Les Saints de l'église de Marseille* (ibid., 1885); MORTREUIL, *La bibliothèque de l'abbaye de S. Victor* (ibid., 1854); CAMAU, *Les institutions de bienfaisance, de charité et de prévoyance à Marseille* (ibid., s. d.); IDEM, *Marseille au XV siècle* (Paris, 1905); CHEVALIER, *Topobibl.*, 1857–1862.

GEORGES GOYAU.

Marshall, THOMAS WILLIAM, LL.D., K.S.G., controversial writer, b. 1818; d. at Surbiton, Surrey, 14 Dec., 1877. He was son of John Marshall, government agent for colonizing New South Wales. His parents were Protestants, and he was educated at Cambridge (Trinity College) where he graduated B.A. in 1840. Taking orders in the Church of England, he became Vicar of Swallowcliff, in Wiltshire, to which living the Perpetual Curacy of Antstey was attached. Profoundly influenced by the Tractarian movement, he set himself to study the episcopal government of the Church, and his first book, published in 1844, was a work on this subject. But in writing this book he was led by his researches to abandon the Anglican position as untenable, and in November, 1845, he was received into the Catholic Church in Lord Arundell's chapel at Wardour Castle. In 1847 he was appointed the first inspector of Catholic Schools, a position which he held till 1860, when he was asked to resign, owing to the public feeling aroused against him by the publication of his pamphlet exposing the Anglican missions to the heathen. After two years spent in America he returned to England and published his best known work on "Christian Missions" (1862). In 1870 and the following year he lectured in the United States with great success, the Jesuit College of Georgetown conferring on him the degree of Doctor of Laws. In 1872 he returned to England, where he devoted himself to literary pursuits for the remaining five years of his life. He married Harriet, daughter of the Rev. William Dansey, Rector of Donhead-St.-Andrew, who joined the Church with him and who survived him.

He was a valued contributor to the Catholic press in England and America. His published works are: "Notes on the Episcopal Polity of the Holy Catholic Church" (1844); "Twenty-two Reasons for Entering the Catholic Church" (1846); "Letter to the Rev. Cecil Wray, M.A." (1846); "Christianity in China" (1858); "Tabulated Reports on Roman Catholic Schools inspected in the South and East of England" (1859); "Christian Missions, their Agents, their Method and their Results" (1862; 1863; New York, 1865; London, 1865. Translated into French and German); "Catholic Missions in Southern India to 1865" (1865, written in conjunction with the Rev. W. Strickland, S.J.); "Order and Chaos, a Lecture delivered at Baltimore" (1869); "My Clerical Friends and their Relation to Modern Thought" (1873); "Church Defence: Report of a Conference on the Present Dangers of the Church" (1873); "Protestant Journalism" (1874); "Anglicans of the Day" (1875).

ARTHUR FEATHERSTONE MARSHALL, B.A. Oxon., a younger brother of Thomas, abandoned his curacy at Liverpool to become a Catholic in the early sixties. He was widely known as the author of "The Comedy of Convocation", a satirical brochure exposing the inconsistencies invoked in all three of the Anglican views—High, Low, and Broad Church. His "Old Catholics at Cologne" was hardly less popular during the period immediately following the Vatican Council and the defection of Döllinger. Other controversial works of a light and popular character by this brilliant writer were "Reply to the Bishop of Ripon's Attack on the Catholic Church" and "The Infallibility of the Pope."

GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.*, IV, 479–484; COOPER in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, XXXVI, s. v.; GONDON, *Motifs de conversion de dix ministres Anglicains* (Paris, 1847); *The Tablet* (December, 1877).

EDWIN BURTON.

Marshall Islands, VICARIATE APOSTOLIC OF THE. These islands, a German possession since 1885, lying in the Pacific Ocean, east of the Caroline Islands, between 4° and 13° N. lat., and 161° and 171° E. longitude, were discovered in 1529 by Saavedra, Villalobos and other Spanish mariners, and explored by Marshall and Gilbert in 1788. They are fifty in number, an archipelago of low-lying atolls, the highest point being only 33 feet above sea-level. Their total area, including Nauru, or Pleasant Island, 385 miles to the south, is about 150 square miles. The population in 1908 amounted to 15,000, of whom 162 were Europeans. Most of the natives are still pagan. In 1891 the Missionaries of the Sacred Heart began work there, but were soon forced to desist by the civil authorities. In 1898 they resumed their labours. The islands were then included in the Vicariate Apostolic of New Pomerania; but in September, 1905, they were erected into a separate vicariate, though it has not yet been invested with an episcopal character. The superior of the mission, Very Rev. Augustus Erdland, resides on the island of Jaluit. He was born, 11 October, 1874; joined the Missionary Fathers of the Sacred Heart, 30 September, 1895; was ordained, 25 July, 1900, and appointed to his present office, 16 September, 1905. In 1907 the mission contained 7 priests and 8 brothers; 13 Sisters of Our Lady of the Sacred Heart (of Hiltrup, Germany); 323 Catholics; 520 catechumens; 6 churches and stations (on Jaluit Likieb, Arno, Mejeru, and Nauru Islands); 8 schools, with 225 pupils.

Missiones Catholicæ (Rome, 1907); GUILLEMARD, *Australasia*, II (London, 1894), 545–6; *Australian Catholic Directory* (1910).

A. A. MACERLEAN.

Marsi, DIOCESE OF (MARSORUM), in the province of Aquila, Central Italy, with its seat at Pescina. With the exception of Sabina, it is the only diocese that receives its name from a people, and not from a city. The Marsi were a warlike people who lived about Lake Fucino. In 325 B.C. they allied themselves with the Romans, revolted in 309 in favour of the Samnites, but in 304 returned to the Roman alliance. The chief divinity of the Marsi was the goddess Angitia. In the time of the Lombards the territory formed a county subject to the Duchy of Spoleto, and the counts gave several popes to the Church—among them Innocent III. According to legend, the Gospel was preached to the Marsi in Apostolic times by Saint Mark, and Saint Rufinus, their bishop, was martyred about 240. The episcopal see was originally at Santa Savina, but, as this place was isolated and therefore insecure, Gregory XIII permitted, in 1580, the removal of the bishop's residence to Pescina, where the cathedral was completed in 1596. Among the bishops of this diocese was Saint Berardo of the family of the Counts of the Marsi. He was educated at Montecassino, and became pontifical governor of the Campagna. On account of his justice and of his severity in that office, he was imprisoned by Pietro Colonna, but Paschal II made him a cardinal, and bishop of his native town. Other prelates of the Marsi were Bishop Jacopo (1276), during whose government of the diocese dissensions arose between the canons of Santa Savina and those of Celano concerning the right to nominate the bishops; Angelo Maccafani (1445), treasurer general of the Marches; Cardinal Marcello Crescenzi (1533); Matteo Colli (1579), under whom the removal of the bishop's residence to Pescina took place; he was a prisoner for some time in the Castle of Sant'Angelo, but proved his innocence and was liberated; Gian Paolo Caccia (1648), who did much for the public schools; Diego Petra (1664), who restored the seminary, enlarged by Francesco Corradini (1680) and by Nunzio de' Vecchi

(1719). The diocese is immediately subject to the Holy See; it has 78 parishes with 140,000 inhabitants, 6 religious houses of men and 9 of women, 2 educational institutes for male students and 5 for girls.

CAPPELLETTI, *Chiese d'Italia*, XXI (Venice, 1857).

U. BENIGNI.

Marsico Nuovo and Potenza, DIOCESE OF (MARSICENSIS ET POTENTINA), suffragan of Salerno. Marsico Nuovo is a city of the province of Potenza in the Basilicata (Southern Italy), and is situated on the Agri. Its origin is obscure, but, after the destruction by the Saracens, of the ancient Grumentum, the town grew in importance, and became under the Normans the seat of a county. It became an episcopal seat, when Bishop Grimaldo of Grumentum established his residence there, retaining, however, his former title. There were bishops of Grumentum as early as the sixth century: it is said that a Saint Laberius or Saverius first preached the Gospel there. Other bishops were Enrico (1131), who finished the cathedral; Blessed Reginaldo of Viperno, a Dominican (1275); Pietro (1329), several times papal legate; the friar Paolo Caselli (1614), who restored the cathedral. In 1818 the diocese was united *æque principaliter* to that of Potenza. This city is the capital of a fertile province in the Basilicata, over 2400 feet above the sea—the ancient city of the Lucani was farther down in the valley of La Murata. Potenza was destroyed by Frederick II, and was rebuilt by Bishop Oberto in 1250, to be destroyed again by Charles of Anjou. On 21 December, 1857, it was greatly damaged by an earthquake. The town claims that it was evangelized by Saint Peter; Saint Aruntius and his companions suffered martyrdom there under Maximian. The first known bishop was Amandus (about 500). Other bishops were Saint Gerardo della Porta (1099–1119)—to whom the above-mentioned cathedral, built by Bishop Oberto and restored by Giovanni Andrea Serra (1783–99), is dedicated—and Achille Caracciolo (1616), who founded the seminary. Blessed Bonaventure of Potenza (1654–1711), a Franciscan Conventual priest, was from this city. It is to be noted that, in medieval documents, the Bishop of Marsico and the Bishop of the Marsi are both called *Marsicanus*, a source of some confusion. The united sees have 21 parishes, 96,500 inhabitants, one religious house of men and three of women.

CAPPELLETTI, *Le Chiese d'Italia*, XX (Venice, 1857).

U. BENIGNI.

Marsigli, LUIGI FERDINANDO, COUNT DE, Italian geographer and naturalist, b. at Bologna 10 July, 1658; d. at Bologna 1 Nov., 1730. He was a member of an old patrician family and was educated in accordance with his rank. He supplemented his training by studying mathematics, anatomy, and natural history with the best teachers, and by personal observations. As a soldier he was sent by the Republic of Venice to Constantinople in 1679. There he investigated the condition of the Turkish forces, while at the same time he observed the surroundings of the Thracian Bosporus. Both of these matters were fully reported by him. In 1680, when the Turks threatened to invade Hungary, he offered his services to the Emperor Leopold. On 2 July, 1683 (the feast of the Visitation), he fell wounded and was taken prisoner. He suffered as a slave until he was ransomed on 25 March, 1684 (the feast of the Annunciation). His reflections on these two feast days show his great piety: on these days, he says, on which the august protectress of the faithful is particularly honoured, she obtained for him two graces: salutary punishment for his past faults and an end to his punishment. After the long war he was employed to arrange the boundaries between the Venetian Republic, Turkey, and the Empire. During the war of the Spanish Succession he was second in command under Count d'Arco at the fortress of Breisach, which surrendered in 1703. Count d'Arco was beheaded because he was found guilty of capitulating before it was necessary, while Marsigli was stripped of all honours and commissions, and his sword was broken over him. His appeals to the emperor were in vain. Public opinion, however, acquitted him later of the charge of neglect or ignorance.

In the midst of his work as a soldier he had always found enough leisure to devote to his favourite scientific pursuits. He drew plans, made astronomical observations, measured the speed and size of rivers, studied the products, the mines, the birds, fishes, and fossils of every land he visited, and also collected specimens of every kind, instruments, models, antiquities, etc. Finally he returned to Bologna and presented his entire collection to the Senate of Bologna in 1712. There he founded his "Institute of Sciences and Arts", which was formally opened in 1715. Six professors were put in charge of the different divisions of the institute. Later he established a printing-house furnished with the best types for Latin, Greek, Hebrew, and Arabic. This was put in charge of the Dominicans, and placed under the patronage of St. Thomas Aquinas. In 1727 he added to his other collections East India material which he collected in England and Holland. A solemn procession of the institute he founded was ordered for every twenty-five years on the feast of the Annunciation. In 1715 he was named foreign associate of the Paris Academy of Sciences; he was also a member of the Royal Society of London, and of Montpellier.

His principal works are the following: "Osservazioni intorno al Bosforo Tracio" (Rome, 1681); "Histoire physique de la mer", translated by Leclerc (Amsterdam, 1725); "Danubius Pannonico-mysicus, observationibus", etc. (7 vols., Hague, 1726); "L'Etat militaire de l'empire ottoman" (Amsterdam, 1732).

FONTENELLE, *Eloges des Acad.*, II (Paris, 1825); QUINCY, *Mémoires* (Zurich, 1741).

WILLIAM FOX.

Marsilius of Padua, physician and theologian, b. at Padua about 1270; d. about 1342. Contrary to the assertion of several authors, he was only a layman and neither a religious nor the legitimate Archbishop of Milan, though he was a canon of his native city. He served at first in the army of the emperor, and afterwards, on the advice of Mussato, began the study of medicine at the University of Padua. To complete his medical studies he proceeded to Paris, and before 25 December, 1312, became rector of the university there. A little later he went to Avignon and obtained from John XXII letters appointing him to one of the canonries of the Church of Padua (Reg. Vat., a. I, p. 2, n. 1714). It was at this time that Louis of Bavaria was about to reopen against the pope the struggles of Philippe le Bel against Boniface VIII. John XXII had just denounced Louis as a supporter of heretics, excommunicated him, and ordered him to cease within three months administering the affairs of the Empire. The emperor was looking for help, and Marsilius, who had now begun the study of theology, joined with Jean de Jandun, canon of Senlis, in offering him his assistance. Together they composed the "Defensor pacis" at Paris, and, about 1326, setting out for Germany, presented their work to the emperor. They became his intimate friends, and on several occasions expounded their teaching to him. What were the doctrines of these two Parisian doctors, the very audacity of which at first startled Louis of Bavaria? They recalled the wildest theories of the legists of Philippe le Bel, and Cæsarian theologians like Guillaume Durand and the Dominican John of Paris. The teachings of these last mentioned had been proposed with hesitation, restrictions, and moderation of language which met with no favour before the rigorous logic of Marsilius of Padua. He completely abandoned the olden theocratic conception of society.

God, it is true, remained the ultimate source of all power, but it sprang immediately from the people, who had in addition the power to legislate. Law was the expression, not of the will of the prince, as John of Paris taught, but of the will of the people, who, by the voice of the majority, could enact, interpret, modify, suspend, and abrogate it at will. The elected head of the nation was possessed only of a secondary, instrumental, and executive authority. We thus arrive at the theory of the "Contrat Social". In the Church, according to the "Defensor Pacis", the faithful have these two great powers—the elective and the legislative. They nominate the bishops and select those who are to be ordained. The legislative power is, in the Church, the right to decide the meaning of the old Scriptures; that is the work for a general council, in which the right of discussion and voting belongs to the faithful or their delegates. The ecclesiastical power, the priesthood, comes directly from God and consists essentially in the power to consecrate the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ and remit sins, or, rather, to declare them remitted. It is equal in all priests, each of whom can communicate it by ordination to a subject legitimately proposed by the community. Luther would have recognized his theories in these heretical assertions, and the Gallicans of later times would willingly have subscribed to such revolutionary declarations. The two writers are just as audacious in their exposition of the respective rôles of the Empire and the Church in Christian society and of the relations of the two powers.

According to the idea of the State propounded by Marsilius all ecclesiastical power proceeded from the community and from the emperor, its principal representative, there being no limit to the rights of the lay State (cf. Franck, "Journal des savants", March, 1883; Noël Valois, "Histoire littéraire de la France", XXXIII). As to the Church it has no visible head. St. Peter, he goes on, received no more power or authority than the other Apostles, and it is uncertain that he ever came to Rome. The pope has only the power of convoking an œcumenical council which is superior to him. His decrees are not binding; he can impose on the people only what the general council has decided and interpreted. The community elects the parish priest and supervises and controls the clergy in the performance of their duties; in a word—the community or the state is everything, the Church playing an entirely subsidiary part. It cannot legislate, adjudicate, possess goods, sell, or purchase without authorization; it is a perpetual minor. As is clear, we have here the civil constitution of the clergy. Marsilius, moreover, shows himself a severe and often unjust censor of the abuses of the Roman curia. Regarding the relations between the emperor and the pope, it is maintained in the "Defensor Pacis", that the sovereign pontiff has no power over any man, except with the permission of the emperor; while the emperor has power over the pope and the general council. The pontiff can act only as the authorized agent of the Roman people; all the goods of the Church belong by right to Cæsar. This is clearly the crudest concept of the pagan empire, an heretical assault on the Church's constitution, and a shameless denial of the rights of the sovereign pontiff to the profit of Cæsar. Dante, the Ghibelline theorist, is surpassed. Arnold of Brescia is equalled. William Occam could never have proposed anything more revolutionary.

The pope was stirred by these heretical doctrines. In the Bull of 3 April, 1327, John XXII reproached Louis of Bavaria with having welcomed *duos perditionis filios et maledictionis alumnos* (Denifle, "Chart", II, 301). On 9 April he suspended and excommunicated them ("Thesaurus novus anecdotorum", ii, 692). A commission, appointed by the pope at Avignon, condemned on 23 October five of the propositions of Marsilius in the following terms: "1) These reprobates do not hesitate to affirm in what is related of Christ in the Gospel of St. Matthew, to wit that He paid tribute . . . that he did so, not through condescension and liberality, but of necessity—an assertion that runs counter to the teaching of the Gospel and the words of our Saviour. If one were to believe these men, it would follow that all the property of the Church belongs to the emperor, and that he may take possession of it again as his own; 2) These sons of Belial are so audacious as to affirm that the Blessed Apostle St. Peter received no more authority than the other Apostles, that he was not appointed their chief, and further that Christ gave no head to His Church, and appointed no one as His vicar here below—all which is contrary to the Apostolic and evangelic truth; 3) These children of Belial do not fear to assert that the emperor has the right to appoint, to dethrone, and even to punish the pope—which is undoubtedly repugnant to all right; 4) These frivolous and lying men say that all priests, be they popes, archbishops, or simple priests are possessed of equal authority and equal jurisdiction, by the institution of Christ; that whatever one possesses beyond another is a concession of the Emperor, who can moreover revoke what he has granted,—which assertions are certainly contrary to sacred teaching and savour of heresy; 5) these blasphemers say that the universal Church may not inflict a coactive penalty on any person unless with the emperor's permission." All the pontifical propositions opposed to the declarations of Marsilius of Padua and Jean de Jandun are proved at length from the Scriptures, traditions, and history. These declarations are condemned as being contrary to the Holy Scriptures, dangerous to the Catholic faith, heretical, and erroneous, and their authors Marsilius and Jean as being undoubtedly heretics and even heresiarchs (Denzinger, "Enchiridion", 423, ed. Bannwart, 495; Noël Valois, "Histoire littéraire de la France", XXXIII, 592).

As this condemnation was falling on the head of Marsilius, the culprit was coming to Italy in the emperor's train and he saw his revolutionary ideas being put into practice. Louis of Bavaria had himself crowned by Colonna, syndic of the Roman people; he dethroned John XXII, replacing him by the Friar Minor, Peter of Corbara, whom he invested with temporal power. At the same time he bestowed the title of imperial vicar on Marsilius and permitted him to persecute the Roman clergy. The pope of Avignon protested twice against the sacrilegious conduct of both. The triumph of Marsilius was, however, of short duration. Abandoned by the emperor in October, 1336, he died towards the end of 1342. Among his principal works, the "Defensor Pacis", which we possess in twenty manuscripts, has been printed frequently and translated into various languages. The "Defensor Minor", a résumé of the preceding work, compiled by Marsilius himself, has just been recovered in the Bodleian Library, Oxford (Canon. Miscell., 188). It throws light on certain points in the larger work; but has not yet been published. "De translatione Imperii Romani" has been printed four times in Germany and once in England. "De jurisdictione Imperatoris in causa matrimoniali" has been edited by Preher and by Goldast (Monarchia sancti Rom. Imperii, II, c. 1283). The influence of the "Defensor pacis" was disastrous, and Marsilius may well be reckoned one of the fathers of the Reformation.

BAUDRILLART, *Revue d'hist. et de litt. religieuse*, 1898, p. 320; BAYLE, *Dict. crit.*, III (1741), 379–80; BEZOLD in *Histor. Zeitschr.*, XXXVI (1876), 343–7; BIRCK, *Marsiglio von Padua und Alvaro Pelayo über Papst und Kaiser, Kirche und Staat* in *Jahrsber. höh. Burgerschule*, Mulheim a Rh. (1868); BULÆUS, *Hist. Univ. Paris*, IV (1669), 974–5; CASTELLOTTI, *La dottrina dello stato in Marsiglio da Padova* (Asti, 1898); DENIFLE, *Chart. univers.*, II (Paris, 1891), 158, 303; DÖLLINGER, *Papstfabeln Mittel.* (1863), 92–3; DUPIN, *B. a. e.*, XIV (1701), 226–30; FABRICIUS, *B. M. ae.* V (1736), 102–3; FÉRET, *Facul. théol.*, III

(Paris, 1896), 125–8, 193–200; FRANCK, *Réform. et Public. moy. âge* (1864), 135–51; GRALSSE, *Trésor*, IV (1863), 418; HURAUT, *Etude sur Marsile de Padoue . . .* (Paris, 1892); JOURDAN, *Etude sur Marsile de Padoue, Jurisconsulte et théologien du XIV^ème siècle, thèse . . .* (Montauban, 1892); LABANCA, *Marsiglio da Padova riformatore politico e religioso del sec. XIV* (Padua, 1882); *Marsiglio da Padova e Martino Lutero* in *Nuova Antologia*, XLI (1883), 209–27; MEYER, *Etude sur Marsile de Padoue, theolog. du XIV^ème siècle* (Strasburg, 1870); NIMIS, *Marsilius von Padua republikanische Staatslehre* (Heidelberg, 1898); RAYNALDUS, *Ann.* (1652), 1313, 19; 1327, 2737; 1328, 7, 9–10; 1331, 1–2; SCADUTO, *Stato e Chiesa negli scritti polit.* (1882), 112–3; THOMAS in *Mel. arch. hist. écr. français.*, II (Rome, 1882), 447–50; TIRABOSCHI, *Stor. lett. Ital.*, V (1807), i, 172, 8; VALOIS, *Hist. littér. de la France*, XXXIII; VILLARI in *Nuova Antologia*, LV (1881), 553–9; WHARTON in CAVE, s. v. (1744), II, ii, 26; WURM, *Zu Marsilius von Padua* in *Histor. Jahrb.*, XIV (1893), 68–9.

L. SALEMBIER.

Martène, EDMOND, historian and liturgist, b. 22 December, 1654, at Saint-Jean-de-Losne near Dijon; d. 20 June, 1739, at Saint-Germain-des-Prés near Paris. In 1672 he entered the Benedictine Abbey of St-Rémy at Reims, a house of the Congregation of Saint-Maur. Owing to his extraordinary zeal in the pursuit of learning, however, he was sent by his superiors to Saint-Germain to receive further training under the direction of d'Achéry and Mabillon, and also to assist in the preliminary work connected with the new edition of the Fathers. Thenceforth he devoted his whole life to a most profound study of subjects connected with history and liturgy, residing in various monasteries of his order, especially at Rouen, where he received the sympathetic co-operation of the prior of Sainte-Marthe. Even in his student years he had shown indefatigable zeal in gathering from widely various sources everything that might be helpful in elucidating the Rule of St. Benedict; the fruit of his labours he published in 1690 as "Commentarius in regulam S. P. Benedicti litteralis, moralis, historicus ex variis antiquorum scriptorum commentationibus, actis sanctorum, monasticis ritibus aliisque monumentis cum editis tum manuscriptis concinnatus" (Paris, 1690; 1695). During the same year he issued as a supplement to this: "De antiquis monachorum ritibus libri 5 collecti ex variis ordinariis, consuetudinariis ritualibusque manuscriptis" (Lyons, 1690; Venice, 1765). These were followed by other liturgical works, as "De antiquis ecclesiæ ritibus libri 4" (Rouen, 1700–2) and "Tractatus de antiqua ecclesiæ disciplina in divinis officiis celebrandis" (Lyons, 1706); likewise "De antiquis ecclesiæ ritibus editio secunda" (4 vols., Antwerp, 1736–8; Venice, 1763–4; 1783; Bassano, 1788), in which he collected and expanded his earlier writings. "Veterum scriptorum et monumentorum moralium, historicorum, dogmaticorum ad res ecclesiasticas monasticas et politicas illustrandas collectio" (Rouen, 1700) is a continuation of the "Spicilegium" of Martène's teacher, d'Achéry. He also wrote "La vie du vénérable Claude Martin, religieux bénédictin" (Tours, 1697; Rouen, 1698); "Imperialis Stabulensis monasterii jura propugnata adversus iniquas disceptationes" (Cologne, 1730); and the "Histoire de l'abbaye de Marmoutier", first edited in 1874 and 1875 by Chevalier as Vols. XXIV and XXV of "Mémoires de la société archéologique de Touraine". In 1708 Martène and his fellow Benedictine, Ursin Durand, were commissioned to ransack the archives of France and Belgium for materials for the forthcoming revised edition of the "Gallia Christiana", proposed by the prior of Sainte-Marthe. The numerous documents gathered by them from about eight hundred abbeys and one hundred cathedrals were incorporated in the abovementioned work or in the five volumes of the "Thesaurus novus anecdotorum" (Paris, 1717). The results of a journey made through the Netherlands and Germany for the purpose of documentary research were embodied by the two scholars in the nine folio volumes of "Veterum scriptorum et monumentorum ecclesiasticorum et dogmaticorum amplissima collectio" (Paris, 1724–33). Finally, the sixth volume of the "Annales Ordinis S. Benedicti" (Paris, 1739) is the work of Martène alone.

Biographie générale (Paris, 1863), s. v.; DE LAMA, *Bibliothèque des écrivains de la congrégation de Saint-Maur* (Munich and Paris, 1882), 439–50.

PATRICIUS SCHLAGER.

Martha, SAINT (Gr. Μάρθα), from the Aramaic, mentioned only in Luke, x, 38–42; and John, xi; xii, sqq. The Aramaic form occurs in a Nabatæan inscription found at Puteoli, and now in the Naples Museum; it is dated A. D. 5 (Corpus Inscr. Semit., 158); also in a Palmyrene inscription, where the Greek translation has the form Μάρθειν, A. D. 179. Mary, Martha, and Lazarus are represented by St. John as living at Bethania, but St. Luke would seem to imply that they were, at least at one time, living in Galilee; he does not mention the name of the town, but it may have been Magdala, and we should thus, supposing Mary of Bethania and Mary Magdalene to be the same person, understand the appellative "Magdalene". The words of St. John (xi, 1) seem to imply a change of residence for the family. It is possible, too, that St. Luke has displaced the incident referred to in c. x. The likeness between the pictures of Martha presented by Luke and John is very remarkable. The familiar intercourse between the Saviour of the world and the humble family which St. Luke depicts is dwelt on by St. John when he tells us that "Jesus loved Martha, and her sister Mary, and Lazarus" (xi, 5). Again, the picture of Martha's anxiety (John, xi, 20–21, 39) accords with the picture of her who was "busy about much serving" (Luke, x, 40); so also in John, xii, 2: "They made him a supper there: and Martha served." But St. John has given us a glimpse of the other and deeper side of her character when he depicts her growing faith in Christ's Divinity (xi, 20–27), a faith which was the occasion of the words: "I am the resurrection and the life." The Evangelist has beautifully indicated the change that came over Martha after that interview: "When she had said these things, she went, and called her sister Mary secretly, saying: The Master is come, and calleth for thee."

Difficulties have been raised about the last supper at Bethania. St. John seems to put it six days before the Pasch, and, so some conclude, in the house of Martha; while the Synoptic account puts it two days before the Pasch, and in the house of Simon the Leper. We need not try to avoid this difficulty by asserting that there were two suppers; for St. John does not say that the supper took place six days before, but only that Christ arrived in Bethania six days before the Pasch; nor does he say that it was in the house of Martha. We are surely justified in arguing that, since St. Matthew and St. Mark place the scene in the house of Simon, St. John must be understood to say the same; it remains to be proved that Martha could not "serve" in Simon's house.

For St. Martha's connexion with Marseilles, see *Acta SS.*; also DUCHESNE, *Fastes épiscopaux de l'ancienne Gaule*, I, 325 sqq. See also ST. AUGUSTINE, *Sermons*, cxlix, 17; clxxix, 3–6; cclv.; ciii–civ.

HUGH POPE.

Martial, SAINT, Bishop of Limoges in the third century. We have no accurate information as to the origin, dates of birth and death, or the acts of this bishop. All that we know of him we have from Gregory of Tours and it may be summed up thus: Under the consulate of Decius and of Gratus seven bishops were sent from Rome to Gaul to preach the Gospel; Gatien to Tours, Trophimus to Arles, Paul to Narbonne, Saturninus to Toulouse, Denis to Paris, Austromoine to Clermont, and Martial to Limoges. Martial seems to have been accompanied by two priests brought by him from the Orient, so he himself may have been born in that region. He succeeded in converting the inhabitants of Limoges to the true Faith, and his memory has always been venerated there.

Very early, the popular imagination, which so easily creates legends, transformed Martial into an apostle of the first century. Sent into Gaul by St. Peter himself he is said to have evangelized not only the Province of Limoges but all Aquitaine. He performed many miracles, among others the raising of a dead man to life, by touching him with a rod that St. Peter had given him. A "Life of St. Martial" attributed to Bishop Aurelian, his successor, in reality the work of an eleventh-century forger, develops this legendary account. According to it Martial was born in Palestine, was one of the seventy-two disciples of Christ, assisted at the resurrection of Lazarus, was at the Last Supper, was baptized by St. Peter, etc.

This tissue of fables which fills long pages was received with favour not only by the unlettered but also by the learned of past centuries and even of modern times. For a long time however it has been exposed to well-warranted discussion that St. Martial's biography is linked with the great question of the apostolicity of certain Churches of Gaul. As to what concerns St. Martial, it has been clearly proved that we must honour in him not one of the seventy-two disciples of Christ but the first preacher of the Christian faith in the Province of Limoges, and that we should not go beyond this. Mgr Buissas, Bishop of Limoges, having petitioned the Holy See in 1853 that the most ancient of his predecessors should not be deprived of the honours so long accorded him as one of the seventy-two disciples of Christ, the Sacred Congregation, unanimously on 8 April, 1854, and Pius IX in his decree of 8 May following, refused absolutely to bestow on St. Martial the title of disciple of Christ and confined themselves to saying that the veneration that was accorded him was of very ancient origin. Two Epistles inserted in the Bibliotheca Patrum are attributed to St. Martial, but they are apocryphal. The Church celebrates his feast on 30 June.

ARBELLOT, *Documents inédits sur l'apostolat de St. Martial et sur l'apostolicité des églises de France* (Paris, 1860); AURÉLIEN, *Vita S. Martialis apostoli*, from a MS. in the British Museum (no place or date); COUTURE in *Rev. de Gascogne*, XXII, xii (Auch, 1881), 294–8; BARONIUS, *Ann.* (1605), 1032, 1–3; BELLET, *St. Martial apôtre de Limoges* (Paris, 1898); IDEM, *La prose rythmée et la critique hagiographique, nouvelle réponse aux Bollandistes, suivie du texte de l'ancienne Vie de St. Martial* (Paris, 1899); IDEM, *L'âge de la Vie de St. Martial* (Paris, 1900); BOLLANDISTS, *Catal. codd. hagiogr. lat. B. N. Paris.* (Paris, 1889), I, 198–209; II, 293–5, 385–92; III, 276–8, 522–8; *Act. SS.* (1709), June, V, 538–44; DESCHAMPS, *L'apôtre S. Martial* (Limoges, 1893); DUCHESNE, *S. Martial de Limoges* in *Ann. du Midi*, IV (Toulouse, 1892), 289–330; LAPLAGNE, *L'apostolat de St. Martial* (Limoges, 1896); THOMAS, *Le plus ancien manuscrit de la Vie de St. Martial* in *Ann. du Midi*, VI (Toulouse, 1894), 349–51; see also *Analecta Bollandiana* (Brussels), I, 411–46; XII, 465–6; XIII, 404–5; XIV, 328; XV, 87–8; XVI, 501–6.

LÉON CLUGNET.

Martiall (or MARSHALL), JOHN, b. in Worcestershire, 1534, d. at Lille, 3 April, 1597. He was one of the six companions associated with Dr. Allen in the foundation of the English College at Douai in 1568. He received his education at Winchester (1545–49) and New College, Oxford (1549–56), at which latter place, after a residence of seven years, he graduated as bachelor of civil law in 1556. He next accepted a post as assistant master at his old school at Winchester under Thomas Hyde; but soon after the accession of Elizabeth, both of them found it necessary to quit the country. Marshall retired to Louvain, where a number of English Catholic exiles were residing. Thence he removed to Douai, when he joined the new university recently founded there, and graduated B.D. in 1567. Thus it came about that when Allen arrived to found his new college, Marshall was already in residence, and willingly attached himself to the new foundation, which was destined to play so important a part in English Catholic affairs in the future. He did not, however, remain long, chiefly because of the smallness of the allowance which it was possible to give; later on, he obtained a canonry in the church of St. Peter at the neighbouring city of Lille. Owing to the disturbed state of the country, he was not installed until 1579. He lived to enjoy his dignity for eighteen years. It was during his residence at Louvain that he brought out the two chief literary works for which he is known. The first of these, "Treatise of the Cross" (Antwerp, 1564), was a defence of the honour paid by Catholics to the Cross, and he dedicated it to Queen Elizabeth, being "emboldened upon her keeping the image of a crucifix in her chapel". He was attacked by James Calfhill, the Calvinist, which brought forth his "Reply" (Louvain, 1566). He also wrote a treatise on the "Tonsure of Clerks", which is still in MS.

COOPER in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, s. v.; GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.*, s. v.; KNOX, *Historical Introduction to Douay Diaries;* WOOD, *Athenæ Oxon.*, ed. BLISS, I, 658; DODD, *Church Hist.*, II, 113; PITTS, *De illust. Ang. script.;* HANDECŒUR, *Histoire du Collège Anglais à Douai* (Reims, 1898); CAMM, *Life of Allen* (London, 1908).

BERNARD WARD.

Martianay, JEAN, b. 30 Dec., 1647, at Saint-Sever-Cap, Diocese of Aire; d. 16 June, 1717, at Saint-Germain-des-Prés, Paris. He entered the Benedictine Congregation of St. Maur at an early age, and devoted himself to Biblical studies. He is spoken of repeatedly in the Benedictine annals as "most learned in Greek and Hebrew", and he was ever engaged in perfecting his knowledge. He spent over thirty years in searching the libraries of France for information, particularly with regard to the works of St. Jerome. A circular letter of Martianay's is still extant, in which he begs the co-operation of all the Benedictine abbeys in the work of producing a critical and complete edition of Jerome's writings. Ziegelbauer says (op. cit. below, II, 58) that Martianay completed without aid the gigantic task of editing St. Jerome's works; this is true if we except the "Divina Bibliotheca", or Hieronymian edition of the Vulgate. This work was executed with the collaboration of Dom Ant. Pouget. Martianay's fame as editor of St. Jerome has unfortunately eclipsed his repute as a Biblical scholar. He undertook the work of editing St. Jerome simply because he felt the pressing need of such an edition for all who devoted themselves to Biblical research. He himself taught Scripture at Arles, Bordeaux, and Carcassonne. In addition, he published many critical works on Biblical questions; he wrote a treatise on inspiration against Richard Simon; also a vindication of the Hebrew text and of the chronology given in the Vulgate. Martianay also treated of the history of the canon; the French versions of the New Testament—the "Tentamen Versionis"; and wrote a treatise on "The Method of explaining Holy Scripture". In 1711 he published the life of a nun of the monastery of Beaume.

In one sense it may be said that Martianay's most important contribution to Biblical criticism was his edition of the "Divina Bibliotheca", or St. Jerome's text of the Vulgate. It was a bold thing at that date to attempt to reproduce St. Jerome's text, for the materials were comparatively scanty, and, considering the means at his disposal, Martianay's work was a triumph, not only of industry, but of critical acumen. He tells us at the close of his prolegomena what manuscripts he had at his disposal, six in all, the most important of which was the famous MS. Sangermanensis. Martianay published (1695) a separate collation of this text in his edition of the old Latin version of St. Matthew's Gospel and of the Epistle of St. James. This collation, reproduced by Bianchini in his "Evangelium Quadruplex", was faulty, and the student will find a correction of it in the first volume of Wordsworth and White, "Old Latin Biblical Texts". Ziegelbauer mentions also another work of Martianay, never printed, namely, an edition of the Vulgate with variant readings suggested by the Hebrew and Greek

texts, and furnished with a series of references to the parallel passages. He also published the three psalters of St. Jerome; these appeared in French. Lastly should be mentioned his "New Testament in French" (2 vols., Paris, 1712).

ZIEGELBAUER, *Hist. rei. lit. Ord. S. Bened.* (Augsburg, 1754); TASSIN, *Hist. litt. de la Congrég. de St-Maur* (Paris, 1770), 382–97; DE LAMA, *Bibl. des écrivains de la congrég. de Saint-Maur* (Paris, 1882).

HUGH POPE.

Martianus Capella, Roman writer of Africa who flourished in the fifth century. His work is entitled: "De nuptiis philologiæ et Mercurii". It was composed after the taking of Rome by Alaric (410) and before the conquest of Africa by the Vandals (429). The author, a native of Madaura, Apuleius's birthplace, had settled in Carthage where he earned a precarious living as a solicitor. He proposed to write an encyclopedia of the liberal culture of the time, dedicated to his son Martianus, and this work he planned like the ancient "Satyra", that is a romance which was a medley of prose and verse. The original conception was both bizarre and entertaining. Mercury has grown weary of celibacy but has been refused by Wisdom, Divination and Soul. Apollo speaks favourably of a charming and wise young maiden, Philologia. The gods give their consent to this union provided that the betrothed be made divine. Philologia agrees. Her mother Reflection, the Muses, the Cardinal Virtues, the three Graces surround her and bedeck her. Philologia drinks the cup of ambrosia which makes her immortal and is introduced to the gods. The wedding gifts are examined. Phœbe offers, in her husband's name, a number of young women who will be Philologia's slaves. These women are the 7 liberal arts: Grammar, Dialectics, Rhetoric, Geometry, Arithmetic, Astronomy and Harmony. The first and second books of "De Nuptiis" contain this allegory. Of the remaining books each one treats of an art. Art herself gives an exposition of the principles of the science she governs. Finally night has come. Architecture and Medicine are indeed present, but as they care for nothing but earthly things, they are condemned to remain silent. Harmony escorts the bride to the bridal chamber while nuptial songs are sung. Allegory, as we see, predominates in this work. In it, Martianus Capella notably departs from his model Apuleius and comes nearer medieval times. While the Psyche of Apuleius is a living person and her story a charming one, the personages of Martianus Capella are cold abstractions. His style also suffers in the attempt to imitate Apuleius, for he exaggerates the defects, incongruities, and pedantry of the latter, and is wanting in his qualities of grace, clearness and brilliancy. His verse is better than his prose, as is generally the case among the decadent writers.

The subject treated belongs to a tradition which goes back to Varro's "Disciplinæ". The allusion to architecture and medicine in Martianus Capella is an idea borrowed from Varro who mentioned these arts in his book in connection with the other seven. And before this, in a celebrated passage in "De Officiis" (I, § 161) Cicero opposes medicine and architecture to the precepts which lead to the making of an honest man, while placing them among the liberal arts. In Martianus Capella's day architecture and medicine were no longer taught in the schools, the curriculum of which was reduced to rhetoric and its accompanying arts. St. Augustine, broader minded, mentions architecture and medicine but does not group them with the other arts. Moreover, even in Varro, philosophy is represented only by dialectics. There again, St. Augustine attempted, but vainly, to broaden the narrow school plan and to introduce philosophy. The encyclopedia of human knowledge remained in medieval days as it had been represented to be by the Madaura barrister. Each book is an extract from, or a compilation of, earlier authors: book V (rhetoric), from Aquila Romanus and Fortunatianus; book VI (geometry, including geography), from Solinus and, in an abridged form, from Pliny the Elder; and book X (music), from Aristide's "Quintilian". Varro must also have been largely drawn upon, and, possibly, through Varro, Nigidius Figulus, for data of a religious and astrological order. This encyclopedic work of Martianus Capella is one of the books which exercised a lasting influence. As early as the end of the fifth century, another African, Fulgentius, composed a work modelled on it. In the sixth century Gregory of Tours tells us that it became, in a way, a school manual ("Hist. Franc.", X, 449, 14 Amdt). It was commented upon by Scotus Erigena, Hadoard, Alexander Neckam, Remy of Auxerre. Copies of "De Nuptiis" increased in number; as early as the middle of the sixth century Securus Memor Felix, a professor of rhetoric, received the text in Rome. The book, which is thoroughly pagan and in which one vainly seeks any allusion to Christianity, was the mentor of teachers and suggested the figures of the seven arts which adorn the façades of the cathedrals of the time. A critical edition was published at Leipzig in 1866.

SANDYS, *A history of classical scholarship*, I (Cambridge, 1903), 228; THULIN, *Die götter des Martianus Capella und der Bronzeleber von Piacenza* (Giessen, 1906); NORDEN, *Die antike Kunstpros*, (Leipzig 1898), 11, 670; LUEDECKE, *De M. C. libro sexto* (Göttingen, 1862).

PAUL LEJAY.

Martigny, JOSEPH-ALEXANDRE, canon of Belley, archæologist; b. at Sauverny, Ain, in 1808; d. at Belley, 19 August, 1880. He studied at the *petit séminaire* of Belley and became a professor there in 1832. He was curate later at Cressy and afterwards parish priest of Arbignieu. Encouraged by his bishop and the learned Abbé Greppo, who was distinguished for his labours in promoting a revival of religious archæology in France, he devoted his leisure hours to the pursuit of that science. He was appointed curé of Bagé-le-Châtel and made an honorary canon in 1849. From that time dates his acquaintance with J. B. de Rossi, to whom he became closely attached by reason of his work in the domain of Christian archæology. Though living in a retired locality he collected the matter for his "Dictionnaire des antiquités chrétiennes", which appeared in 1865, the first work of its kind, giving evidence of vast erudition, too vast perhaps, for the articles, so varied in matter and character, are all from the pen of this learned country priest. This work was soon taken up again by Smith in England and Kraus in Germany. Martigny published a corrected edition of his dictionary in 1877. The publisher, Hachette, had intended the work to be a part of the "Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines" of Daremberg and Saglio, but its importance made it an independent work. Mgr. Martigny published also a French edition of the "Bullettino di archæologia cristiana" of de Rossi. His writings include beside his "Dictionnaire des antiquités chrétiennes" (Paris, 1865; 2nd edition, 1877) various articles in "Annales de l'Académie de Macon", 1851, sqq., etc.

Polybiblion, XXIX, 1880, p. 375–76.

R. MAERE.

Martin I, SAINT, POPE, martyr, b. at Todi on the Tiber, son of one Fabricius; elected pope at Rome, 21 July, 649, to succeed Theodore I; d. at Cherson in the present peninsula of Krym, 16 Sept., 655, after a reign of six years, one month and twenty-six days, having ordained eleven priests, five deacons, and thirty-three bishops. 5 July is the date commonly given for his election, but 21 July (given by Lobkowitz, "Statistik der Päpste", Freiburg, 1905) seems to correspond better with the date of death and term of reign (Duchesne, "Lib. Pont.", I, 336); his feast is on 12 Nov. The Greeks honour him on 13 April and 15

Sept., the Muscovites on 14 April. In the hymns of the Office the Greeks style him *infallibilis fidei magister* because he was the successor of St. Peter in the See of Rome (Nilles, "Calendarium Manuale", Innsbruck, 1896, I, 336). Martin, one of the noblest figures in the long line of Roman pontiffs (Hodgkin, "Italy", VI, 268), was, according to his biographer Theodore (Mai, "Spicil. Rom.", IV, 293) of noble birth, a great student, of commanding intelligence, of profound learning, and of great charity to the poor. Piazza, II, 457 states that he belonged to the Order of St. Basil. He governed the Church at a time when the leaders of the Monothelite heresy, supported by the emperor, were making most strenuous efforts to spread their tenets in the East and the West. Pope Theodore had sent Martin as apocrysiary to Constantinople to make arrangements for the canonical deposition of the heretical patriarch, Pyrrhus. After his election Martin had himself consecrated without waiting for the imperial confirmation, and soon called a council in the Lateran at which one hundred and five bishops met. Five sessions were held on 5, 8, 17, 19, and 31 Oct., 649 (Hefele, "Conciliengeschichte", III, 190). The "Ecthesis" of Heraclius and the "Typus" of Constans II, were rejected; nominal excommunication was passed against Sergius, Pyrrhus, and Paul of Constantinople, Cyrus of Alexandria, and Theodore of Pharan in Arabia; twenty canons were enacted defining the Catholic doctrine on the two wills in Christ. The decrees signed by the pope and the assembled bishops were sent to the other bishops and the faithful of the world together with an encyclical of Martin. The Acts with a Greek translation were also sent to the Emperor Constans II.

The pope appointed John, Bishop of Philadelphia, as his vicar in the East with necessary instructions and full authority. Bishop Paul of Thessalonica refused to recall heretical letters previously sent to Rome and added others,—he was, therefore, formally excommunicated and deposed. The Patriarch of Constantinople, Paul, had urged the emperor to use drastic means to force the pope and the Western bishops at least to subscribe to the "Typus". The emperor sent Olympius as exarch to Italy, where he arrived while the council was still in session. Olympius tried to create a faction among the Fathers to favour the views of the emperor, but without success. Then upon pretence of reconciliation he wished to receive holy communion from the hands of the pontiff with the intention of slaying him. But Divine Providence protected the pope, and Olympius left Rome to fight against the Saracens in Sicily and died there. Constans II, thwarted in his plans, sent as exarch Theodore Calliopas with orders to bring Martin to Constantinople. Calliopas arrived in Rome, 15 June, 653, and, entering the Lateran Basilica two days later, informed the clergy that Martin had been deposed as an unworthy intruder, that he must be brought to Constantinople and that another was to be chosen in his place. The pope, wishing to avoid the shedding of human blood, forbade resistance and declared himself willing to be brought before the emperor. The saintly prisoner, accompanied by only a few attendants, and suffering much from bodily ailments and privations, arrived at Constantinople on 17 Sept., 653 or 654, having landed nowhere except at the island of Naxos. The letters of the pope seem to indicate that he was kept at Naxos for a year. Jaffé, n. 1608, and Ewald, n. 2079, consider the *annum fecimus* an interpolation and would allow only a very short stop at Naxos, which granted the pope an opportunity to enjoy a bath. Duchesne, "Lib. Pont.", I, 336, can see no reason for abandoning the traditional account; Hefele, "Conciliengeschichte", III, 212, held the same view (see "Zeitschr. für Kath. Theol.", 1892, XVI, 375).

From Abydos messengers were dispatched to the imperial city to announce the arrival of the prisoner, who was branded as a heretic and rebel, an enemy of God and of the State. Upon his arrival at Constantinople Martin was left for several hours on deck exposed to the jests and insults of a curious crowd of spectators. Towards evening he was brought to a prison called Prandearia and kept in close and cruel confinement for ninety-three days, suffering from hunger, cold, and thirst. All this did not break his energy and on 19 December he was brought before the assembled senate where the imperial treasurer acted as judge. Various political charges were made, but the true and only charge was the pope's refusal to sign the "Typus". He was then carried to an open space in full view of the emperor and of a large crowd of people. These were asked to pass anathema upon the pope, to which but few responded. Numberless indignities were heaped upon him, he was stripped of nearly all his clothing, loaded with chains, dragged through the streets of the city and then again thrown into the prison of Diomede, where he remained for eighty-five days. Perhaps influenced by the death of Paul, Patriarch of Constantinople, Constans did not sentence the pope to death, but to exile. He was put on board a ship, 26 March, 654 (655) and arrived at his destination on 15 May. Cherson was at the time suffering from a great famine. The venerable pontiff here passed the remaining days of his life. He was buried in the church of Our Lady, called Blachernæ, near Cherson, and many miracles are related as wrought by St. Martin in life and after death. The greater part of his relics are said to have been transferred to Rome, where they repose in the church of San Martino ai Monti. Of his letters seventeen are extant in P. L., LXXXVII, 119.

MANN, *Lives of the Popes*, I (London, 1902), 385; *Hist. Jahrbuch*, V, 424; XII, 757; LECLERCQ, *Les Martyrs*, IX (Paris, 1905), 234; *Civiltà Cattolica*, III (1907), 272, 656.

FRANCIS MERSHMAN.

Martin II, III, POPES. See MARINUS I, II, POPES.

Martin IV (SIMON DE BRIE), POPE; b. at the castle of Montpensier in the old French province of Touraine at an unknown date; d. at Perugia 28 March, 1285. As priest he held a benefice at Rouen for a short time, whereupon he became canon and treasurer at the church of St. Martin in Tours. King Louis IX made him Chancellor of France in 1260 and Urban VI created him cardinal-priest with the titular church of St. Cecilia in December, 1262. Under Urban VI (1261–4) and his successor, Clement IV (1265–8), he was legate in France with powers to offer the Kingdom of Sicily to Charles of Anjou on certain conditions. Under Gregory X (1271–76) he was sent as legate to France a second time, with ample faculties to stem the abuses that had crept into the Church of France. In this capacity he presided over various reformatory synods, the most important of which was the one held at Bourges in September, 1276 (Mansi, Sacr. Conc. nova et ampl. Collectio XXIV, 165–180). Just six months after the death of Pope Nicholas III, Simon de Brie was unanimously elected pope at Viterbo on 22 February, 1281. His election was due to Charles of Anjou who was present at Viterbo and caused the two most influential cardinals of the Italian faction to be imprisoned before the conclave, on the plea that they were retarding the election. Cardinal Simon de Brie accepted the tiara with reluctance and chose the name of Martin. Though he was only the second pope by the name of Martin he is generally known as Martin IV, because since the beginning of the thirteenth century the Popes Marinus I (882–4) and Marinus II (942–6) were listed among the Martins.

ARMS OF MARTIN IV

Unable to go to Rome where a pope of French nationality was hated, and unwilling to stay at Viterbo

which was under interdict because it had imprisoned two cardinals, Martin IV went to Orvieto where he was crowned on 23 March. Though personally pious and well-meaning, the new pope was dependent in everything on Charles of Anjou whom he at once appointed to the influential position of Roman Senator. He also assisted him in his endeavours to restore the Latin Empire of the East, and excommunicated the Greek emperor, Michael Palaeologus, of Constantinople, who opposed the plans of Charles of Anjou. By this imprudent act he broke the union which had been effected between the Greek and the Latin Churches at the Council of Lyons in 1274. After Sicily forcibly threw off the galling yoke of Charles of Anjou and gave expression to its deep hatred of France in the cruel massacre known as the Sicilian Vespers, Pope Martin IV used his full papal power to save Sicily for France. He excommunicated Peter III of Aragon whom the Sicilians had elected as their king, declared his kingdom of Aragon forfeited and ordered a crusade to be preached against him. But all his efforts proved useless. Among the seven cardinals created by Martin IV was Benedetto Gaetano, who afterwards ascended the papal throne as the famous Boniface VIII.

Les Régistres de Martin IV (1281–1285) in *Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome*, four fascicles (Paris, 1901); *Vita Martini ex Ms. Bernardi Guidonis* in MURATORI, *Rerum italicarum scriptores*, III, i, 608–610; CHOULLIER, *Recherches sur la vie du pape Martin IV* in *Revue de Champagne* IV (1878), 15–30; DUCHESNE, *Liber Pontificalis*, II (Paris, 1902), 459–464; POTTHAST, *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum*, II, (Berlin, 1874), 1756–1795.

MICHAEL OTT.

Martin V (ODDONE COLONNA), POPE; b. at Genazzano in the Campagna di Roma, 1368; d. at Rome, 20 February, 1431. He studied at the University of Perugia, became prothonotary Apostolic under Urban VI, papal auditor and nuncio at various Italian courts under Boniface IX, and was administrator of the Diocese of Palestrina from 15 December, 1401, to 1405, and from 18 to 23 September, 1412. On 12 June, 1405, he was made Cardinal Deacon of San Giorgio in Velabro. He deserted the lawful pope, Gregory XII, was present at the Council of Pisa, and took part in the election of the antipopes Alexander V and John XXIII. At the Council of Constance he was, after a conclave of three days, unanimously elected pope on 11 November, 1417, by the representatives of the five nations (Germany, France, Italy, Spain, and England) and took the name of Martin V in honour of the saint of Tours whose feast fell on the day of his election. Being then only subdeacon, he was ordained deacon on 12, and priest on 13, and was consecrated bishop on 14 November. On 21 November he was crowned pope in the great court of the episcopal palace at Constance. (Concerning his further activity at the council, see CONSTANCE, COUNCIL OF.)

ARMS OF MARTIN V

The influential family of the Colonnas had already given twenty-seven cardinals to the Church, but Martin V was the first to ascend the papal throne. He was in the full vigour of life, being only forty-one years of age. Of simple and unassuming manners and stainless character, he possessed a great knowledge of canon law, was pledged to no party, and had numerous other good qualities. He seemed the right man to rule the Church, which had just passed through the most critical period of its history—the so-called Western Schism. The antipopes, John XXIII and Benedict XIII, were still recalcitrant. The former, however, submitted to Martin at Florence on 23 June, 1419, and was made Dean of the Sacred College and Cardinal-Bishop of Frascati. The latter remained stubborn to the end, but had little following. His successor Clement VIII submitted to Martin V in 1429, while another successor of Benedict XIII, who had been elected by only one cardinal and styled himself Benedict XIV, was excommunicated by Martin V, and thereafter had only a few supporters (see SCHISM, WESTERN). On 22 April, 1418, Martin V dissolved the council, but remained in Constance, concluding separate concordats with Germany (Mansi, "Sacrorum Conc. nova et ampl. Coll.", XXVII, 1189–93), France (ibid., 1184–9) England (ibid., 1193–5), Spain ("Colección completa de concordatos españoles", Madrid, 1862, 9 sq.). A separate concordat was probably made also with Italy, though some believe it identical with the concordat of Spain. King Sigismund of Germany used every effort to induce Martin V to reside in a German city, while France begged him to come to Avignon, but, rejecting all offers, he set out for Rome on 16 May, 1418.

The sad state of Rome, however, made it impossible at that time to re-establish the papal throne there. The city was wellnigh in ruins, famine and sickness had decimated its inhabitants, and the few people that still lived there were on the verge of starvation. Martin V, therefore, proceeded slowly on his way thither, stopping for some time at Berne, Geneva, Mantua, and Florence. While sojourning in the two last-named cities, he gained the support of Queen Joanna of Naples, who was in possession of Rome and Naples, by consenting to recognize her rights as Queen of Naples and to permit her coronation by the Cardinal Legate Morosini on 28 October, 1419. She ordered her general, Sforza Attendolo, to evacuate Rome on 6 March, 1419, and granted important fiefs in her kingdom to the pope's two brothers, Giordano and Lorenzo. With the help of the Florentines, Martin also came to an understanding with the famous condottiere Braccio di Montone, who had gained mastery over half of Central Italy. The pope allowed him to retain Perugia, Assisi, Todi, and Jesi as vicar of the Church, whereupon Braccio restored all his other conquests, and in July, 1420, compelled Bologna to submit to the pope.

Martin was now able to continue his journey to Rome, where he arrived on 28 September, 1420. He at once set to work, establishing order and restoring the dilapidated churches, palaces, bridges, and other public structures. For this restoration he engaged some famous masters of the Tuscan school, and thus laid the foundation of the Roman Renaissance. When practically a new Rome had risen from the ruins of the old, the pope turned his attention to the rest of the Papal States, which during the schism had become an incoherent mass of independent cities and provinces. After the death of Braccio di Montone in June, 1424, Perugia, Assisi, Todi, and Jesi freely submitted to the pope, and they were soon followed by the remaining papal territory. Bologna again revolted in 1428, but returned to the papal allegiance in the following year. In these activities, Martin V was greatly assisted by his kindred, the Colonna family, whom he overwhelmed with important civil and ecclesiastical offices. In his case, however, the charge of nepotism loses some of its odiousness, for, when he came to Rome, he was a landless ruler and could look for support to no one except his relatives.

The tendency, which some of the cardinals had manifested at the Council of Constance to substitute constitutional for monarchical government in the Church and to make the pope subject to a General Council, was firmly and successfully opposed by Martin V. The council had decided that a new council should be convened within five years. Accordingly, Martin convened a council, which opened at Pavia in April, 1423, but had to be transferred to Siena in June in consequence of the plague. He used the small attendance and the disagreement of the cardinals as a pretext to dissolve it again on 26 February, 1424, but agreed to summon a new council at Basle within seven

years. He died, however, before this convened, though he had previously appointed Cardinal Giuliano Cesarini as president of the council with powers to transfer and, if necessary, suspend it. Though Martin V allowed adjustment of the temporal affairs of the Church to draw his attention from the more important duty of reforming the papal court and the clergy, still the sorry condition of Rome and the Papal States at his acession palliate this neglect. He did not entirely overlook the inner reform of the Church; especially during the early part of his pontificate, he made some attempts at reforming the clergy of St. Peter's and abolishing the most crying abuses of the Curia. In a Bull issued on 16 March, 1425, he made some excellent provisions for a thorough reform, but the Bull apparently remained a dead letter. (This Bull is printed in Döllinger, "Beiträge zur politischen, kirchlichen and Kulturgeschichte der sechs letzten Jahrhunderte", II, Ratisbon, 1863, pp. 335–44.) He also successfully opposed the secular encroachments upon the rights of the Church in France by issuing a Constitution (13 April, 1425), which greatly limited the Gallican liberties in that part of France which was subject to King Henry VI of England, and by entering a new concordat with King Charles VII of France in August, 1426 (see Valois, "Concordats antérieurs à celui de François I. Pontificat de Martin V" in "Revue des questions historiques", LXXVII, Paris, 1905, pp. 376–427). Against the Hussites in Bohemia he ordered a crusade, and negotiated with Constantinople in behalf of a reunion of the Greek with the Latin Church. His bulls, diplomas, letters etc. are printed in Mansi, "Sacrorum Conc. nova et ampl., coll.," XXVII–XXVIII.

PASTOR, *Gesch. der Päpste seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalters*, I (4th ed., Freiburg, 1901), 1st ed. tr. ANTROBUS, *History of the Popes from the close of the Middle Ages*, I (London, 1891), 208–82; CREIGHTON, *History of the Papacy during the Period of the Reformation*, I-II (London, 1882); HALLER, *England u. Rom. unter Martin V* (Rome, 1905); CONTELORI, *Vita di Martino V* (Rome, 1641); CIROCCO, *Vita di Martino V* (Foligno, 1638); FUNK, *Martin V und das Konzil zu Konstanz* in *Theolog. Quartalschr.*, LXX (Tübingen, 1888), 451–65; VERNET, *Martin V et Bernardin de Sienne* in *Université Catholique*, IV (Lyons, 1890), 563–94; IDEM, *Le pape Martin V et les Juifs* in *Revue des questions hist.*, LI (Paris, 1892), 373–423; LANCIANI, *Patrimonio della famiglia Colonna al tempo di Martin V* in *Archivio della Società Romana di storia patria*, XX (Rome, 1897), 369–449; FROMME, *Die Wahl des Papstes Martin V* in *Römische Quartalschr.*, X (Rome, 1896), 131–61. Earlier lives of Martin V are printed in MURATORI, *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, III, ii, 857–68. See also bibliography under CONSTANCE, COUNCIL OF, and SCHISM, WESTERN.

MICHAEL OTT.

Martin, Benedictine Abbot of the Schottenkloster at Vienna, b. about 1400; d. 28 July, 1464 (29 July 1470). Born of wealthy farmers at Leibitz, County of Zips in Hungary, he made his studies at Krakow and Vienna, and in the latter place taught for some time in the faculty of arts. Accompanying his mother on a pilgrimage to Italy, he visited the ancient monastery of Subiaco and took the habit of St. Benedict about 1425. But he found the climate and discipline too severe for his delicate health, and was transferred to the Schottenkloster at Vienna. In 1428 he was sent to the Council of Basle, and on his return was made prior. After the death of John IV, he was elected abbot on 19 Oct., 1446. He now laboured hard and incessantly for the welfare, spiritual and temporal, of the abbey and of the order. To advance the education of his subjects he secured a library not equalled by many in his days. Cardinal legate Nicholas of Cusa in 1451 appointed him, with some others, visitors of the Benedictine abbeys of the Diocese of Salzburg, with powers to introduce necessary or useful reforms. By authority of Nicholas V, he examined the election of the Abbot of Melk and, finding no canonical defect, confirmed the same. He also stood high in the estimation of Pius II and Emperor Frederick IV. Though paying heavy taxes towards a fund against the Turks, Martin placed his abbey on a solid financial basis. For unknown reasons he resigned the abbatial dignity at the close of 1460 or the beginning of 1461 (some say 1455). Only one work of Martin's has appeared in print, called "Senatorium", which gives accounts of himself, his visitation trip and other matters of interest in Austrian history — complete edition in Pez, "Rerum Austr. Script.", II, 626. In Munich and Vienna there are some copies of smaller works in manuscript.

BRAUNMÜLLER in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.; BRUNNER, *Benedictinerbuch* (Würzburg), 390; HAUSWIRTH, *Abriss einer Gesch. der Schotten* (Vienna, 27); HURTER, *Nomencl.*, II (1906), 945.

FRANCIS MERSHMAN.

Martin, FELIX, antiquary, historiographer, architect, educationist, b. 4 October, 1804, at Auray, seat of the famous shrine of St. Ann in Brittany, France; d. at Vaugirard, Paris, 25 November, 1886. His father, Jacques Augustin Martin, for many years mayor of Auray and Attorney-General of Morbihan, was a public benefactor. His mother was Anne Armel Lauzer de Kerzo, a truly pious matron, of whose ten children three entered religious communities, while the others, as heads of families, shone in Breton society as models of every domestic virtue. Felix, having made his classical studies at the Jesuit seminary close by the shrine of St. Anne, entered the Society of Jesus at Montrouge, Paris, 27 September, 1823, but on the opening of a new novitiate at Avignon, in Aug., 1824, he was transferred there. Thence in 1826 he was sent to the one time famous college of Arc, at Dôle, to complete his logic and gain his first experience in the management of youth among its 400 pupils. The following scholastic year, 1826–1827, at St-Acheul, he began his career as teacher. This was soon to be interrupted, for already among the revolutionists of the boulevards and in the Chamber of Deputies the wildest and most preposterous accusations had been formulated against the Society. This agitation culminated on 16 June, 1828, in the "Ordonnances de Charles X" which were to be enforced the following October. The Fathers, meanwhile, quietly closed their colleges, their teachers went into temporary exile and among them Fr. Martin. He spent the succeeding years in colleges established across the frontier.

In Switzerland, Brieg and Estavayé; in Spain, Le Passage near St. Sebastian; in Belgium, the College of Brugelette, were in turn the scenes of his labours as student or as teacher. It was when he was in Switzerland, in 1831, that he received Holy orders. Eleven years later, while engaged in the ministry at Angers he was informed that, under Father Chazelle, ex-rector of St. Mary's College, Kentucky, he was chosen together with Fathers Hainpaux, Tellier and Dominique du Ranquet to restore the Society of Jesus in Canada, extinct since the death of Father Jean Joseph Casot at Quebec on 16 March, 1800. The party reached their destination on 31 May, 1842. On 2 July, Mgr. Bourget, at whose invitation the fathers had come, confided to them the parish of Laprairie, deprived of its pastor, the Rev. Michael Power, by his promotion to the newly erected episcopal see of Toronto, 26 June, 1842. On 31 July, 1844, Fr. Martin was named superior of the mission in Lower Canada, now the Province of Quebec. The enthusiastic citizens of Montreal had generously subscribed towards the building of a college, his principal preoccupation. In May, 1847, ground was broken and the foundations were laid. Then came a series of disasters which interrupted all further work. The greater portion of Laprairie was swept by fire and the presbytery of the fathers was reduced to ashes. The great conflagration of Quebec followed, whereby a vast portion of the city was destroyed. Thousands of Irish immigrants were pouring into the country; in 1847 the numbers reached nearly 100,000. With them they brought the dreaded typhus or ship-fever. In that year alone nearly two thousand were stricken down in Montreal. With Christian intre-

pidity the priests of St. Sulpice, pastors of the city, devoted themselves to the spiritual relief of the sick and dying, and five at the outset fell victims to their zeal. Fathers Paul Mignard and Henri du Ranquet, arriving from New York gave timely assistance. But this was far from sufficient, so Fr. Martin appealed to Fr. Thébaud, rector of St. John's, Fordham, for volunteers to assist the plague-stricken. The answer was the immediate arrival of Fathers Driscoll, Dumerle, Ferard and Schianski. All escaped the contagion except Fr. Dumerle, who fell a martyr of charity.

The priests of St. Sulpice, whose ranks were thinned by the ravages of the plague, asked for four English-speaking Fathers to take charge of St. Patrick's Church. A presbytery was provided for them near the very ground whereon the college had been commenced. In it there was room sufficient to house a few teachers. A temporary structure was put up, and opened as a college on 20 September, 1848. A few boarders even were received and lodged in a small tenement in a street hard by. It was not till the month of May, 1850, that work was resumed on the college building, but so strenuously was it prosecuted that Mgr Bourget was invited to bless it, in its advanced stage of completion, on 31 July, 1851, feast of St. Ignatius. On 4 August the novitiate was transferred from its temporary quarters in M. Rodier's house, and installed in the new edifice, and in the beginning of September everything was in perfect working order in the young institution of learning, from under whose roof, in later years, so many remarkable men were to go forth as statesmen, judges, physicians and members of the clergy and of the bar. This was Fr. Martin's achievement. But he was not only the founder of St. Mary's College, the financier, the architect, and the overseer of the material construction, he was also the systematizer of its curriculum during his rectorship which lasted until 1857. The stately pile of St. Patrick's Church, Montreal, was also of his designing, the main outlines of which are in pure thirteenth-century Gothic. Fr. Martin was the originator of the well-known Archives of St. Mary's College, and the principal collector of the priceless historical treasures they contain. He awakened in his contemporaries a keen interest in the records of an almost forgotten past. With such men as Viger, Faribault, E. B. O'Callaghan, etc., he quickened, if he really did not set on foot, that campaign of research which ended in the placing within reach of all the original historical sources of the colonial and missionary days of New France.

No better account of Fr. Martin's labours in this field could be given than that which appeared a few months after his death in the "Catholic World" (N. Y., April, 1887): "But, it is, perhaps, as an antiquarian and a man of letters that Fr. Martin has become most generally known. His services to historical literature, particularly the history of Canada, have been many and great. He devoted himself amidst all his onerous duties to the task of throwing light on the dark places of the past. He was commissioned by Government to explore the regions where of old the Jesuits had toiled amongst the Hurons, giving at last to the dusky tribes the priceless gifts of faith. He wrote at this time a work embellished with various plans and drawings, all of which remained in possession of the Government. He also collected many curious Indian relics. In 1857 he was sent by the Canadian Government to Europe on a scientific mission, and was likewise entrusted with the task of examining the Archives of Rome and of Paris for points of interest in relation to Canadian history. In this he was eminently successful. He discovered a number of unpublished documents relating to Canada which would be sufficient to fill a folio volume. Perhaps his most eminent service to historical literature was his great share in bringing out the 'Relations des Jésuites' [1611–1672], a very mine of information for the scholar. . . . He discovered and put into print, with preface and most valuable annotations by himself, the 'Relations', extending from 1672 to 1679. He added to them two geographical charts. . . . Fr. Martin also translated from Italian to French the 'Relation' of Père Bressani, which he published with notes, together with a biography of that glorious martyr. His historical works included Lives of Samuel de Champlain (?), the founder of Quebec, of Fathers Brébeuf, Chaumonot and Jogues [and, not mentioned in the article, of Montcalm]. The latter [that of Fr. Jogues] has become known to the American public through the translation made by our foremost Catholic historian, John Gilmary Shea. Fr. Martin was the friend, adviser, and co-labourer of the eminent Canadian historical writer, J. Viger." And letters preserved in the College archives attest that his relations with E. B. O'Callaghan, compiler of the "Documentary History of New York", were of a kindred nature.

Among his lesser publications may be mentioned: "Notice Biographique de la Mère S. Stanislas [his sister] Religieuse de la Misericorde de Jésus, de la Hôtel-Dieu d'Auray, 1886", "Manuel du Pélerin à N. D. de Bonsecours", "Neuvaine à St François Xavier" and "Neuvaine à St. Antoine de Padoue". After his return from Europe, in 1858 and 1859, he was bursar of St. Mary's College, and the two following years, 1860 and 1861, superior of the Quebec residence. His eyesight was already much impaired, and the glare of the Canadian snows was very trying, so much so that he was threatened with total blindness. For this reason he was recalled to France. He spent part of the year 1862 at Ste Geneviève College, Paris, and was appointed on the 12 September (1862) rector of the college of Vannes.

After three years, on 8 Sept., 1865, he was named superior of the residence of the Holy Name at Poitiers. Thence he was transferred to Vaugirard College at Paris, where he had the spiritual direction of the house for six years. On 5 Sept., 1874, he went to Rouen for three years as superior, and returned to Vaugirard in 1878. At the closing of the Jesuit colleges by the arbitrary enactments of the French Republic, the community of Vaugirard was dispersed, and Fr. Martin, with a few others of his fellow religious took up their abode in 1882 at No. 1 Rue Desnouettes. Here he remained for five years patiently awaiting the final call of the Master, though never ceasing to collect materials bearing on the history of the country of his predilection. Physically, Fr. Martin was of medium height, heavily built, but carrying his weight lightly and with dignity. His name is a household word for all who are given to historical research not only in Canada of to-day but throughout the vast territory comprised within the vaguely defined limits of New France.

THWAITES, *Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents*, LXXIII, 133; *Cath. World*, New York, April, 1887, 107; [VIGNON?], *Le Père Martin* (brochure); [DE BOMPART?], *L'Enseignement des Jésuites au Canada* in the *Revue Canadienne* (Oct., 1891); TANGUAY, *Répertoire Gén. du Clergé Canadien;* MARTIN, *Notice Biographique de la Mère S. Stanislas* (Paris, 1886).

ARTHUR EDWARD JONES.

Martin, GREGORY, translator of the Douai Version of the Bible from the Latin Vulgate; b. in Maxfield, parish of Guestling, near Winchelsea, in Sussex; d. at Reims, 28 October, 1582. In preparing the translation he was assisted by several of the other great scholars then living in the English College at Douai, but Gregory Martin made the whole translation in the first instance and bore the brunt of the work throughout. He was well qualified for the undertaking. During his thirteen years' residence at Oxford, he bore the reputation of a brilliant scholar and linguist, whose abilities were only equalled by his industry. He entered as one of the original scholars of St. John's College, in 1557. Among

those who entered at the beginning was Edmund Campion, the renowned Jesuit martyr. At this period of his life, however, he was possessed with the ambitions of youth, and although at heart a Catholic, he conformed to the Established Church, and even accepted ordination as a deacon. Gregory Martin was his close friend throughout his Oxford days, and himself remained a devout Catholic. When he found it necessary to quit the university, he took refuge as tutor in the family of the Duke of Norfolk, where he had among his pupils Philip, Earl of Arundel, also subsequently martyred. During his residence with the Duke, Martin wrote to Campion, warning him that he was being led away into danger by his ambition, and begging him to leave Oxford. It is said that it was in great measure due to this advice that Campion migrated to Dublin in 1570, and accepted a post in the university there. He continued to conform to the established religion outwardly; but his Catholic sentiments were no secret.

In the meantime Gregory Martin left the house of the Duke of Norfolk, and crossing the seas, presented himself at Dr. Allen's College at Douai as a candidate for the priesthood, in 1570. During his early days there, he wrote once more to Campion, who yielded to his entreaties, and the following year saw the two friends once more united within the venerable walls of the English College at Douai. Campion was now a professed Catholic, and he received minor orders and the subdiaconate, after which he proceeded to Rome and eventually entered the Society of Jesus. Having finished his theology, Gregory Martin was ordained priest in March, 1573. Three years later he went to Rome to assist Allen in the foundation of the English College there, known by the title of the "Venerabile". Campion, however, was at that time absent from Rome. Martin remained two years, during which time he organized the course of studies at the new college; when he was recalled by Allen to Reims, whither the college had been removed from Douai in consequence of political troubles. Martin and Campion met once more in this world, when the latter made a short stay at Reims in the summer of 1580, on his way to the English Mission, and—as it turned out—to early martyrdom.

It was during the next four years after his return from Rome that Gregory Martin's brilliant talents and scholarship found full scope in a work destined to be of far-reaching and permanent utility to English Catholics. The need of a Catholic translation of the Bible had long been felt, in order to counteract the various inaccurate versions which were continually quoted by the Reformers, and as Allen said, to meet them on their own ground. He determined to attempt the work at his college, and deputed Martin to undertake the translation. Thomas Worthington, Richard Bristowe, John Reynolds, and Allen himself were to assist in revising the text and preparing suitable notes to the passages which were most used by the Protestants.

The merits and shortcomings of Martin's translation have been discussed in the article on the Douai Bible (q. v.). It is sufficient here to say that it was made from the Vulgate, and is full of Latinisms, so that it has little of the rhythmic harmony of the Anglican Authorized Version which has become part of the literature of the nation: but in accuracy and scholarship, it was superior to any of the English versions which had preceded it, and it is understood to have had great influence on the translators of King James's Version. In many cases in which they did not follow the Douai, the editors of the Revised Version have upheld Gregory Martin's translation. And it was accuracy of rendering which was chiefly needed by the controversial exigencies of the day.

The Reims New Testament first appeared in 1582. The Old Testament was not published till more than a quarter of a century later. This, however, was solely due to want of funds. It was not called for with such urgency, and its publication was put off from year to year. But it was all prepared at the same time as the New Testament, and by the same editors.

The constant work told on Martin's constitution, and he was found to be in consumption. In the hope of saving his life, Allen sent him to Paris, where he consulted the best physicians of the day, only to be told that the disease was past cure. He returned to Reims to die, and he was buried in the parish church of St. Stephen. Allen preached the funeral discourse, and erected a long Latin inscription on the tomb of his friend. The following is a list of Martin's works: "Treatise of Schisme" (Douai, 1578); "Discovery of the Manifold Corruptions of the Holy Scriptures by the Heretikes of our Daies" (Reims, 1582); Reims Testament and Douay Bible; "Treatise of Christian Peregrination" (Reims, 1583); "Of the Love of the Soul" (St. Omer, 1603); "Gregorius Martinus ad Adolphum Mekerchum pro veteri et vera Græcarum Literarum Pronunciatione" (Oxford, 1712); several other works in MS. mentioned by Pitts.

BURTON, *Life of Challoner* (London, 1909); DODD, *Ch. Hist.*; PITTS, *De Illust. Script. Eccles.*; WOOD, *Athenæ Oxon.*; KNOX, *Historical Introduction to Douay Diaries* (1878); IDEM, *Letters of Card. Allen* (1882); FOLEY, *Records S. J.*; SIMPSON, *Life of Campion* (London, 1866; reissued, 1907); *Menology of St. Edmund's College* (London, 1909). Also bibliography of article DOUAI BIBLE.

BERNARD WARD.

Martin, KONRAD, Bishop of Paderborn; b. 18 May, 1812, at Geismar, Province of Saxony; d. 16 July, 1879, at Mont St Guibert, near Brussels, Belgium. He studied at first under an elder brother who was a priest, and later at the "gymnasium" at Heiligenstadt; he studied theology and Oriental languages for two years at Munich under Döllinger and Allioli, then went to Halle where the famous Gesenius taught, and thence to Würzburg where he passed the *examen rigorosum* for the degree of "Doctor Theologiæ". But before he could present the necessary Public Act, he was compelled to leave Würzburg, and undergo the same examination in Münster, Westphalia, because the Prussian ministry forbade studying at South German universities and did not recognize their degrees. In 1835 he obtained in Münster the degree of D.D., for his dissertation: "De Petri denegatione, qua inquiritur de huius criminis ethica natura et iuculentioribus effectibus". Feeling an inclination towards academic teaching which the Diocese of Paderborn was unable to satisfy, he entered the Archdiocese of Cologne, and as a student of the theological seminary was ordained priest in 1836. Immediately after this he was appointed rector of the "pro-gymnasium" at Wipperfürth, which had just been established, and published, in Mainz, 1839, under the pseudonym Dr. Fridericus Lange, a sharp and forceful pamphlet against Hermesianism, written in classical Latin and entitled "Novæ annotationes ad Acta Hermesiana et Acta Romana, quas ad causam Hermesianam denuo illustrandam scripsit". The pamphlet created a sensation everywhere and caused the coadjutor Geissel of Cologne to appoint the young savant teacher of religion at the Marzellengymnasium at Cologne in the year 1840. In order to elevate the teaching of religion in the higher schools and to infuse into it a deeper significance, he wrote his famous text-book of the Catholic religion for high-schools, which appeared at Mainz in 1843 in two volumes and went through fifteen editions. It was used as a text-book in all Prussian gymnasia and translated into Hungarian and French, but later on, during the Kulturkampf, it was suppressed by order of the Prussian minister of education.

Before the end of the same year he was invited by Bishop Dammers of Paderborn to become professor of dogmatic theology in the faculty of his home diocese, but Geissel requested him to remain in Cologne and

made him extraordinary professor of theology at the University of Bonn, inspector of the local seminaries, and, with Dieringer, university preacher. In 1848 he became ordinary professor of moral theology and published, in 1850, the "Lehrbuch der katholischen Moral" which as early as 1865 had gone through five editions. Dating back to his work as professor in Bonn, there exist numerous articles in the "katholischen Vierteljahrsschrift für Wissenschaft und Kunst" of which he was one of the founders, as well as in the "Kirchenlexikon"; there are furthermore an unfinished translation of the "Jewish History" of Flavius Josephus, a translation of the writings of St. Thomas Aquinas on the Eucharist and the Ten Commandments, an edition of Maldonatus's "Commentary on the Four Gospels" (1854 and 1862) and finally, "Die Wissenschaft von der göttlichen Dingen" a popular handbook of Dogma representing the ripe fruits of his long work upon the writings of St. Thomas (1855 and 1869). Soon, however, he was compelled to give up his work at Bonn.

In 1856 he was elected Bishop of Paderborn, and consecrated by Cardinal Geissel on 17 August. Filled with apostolic zeal he accepted the responsible office, and became one of the most illustrious bishops of Germany; one who with his untiring labour and perseverance encouraged Christian life in his extensive diocese, and who exerted a beneficent influence even far beyond his own domain, by his example and his writings. As a man of firm and unshakable faith he considered it his chief duty to protect the Faith against all attacks. It was his first care to train effective priests. In order to accomplish this purpose, he combined his annual confirmation journeys with detailed investigations so as to become acquainted with his clergy and to instil everywhere a true ecclesiastical spirit. He founded, in 1857, at Heiligenstadt a second seminary for boys and introduced the general examination for priests. In connection with ideas he formed in 1860 during the provincial council at Cologne, he founded with his own money a theological school at Paderborn He even had the satisfaction of holding a diocesan synod at Paderborn in 1867, the first for two centuries; at this synod the resolutions passed at the Council of Cologne were adopted, although in slightly changed form. In order to give more effect to these resolutions, he caused them to be published in the "Acta et Decreta synodi diœcesis Paderborniensis", 1867 (2nd edition, 1888). He acquired especial merit through the establishment and enlargement of the Bonifatius-Verein, of which he was president from 1859 until 1875, and through the assistance of which he was able to found about fifty new missionary posts in neglected districts. In two magnificent works, "The Chief Duty of Catholic Germany", and "Another Message to the Christian German People in Matters Regarding the Bonifatius-Verein" he explained its noble aims and made a powerful appeal for the manifesting of Christian faith by giving assistance to poor Catholic churches and priests. Full of enthusiasm he even planned to lead the Protestants of Germany back to the Catholic Church and addressed to them three friendly brochures entitled: "An episcopal message to the Protestants of Germany, especially to those of my own Diocese, regarding the points of controversy between us" (Paderborn, 1866); "Second Episcopal Message to the Protestants of Germany" (same year); and "Why is there still this gulf between the Churches? An open message to Germany's Catholics and Protestants" (Paderborn, 1869). Naturally these writings did not have the success expected by him, but on the contrary made him many enemies; they stirred, however, many Catholics from their torpidity and strengthened them in their faith.

The Vatican Council gave him the opportunity to show his fidelity to the Holy See and to champion his faith. As a member of the "Congregatio dogmatica" and the "Commissio pro postulatis" he took a lively part in the discussions of the same, and was from the beginning a zealous defendant of the infallibility of the papal office; with him originated the wording of the most important chapter of the final decision. Soon after the new dogma had been formulated, and, in order to quiet nervous minds and to enlighten the faithful, he published several pastorals which passed far beyond the confines of his own diocese; as, for instance, "The Infallible Office of the Pope", (1870); and "A Pastoral Message: What the Vatican Council presents to us as Faith regarding the pope" (1871); and several more extensive works, in which he explains in detail the far-reaching consequences of the decision, as "The real meaning of the Vatican decision regarding the Infallible Papal Office" (Paderborn, 1871), the "Deliberations of the Vatican Council" (Paderborn, 1873), which was also translated into Italian, and "Omnium Concilii Vaticani, quæ ad doctrinam et disciplinam pertinent documentorum collectio" (Paderborn, 1873). This fidelity to the Apostolic See which he showed openly at every opportunity despite all hostile criticisms; his restless activity for the spread of the Catholic faith; the establishment of missions in Northern Germany, and his open message to the Protestants of Germany, formed the opportunity for the most vituperious attacks against him in the daily press and, as soon as the necessary laws had been passed, a welcome occasion to proceed against him by means of different oppressive measures and a chance to attempt to undermine his authority; but in vain, for as soon as the intentions of the Prussian government became clear to all, thousands of men from the whole diocese journeyed to the cathedral town enthusiastically to swear undying fidelity to their bishop and to the Catholic Church.

Finally, in 1874, because of his transgression of the May Laws, he was sentenced to imprisonment; in the following year relieved of his office, by order of the Minister of Worship, and incarcerated in the fortress of Wesel. A few months later, however, he succeeded in escaping to Holland, but was expelled on the demand of the Prussian government. He found a refuge with the Sisters of Christian Love, who had been banished from Paderborn and who had settled in Mont St. Guibert. From there, as a centre, he governed secretly his diocese, laboured as pastor and teacher of religion, and wrote several works, of which these are noteworthy: "Drei Jahre aus meinen Leben: 1874–1877" (Paderborn, 1877); "Zeitbilder oder Erinnerungen an meine verewigten Wohltäter", (Mainz, 1879). Numerous other writings, mostly the fruit of lectures in the seminary, in the mother house of the Sisters of Christian Love at Paderborn and in St Guibert, we must leave unnoticed. Some have only been found among his papers after his death, and were published by his companion and private secretary, Stamm, in seven volumes, 1882–1890.

STAMM, *Dr. Conrad Martin, ein bibliographischer Versuch.* (1892); IDEM, *Urkundensammlung zur Biographie* (1892); IDEM, *Aus der Briefmappe Martins* (Paderborn, 1902).

PATRICIUS SCHLAGER.

Martin, PAULIN, a French Biblical scholar, b. at Lacam, Lot, 20 July, 1840; d. at Amélie-les-Bains, Pyrénées-Orientales, 14 Jan., 1890. His secondary studies were made at the *petit séminaire* of Montfaucon, and his theology at St. Sulpice. Here he came under the influence of Le Hir. At the end of his theology, Martin was too young for ordination; so he went to the French Seminary, Rome, attended the lectures at the Gregorian University, and was raised to the priesthood in 1863. He remained in Rome till 1868, obtained a doctorate in sacred theology and licentiate in canon law, and started upon his life study of Semitic languages. He worked chiefly at Hebrew, Syriac, Aramaic, and Arabic. It was as a Syriac scholar that he first attracted attention. Abbé Martin

was in France ten years, as curate in various parishes of Paris, before his appointment to the chair of Sacred Scripture and Oriental Languages in the Institut Catholique of Paris, which he filled from 1878 to 1890. The time of literary activity of Abbé Martin was the twelve years of his professorship at the Institut. His best work is said to be the lithographed lectures delivered from 1882 to 1886: "Introduction à la critique textuelle du N. T., partie théorique" (Paris, 1882–83); a supplement thereto, "Description technique des manuscrits grecs, relatifs au N. T., conservés dans les bibliothèques de Paris" (Paris, 1883); "Introduction à la critique textuelle du N. T., partie pratique" (4 vols., Paris, 1884–86). These four volumes contain studies in the ancient manuscripts of the New Testament, the authenticity and historicity of disputed fragments of the New Testament,—notably the ending of Mark, the bloody sweat, the woman taken in adultery, the three heavenly witnesses. In regard to this last fragment, he carried on a controversy with MM. Vacant, Maunoury, and Rambouillet in the "Revue des sciences ecclésiastiques" (1887 and 1889), and in "La Controverse" (1888). Earlier writings of Abbé Martin were: "Œuvres grammaticales d'Abu el-Faraj, dit Bar-Hebræus" (Paris, 1872); "Grammatica, chrestomathia, et glossarium linguæ syriacæ" (Paris, 1873); "Histoire de la ponctuation ou de la massore chez les Syriens" (Paris, 1875). In addition he published a general introduction to the Bible (Paris, 1887–89).

Mangenot, *M. l'abbé Paulin Martin* in *Revue des sciences ecclésiastiques* (1891).

Walter Drum.

Martin, Richard, Venerable. See Leigh, Richard, Venerable.

Martina, Saint, Roman virgin, martyred in 226, according to some authorities, more probably in 228, under the pontificate of Saint Urban I, according to others. The daughter of an ex-consul and left an orphan at an early age she so openly testified to her Christian faith that she could not escape the persecution under Alexander Severus. Arrested and commanded to return to idolatry, she courageously refused, whereupon she was subjected to various tortures, and was finally beheaded. The accounts of her martyrdom which we possess belong to a late period and as usual contain many amplifications which have not, as Baronius has already observed, any historical value. The relics of Saint Martina were discovered on 25 October, 1634, in the crypt of an ancient church situated near the Mamertine prison and dedicated to the saint. Urban VIII who occupied the Holy See at that time, had the church repaired and, it would seem, composed the hymns which are sung at the office of the noble martyr, 30 January.

Act SS. Bolland. (1643), January, I, II; Baronius, *Ann.* (1589), 228, I; Surius, *De Vit. SS.* (1618), I, 9–10; Vincent of Beauvais, *Spec. Hist.* (1473), XII, 27–29; Mombritius, *Sanctuarium* (Milan, 1749), II, CXXV–XL; *Ragguaglio della vita di S. Martina Vergine e martire* (Rome, 1801).

Léon Clugnet.

Martini, Antonio, Archbishop of Florence, Biblical scholar; b. at Prato, in Tuscany, 20 April, 1720; d. at Florence, 31 December, 1809. Having received holy Orders, he was appointed director of the Superga College at Turin. Cardinal delle Lanze, knowing that Benedict XIV, then pope, desired a good version of the Bible in contemporary Tuscan, urged Martini to undertake the work. The latter began a translation of the New Testament from the original Greek, but soon found this labour, in conjunction with his duties in the Superga, beyond his physical strength. He accordingly resigned the directorship and accepted from King Charles Emanuel of Sardinia a state councillorship together with a pension. In spite of some discouragement consequent upon the decease of Benedict XIV, Martini persevered, completing the publication of the New Testament in 1771. In his work upon the Hebrew text of the Old Testament, which followed, he was assisted by the Rabbi Terni, a Jewish scholar. The whole work was approved, and Martini personally commended, by Pius VI, who made him Archbishop of Florence in 1781. As archbishop he succeeded in partly foiling an attempt to publish a garbled edition of his work, and a third authorized edition issued from the Archiepiscopal Press of Florence in 1782–92 (see also Versions of the Bible).

Begagli, *Biografia degli uomini illustri* (Venice, 1840); Minocchi in Vigouroux, *Dict. de la Bible*, s. v. *Italiennes (Versions) de la Bible.*

E. Macpherson.

Martini, Martino (Chinese name: *Wei*), distinguished Austrian Jesuit missionary to the Chinese, in the seventeenth century. He was born at Trent in 1614; and on 8 October, 1631, entered the Austrian province of his order; where he studied mathematics under Athanasius Kircher (q. v.) in the Roman College, probably with the intention of being sent to China. He set out for China in 1640, and arrived in 1643. While there he made great use of his talents as missionary, scholar, writer, and superior. In 1650 he was sent to Rome as procurator for the Chinese Mission, and took advantage of the long, adventurous voyage (going first to the Philippines, from thence on a Dutch privateer to Batavia, he reached Bergen in Norway, 31 August, 1653), to sift his valuable historical and cartographical data on China. During his sojourn in Europe the works were printed that made his name so famous. In 1658 he returned with provisionally favourable instructions on the question of ritual to China, where he laboured until his death in Hangtscheu, 6 June, 1661. According to the attestation of P. Prosper Intorcetta ("Litt. annuæ", 1681), his body was found undecayed twenty years after. Richthofen calls Martini "the leading geographer of the Chinese mission, one who was unexcelled, and hardly equalled, during the eighteenth century . . . There was no other missionary, either before or after, who made such diligent use of his time in acquiring information about the country" (China, I, 674 sq.).

Martini's most important work is his "Novus Atlas Sinensis" (Vienna, 1653), with 17 maps and 171 pages of text, a work which is, according to Richthofen, "the most complete geographical description of China that we possess, and through which Martini has become the father of geographical learning on China". Of the great chronological work which Martini had planned, and which was to comprise the whole Chinese history from the earliest age, only the first part appeared: "Sinicæ Historiæ, Decas I" (Munich, 1658). His "De Bello Tartarico Historiæ" (Cologne, 1654) is also important as Chinese history, for Martini himself had lived through the frightful occurrences which brought about the overthrow of the ancient Ming dynasty. The works have been repeatedly published and translated into different languages (cf. Sommervogel, "Bibliothèque" . . . etc.). Interesting as missionary history is his "Brevis relatio de numero et qualitate Christianorum apud Sinæ" (Rome, 1654; Cologne, 1655; Ger. ed., 1654). Besides these, Martini wrote a series of theological and apologetical works in Chinese. Several works, among them a Chinese translation of the theological works of Suarez, still exist in his handwriting (cf. Sommervogel and H. Cardier, "Essai d'une bibliographie des ouvrages publiés en Chine par les Européens", Paris, 1882).

The scientific correspondence between Martini and his distinguished teacher, P. Athanasius Kircher, is to be found in his *Magnes* (3rd ed., Rome, 1654), 316, 318, 348. An excellent appreciation by Schrameier of Martini is to be found in *Peking Society*, II, 99–119; cf. also *Globus*, LXXXVII, p. 157.

A. Huonder.

Martini, Simone (also known as Simone di Martino, and as Simone Memmi), Sienese painter, b. in

Siena, 1283; died either in the same place or at Avignon in 1344 or 1349. This artist is now declared to have been a direct pupil of Duccio, whom he surpassed in the decorative quality of his work. Vasari states that he was a pupil of Giotto, but this statement is refuted by an examination of Simone's works, and also by all the evidence which has been gathered regarding the Sienese school. The earliest of Simone's authentic works is his great fresco in Siena of the enthroned Virgin and Child, painted originally in 1315, and restored by the master himself in 1321, after it had suffered damage from damp. In 1320 he painted an altar-piece for the church of St. Catherine at Pisa, which has now been taken to pieces, and although the greater part is in the Academy at Pisa, two other portions are in other buildings in the same city. In the following year he was at Orvieto, painting an altar-piece for the church of San Dominico which is now preserved in the museum of that city, and then he returned to Siena, where he was busily engaged in 1328 on his splendid portrait of Fogliano, painted in honour of that general's capture of Montemassi. A little later on we hear of him at Assisi, where he painted a wonderful series of works relating to the life of St. Martin, adorning the chapel of St. Martin in the church of San Francesco. The latter part of his life was passed in Avignon in the service of the papal court then resident in that place, and there he decorated various portions of the cathedral and several chapels and rooms in the papal palace. It was in Avignon that he met Petrarch, and there painted the portrait, so famous in later years, of Madonna Laura.

He is said to have painted a portrait at Avignon of Petrarch himself, commissioned by Pandolfo Malatesta, but if he did this, it was during an earlier visit to Avignon, and respecting it we have not much information. We are only certain concerning his second visit to the place, after being called by Pope Clement VI. The exact date of his funeral is proved by certain Sienese records as 4 August, 1344, but the record is not sufficiently clear as to whether his body was transported from Avignon to Siena for burial, or whether he actually died in Siena. There are several of his works in the city of his birth, one at the Louvre, one in Berlin, an exceedingly fine one at Antwerp, and a remarkable signed and dated picture at Liverpool. In the museum at Altenburg there is one of his works, and there are at least three in private collections in America. The portrait of Petrarch attributed to him was sold in 1867 at the Poniatowski sale, and at the same sale there was sold a portrait of Laura, which was undoubtedly his work.

See special manuscript material gathered up in Siena by Lucy Ollcott; Vasari, *Le Vite dei Pittori*, Milanesi edition (Florence, 1878, 1885); Valle, *Lettere Senesi* (Rome, 1782), and other works by the same author.

George Charles Williamson.

Martinique, Diocese of (Sancti Petri et Arcis Gallicæ.) Martinique is one of the French Lesser Antilles, 380 sq. miles in area; it was discovered by Christopher Columbus in 1493, and colonized by the French about 1625; it was in the hands of the English from 1762 to 1783, was again occupied by them in 1794, 1802, 1809, 1815, and again became French territory in 1818. The name Martinique comes from the Carib word *Madinina*. On Good Friday, 1640, Pères Bouton and Hempteau, Jesuits, set out for Martinique, where they founded the celebrated Jesuit mission. Pères Ceubergeon and Gueimu, Jesuits, were slain there in 1654 by the revolting Caribs. The "Mémoire concernant la Mission des Pères de la Compagnie de Jésus dans les îles françaises de l'Amérique" addressed in 1707 by Père Combaid to Père Tamburini, General of the Jesuits, and published in 1907 by Père Rochemonteix, contains moving details concerning the catechetical instruction of the negro slaves by the Jesuits. In 1753 Père de Lavalette was named superior general and Prefect Apostolic of the Mission of Martinique; his business transactions were later the cause of very violent attacks on the Society. Père Rochemonteix has proved that Père de Lavalette acted thus without the knowledge of even his fellow-missionaries of Martinique or of his superiors at Paris and Rome; that when at length, in 1759 and 1760, the missionaries accused him of taking part in forbidden traffic they had no written proofs, and that the superiors were not certain until 1762, after the investigation of Père de La Marche, when Père de Lavalette was deposed, silenced, and sent back to Europe. When in 1848 the Second Republic suppressed slavery in the colonies the prefect Apostolic, Castelli, in a public address hailed the new epoch as an "era of light and evangelical regeneration".

The Diocese of Martinique is suffragan of the Archdiocese of Bordeaux, was created 27 Sept., 1850, and by a law of 20 July, and a decree of 18 December, 1850. At first the see was fixed at Fort de France, was transferred to St. Pierre on 12 Sept., 1853, and the bishop took the title of Bishop of St. Pierre and Fort de France. Bishop Le Herpeur (1851–1858) organized the pilgrimage of Notre Dame de la Délivrande. Bishop Fava (1872–1879) founded in 1872 a religious weekly bulletin, which later became the daily "Le Bien Public". Martinique was cruelly tried, 8 May, 1902, by the eruption of Mt. Pelée, which had long been considered an extinct volcano. This eruption completely destroyed the town of St. Pierre. The island suffered also from the cyclone of 8 August, 1903, and the earthquakes of 1906. After the catastrophe of 1902 the episcopal residence was again transferred to Fort de France. The Diocese of Martinique contains 170,000 inhabitants and 46 priests. There are in the diocese Fathers of the Holy Ghost, Sisters of St. Joseph of Cluny and of St. Paul of Chartres, hospital and teaching sisters. The Congregation of the Daughters of Notre Dame de la Délivrande had its origin in the diocese. The present bishop, Mgr de Cormont, was born at Paris, France, 29 March, 1847, chosen as bishop 14 December, 1899, in succession to Mgr Carmené, who resigned.

Aube, *La Martinique* (Paris, 1882); Rochemonteix, *Antoine Lavalette à la Martinique* (Paris, 1907); Hess, *La Catastrophe de la Martinique, Notes d'un reporter* (Paris, 1902); Lacroix, *La Montagne Pelée et ses éruptions* (Paris, 1904); *L'épiscopat français aux xix^e siècle* (Paris, 1907), 339–344.

Georges Goyau.

Martin of Braga (Bracara; or, of Dumio), Saint, bishop and ecclesiastical writer; b. about 520 in Pannonia; d. in 580 at Braga in Portugal. He made a pilgrimage to Palestine, where he became a monk and met some Spanish pilgrims whose narrations induced him to come to Galicia (Northwestern Spain) with the purpose of converting the Suevi, some of whom were still half pagans and others Arians. He arrived in Spain in 550, founded various monasteries, among them that of Dumio, of which he became abbot and afterwards bishop. At the Synod of Braga, in May, 561, he signed as Bishop of Dumio. Later he became Archbishop of Braga and, as such, presided over the second Council of Braga in 572. He was successful in converting the Arian Galicians and rooting out the last remnants of paganism among them. He is venerated as a saint, his feast day being 20 March. His great learning and piety are attested by Gregory of Tours (Hist. Franc., V, xxxviii), who styles him full of virtue (*plenus virtutibus*) and second to none of his contemporaries in learning ("in tantum se litteris imbuit ut nulli secundus sui temporis haberetur").

His writings consist chiefly of moral, liturgical, and ascetical treatises. The best known of his moral treatises, "Formula vitæ honestæ" or "De differentiis quatuor virtutum", as St. Isidore of Seville (De viris illustribus xxxv) entitles it, is an exposition of Christian life chiefly for laymen, from the standpoint

of the four cardinal virtues, and is believed to be based on a lost work of Seneca. His little work, "De ira", is merely a compendium of Seneca's three books, "De ira". The two preceding works proceed from the standpoint of natural ethics, while his three other moral treatises: "Pro repellenda jactantia", "De superbia", and "Exhortatio humilitatis", are expositions of Christian morality. Of great importance in the history of medieval canon law is Martin's collection of eighty-four canons: "Collectio orientalium canonum, seu Capitula Martini", which was compiled after 561, and contains mostly Greek, also a few Spanish and African, canons. It is in two parts; the first, containing sixty-eight canons, treats of the ordination and the duties of clerics; the second, containing sixteen canons, treats chiefly of the duties and faults of laymen. His two liturgical works are a little treatise: "De pascha", in which he explains to the people the reason why Easter is celebrated at variable periods between IX Kal. April, and XI Kal. Maii, and "Epistola ad Bonifatium de trina mersione", in answer to a letter from a Spanish bishop who supposed that the custom of triple aspersion in baptism was of Arian origin. His ascetical works are "Sententiæ patrum Ægyptiorum", a collection of edifying narratives concerning Egyptian monastic life, and of pious sayings of Egyptian abbots, which he translated from the Greek; and another work of similar nature, "Verba seniorum", translated from the Greek by Paschasius, a deacon of Dumio, by order and with the help of Martin. He also wrote an interesting sermon "De correctione rusticorum", against the pagan superstitions which were still prevalent among the peasantry of his diocese. There are also extant three poetical inscriptions, "In basilico", "In refectorio", "Epistaphium". No complete edition of Martin's works has ever been published. His "Formula vitæ honestæ", "Libellus de moribus" (spurious), "Pro repellenda jactantia", "De superbia", "Exhortatio humilitatis", "De ira", "De pascha", and the three poetical inscriptions are printed in Gallandi, "Bibl. Vet. Patr.", XII, 275–288, and in Migne, P. L., LXXII, 21–52. Migne also reprints "Verba seniorum" (P. L. LXXIII, 1025–62);" "Ægyptiorum patrum sententiæ (P. L., LXXIV, 381–394); "Capitula Martini" (P. L., 574–586). The sermon, "De correctione rusticorum" was edited with notes and a learned disquisition on Martin's life and writings by C. P. Caspari (Christiania, 1883). The epistle, "De trina mersione", is printed in "Collectio maxima conciliorum Hispaniæ", II (Rome, 1693), 506, and in "España sagrada", XV (Madrid, 1759), 422. The latest editions of the "Formula honestæ vitæ" were prepared by Weidner (Magdeburg, 1872) and May (Neisse, 1892). The treatise "De pascha" was recently edited by Burn, in "Niceta of Remesiana" (Cambridge, 1905), 93 sq.

Besides the work of CASPARI, mentioned above, see BARDENHEWER, *Patrology*, tr. SHAHAN (St. Louis, 1908), 658–660; GAMS, *Kirchengesch. Spaniens*, II (Ratisbon, 1864), i, 471–5; DE AMARAL, *Vida e opuscula di s. Martingho Bracharense* (Lisbon, 1803); SEEBERG-WAGENMANN in *Realencyklopädie für prot. Theol.* s. v. Martin von Bracara; WARD in *Dict. Christ. Biogr.* s. v. Martinus of Braga.

MICHAEL OTT.

Martin of Cochem. See COCHEM, MARTIN OF.

Martin of Leon, SAINT, a priest and canon regular of the Augustinians; b. at Leon in Spain (Old Castile) before 1150; d. there, 12 January, 1203. Having been educated in the monastery of St. Marcellus at Leon, he visited Rome and Constantinople. Returning to Spain, he took the religious habit at St. Marcellus; but this monastery having been secularized by the bishops, he entered the collegiate church of St. Isidore in the same city. The date of his death is given us by the necrology preserved in the monastery. He wrote commentaries on different Epistles and the Apocalypse, and left numerous discourses on the most varied subjects. His complete works were published first by Espinosa (Seville, 1782) and again by Migne in P. L., LXXXI, 53–64, CCVIII, CCIX (Paris, 1855). The religious of St. Isidore's dedicated a chapel to Martin very early and celebrated his feast each year, but the Church has not officially included him in the list of her saints.

Acta SS., February, II, 568; CASTRO, *Bibl. Españ.*, II (Madrid, 1786), 514–5; CAVE, *Script. Eccles.*, II (Basle, 1745), 301; CEILLIER, *Hist. gén. des auteurs sacrés et eccls.*, XIV (Paris, 1863), 833–4; LUC, *Vita S. Martini* in *P. L.*, CCVIII, 9–24.

LÉON CLUGNET.

Martin of Tours, SAINT, bishop; b. at Sabaria (today Steinamanger in German, or Szombathely in Hungarian), Pannonia (Hungary), about 316; d. at Candes, Touraine, most probably in 397. In his early years, when his father, a military tribune, was transferred to Pavia in Italy, Martin accompanied him thither, and when he reached adolescence was, in accordance with the recruiting laws, enrolled in the Roman army. Touched by grace at an early age, he was from the first attracted towards Christianity, which had been in favour in the camps since the conversion of Emperor Constantine. His regiment was soon sent to Amiens in Gaul, and this town became the scene of the celebrated legend of the cloak. At the gates of the city, one very cold day, Martin met a shivering and half-naked beggar. Moved with compassion, he divided his coat into two parts and gave one to the poor man. The part kept by himself became the famous relic preserved in the oratory of the Frankish kings under the name of "St. Martin's cloak". Martin, who was still only a catechumen, soon received baptism, and was a little later finally freed from military service at Worms on the Rhine. As soon as he was free, he hastened to set out to Poitiers to enrol himself among the disciples of St. Hilary, the wise and pious bishop whose reputation as a theologian was already passing beyond the frontiers of Gaul. Desiring, however, to see his parents again, he returned to Lombardy across the Alps. The inhabitants of this region, infested with Arianism, were bitterly hostile towards Catholicism, so that Martin, who did not conceal his faith, was very badly treated by order of Bishop Auxentius of Milan, the leader of the heretical sect in Italy. Martin was very desirous of returning to Gaul, but, learning that the Arians troubled that country also and had even succeeded in exiling Hilary to the Orient, he decided to seek shelter on the island of Gallinaria (now Isola d'Albenga) in the middle of the Tyrrhenian Sea.

As soon as Martin learned that an imperial decree had authorized Hilary to return to Gaul, he hastened to the side of his chosen master at Poitiers in 361, and obtained permission from him to embrace at some distance from there in a deserted region (now called Ligugé) the solitary life that he had adopted in Gallinaria. His example was soon followed, and a great number of monks gathered around him. Thus was formed in this Gallic Thebaid a real laura, from which later developed the celebrated Benedictine Abbey of Ligugé. Martin remained about ten years in this solitude, but often left it to preach the Gospel in the central and western parts of Gaul, where the rural inhabitants were still plunged in the darkness of idolatry and given up to all sorts of gross superstitions. The memory of these apostolic journeyings survives to our day in the numerous local legends of which Martin is the hero and which indicate roughly the routes that he followed. When St. Lidorius, second Bishop of Tours, died in 371 or 372, the clergy of that city desired to replace him by the famous hermit of Ligugé. But, as Martin remained deaf to the prayers of the deputies who brought him this message, it was necessary to resort to a ruse to overcome his resistance. A certain Rusticius, a rich citizen of Tours, went and begged him to come to his wife, who was in the last extremity, and to prepare her for death. Without any suspicion,

Martin followed him in all haste, but hardly had he entered the city when, in spite of the opposition of a few ecclesiastical dignitaries, popular acclamation constrained him to become Bishop of the Church of Tours.

Consecrated on 4 July, Martin brought to the accomplishment of the duties of his new ministry all the energy and the activity of which he had already given so many proofs. He did not, however, change his way of life: fleeing from the distractions of the large city, he settled himself in a small cell at a short distance from Tours, beyond the Loire. Some other hermits joined him there, and thus was gradually formed a new monastery, which surpassed that of Ligugé, as is indicated by the name, Marmoutier (*Majus Monasterium*), which it has kept to our own day. Thus, to an untiring zeal Martin added the greatest simplicity, and it is this which explains how his pastoral administration so admirably succeeded in sowing Christianity throughout Touraine. Nor was it a rare occurrence for him to leave his diocese, when he thought that his appearance in some distant locality might produce some good. He even went several times to Trier, where the emperors had established their residence, to plead the interests of the Church or to ask pardon for some condemned person. His rôle in the matter of the Priscillianists and Ithacians was especially remarkable. Against Priscillian, the Spanish heresiarch, and his partisans, who had been justly condemned by the Council of Saragossa, furious charges were brought before Emperor Maximus by some orthodox bishops of Spain, led by Bishop Ithacius. Martin hurried to Trier, not indeed to defend the gnostic and Manichæan doctrines of Priscillian, but to remove him from the secular jurisdiction of the emperor. Maximus at first acceded to his entreaty, but, when Martin had departed, yielded to the solicitations of Ithacius and ordered Priscillian and his followers to be beheaded. Deeply grieved, Martin refused to communicate with Ithacius. However, when he went again to Trier a little later to ask pardon for two rebels, Narses and Leucadius, Maximus would only promise it to him on condition that he would make his peace with Ithacius. To save the lives of his clients, he consented to this reconciliation, but afterwards reproached himself bitterly for this act of weakness.

After a last visit to Rome, Martin went to Candes, one of the religious centres created by him in his diocese, when he was attacked by the malady which ended his life. Ordering himself to be carried into the presbytery of the church, he died there in 400 (according to some authorities; more probably in 397) at the age of about 81, evincing until the last that exemplary spirit of humility and mortification which he had ever shown. The Church of France has always considered Martin one of her greatest saints, and hagiographers have recorded a great number of miracles due to his intercession while he was living and after his death. His cult was very popular throughout the Middle Ages, a multitude of churches and chapels were dedicated to him, and a great number of places have been called by his name. His body, taken to Tours, was enclosed in a stone sarcophagus, above which his successors, St. Britius and St. Perpetuus, built first a simple chapel, and later a basilica (470). St. Euphronius, Bishop of Autun and a friend of St. Perpetuus, sent a sculptured tablet of marble to cover the tomb. A larger basilica was constructed in 1014, which was burned down in 1230 to be rebuilt soon on a still larger scale. This sanctuary was the centre of great national pilgrimages until 1562, the fatal year when the Protestants sacked it from top to bottom, destroying the sepulchre and the relics of the great wonder-worker, the object of their hatred. The ill-fated collegiate church was restored by its canons, but a new and more terrible misfortune awaited it. The revolutionary hammer of 1793 was to subject it to a last devastation. It was entirely demolished with the exception of the two towers which are still standing, and, so that its reconstruction might be impossible, the atheistic municipality caused two streets to be opened up on its site. In December, 1860, skilfully executed excavations located the site of St. Martin's tomb, of which some fragments were discovered. These precious remains are at present sheltered in a basilica built by Mgr Meignan, Archbishop of Tours, which is unfortunately of very small dimensions and recalls only faintly the ancient and magnificent cloister of St. Martin. On 11 November each year the feast of St. Martin is solemnly celebrated in this church in the presence of a large number of the faithful of Tours and other cities and villages of the diocese.

Of the numerous works on the life and rôle of St. Martin, we cite only the most important: ALET, *St. Martin et sa basilique de Tours in Étude relig. hist. litt.* (Paris, 1864), C, V, 427–453; *Anal. Bolland.* (Paris, 1884–6), III, 217–57, app. 422–4; IV, app. 331–3; V, 316, app. 484–92, 499–503, 506–9, 547; BAPST, *Le Tombeau de St. Martin* in *Rev. Archéol.* (Paris, 1886), C, VII, 321–35; BARBIER DE MONTAULT, *Œuvr. compl.* (Paris, 1893), VII, 428–32; XIII, 4–308; BARONIUS, *Ann.* (1590), 351, 17–22; 356, 124–5; 358, 20; 375, 1–3; 386, 25–35; 389, 110–3; 400, 19; 402, 49–53; 482, 47–50; 559, 30; 560, 7–11, 13; 566, 22–7; 574, 20–3; 576, 2; 577, 3–4; 580, 22; 581, 14; BAVARD, *Apostolat de St. Martin en Bourgogne* in *Soc. hist. archéol. litt. de Beaune* (1879), 207; BULLIOT, *La mission et le culte de St. Martin d'après les légendes et les monuments populaires dans le pays Éduen* in *Mém. de la Soc. éduenne* (1888–91), B, XVI, 67–94; XVII, 57–223; XVIII, 241–328; XIX, 1–180; CHAMARD, *St. Martin et son monastère de Ligugé* (Poitiers, 1873); CHEVALIER, *Le tombeau de St. Martin à Tours* (Tours, 1880); CORBLET, *Hagiogr. du dioc. d'Amiens*, IV (Paris, 1874), 501–15; DORANGE, *Les reliques de St. Martin au XVI^e^ et au XVII^e^ siècles* in *Bull. de la Soc. archéol. de Touraine*, III (Tours, 1874), 59–65; FLACHARD, *Essai sur l'apostolat de St. Martin de Tours entre Vichy et Roanne* (Moulins, 1899); GERVAISE, *La vie de St. Martin, évêque de Tours* (Tours, 1699; 1828); GREGORY OF TOURS, *Hist. Francorum*, X; *Hist. litt. de la France* (Paris, 1733), I, II, 413–7; LECOY DE LA MARCHE, *Les monuments écrits relatifs à St. Martin* in *Lettres chrét.*, I (Paris, 1880), 427–57; LELONG, *Bibl. hist. de la France*, I (Paris, 1768), 10275–302; LONGUEVAL, *Hist. de l'Eglise gallicane*, IV (Paris, 1730), 555–62; MABILLON, *Acta SS. O.S.B.* (Paris, 1680), VI, II, 469–70; PIRA, *Dissert. sul soggiorno di S. Martino nell' isola Gallinaria* (Porto Maurizio, 1808); RABORY, *Vie de St. Martin, apôtre des Gaules, fondateur de Ligugé et évêque de Tours* (Abbeville, 1894); REINKENS, *Martin von Tours, der wunderthätige Mönch u. Bischof, in seinem Leben u. Wirken dargestellt* (Breslau, 1866); RIVIÈRE, *Les miracles de Saint Martin, le grand thaumaturge des Gaules, devant le Conseil Municipal de Tours* (Tours, 1861); SCULLARD, *Martin of Tours, Apostle of Gaul* (London, 1891); SULPICIUS SEVERUS, *Vita S. Martini Turonensis* in the different editions of his works; SURIUS, *De vit. sanct.*, VI (Venice, 1581), 79–87; SZTACHOVICS, *De S. Martini loco natali et cultu* in *Wissenschaftl. Studien u. Mitteil. aus dem Benediktiner Orden* (1880), I, i, 52–64; II, 26–46; TILLEMONT, *Mém. pour servir à l'hist. ecclés.*, X (1705), 309–57, 771–87; *Vie de St. Martin, évêque de Tours* (Tours, 1860 and 1864); *Vita di S. Martino, vescovo di Tours* (Monza, 1876); WOESTINE, *Vie de St. Martin* (Tours, 1888).

LÉON CLUGNET.

Martin of Troppau, chronicler, date of birth unknown; d. 1278. His family name was Strebski, and, being by birth a native of Troppau (Oppavia), he is also known as Martinus Oppaviensis. In his youth he entered the Dominican Order at Prague, and, as the Bohemian monasteries of the Dominicans belonged to the Polish province of the order, he was usually known as Martinus Polonus. After the middle of the thirteenth century he went to Rome, was appointed papal chaplain and penitentiary by Clement IV (1265–8), and retained this position under the succeeding popes. On 22 June, 1278, Nicholas III appointed him Archbishop of Gnesen, and performed in person the episcopal consecration. Shortly afterwards Martin set out on his journey to Poland, but fell so seriously ill on the way that he was compelled to stop at Bologna. He died at this city in the same year, and found interment there. Martin is remembered chiefly for his epitome of the history of the world (Chronica Pontificum et Imperatorum), which was the favourite handbook of the later Middle Ages. The first edition appeared during the pontificate of Clement IV (1265–8); a second recension extends to the death of this pontiff, and a third to 1277. The "Chronicle" was arranged in such a manner that the

popes were treated on one side of the codex, and the emperors on the opposite page. As each page contains fifty lines, and each line the historical matter of one year, each page covers a period of fifty years. Alike in matter and in arrangement he followed the old models. The work is entirely uncritical; his sources were to a great extent legendary, and this material is again employed by him in uncritical fashion. The "Chronicle" thus contains little true history, but chiefly a mass of fables and popular legends. He admits, for example, into his third edition the fable of Popess Joan (q. v.), which indeed owes to him its wide dissemination (Chronicle ed. in Mon. Germ., Script., XXII, 397–475). The "Chronicle" was continued by many imitators of Martin. The work printed at Turin in 1477 under the title "Martini Poloni Chronicon summorum Pontificum et Imperatorum" is, however, by a later author, and has no connexion with Martin of Troppau. Besides the "Chronicle", Martin is said to have also written sermons (Sermones de tempore et de Sanctis, Argentorati, 1484), a lexicon of canon law, and a work on the Greek Schism.

WEILAND, *Introductio* in *Mon. Germ. hist. Script.*, XXII, 377; IDEM, in *Archiv der Ges. für aeltere deutsche Geschichtskunde*, XII, 1–79; WATTENBACH, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen*, II (6th ed.), 466–71; HURTER, *Nomenclator*, II (3rd ed.), 420–1; MICHAEL, *Gesch. des deutschen Volkes*, III, 384–8; POTTHAST, *Bibl. hist. medii ævi*, 2nd ed., I, 771–2.

J. P. KIRSCH.

Martin of Valencia, O.F.M. (Juan Martin de Boil), b. at Villa de Valencia, Spain, about the middle of the fifteenth century; died in the odour of sanctity at Tlalmanalco, Mexico, 31 August, 1534. He entered the Franciscan Order at Mayorga in the Province of Santiago, built the monastery of Santa Maria del Berrogal, and was the chief founder of the Custody of San Gabriel, for which he visited Rome. In 1523 he was chosen to head a band of twelve Franciscans who were to labour for the conversion of the Mexican natives. They reached their destination on 13 May, 1524, and to the amazement of the Mexican chiefs were received with the most profound veneration by Hernando Cortes shortly after their arrival. (See FRIARS MINOR IN AMERICA.) Fr. Martin, as apostolic delegate, presided at the first ecclesiastical synod in the New World, 2 July, 1524. At the same time he established the Custody of the Holy Gospel, of which he was elected the first *custos*. After an interval of three years he was re-elected in 1830. He led a most penitential life, and he and his eleven companions, the band known as the Twelve Apostles of Mexico, are said to have baptized several million natives.

HAROLD, *Epitome Annalium FF. Minorum* (Rome, 1672); GONZAGA, *De Origine Seraphicæ Religionis*, II (Rome, 1587); MENDIETA, *Historia Eclesiástica Indiana* (Mexico, 1870); VETANCURT, *Cronica de la Prov. del Santo Evangelio* (Mexico, 1697); *Menologio Franciscano* (Mexico, 1697); TORQUEMADA, *Monarquia Indiana*, I (Madrid, 1723); PERUSINI, *Cronologia Historico-Legalis*, III (Rome, 1752).

ZEPHYRIN ENGELHARDT.

Martinov, JOHN, b. 7 October, 1821; d. 26 April, 1894. Having passed through his university course at St. Petersburg with distinction, Count Schouvalov engaged him as tutor to his children during a tour through Europe. In France he became acquainted with Father de Ravignan, and this led to his reception into the Church. Being now unable to return to Russia, he entered the French Jesuits, 18 September, 1845. Similarly his patron, Count Schouvalov, having also become a Catholic, joined the Barnabites. Father Martinov, like Father Gagarin, with whom he often co-operated, could now only reach his countrymen by his writings, and devoted himself to literature and correspondence with great success. He wrote frequently for the "Revue des Questions Historiques", for "Polybiblion", and "Les Etudes Religieuses". Called by Pius IX to Rome as a papal theologian for the Vatican Council, he was afterwards a consultor of the Propaganda in matters connected with Oriental rites. The last days of his busy, well-filled life were passed at Cannes. His bibliography, under fifty-two titles, comprises works of every class, in Russian, French, and Latin. His most notable work is the "Annus Ecclesiasticus Græco-Slavonicus", which forms part of the eleventh volume of the Bollandist "Acta Sanctorum", for October (Brussels, 1863).

Précis Historiques (Brussels, 1894), 291; *Polybiblion* (1894), ser. II, vol. 39, 540; SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus*, ix, 645–52.

J. H. POLLEN.

Martinsberg, or PANNONHALMA, an important Benedictine abbey in Hungary, about fourteen English miles south of Raab, and sixty west of Buda-Pesth. From an early date the place was traditionally regarded as the scene of the birth and early life of the famous St. Martin of Tours and was held in great veneration by the small Christian population of Hungary. Towards the end of the tenth century the Benedictine monastery was begun by Duke Geysa, and completed by his more celebrated son, St. Stephen, the king. The second Sunday of October, 1001, witnessed the dedication of the church. The site is a pleasant one on a high plateau with extensive views to the north and east, and occupies the ground once covered by a strongly fortified Roman encampment. Almost uninterruptedly from that date the "Holy Mountain of Hungary", as it came to be called, has been the centre of all that is best in the religious and intellectual life of the kingdom. The first Christian school established in Hungary, it soon attracted large numbers of students; popes and kings increased and guaranteed its possessions, and owing to its strongly fortified position it escaped destruction more than once when all around was ruined. The Tartar invasion left it unscathed. It was less fortunate under Archabbot Matthew, who died in 1584, during the disastrous five years in which the Turks were masters of Hungary, though it escaped annihilation till the fall of its fortress in 1594, when the community was scattered. The younger monks were received into various Austrian monasteries and the valuable archives were saved from destruction. It was not till peace was fully restored in 1683 that St. Martin's Abbey rose from its ashes, the only house of the fifty which had belonged to the Benedictine Order in medieval Hungary. Its schools were reopened in 1724 and flourished till the days of Joseph II, "the Sacristan" (1780–86), whose narrowmindedness could not leave untouched so vigorous a centre of religious feeling and Hungarian sentiment and language.

The eclipse of Martinsberg lasted about sixteen years. In 1802, on 12 March, the abbey and its colleges were reopened in deference to the general desire of the nation, and an archabbot was appointed in the person of Dom Chrysostom Novak. Since that time the fortunes of the community have prospered. The abbey and church have been rebuilt in the Italian style, and form an imposing group of buildings. The house is the central home of all the monks of the Hungarian congregation; its superior, the archabbot, is a prelate "nullius", immediately subject to the Holy See, Ordinary of the Diocese, perpetual President of the Benedictine Congregation of Hungary, and a member of the House of Magnates of the kingdom. Subject to his government, besides the actual community at Martinsberg, are the abbeys of St. Maurice and Companions at Bakonybel, of St. Anian at Tihany, of St. Mary at Doemelk, and St. Hadrian at Zalavar, and six residences, with colleges attached, in various parts of the kingdom; Gyor with 448 students, Sopron with 345, Estergom with 366, and three minor gymnasia; Koszeg with 208, Komarom with 144, and Papa with 157 students. The entire congregation of Hungarian Benedictines numbers about 160 priests, with some 40 or 50 clerics and novices. The congre-

gation administers also in 26 incorporated parishes, with seventy-five daughter churches and forty-four chapels; serving a population of nearly 18,000 souls; it has the supervision besides of five convents of nuns; its high schools, "gymnasia majora" are attended by about 1200 boys, its lesser seminaries by over 500. The monks of St. Martin's have contributed largely to the modern theological, scientific and historical literature of their country, and have given many distinguished men to the Church. Cardinal Claud Vaszary, Archbishop of Gran, and Bishop Kohl, his auxiliary, are perhaps the best known representatives of the Hungarian Benedictines at the present day.

Album Benedictinum (St. Vincent's Abbey, Pennsylvania, 1880); *SS. Patriarchæ Benedicti familæ confœderatæ* (Rome, Vatican Press, 1905); *Scriptores Ord. S. Benedicti, qui 1750-1880 fuerunt in imperio Austriaco-Hungarico* (Vienna, 1880).

JOHN GILBERT DOLAN.

Martinuzzi, GEORGE, monk, bishop, cardinal, b. at Kamicac, Dalmatia, 1482; d. 16 December, 1551. His real name was George Utjesenovic. His mother, a native of Venice of the name of Martinuzzi, had a brother who was a bishop, and, out of regard for his mother and uncle, George preferred to be called Martinuzzi (Latin *Martinuzius*). His father died in battle against the Turks. At the age of eight, George came to the court of Duke John Corvinus, in whose service he remained at the Castle Hunyad 15 years under hard conditions. Then he entered the service of the Duchess Hedwig, the widow of Count Stephan Zapolya, by whom he was well treated. A year later (1504), at the age of 22, he entered the Pauline monastery of St. Laurentius near Ofen, where his unusual intellectual gifts soon attracted attention. A monk taught him writing and reading; later, he studied philosophy and theology and was ordained priest. Owing to his talent, skill, and zeal, his superiors appointed him prior of the monastery of Czenstochau in Poland, and later of the monastery of Sajolad, near Erlau in North Hungary. Here the Hungarian pretender, John Zapolya, found him, when, after the battle of Kashau, 1527, he was compelled to flee before King Ferdinand, and discovered in the prior "Frater Georgius", an acquaintance from the court of his mother Hedwig. Recognizing the prior's ability and energy, the prince requested him to enter his service. Moved by ambition as well as patriotism, Martinuzzi left his monastery to go with the fugitive prince to Poland, and to defend with tact and energy the prince's cause. During the unfortunate troubles brought upon Hungary by the war between the two pretenders, John Zapolya and Ferdinand of Austria, and by the Turkish conquests, Martinuzzi was prominent in Hungarian politics. He went from Poland to Hungary, organized the adherents of Zapolya, secured financial support from Magyar nobles, and raised an army which defeated Ferdinand's general, Ravay (1528). In 1529, Zapolya entered Ofen. He appointed Martinuzzi royal counselor and treasurer, and in 1534 conferred on him the diocese of Grosswardein, though the newly nominated bishop did not receive papal approbation until five years later. Meanwhile, he ruled his diocese, but not being consecrated bishop, all the episcopal functions were performed by auxiliary bishops.

John Zapolya died 21 July, 1540. He left only one young son, John Sigmund, who was born nine days before Zapolya's death. The deceased monarch in his will had appointed Martinuzzi and Peter Petrovich guardians of the child. They proclaimed him king and the Sultan Suleiman promised to recognize him. But Ferdinand, who had the support of several Magyarian nobles, demanded the fulfillment of an agreement concluded between him and John Zapolya, according to which, Hungary after the latter's death, was to be ceded to him. His demand proving ineffectual, Ferdinand sent a new army to Hungary which occupied several cities and laid siege to Ofen. In the meantime, he negotiated with Isabella, to whom Martinuzzi was chief adviser. On one occasion Martinuzzi even placed himself at the head of an army and repulsed an attack on his city. Meanwhile, the Sultan Suleiman declared war against Ferdinand, and in person led a formidable army into Hungary. He occupied Ofen, and turned the lands along the Danube into a Turkish province. But he respected the territory of Isabella and her son which was to be governed during the latter's minority by Martinuzzi and Petrovich. The war between Ferdinand and the Sultan continued, while Isabella governed the principality of Siebenbürgen for some years in peace. There was a powerful cabal among the nobles vehemently hostile to Martinuzzi, who governed with an autocractic firmness that brought him many enemies. He had also disagreements with Isabella, who permitted herself to be swayed by his opponents. Martinuzzi now began secretly negotiating with King Ferdinand, and in 1549 an agreement was come to by which Isabella had to give up Siebenbürgen. In return she was to receive the principality of Opelln in Silesia, and in addition all that had been left her by her husband. Ferdinand was also to provide for her son John Sigmund, and later to marry him to his daughter. Martinuzzi was to be made Archbishop of Gran, and to receive the cardinal's hat. As soon as this contract became known, a quarrel broke out between Isabella and the minister. The latter, however, had the upper hand, and the queen was compelled to come to an agreement (1551); this agreement however did not allay the mistrust between the two.

In the meantime the astute Martinuzzi treated with the Sultan, and succeeded for a time in deceiving him regarding the fate of Siebenbürgen and his own relations with King Ferdinand. Ferdinand sent his general, Castaldo, Margrave of Cassiano, with an army to Siebenbürgen to discuss the agreement made with Martinuzzi. Castaldo was told to keep on good terms with the minister; but having little faith in Martinuzzi, he was eager to settle the matter with Isabella as soon as possible. In accordance with a previous arrangement made with Martinuzzi, a treaty was concluded by which Isabella agreed to give up, under certain conditions, Hungary and Siebenbürgen, and to hand over to Ferdinand the crown and insignia of the Kingdom. When the Sultan learned this, he sent a new army against the king. Castaldo at once suspected that Martinuzzi was in secret alliance with the Turks, and that the negotiations were directed against him and king Ferdinand. Castaldo told the king of his suspicion and was told to deal with Martinuzzi in such a way as he thought the country's need and the well being of its people demanded. Whether Castaldo's suspicion was well founded, or whether he wished to rid himself of a rival is a difficult question to decide Older historical authority considered Martinuzzi's secret negotiations with the Sultan as treason against Ferdinand. Modern historical research, however, scouts these accusations, and maintains that Martinuzzi cannot be convicted of any treason against Ferdinand. (Danko in the "Kirchenlex", s. v.) Castaldo brought about the assassination of Martinuzzi. The order was executed on the night of December 16th 1551, by Sforza Pallavicini and several accomplices. The body remained unburied until February 25th, 1552, when it was interred in St. Michael's church at Karlsburg. Although Ferdinand and Castaldo endeavored to justify themselves to the pope, Julius III excommunicated the murderers and instigators of the crime. In 1555 however the punishment was withdrawn. Though Martinuzzi's fame lies mainly in the political sphere, he was also largely occupied with ecclesiastical affairs. He exerted himself greatly in resisting the invasion of Protestantism. But a measure with the same object which passed the legislative assembly of Siebenbürgen in 1544 had little result, for

the reason that Petrovich, the second guardian of the king, was on the side of the new doctrine. In his own diocese of Grosswardein, Martinuzzi battled energetically with the innovations, though he could not prevent their progress in Siebenbürgen. A reliable historical account of this remarkable man has not yet been compiled.

BECHET, *Histoire du ministère du cardinal Martinusius* (Paris, 1771); UTJESENOVIC, *Lebensgeschichte des Kardinal Georg Utjesenovic genannt Martinusius* (Vienna, 1881); SCHWICKER, *Kard. Martinuzzi und die Reformation in Ungarn und Siebenbürgen* (*Oesterr. Vierteljahrschrift für kath. Theologie*, 1867, VI, 397 ff.); MAILATH, *Geschichte der Magyaren*, III, (Rengesburg, 1863), 59 sq., 94 sq., 112 sq., 116 sq.; WEISS, *Weltgeschichte*, 3 ed., VIII, 68–70, 116.

J. P. KIRSCH.

Martin y Garcia, LUIS, twenty-fourth General of the Society of Jesus; b. of humble parentage at Melgar de Fernamental, Burgos, Spain, 19 August, 1846; d. at Fiesole, Italy, 18 April, 1906. After a course of six years in the seminary of Burgos, he entered the Society at Loyola, in 1864; studied philosophy at Léon, Vals (Haute-Loire, France), and Poyanne (Landes, France), and theology at the last-named place, where he also taught theology. He was ordained priest in 1876, was successively rector of the seminary at Salamanca, director of "El Mensajero" (The Messenger), superior of the college of Deusto-Bilbao, provincial of Castile, and vicar; and was general of the Society from 2 October, 1892, until his death. The disease (sarcoma) which ended his life necessitated the amputation of an arm and other painful operations, which he bore with Christian fortitude. His superior talents were shown in such splendid works as the rebuilding of the great seminary at Salamanca, the foundation of the Cornillense seminary, and his plan for compiling the history of the Society. In prose he wrote with a nervous and graceful style, in verse with a robust sonority and great wealth of imagery, while as a preacher the elegance of his diction, the profoundity of his thought, and his emotional warmth made him almost unrivalled among the Spanish orators of his time. His published works include: "Discurso leido en el tercer centenario de la muerte de Sta. Teresa" (discourse on St. Teresa's centenary), (Madrid, 1882; Bilbao, 1891; Barcelona, 1908); "De Studiis Theologicis ordinandis" (Bilbao, 1892); an epistle to the fathers and brothers of the society; articles in "El Mensajero", I (1886), of which he was editor for some years; and some uncollected poems.

Razón y Fe, XV (Madrid), 141–56; 279–92; *La Cruz*, I (Madrid, 1893), 146; I (1906), 415; *Diccionario énciclopédico Hispano-americano*, XII (Barcelona, 1893); *Letters and Notices* (London, 1906–07).

ANTONIO PEREZ GOYENA.

Martyr.—The Greek word *μάρτυς* signifies a witness who testifies to a fact of which he has knowledge from personal observation. It is in this sense that the term first appears in Christian literature; the Apostles were "witnesses" of all that they had observed in the public life of Christ, as well as of all they had learned from His teaching, "in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and Samaria, and even to the uttermost part of the earth" (Acts, i, 8). St. Peter, in his address to the Apostles and disciples relative to the election of a successor to Judas, employs the term with this meaning: "Wherefore, of these men who have companied with us all the time that the Lord Jesus came in and went out among us, beginning from the baptism of John until the day he was taken up from us, one of these must be made *witness* with us of his resurrection" (Acts, i, 22). In his first public discourse the chief of the Apostles speaks of himself and his companions as "witnesses" who saw the risen Christ, and subsequently, after the miraculous escape of the Apostles from prison, when brought a second time before the tribunal, Peter again alludes to the twelve as witnesses to Christ, as the Prince and Saviour of Israel, Who rose from the dead; and added that in giving their public testimony to the facts, of which they were certain, they must obey God rather than man (Acts, v, 29 sqq.). In his First Epistle St. Peter also refers to himself as a "witness of the sufferings of Christ" (I Pet., v. 1).

But even in these first examples of the use of the word *μάρτυς* in Christian terminology a new shade of meaning is already noticeable, in addition to the accepted signification of the term. The disciples of Christ were no ordinary witnesses such as those who gave testimony in a court of justice. These latter ran no risk in bearing testimony to facts that came under their observation, whereas the witnesses of Christ were brought face to face daily, from the beginning of their apostolate, with the possibility of incurring severe punishment and even death itself. Thus, St. Stephen was a witness who early in the history of Christianity sealed his testimony with his blood. The careers of the Apostles were at all times beset with dangers of the gravest character, until eventually they all suffered the last penalty for their convictions. Thus, within the lifetime of the Apostles, the term *μάρτυς* came to be used in the sense of a witness who at any time might be called upon to deny what he testified to, under penalty of death. From this stage the transition was easy to the ordinary meaning of the term, as used ever since in Christian literature: a martyr, or witness of Christ, is a person who, though he has never seen nor heard the Divine Founder of the Church, is yet so firmly convinced of the truths of the Christian religion, that he gladly suffers death rather than deny it. St. John, at the end of the first century, employs the word with this meaning; Antipas, a convert from paganism, is spoken of as a "faithful witness (*μάρτυς*) who was slain among you, where Satan dwelleth" (Apoc., ii, 13). Further on the same Apostle speaks of the "souls of them that were slain for the Word of God and for the testimony (*μαρτυρίαν*) which they held" (Apoc., vi, 9).

Yet, it was only by degrees, in the course of the first age of the Church, that the term martyr came to be exclusively applied to those who had died for the faith. The grandsons of St. Jude, for example, on their escape from the peril they underwent when cited before Domitian were afterwards regarded as martyrs (Euseb., "Hist. eccl.", III, xx, xxxii). The famous confessors of Lyons, who endured so bravely awful tortures for their belief, were looked upon by their fellow-Christians as martyrs, but they themselves declined this title as of right belonging only to those who had actually died: "They are already martyrs whom Christ has deemed worthy to be taken up in their confession, having sealed their testimony by their departure; but we are confessors mean and lowly" (Euseb., op. cit., V, ii). This distinction between martyrs and confessors is thus traceable to the latter part of the second century: those only were martyrs who had suffered the extreme penalty, whereas the title of confessors was given to Christians who had shown their willingness to die for their belief, by bravely enduring imprisonment or torture, but were not put to death. Yet the term martyr was still sometimes applied during the third century to persons still living, as, for instance, by St. Cyprian, who gave the title of martyrs to a number of bishops, priests, and laymen condemned to penal servitude in the mines (Ep. 76). Tertullian speaks of those arrested as Christians and not yet condemned as *martyres designati*. In the fourth century, St. Gregory of Nazianzus alludes to St. Basil as "a martyr", but evidently employs the term in the broad sense in which the word is still sometimes applied to a person who has borne many and grave hardships in the cause of Christianity. The description of a martyr given by the pagan historian Ammianus Marcellinus (XXII, xvii), shows that by the middle of the fourth century the title was

everywhere reserved to those who had actually suffered death for their faith. Heretics and schismatics put to death as Christians were denied the title of martyrs (St. Cyprian, "De Unit.", xiv; St. Augustine, Ep. 173; Euseb., "Hist. Eccl.", V, xvi, xxi). St. Cyprian lays down clearly the general principle that "he cannot be a martyr who is not in the Church; he cannot attain unto the kingdom who forsakes that which shall reign there." St. Clement of Alexandria strongly disapproves (Strom., IV, iv) of some heretics who gave themselves up to the law; they "banish themselves without being martyrs".

The orthodox were not permitted to seek martyrdom. Tertullian, however, approves the conduct of the Christians of a province of Asia who gave themselves up to the governor, Arrius Antoninus (Ad. Scap., v). Eusebius also relates with approval the incident of three Christians of Cæsarea in Palestine who, in the persecution of Valerian, presented themselves to the judge and were condemned to death (Hist. Eccl., VII, xii). But while circumstances might sometimes excuse such a course, it was generally held to be imprudent. St. Gregory of Nazianzus sums up in a sentence the rule to be followed in such cases: it is mere rashness to seek death, but it is cowardly to refuse it (Orat. xlii, 5, 6). The example of a Christian of Smyrna named Quintus, who, in the time of St. Polycarp, persuaded several of his fellow believers to declare themselves Christians, was a warning of what might happen to the over-zealous: Quintus at the last moment apostatized, though his companions persevered. Breaking idols was condemned by the Council of Elvira (306), which, in its sixtieth canon, decreed that a Christian put to death for such vandalism would not be enrolled as a martyr. Lactantius, on the other hand, has only mild censure for a Christian of Nicomedia who suffered martyrdom for tearing down the edict of persecution (De mort. pers., xiii). In one case St. Cyprian authorizes seeking martyrdom. Writing to his priests and deacons regarding repentant *lapsi* who were clamouring to be received back into communion, the bishop after giving general directions on the subject, concludes by saying that if these impatient personages are so eager to get back to the Church there is a way of doing so open to them. "The struggle is still going forward", he says, "and the strife is waged daily. If they (the *lapsi*) truly and with constancy repent of what they have done, and the fervour of their faith prevails, he who *cannot* be delayed may be crowned" (Ep. xiii).

Legal Basis of the Persecutions.—Acceptance of the national religion in antiquity was an obligation incumbent on all citizens; failure to worship the gods of the State was equivalent to treason. This universally accepted principle is responsible for the various persecutions suffered by Christians before the reign of Constantine; Christians denied the existence of and therefore refused to worship the gods of the state pantheon. They were in consequence regarded as atheists. It is true, indeed, that the Jews also rejected the gods of Rome, and yet escaped persecution. But the Jews, from the Roman standpoint, had a national religion and a national God, Jehovah, whom they had a full legal right to worship. Even after the destruction of Jerusalem, when the Jews ceased to exist as a nation, Vespasian made no change in their religious status, save that the tribute formerly sent by Jews to the temple at Jerusalem was henceforth to be paid to the Roman exchequer. For some time after its establishment, the Christian Church enjoyed the religious privileges of the Jewish nation, but from the nature of the case it is apparent that the chiefs of the Jewish religion would not long permit without protest this state of things. For they abhorred Christ's religion as much as they abhorred its Founder. At what date the Roman authorities had their attention directed to the difference between the Jewish and the Christian religion cannot be determined, but it appears to be fairly well established that laws proscribing Christianity were enacted before the end of the first century. Tertullian is authority for the statement that persecution of the Christians was *institutum Neronianum*—an institution of Nero—(Ad nat., i, 7). The First Epistle of St. Peter also clearly alludes to the proscription of Christians, as Christians, at the time it was written (I, St. Peter, iv, 16). Domitian (81–96) also, is known to have punished with death Christian members of his own family on the charge of atheism (Suetonius, "Domitianus", xv). While it is therefore probable that the formula: "Let there be no Christians" (*Christiani non sint*) dates from the second half of the first century, yet the earliest clear enactment on the subject of Christianity is that of Trajan (98–117) in his famous letter to the younger Pliny, his legate in Bithynia.

Pliny had been sent from Rome by the emperor to restore order in the Province of Bithynia-Pontus. Among the difficulties he encountered in the execution of his commission one of the most serious concerned the Christians. The extraordinarily large number of Christians he found within his jurisdiction greatly surprised him: the contagion of their "superstition", he reported to Trajan, affected not only the cities but even the villages and country districts of the province (Pliny, Ep., x, 96). One consequence of the general defection from the state religion was of an economic order: so many people had become Christians that purchasers were no longer found for the victims that once in great numbers were offered to the gods. Complaints were laid before the legate relative to this state of affairs, with the result that some Christians were arrested and brought before Pliny for examination. The suspects were interrogated as to their tenets and those of them who persisted in declining repeated invitations to recant were executed. Some of the prisoners, however, after first affirming that they were Christians, afterwards, when threatened with punishment, qualified their first admission by saying that at one time they had been adherents of the proscribed body but were so no longer. Others again denied that they were or ever had been Christians. Having never before had to deal with questions concerning Christians Pliny applied to the emperor for instructions on three points regarding which he did not see his way clearly: first, whether the age of the accused should be taken into consideration in meting out punishment; secondly, whether Christians who renounced their belief should be pardoned; and thirdly, whether the mere profession of Christianity should be regarded as a crime, and punishable as such, independent of the fact of the innocence or guilt of the accused of the crimes ordinarily associated with such profession.

To these inquiries Trajan replied in a rescript which was destined to have the force of law throughout the second century in relation to Christianity. After approving what his representative had already done, the emperor directed that in future the rule to be observed in dealing with Christians should be the following: no steps were to be taken by magistrates to ascertain who were or who were not Christians, but at the same time, if any person was denounced, and admitted that he was a Christian, he was to be punished —evidently with death. Anonymous denunciations were not to be acted upon, and on the other hand, those who repented of being Christians and offered sacrifice to the gods, were to be pardoned. Thus, from the year 112, the date of this document, perhaps even from the reign of Nero, a Christian was ipso facto an outlaw. That the followers of Christ were known to the highest authorities of the State to be innocent of the numerous crimes and misdemeanors attributed to them by popular calumny, is evident from Pliny's testimony to this effect, as well as from

Trajan's order: *conquirendi non sunt.* And that the emperor did not regard Christians as a menace to the State is apparent from the general tenor of his instructions. Their only crime was that they were Christians, adherents of an illegal religion. Under this regime of proscription the Church existed from the year 112 to the reign of Septimius Severus (193–211). The position of the faithful was always one of grave danger, being as they were at the mercy of every malicious person who might, without a moment's warning, cite them before the nearest tribunal. It is true indeed, that the delator was an unpopular person in the Roman Empire, and, besides, in accusing a Christian he ran the risk of incurring severe punishment if unable to make good his charge against his intended victim. In spite of the danger, however, instances are known, in the persecution era, of Christian victims of delation.

The prescriptions of Trajan on the subject of Christianity were modified by Septimius Severus by the addition of a clause forbidding any person to become a Christian. The existing law of Trajan against Christians in general was not, indeed, repealed by Severus, though for the moment it was evidently the intention of the emperor that it should remain a dead letter. The object aimed at by the new enactment was, not to disturb those already Christians, but to check the growth of the Church by preventing conversions. Some illustrious convert martyrs, the most famous being Sts. Perpetua and Felicitas, were added to the roll of champions of religious freedom by this prohibition, but it effected nothing of consequence in regard to its primary purpose. The persecution came to an end in the second year of the reign of Caracalla (211–17). From this date to the reign of Decius (250–53) the Christians enjoyed comparative peace, with the exception of the short period when Maximinus the Thracian (235–38) occupied the throne. The elevation of Decius to the purple began a new era in the relations between Christianity and the Roman State. This emperor, though a native of Illyria, was nevertheless profoundly imbued with the spirit of Roman conservatism. He ascended the throne with the firm intention of restoring the prestige which the empire was fast losing, and he seems to have been convinced that the chief difficulty in the way of effecting his purpose was the existence of Christianity. The consequence was that in the year 250 he issued an edict, the tenor of which is known only from the documents relating to its enforcement, prescribing that all Christians of the empire should on a certain day offer sacrifice to the gods.

This new law was quite a different matter from the existing legislation against Christianity. Proscribed though they were legally, Christians had hitherto enjoyed comparative security under a regime which clearly laid down the principle that they were not to be sought after officially by the civil authorities. The edict of Decius was exactly the opposite of this: the magistrates were now constituted religious inquisitors, whose duty it was to punish Christians who refused to apostatize. The emperor's aim, in a word, was to annihilate Christianity by compelling every Christian in the empire to renounce his faith. The first effect of the new legislation seemed favourable to the wishes of its author. During the long interval of peace since the reign of Septimius Severus—nearly forty years—a considerable amount of laxity had crept into the Church's discipline, one consequence of which was, that on the publication of the edict of persecution, multitudes of Christians besieged the magistrates everywhere in their eagerness to comply with its demands. Many other nominal Christians procured by bribery certificates stating that they had complied with the law, while still others apostatized under torture. Yet after this first throng of weaklings had put themselves outside the pale of Christianity there still remained, in every part of the empire, numerous Christians worthy of their religion, who endured all manner of torture, and death itself, for their convictions. The persecution lasted about eighteen months, and wrought incalculable harm.

Before the Church had time to repair the damage thus caused, a new conflict with the State was inaugurated by an edict of Valerian published in 257. This enactment was directed against the clergy, bishops, priests, and deacons, who were directed under pain of exile to offer sacrifice. Christians were also forbidden, under pain of death, to resort to their cemeteries. The results of this first edict were of so little moment that the following year, 258, a new edict appeared requiring the clergy to offer sacrifice under penalty of death. Christian senators, knights, and even the ladies of their families, were also affected by an order to offer sacrifice under penalty of confiscation of their goods and reduction to plebeian rank. And in the event of these severe measures proving ineffective the law prescribed further punishment: execution for the men, for the women exile. Christian slaves and freedmen of the emperor's household also were punished by confiscation of their possessions and reduction to the lowest ranks of slavery. Among the martyrs of this persecution were Pope Sixtus II and St. Cyprian of Carthage. Of its further effects little is known, for want of documents, but it seems safe to surmise that, besides adding many new martyrs to the Church's roll, it must have caused enormous suffering to the Christian nobility. The persecution came to an end with the capture (260) of Valerian by the Persians; his successor, Gallienus (260–68), revoked the edict and restored to the bishops the cemeteries and meeting places.

From this date to the last persecution inaugurated by Diocletian (284–305) the Church, save for a short period in the reign of Aurelian (270–75), remained in the same legal situation as in the second century. The first edict of Diocletian was promulgated at Nicomedia in the year 303, and was of the following tenor: Christian assemblies were forbidden; churches and sacred books were ordered to be destroyed, and all Christians were commanded to abjure their religion forthwith. The penalties for failure to comply with these demands were degradation and civil death for the higher classes, reduction to slavery for freemen of the humbler sort, and for slaves incapacity to receive the gift of freedom. Later in the same year a new edict ordered the imprisonment of ecclesiastics of all grades, from bishops to exorcists. A third edict imposed the death-penalty for refusal to abjure, and granted freedom to those who would offer sacrifice; while a fourth enactment, published in 304, commanded everybody without exception to offer sacrifice publicly. This was the last and most determined effort of the Roman State to destroy Christianity. It gave to the Church countless martyrs, and ended in her triumph in the reign of Constantine.

Number of the Martyrs.—Of the 249 years from the first persecution under Nero (64) to the year 313, when Constantine established lasting peace, it is calculated that the Christians suffered persecution about 129 years and enjoyed a certain degree of toleration about 120 years. Yet it must be borne in mind that even in the years of comparative tranquillity Christians were at all times at the mercy of every person ill-disposed towards them or their religion in the empire. Whether or not delation of Christians occurred frequently during the era of persecution is not known, but taking into consideration the irrational hatred of the pagan population for Christians, it may safely be surmised that not a few Christians suffered martyrdom through betrayal. An example of the kind related by St. Justin Martyr shows how swift and terrible were the consequences of delation. A woman who had been converted to Christianity was accused by her

husband before a magistrate of being a Christian. Through influence the accused was granted the favour of a brief respite to settle her worldly affairs, after which she was to appear in court and put forward her defence. Meanwhile her angry husband caused the arrest of the catechist, Ptolomæus by name, who had instructed the convert. Ptolomæus, when questioned, acknowledged that he was a Christian and was condemned to death. In the court, at the time this sentence was pronounced, were two persons who protested against the iniquity of inflicting capital punishment for the mere fact of professing Christianity. The magistrate in reply asked if they also were Christians, and on their answering in the affirmative both were ordered to be executed. As the same fate awaited the wife of the delator also, unless she recanted, we have here an example of three, possibly four, persons suffering capital punishment on the accusation of a man actuated by malice, solely for the reason that his wife had given up the evil life she had previously led in his society (St. Justin Martyr, II, Apol., ii).

As to the actual number of persons who died as martyrs during these two centuries and a half we have no definite information. Tacitus is authority for the statement that an immense multitude (*ingens multitudo*) were put to death by Nero. The Apocalypse of St. John speaks of "the souls of them that were slain for the word of God" in the reign of Domitian, and Dion Cassius informs us that "many" of the Christian nobility suffered death for their faith during the persecution for which this emperor is responsible. Origen, indeed, writing about the year 249, before the edict of Decius, states that the number of those put to death for the Christian religion was not very great, but he probably means that the number of martyrs up to this time was small when compared with the entire number of Christians (cf. Allard, "Ten Lectures on the Martyrs", 128). St. Justin Martyr, who owed his conversion largely to the heroic example of Christians suffering for their faith, incidentally gives a glimpse of the danger of professing Christianity in the middle of the second century, in the reign of so good an emperor as Antoninus Pius (138–61). In his "Dialogue with Trypho" (cx), the apologist, after alluding to the fortitude of his brethren in religion, adds, "for it is plain that, though beheaded, and crucified, and thrown to wild beasts, and chains, and fire, and all other kinds of torture, we do not give up our confession; but, the more such things happen, the more do others in larger numbers become faithful. . . . Every Christian has been driven out, not only from his own property, but even from the whole world; *for you permit no Christian to live.*" Tertullian also, writing towards the end of the second century, frequently alludes to the terrible conditions under which Christians existed ("Ad martyres", "Apologia", "Ad Nationes", etc.): death and torture were ever present possibilities.

But the new régime of special edicts, which began in 250 with the edict of Decius, was still more fatal to Christians. The persecutions of Decius and Valerian were not, indeed, of long duration, but while they lasted, and in spite of the large number of those who fell away, there are clear indications that they produced numerous martyrs. Dionysius of Alexandria, for instance, in a letter to the Bishop of Antioch, tells of a violent persecution that took place in the Egyptian capital, through popular violence, before the edict of Decius was even published. The Bishop of Alexandria gives several examples of what Christians endured at the hands of the pagan rabble and then adds that "many others, in cities and villages, were torn asunder by the heathen" (Euseb., "Hist. eccl.", VI, xli sq.). Besides those who perished by actual violence, also, a "multitude wandered in the deserts and mountains, and perished of hunger and thirst, of cold and sickness and robbers and wild beasts" (Euseb., l. c.). In another letter, speaking of the persecution under Valerian, Dionysius states that "men and women, young and old, maidens and matrons, soldiers and civilians, of every age and race, some by scourging and fire, others by the sword, have conquered in the strife and won their crowns" (Id., op. cit., VII, xi). At Cirta, in North Africa, in the same persecution, after the execution of Christians had continued for several days, it was resolved to expedite matters. To this end the rest of those condemned were brought to the bank of a river and made to kneel in rows. When all was ready the executioner passed along the ranks and despatched all without further loss of time (Ruinart, p. 231).

But the last persecution was even more severe than any of the previous attempts to extirpate Christianity. In Nicomedia "a great multitude" were put to death with their bishop, Anthimus; of these some perished by the sword, some by fire, while others were drowned. In Egypt "thousands of men, women and children, despising the present life, . . . endured various deaths" (Euseb., "Hist. eccl.", VII, iv sqq.), and the same happened in many other places throughout the East. In the West the persecution came to an end at an earlier date than in the East, but, while it lasted, numbers of martyrs, especially at Rome, were added to the calendar (cf. Allard, op. cit., 138 sq.). But besides those who actually shed their blood in the first three centuries account must be taken of the numerous confessors of the Faith who, in prison, in exile, or in penal servitude suffered a daily martyrdom more difficult to endure than death itself. Thus, while anything like a numerical estimate of the number of martyrs is impossible, yet the meagre evidence on the subject that exists clearly enough establishes the fact that countless men, women and even children, in that glorious, though terrible, first age of Christianity, cheerfully sacrificed their goods, their liberties, or their lives, rather than renounce the faith they prized above all.

Trial of the Martyrs.—The first act in the tragedy of the martyrs was their arrest by an officer of the law. In some instances the privilege of *custodia libera*, granted to St. Paul during his first imprisonment, was allowed before the accused were brought to trial; St. Cyprian, for example, was detained in the house of the officer who arrested him, and treated with consideration until the time set for his examination. But such procedure was the exception to the rule; the accused Christians were generally cast into the public prisons, where often, for weeks or months at a time, they suffered the greatest hardships. Glimpses of the sufferings they endured in prison are in rare instances supplied by the Acts of the Martyrs. St. Perpetua, for instance, was horrified by the awful darkness, the intense heat caused by overcrowding in the climate of Roman Africa, and the brutality of the soldiers (Passio SS. Perpet., et Felic., i). Other confessors allude to the various miseries of prison life as beyond their powers of description (Passio SS. Montani, Lucii, iv). Deprived of food, save enough to keep them alive, of water, of light and air; weighted down with irons, or placed in stocks with their legs drawn as far apart as was possible without causing a rupture; exposed to all manner of infection from heat, overcrowding, and the absence of anything like proper sanitary conditions—these were some of the afflictions that preceded actual martyrdom. Many, naturally, died in prison under such conditions, while others, unfortunately, unable to endure the strain, adopted the easy means of escape left open to them, namely, complied with the condition demanded by the State of offering sacrifice.

Those whose strength, physical and moral, was capable of enduring to the end were, in addition, frequently interrogated in court by the magistrates, who endeavoured by persuasion or torture to induce them to recant. These tortures comprised every means that human ingenuity in antiquity had devised to break down even the most courageous; the obstinate

were scourged with whips, with straps, or with ropes; or again they were stretched on the rack and their bodies torn apart with iron rakes. Another awful punishment consisted in suspending the victim, sometimes for a whole day at a time, by one hand; while modest women in addition were exposed naked to the gaze of those in court. Almost worse than all this was the penal servitude to which bishops, priests, deacons, laymen and women, and even children, were condemned in some of the more violent persecutions; these refined personages of both sexes, victims of merciless laws, were doomed to pass the remainder of their days in the darkness of the mines, where they dragged out a wretched existence, half naked, hungry, and with no bed save the damp ground. Those were far more fortunate who were condemned to even the most disgraceful death, in the arena, or by crucifixion.

HONOURS PAID THE MARTYRS.—It is easy to understand why those who endured so much for their convictions should have been so greatly venerated by their co-religionists from even the first days of trial in the reign of Nero. The Roman officials usually permitted relatives or friends to gather up the mutilated remains of the martyrs for interment, although in some instances such permission was refused. These relics the Christians regarded as "more valuable than gold or precious stones" (Martyr. Polycarpi, xviii). Some of the more famous martyrs received special honours, as for instance, in Rome, St. Peter and St. Paul, whose "trophies", or tombs, are spoken of at the beginning of the third century by the Roman priest Caius (Eusebius, "Hist. eccl.", II, xxi, 7). Numerous crypts and chapels in the Roman catacombs, some of which, like the *capella græca*, were constructed in sub-Apostolic times, also bear witness to the early veneration for those champions of freedom of conscience who won, by dying, the greatest victory in the history of the human race. Special commemoration services of the martyrs, at which the holy Sacrifice was offered over their tombs—the origin of the time-honoured custom of consecrating altars by enclosing in them the relics of martyrs—were held on the anniversaries of their death; the famous *Fractio Panis* fresco of the *capella græca*, dating from the early second century, is probably a representation (see s. v. FRACTIO PANIS; EUCHARIST, SYMBOLS OF) in miniature, of such a celebration. From the age of Constantine even still greater veneration was accorded the martyrs. Pope Damasus (366–84) had a special love for the martyrs, as we learn from the inscriptions, brought to light by de Rossi, composed by him for their tombs in the Roman catacombs. Later on veneration of the martyrs was occasionally exhibited in a rather undesirable form; many of the frescoes in the catacombs have been mutilated to gratify the ambition of the faithful to be buried near the saints (*retro sanctos*), in whose company they hoped one day to rise from the grave. In the Middle Ages the esteem in which the martyrs were held was equally great; no hardships were too severe to be endured in visiting famous shrines, like those of Rome, where their relics were contained.

ALLARD, *Ten Lectures on the Martyrs* (New York, 1907); BIRKS in *Dict. of Christ. Antiq.* (London, 1875–80), s. v.; HEALY, *The Valerian Persecution* (Boston, 1905); LECLERCQ, *Les Martyrs*, I (Paris, 1906); DUCHESNE, *Histoire ancienne de l'église*, I (Paris, 1906); HEUSER in KRAUS, *Realencyklopädie f. Christlichen Altenthümer* (Freiburg, 1882–86), s. v. *Märtyrer;* BONWETCH in *Realencyklopädie f. prot. Theol. u. Kirche* (Leipzig, 1903), s. v. *Märtyrer u. Bekenner*, and HARNACK in op. cit., s. v. *Christenverfolgungen.*

MAURICE M. HASSATT.

Martyr d'Anghiera, PETER, historian of Spain and of the discoveries of her representatives, b. at Arona, near Anghiera, on Lake Maggiore in Italy, 2 February, 1457; d. at Granada in October, 1526. He went to Rome at the age of twenty, and there made the acquaintance of Pomponius Lætus, the antiquarian. Cardinals Arcimbolo and Sforza became his patrons, and under Pope Innocent VIII he was made secretary of the prothonotary, Francesco Negro. He became acquainted through the Spanish prothonotary, Geraldino, with the Ambassador Don Iñigo Lopez de Mendoza, Count of Tendilla, whom he accompanied to Saragossa in August, 1487. He soon became a notable figure among the Humanists of Spain, and in 1488 gave lectures in Salamanca on the invitation of the university. The new learning was under high patronage. King Ferdinand was a pupil of Vidal de Noya; Queen Isabel had studied under Beatrice Galindo, surnamed The Latina; Erasmus has praised the learning of Catherine of Aragon, who married Henry VIII of England; and Luis Vines relates that the daughter of Isabel the Catholic, Doña Juana La Loca, could converse in Latin with the ambassadors from the Low Countries. Italians were spreading the Renaissance movement throughout Spain, and the intelligence of Castile sat at the feet of Peter Martyr d'Anghiera. His chief task, however, after 1492 was the education of young nobles at the Spanish court, and a great number of noted men issued from his school. In 1501 he was sent to Egypt on a diplomatic mission to dissuade the Sultan from taking vengeance on the Christians in Egypt and Palestine for the defeat of the Moors in Spain. Following on the successful issue of this mission, he received the title of "maestro de los caballeros". In 1504 he became papal prothonotary and prior of Granada. In 1511 he was given the post of chronicler in the newly formed State Council of India, which was commissioned by the Government to describe what was transpiring in the New World. In 1522 his old friend, Adrian of Louvain, now Pope Adrian VI, appointed him archpriest of Ocaña. Charles V gave him in 1523 the title of Count Palatine, and in 1524 called him once more into the Indian State Council. At last he was invested by Clement VII, on the proposal of Charles V, with the dignity of Abbot of Jamaica. Martyr never visited the island, but as abbot he had built there the first stone church.

As chronicler he performed notable literary work, which has preserved his name to posterity. The year of his appointment (1511), he published, with other works, the first historical account of the great Spanish discoveries under the title of "Opera, Legatio, Babylonica, Oceani decas, Pœmata, Epigrammata" (Seville, 1511). The "Decas" consisted of ten reports, of which two, in the form of letters describing the voyages of Columbus, had been already sent by Martyr to Cardinal Ascanius Sforza in 1493 and 1494. In 1501 Martyr, at the urgent request of the Cardinal of Aragon, had added to these eight chapters on the third voyage of Columbus and the exploits of Niño and Pinzon, and in 1511 he added a supplement giving an account of events from 1501 to 1511. Jointly with this "Decade", he published a narrative of his experiences in Egypt with a description of the inhabitants, their country, and history. By 1516 he had finished two other "Decades", the first of these being devoted to the exploits of Ojeda, Nicuesa, and Balboa, the other giving an account of the discovery of the Pacific Ocean by Balboa, of the fourth voyage of Columbus, and furthermore of the expeditions of Pedrarias. All three appeared together at Alcalá in 1516 under the title: "De orbe novo decades cum Legatione Babylonica". The "Enchiridion de nuper sub D. Carolo repertis insulis" (Basle, 1521) came out as the fourth "Decade" treating of the voyages of Hernandez de Córdoba, Drijalva, and Cortés. The fifth "Decade" (1523) dealt with the conquest of Mexico and the circumnavigation of the world by Magellan; the sixth "Decade" (1524) gave an account of the discoveries of Davila on the west coast of America; in the seventh "Decade" (1525) there are collected together descriptions of the customs of the natives in South Carolina, as well as Florida, Haiti, Cuba, Darien; the eighth "Decade" (1525) gives for

the most part the story of the march of Cortés against Olit.

Martyr got many of his accounts from the discoverers themselves; he profited by letters of Columbus, and was able also to make use of the reports of the Indian State Council. He himself had a great grasp of geographical problems: it was he, for example, who first realized the significance of the Gulf Stream. For these reasons his "Decades", which are also written with spirited vivacity, are of great value in the history of geography and discovery. All the eight "Decades" were published together for the first time at Alcalá in 1530. Later editions of single or of all the "Decades" appeared at Basle (1533), Cologne (1574), Paris (1587), and Madrid (1892). A German translation came out at Basle in 1582; an English version may be found in Arber, "The first three English books on America" (Birmingham, 1885); a French one by Gaffarel in "Recueil de voyages et de documents pour servir à l'histoire de la Géographie" (Paris, 1907). In addition to his "Decades" another valuable source of historical information is his "Opus epistolarum", although its value is somewhat lessened by the fact that it was not arranged or published until after his death. This collection consists of 812 letters to or from ecclesiastical dignitaries, generals, and statesmen of Spain and Italy, dealing with contemporary events, and especially with the history of Spain between 1487 and 1525. It appeared first at Alcalá in 1530; a new edition was issued by Elzevir at Amsterdam in 1670.

In addition to the numerous works concerning Christopher Columbus and the discovery of America, in which Martyr's records are discussed, the reader may consult SCHUMACHER, *Petrus Martyr, der Geschichtschreiber des Weltmeeres* (New York, 1879); HEIDENHEIMER, *Petrus Martyr Anglerius und sein Opus epistolarum* (Berlin, 1881); GERICK, *Das Opus epist. des P. M.*, Dissertation (Braunsberg, 1881); IDEM, *Das Leben des P. M.* in *Jahresber. des Mariengymnasiums zu Posen* (1890); BERNAYS, *P. M. A. u. sein Opus epist.* (Strasburg, 1891).

OTTO HARTIG.

Martyrdom. See MARTYR.

Martyrologium Hieronymianum. See MARTYROLOGY.

Martyrology. —By martyrology is understood a catalogue of martyrs and saints arranged according to the order of their feasts, i. e., according to the calendar. Since the time when the commemorations of martyrs, to which were added those of bishops, began to be celebrated, each Church had its special martyrology. Little by little these local lists were enriched by names borrowed from neighbouring Churches, and when the era of martyrs was definitively closed, those were introduced who had shone in the community by the sanctity of their life and notably by the practice of asceticism. We still possess the martyrology, or ferial, of the Roman Church of the middle of the fourth century, comprising two distinct lists, the "Depositio martyrum" and the "Depositio episcoporum", lists which are elsewhere most frequently found united. Among the Roman martyrs mention is already made in the "Ferial" of some African martyrs (7 March, Perpetua and Felicitas; 14 September, Cyprian). The calendar of Carthage which belongs to the sixth century contains a larger portion of foreign martyrs and even of confessors not belonging to that Church. *Local* martyrologies record exclusively the custom of a particular Church. The name of calendars is sometimes given to them, but this is a mere question of words. Besides special martyrologies, of which very few types have reached us, there are general martyrologies which are of the nature of a compilation. They are formed by the combination of several local martyrologies, with or without borrowings from literary sources. The most celebrated and important of the representatives of this class is the martyrology commonly called Hieronymian, because it is erroneously attributed to St. Jerome. It was drawn up in Italy in the second half of the fifth century, and underwent recension in Gaul, probably at Auxerre, about A. D. 600. All the MSS. we possess of the "Hieronymian Martyrology" spring from this Gallican recension. Setting aside the additions which it then received, the chief sources of the "Hieronymian" are a general martyrology of the Churches of the East, the local martyrology of the Church of Rome, a general martyrology of Italy, a general martyrology of Africa, and some literary sources, among them Eusebius. The manuscript tradition of the document is in inexplicable confusion, and the idea of restoring the text in its integrity must be abandoned. Of course when any part of the text is restored, there arises the further problem of determining the origin of that portion before pronouncing on its documentary value.

The "Hieronymian Martyrology" and those resembling it in form show signs of hurried compilation. The notices consist mostly of a topographical rubric preceding the name of the saint, e. g. "III id. ian. Romæ, in cymiterio Callisti, via Appia, depositio Miltiadis episcopi". There is another type of martyrology in which the name is followed by a short history of the saint. These are the *historical martyrologies*. There exists a large number of them, the best known being those of Bede (eighth century), and Rhabanus Maurus, Florus, Adon, and Usuard, all of the ninth century. Without dwelling here on the relations between them, it may be said that their chief sources are, besides the "Hieronymian", accounts derived from the Acts of the martyrs and some ecclesiastical authors. The present Roman Martyrology is directly derived from the historical martyrologies. It is in sum the martyrology of Usuard completed by the "Dialogues" of St. Gregory and the works of some of the Fathers, and for the Greek saints by the catalogue which is known as the "Menologion" of Sirlet (in H. Canisius, "Lectiones Antiquæ", III, Pt. ii, 412, Amsterdam, 1725). The *editio princeps* appeared at Rome in 1583, under the title: "Martyrologium romanum ad novam kalendarii rationem et ecclesiasticæ historiæ veritatem restitutum, Gregorii XIII pont. max. iussu editum". It bears no approbation. A second edition also appeared at Rome in the same year. This was soon replaced by the edition of 1584, which was approved and imposed on the entire Church by Gregory XIII. Baronius revised and corrected this work and republished it in 1586, with the "Notationes" and the "Tractatio de Martyrologio Romano". The Antwerp edition of 1589 was corrected in some places by Baronius himself. A new edition of the text and the notes took place under Urban VIII and was published in 1630. Benedict XIV was also interested in the Roman Martyrology. The Bull addressed to John V, King of Portugal, dated 1748 (it is to be found at the beginning of the modern editions of the "Martyrology"), makes known the importance of the changes introduced in the new edition, which is in substance and except for the changes made necessary by new canonizations, the one in use to-day.

With the historical martyrologies are connected the great Greek synaxaries, the arrangement and genesis of which makes them an important counterpart. But the literature of the synaxaries, which comprises also the books of that category belonging to the various Oriental Rites, requires separate treatment (see "Analecta Bollandiana", XIV, 396 sqq.; Delehaye, "Synaxarium ecclesiæ Constantinopolitanæ, Propylæum ad Acta Sanctorum novembris", 1902). Worthy of mention, as in some way being included in the preceding categories, are a number of martyrologies or calendars of some special interest, whether considered as documents more or less important for the history of the veneration of saints, or regarded as purely artificial compilations. We may refer to the provisory list drawn up at the beginning of Vol. I for November of

the "Acta SS." Particularly interesting, however, is the marble calendar of Naples, at present in the archdiocesan chapel, and which is the object of the lengthy commentaries of Mazocchi ("Commentarii in marmoreum Neapol. Kalendarium", Naples, 1755, 3 vols.) and of Sabbatini ("Il vetusto calendario napolitano", Naples, 1744, 12 vols.); the metrical martyrology of Wandelbert of Prüm (ninth century), of which Dümmler published a critical edition (Monumenta Germaniæ, Poetæ lat., II, 578–602); the martyrology which it has been agreed to call the "Little Roman", contemporary with Ado, who made it known, and which must be mentioned because of the importance which was for a long time attached to it, wrongly, as recent researches have proved. Among the artificial compilations which have been given the title of martyrologies may be mentioned as more important the "Martyrologium Gallicanum" of André du Saussay (Paris, 1637), the "Catalogus Sanctorum Italiæ" of Philip Ferrari (Milan, 1613), the "Martyrologium Hispanum" of Tamayo (Lyons, 1651–59); the last-named must be consulted with great caution. The universal martyrology of Chastelain (Paris, 1709) represents vast researches.

The critical study of martyrologies is rendered very difficult by the multitude and the disparate character of the elements which compose them. Early researches dealt with the historical martyrologies. The notes of Baronius on the Roman Martyrology cannot be passed over in silence, the work being the result of vast and solid erudition which has done much towards making known the historical sources of the compilations of the Middle Ages. In 1613 Rosweyde published at Antwerp a good edition of Ado, preceded by the "Little Roman" which he called "Vetus Romanum". It was only replaced by that of Giorgi (Rome, 1745), based on new MSS. and enriched with notes. In Vol. II for March of the "Acta SS." (1668) the Bollandists furnished new materials for martyrological criticism by their publication entitled "Martyrologium venerabilis Bedæ presbyteri ex octo antiquis manuscriptis acceptum cum auctario Flori . . . ". The results which seemed then to have been achieved were in part corrected, in part rendered more specific, by the great work of Père Du Sollier, "Martyrologium Usuardi monachi" (Antwerp, 1714), published in parts in Vols. VI and VII for June of the "Acta SS". Although some have criticized Du Sollier for his text of Usuard, the edition far surpasses anything of the kind previously attempted, and considering the resources at his disposal and the methods of the time when it was prepared, it may be regarded as a masterpiece. Quite recently D. Quentin ("Les Martyrologes historiques du moyen âge", Paris, 1908) has taken up the general question and has succeeded in giving a reasonable solution, thanks to a very deep and careful study of the manuscripts.

For a long time the study of the "Hieronymian Martyrology" yielded few results, and the edition of F. M. Fiorentini ("Vetustius occidentalis ecclesiæ martyrologium", Lucca, 1668), accompanied by a very erudite historical commentary, caused it to make no notable progress. It was the publication of the Syriac Martyrology discovered by Wright ("Journal of Sacred Literature", 1866, 45 sqq.), which gave the impetus to a series of researches which still continue. Father Victor De Buck ("Acta SS". Octobris, XII, 185, and elsewhere) signalizes the relationship of this martyrology to the "Hieronymian Martyrology". This fact, which escaped the first editor, is of assistance in recognizing the existence of a general martyrology of the Orient, written in Greek at Nicomedia, and which served as a source for the "Hieronymian". In 1885 De Rossi and Duchesne published a memoir entitled "Les sources du martyrologe hiéronymien" (in Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire, V), which became the starting-point of a critical edition of the martyrology, published through their efforts in Vol. II for November of the "Acta SS." in 1894. But little criticism has been devoted to the Roman Martyrology which has become an official book, its revision being reserved to the Roman Curia. Every effort devoted to the study of the "Hieronymian", the historical martyrologies, and the Greek "Synaxaria" helps the study of this compilation, which is derived from them. Attention may be called to the large commentary on the Roman Martyrology, by Alexander Politi (Florence, 1751). Only the first volume, containing the month of January, has appeared.

Besides the works already quoted see the following: MATAGNE, *Le martyrologe romain actuel* in DE BACKER, *Bib. des écrivains de la Comp. de Jésus*, 2nd ed., III (1876), 368 sqq.; DE SMEDT, *Introductio generalis ad historiam ecclesiasticam critice tractandam* (Ghent, 1876), 127–158; DE BUCK, *Recherches sur les calendriers ecclésiastiques* in *Précis historiques* (Brussels, 1877), 12 sqq.; ACHELIS, *Die Martyrologien, ihre Geschichte und ihr Wert* (Berlin, 1900); DELEHAYE, *Le témoignage des martyrologes* in *Analect. Bolland.*, XXVI, 78 sqq. A handy edition of the *Martyrologium Romanum* was published at Turin (1910); there is an English translation, *The Roman Martyrology* (Baltimore, 1907).

HIPPOLYTE DELEHAYE.

Martyropolis, a titular see, suffragan of Amida in the Province of Mesopotamia or Armenia Quarta. It was only a small town, named Maipherqat, but was rendered celebrated at the end of the fourth century, by its bishop, St. Maruthas. Enjoying great influence at the Roman and the Persian Courts, Maruthas was sent on several important missions to Seleucia-Ctesiphon or Constantinople and succeeded in obtaining religious liberty for the Persian Christians in 410. On his return from one of the journeys he brought back to Maipherqat from Persia many relics of the martyrs, in consequence of which the town became known as Martyropolis. The emperor Theodosius II aided Maruthas in this work of reconstruction and embellishment. Captured by the Persians under Anastasius I, the town was retaken by the Romans and successfully defended in the time of Justinian (Ahrens and Krüger, "Die sogenannte Kirchengeschichte des Zacharias Rhetor", 171–75; Procopius, "Bellum pers.", I, xxi, xxiii; "De ædificiis", III, 2). Its name was then changed for a short time to Justinianopolis (Malalas, "Chronographia", XVIII; P. G., XCVII, 629). Martyropolis is mentioned very often in the time of the wars between the Romans and the Persians, from 584 to 589 (Theophanis, "Chronographia", anno mundi 6077, 6079, 6080); Heraclius halted there in 624 (op. cit., 6116); in 712, it was in the hands of the Arabs (op. cit., 6204). Lequien (Oriens Christianus, II, 997–1002) mentions several of its Greek bishops, among them being the Metropolitan Basil who assisted at the conciliabulum of Photius in 878. We know, indeed, by a statement in the "Notitia episcopatuum" of Antioch, in the tenth century (Echos d'Orient, X, 93) that Martyropolis had been withdrawn from the jurisdiction of Amida, and become a metropolitan see. This town was one of the principal centres of Monophysitism; the "Revue de l'Orient chrétien", VI, 200, gives a list of twenty-seven Jacobite bishops. At present, Martyropolis is called Mefarkin, or Silvan; it is a caza of the vilayet of Diarbekir. The town, situated 42 miles north-east of Diarbekir, contains 7000 inhabitants, of whom 4000 are Mussulmans, 2000 schismatic Armenians, 430 Catholic Armenians, and about 511 Syrian Jacobites. It possesses 3 churches for these different religious communities.

CUINET, *La Turquie d'Asie*, II, 470–72; CHAPOT, *La frontière de l'Euphrate* (Paris, 1907), 359–61.

S. VAILHÉ.

Martyrs, ACTS OF THE.—In a strict sense the Acts of the Martyrs are the official records of the trials of early Christian martyrs made by the notaries of the court. In a wider sense, however, the title is applied to all the narratives of the martyrs' trial and death. In the latter sense, they may be classified as follows:

(1) Official reports of the interrogatories (*acta, gesta*). Those extant, like the "Acta Proconsulis" (Cyprian, "Ep. lxxvii") are few in number and have only come down to us in editions prepared with a view to the edification of the faithful. The "Passio Cypriani" and "Acta Martyrum Scillitanorum" are typical of this class. Of these the former is a composite work of three separate documents showing the minimum of editorial additions in a few connecting phrases. The first document gives an account of the trial of Cyprian in 257, the second, his arrest and trial in 258, the third, of his martyrdom.

(2) Non-official records made by eye-witnesses or at least by contemporaries recording the testimony of eye-witnesses. Such are the "Martyrium S. Polycarpi", admitting though it does much that may be due to the pious fancy of the eye-witnesses. The "Acta SS. Perpetuæ et Felicitatis" is perhaps of all extant Acta the most beautiful and famous, for it includes the autograph notes of Perpetua and Saturus and an eye-witness's account of the martyrdom. And to these must be added the "Epistola Ecclesiarum Viennensis et Lugdunensis", telling the story of the martyrs of Lyons, and other Acta not so famous.

(3) Documents of a later date than the martyrdom based on Acta of the first or second class, and therefore subjected to editorial manipulation of various kinds. It is this class which affords the critic the greatest scope for his discernment. What distinguishes these Acta from the subsequent classes is their literary basis. The editor was not constructing a story to suit oral tradition or to explain a monument. He was editing a literary document according to his own taste and purpose. The class is numerous and its contents highly debatable, for though additional study may raise any particular Acta to a higher class, it is far more likely as a rule to reduce it.

Besides these three classes of more or less reliable documents, many others pass under the name of Acta Martyrum, though their historicity is of little or no value. They are romances, either written around a few real facts which have been preserved in popular or literary tradition, or else pure works of the imagination, containing no real facts whatever. Among the historical romances we may instance the story of Felicitas and her seven sons, which in its present form seems to be a variation of IV Maccabees, viii, 1, though there can be no doubt of the underlying facts, one of which has actually been confirmed by De Rossi's discovery of the tomb of Januarius, the eldest son in the narrative. And according to such strict critics as M. Dufourcq (Etude sur les Gesta martyrum romains, Paris, 1900) and P. Delehaye (Analecta Bollandiana, XVI, 235–248), the Roman "Legendarium" can claim no higher class than this; so that, apart from monumental, liturgical, and topographical traditions, much of the literary evidence for the great martyrs of Rome is embedded in historical romances. It may be a matter for surprise that there should be such a class of Acta as the imaginative romances, which have no facts at all for their foundation. But they were the novels of those days which unfortunately came to be taken as history. Perhaps such is the case with the story of Genesius the Comedian who was suddenly converted while mimicking the Christian mysteries (Von der Lage, "Studien z. Genesius Legende", Berlin, 1898–9), and the Acts of Didymus and Theodora, the latter of whom was saved by the former, a Christian soldier, from a punishment worse than death. And even less reputable than these so-called Acta are the story of Barlaam and Josaphat which is the Christian adaptation of the Buddha legend, the Faust-legend of Cyprian of Antioch, and the romance of the heroine who, under the various names of Pelagia, Marina, Eugenia, Margaret, or Apollinaria is admitted in man's dress to a monastery, convicted of misconduct, and posthumously rehabilitated. St. Liberata also, the bearded lady who was nailed to a cross, is a saint of fiction only, though the romance was probably invented with the definite purpose of explaining the draped figure of a crucifix.

Still these two classes of romantic Acta can hardly be regarded as forgeries in the strict sense of that term. They are literary figments, but as they were written with the intention of edifying and not deceiving the reader, a special class must be reserved for hagiographical forgeries. To this must be relegated all those Acts, Passions, Lives, Legends, and Translations which have been written with the express purpose of perverting history; such, for instance, as the legends and translations falsely attaching a saint's name to some special church or city. Their authors disgraced the name of hagiographer, and they would not merit mention were it not that conscious deceit has in consequence been attributed to those hagiographers, who, having for their object to edify and not to instruct, have written Acta which were meant to be read as romances and not as history.

Besides these detached Acta Martyrum, there are other literary documents concerning the life and death of the martyrs which may be mentioned here. The Calendaria were lists of martyrs celebrated by the different Churches according to their different dates. The Martyrologies represent collections of different Calendaria and sometimes add details of the martyrdom. The Itineraries are guide-books drawn up for the use of pilgrims to the sanctuaries of Rome; they are not without their utility in so far as they reveal, not only the resting places of the great dead, but also the traditions which were current in the seventh century. The writings of the Fathers of the Church also embody many references to the martyrs, as, for instance, the sermons of St. Basil, Chrysostom, Augustine, Peter Chrysologus, and John Damascene.

Finally there are to be considered the collections of Lives, intended for public and private reading. Most important of all are the "Historia Ecclesiastica" of Eusebius (265–340), and his "De Martyribus Palestinæ"; but unfortunately his *μαρτύρων συναγωγή* or Collection of Acts of the Martyrs, to which he refers in the preface of the fifth book of his "Historia Ecclesiastica", is no longer extant. The fourteen poems of Aurelius Prudentius Clemens, published in 404 as the "Persitephanon liber", celebrated the praises of the martyrs of Spain and Italy; but as the author allowed himself the license of the poet with his material, he is not always reliable. The writers of the Middle Ages are responsible for a very large element of the fictitious in the stories of the martyrs; they did not even make a proper use of the material they had at their disposal. Gregory of Tours was the first of these medieval hagiographers with his "De virtutibus S. Martini", "De gloria Confessorum", and "De vitis Sanctorum". Simeon Metaphrastes is even less reliable; it has even been questioned whether he was not consciously deceitful. See, however, the article on METAPHRASTES. But the most famous collection of the Middle Ages was the "Golden Legend" of Jacopo de Soragine, first printed in 1476. All these medieval writers include saints as well as martyrs in their collections. So do Mombritius (Milan, 1476), Lipomanus (Venice, 1551), and Surius (Cologne, 1570). J. Faber Stapulensis included only Martyrs in his "Martyrum agones antiquis ex monumentis genuine descriptos" (1525), and they are only the martyrs whose feasts are celebrated in the month of January. But an epoch was marked in the history of the martyrs by the "Acta primorum martyrum sincera et selecta" of the Benedictine Theodore Ruinart (Paris, 1689), and frequently reprinted (Ratisbon, 1858). Other collections of Acta, subsequent to Ruinart's are Ilbachius, "Acta Martyrum Vindicata" (Rome, 1723). S. Assemai, "Acta SS. Martyrum orient. et occ." (Rome, 1748). T. Mama-

chii, "Origines et Antiquitates Christianæ" (Rome, 1749). The critical study of the Acta Martyrum has been vigorously prosecuted within the last few years, and the standpoint of the critics considerably changed since the attempt of Ruinart to make his selection of Acta. Many of his Acta Sincera will no longer rank as *sincera;* and if they be arranged in different classes according to their historicity very few can claim a place in our first or second class. But on the other hand the discovery of texts and the archæological researches of De Rossi and others have confirmed individual stories of martyrdom. And a general result of criticism has been to substantiate such main facts as the causes of persecution, the number and heroism of the martyrs, the popularity of their cultus, and the historicity of the popular heroes.

The chief problem, therefore, for modern critics is to discover the literary history of the Acta which have come down to us. It cannot be denied that some attempt was made at the very first to keep the history of the Church's martyrs inviolate. The public reading of the Acta in the churches would naturally afford a guarantee of their authenticity; and this custom certainly obtained in Africa, for the Third Council of Carthage (c. 47) permitted the reading of the "Passiones Martyrum cum anniversarii dies eorum celebrentur". There was also an interchange of Acta between different Churches, as we see from the "Martyrium S. Polycarpi" and the "Epistola Ecclesiæ Viennensis et Lugdunensis". But it is not known to what extent those customs were practised. And during the persecutions of Diocletian there must have been a wholesale destruction of documents, with the result that the Church would lose the accounts of its Martyr's history. This seems to be especially true of Rome, which possesses so few authentic Acta in spite of the number and fame of its martyrs; for the Romans had apparently lost the thread of these traditions as early as the second half of the fourth century. The poems of Prudentius, the Calendaria, and even the writings of Pope Damasus show that the story of the persecutions had fallen into obscurity. Christian Rome had her martyrs beneath her feet, and celebrated their memory with intense devotion, and yet she knew but little of their history.

Under these circumstances it is not improbable that the desire of the faithful for fuller information would easily be satisfied by raconteurs who, having only scanty material at their disposal, would amplify and multiply the few facts preserved in tradition and attach what they considered suitable stories to historical names and localities. And in the course of time it is argued these legends were committed to writing, and have come down to us as the Roman *legendarium*. In support of this severe criticism it is urged that the Roman Acta are for the most part not earlier than the sixth century (Dufourcq), and that spurious Acta were certainly not unknown during the period. The Roman Council of 494 actually condemned the public reading of the Acta (P. L., LIX, 171–2). And this Roman protest had been already anticipated by the Sixth Council of Carthage (401) which protested against the cult of martyrs whose martyrdom was not certain (canon 17). St. Augustine (354–340) also had written: "Though for other martyrs we can hardly find accounts which we can read on their festivals, the Passion of St. Stephen is in a canonical book" (Sermo, 315, P. L., XXXVIII, 1426). Subsequently in 692 the Trullan Council at Constantinople excommunicated those who were responsible for the reading of spurious Acta. The supposition, therefore, of such an origin for the Roman legends is not improbable. And unfortunately the Roman martyrs are not the only ones whose Acta are unreliable. Of the seventy-four separate Passions included by Ruinart in his Acta Sincera, the Bollandist Delehaye places only thirteen in the first or second class, as original documents. Further study of particular Acta may, of course, raise this number; and other original Acta may be discovered. The labours of such critics as Gebhardt, Aubé, Franchi de Cavalieri, Le Blant, Conybeare, Harnack, the Bollandists, and many others, have in fact, not infrequently issued in this direction, while at the same time they have gathered an extensive bibliography around the several Acta. These must therefore be valued on their respective merits. It may, however, be noticed here that the higher criticism is as dangerous when applied to the Acts of the Martyrs as it is for the Holy Scriptures. Arguments may of course, be drawn from the formal setting of the document, its accuracy in dates, names, and topography, and still stronger arguments from what may becalled the informal setting given to it unconsciously by its author. But in the first case the formal setting can surely be imitated, and it is unsafe therefore to seek to establish historicity by such an argument. It is equally unsafe to presume that the probability of a narrative, or its simplicity is a proof that it is genuine. Even the improbable may contain more facts of history than many a narrative which bears the appearance of sobriety and restraint. Nor is conciseness a sure proof that a document is of an early date; St. Mark's Gospel is not thus proved to be the earliest of the Synoptics. The informal setting is more reliable; philology and psychology are better tests than dates and geography, for it needs a clever romancer indeed to identify himself so fully with his heroes as to share their thoughts and emotions. And yet even with this concession to higher criticism, it still remains true that the critic is on safer ground when he has succeeded in establishing the pedigree of his document by external evidence.

Acta SS.; *Analecta Bollandiana; Bibliographica hagiographica græca* (Brussels, 1895); *Bibl. hag. latina* (Brussels, 1898); LE BLANT, *Les Persécuteurs et les Martyrs* (Paris, 1893); *Les Actes des Martyrs, Supplément aux Acta Sincera de D. Ruinart* in *Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres*, XXX. (Paris, 1882); NEUMANN, *Der Römische Staat und die allgemeine Kirche bis auf Diokletian*, I (Leipzig, 1890); HARNACK, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius* (Leipzig, 1897–1904); DUFOURCQ, *Etude sur les Gesta Martyrum Romains* (Paris, 1900–07); ACHELIS, *Die Martyrologien, ihre Geschichte und ihr Wert* (Berlin, 1900); QUENTIN, *Les martyrologes historiques du moyen âge* (Paris, 1907); GEBHARDT, *Acta Martyrum Selecta* (Berlin, 1902); LECLERCQ, *Les Martyrs* (Paris, 1902); LIETZMANN, *Die drei ältesten Martyrologien* (Bonn, 1903); DELEHAYE, *Legends of the Saints* (Eng. tr., London, 1907).

JAMES BRIDGE.

Martyrs, COPTIC. See PERSECUTIONS.

Martyrs, ENGLISH. See ENGLISH CONFESSORS AND MARTYRS.

Martyrs, JAPANESE.—There is not in the whole history of the Church a single people who can offer to the admiration of the Christian world annals as glorious, and a martyrology as lengthy, as those of the people of Japan. In January, 1552, St. Francis Xavier had remarked the proselytizing spirit of the early neophytes. "I saw them", he wrote, "rejoicing in our successes, manifesting an ardent zeal to spread the faith and to win over to baptism the pagans they conquered." He foresaw the obstacles that would block the progress of the faith in certain provinces, the absolutism of this or that *daimyo*, a class at that time very independent of the Mikado and in revolt against his supreme authority. As a matter of fact, in the province of Hirado, where he made a hundred converts, and where six years after him, 600 pagans were baptized in three days, a Christian woman (the proto-martyr) was beheaded for praying before a cross. In 1561 the daimyo forced the Christians to abjure their faith, "but they preferred to abandon all their possessions and live in the Bungo, poor with Christ, rather than rich without Him", wrote a missionary, 11 October, 1562. When, under the Shogunate of Yoshiaki, Ota Nobunaga, supported

by Wada Koresama, a Christian, had subdued the greater part of the provinces and had restored monarchical unity, there came to pass what St. Francis Xavier had hoped for. At Miyako (the modern Kiyoto) the faith was recognized and a church built 15 Aug., 1576. Then the faith continued to spread without notable opposition, as the daimyos followed the lead of the Mikado (Ogimachi, 1558–1586) and Ota Nobunaga. The toleration or favour of the central authority brought about everywhere the extension of the Christian religion, and only a few isolated cases of martyrdom are known (Le Catholicisme au Japon, I, 173).

It was not until 1587, when there were 200,000 Christians in Japan, that an edict of persecution, or rather of prescription, was passed to the surprise of everyone, at the instigation of a bigoted *bonze*, Nichijoshonin, zealous for the religion of his race. Twenty-six residences and 140 churches were destroyed; the missionaries were condemned to exile, but were clever enough to hide or scatter. They never doubted the constancy of their converts; they assisted them in secret and in ten years there were 100,000 other converts in Japan. We read of two martyrdoms, one at Takata, the other at Notsuhara; but very many Christians were dispossessed of their goods and reduced to poverty. The first bloody persecution dates from 1597. It is attributed to two causes: (1) Four years earlier some Castilian religious had come from the Philippines and, in spite of the decisions of the Holy See, had joined themselves to the 130 Jesuits who, on account of the delicate situation created by the edict, were acting with great caution. In spite of every charitable advice given them, these men set to work in a very indiscreet manner, and violated the terms of the edict even in the capital itself; (2) a Castilian vessel cast by the storm on the coast of Japan was confiscated under the laws then in vigour. Some artillery was found on board, and Japanese susceptibilities were further excited by the lying tales of the pilot, so that the idea went abroad that the Castilians were thinking of annexing the country. A list of all the Christians in Miyado and Osaka was made out, and on 5 Feb., 1597, 26 Christians, among whom were 6 Franciscan missionaries, were crucified at Nagasaki. Among the 20 native Christians there was one, a child of 13, and another of 12 years. "The astonishing fruit of the generous sacrifice of our 26 martyrs" (wrote a Jesuit missionary) "is that the Christians, recent converts and those of maturer faith, have been confirmed in the faith and hope of eternal salvation; they have firmly resolved to lay down their lives for the name of Christ. The very pagans who assisted at the martyrdom were struck at seeing the joy of the blessed ones as they suffered on their crosses and the courage with which they met death".

Ten years before this another missionary had foreseen and predicted that "from the courage of the Japanese, aided by the grace of God, it is to be expected that persecution will inaugurate a race for martyrdom". True it is that the national and religious customs of the people predisposed them to lay down their lives with singular fatalism; certain of their established usages, religious suicide, *hara-kiri*, had developed a contempt for death; but if grace does not destroy nature it exalts it, and their fervent charity and love for Christ led the Japanese neophytes to scourgings that the missionaries had to restrain. When this love for Christ had grown strong in the midst of suffering freely chosen, it became easier for the faithful to give the Saviour that greatest proof of love by laying down their lives in a cruel death for His name's sake. "The fifty crosses, ordered for the holy mountain of Nagasaki, multiplied ten or a hundred fold, would not have sufficed" (wrote one missionary) "for all the faithful who longed for martyrdom". Associations (*Kumi*) were formed under the patronage of the Blessed Virgin with the object of preparing the members by prayer and scourgings even to blood, to be ready to lay down their lives for the faith. After the persecution of 1597, there were isolated cases of martyrdom until 1614, in all about 70. The reigns of Ieyasu, who is better known in Christian annals by the name of Daifu Sama, and of his successors Hidetada and Iemitziu, were the more disastrous. We are not concerned now with the causes of that persecution, which lasted half a century with some brief intervals of peace. According to Mr. Ernest Satow (quoted by Thurston in "The Month", March, 1905, "Japan and Christianity"): "As the Jesuit missionaries conducted themselves with great tact, it is by no means improbable that they might have continued to make converts year by year until the great part of the nation had been brought over to the Catholic religion, had it not been for the rivalry of the missionaries of other orders." These were the Castilian religious; and hence the fear of seeing Spain spread its conquests from the Philippines to Japan. Furthermore the zeal of certain religious Franciscans and Dominicans was wanting in prudence, and led to persecution.

Year by year after 1614 the number of martyrdoms was 55, 15, 25, 62, 88, 15, 20. The year 1622 was particularly fruitful in Christian heroes. The Japanese martyrology counts 128 with name, Christian name and place of execution. Before this the four religious orders, Dominicans, Franciscans, Augustinians and Jesuits, had had their martyrs, but on 10 Sept., 1622, 9 Jesuits, 6 Dominicans, 4 Franciscans, and 6 lay Christians were put to death at the stake after witnessing the beheading of about 30 of the faithful. From December until the end of September, 1624, there were 285 martyrs. The English captain, Richard Cocks (Calendar of State Papers: Colonial East Indies, 1617–1621, p. 357) "saw 55 martyred at Miako at one time . . . and among them little children 5 or 6 years old burned in their mother's arms, crying out: 'Jesus receive our souls'. Many more are in prison who look hourly when they shall die, for very few turn pagans". We cannot go into the details of these horrible slaughters, the skilful tortures of Mount Unzen, the refined cruelty of the trench. After 1627 death grew more and more terrible for the Christians: in 1627, 123 died, during the years that followed, 65, 79, and 198. Persecution went on unceasingly as long as there were missionaries, and the last of whom we learn were 5 Jesuits and 3 seculars, who suffered the torture of the trench from 25 to 31 March, 1643. The list of martyrs we know of (name, Christian name, and place of execution) has 1648 names. If we add to this the groups we learn of from the missionaries, or later from the Dutch travellers between 1649 and 1660, the total goes to 3125, and this does not include Christians who were banished, whose property was confiscated, or who died in poverty. A Japanese judge, Arai Hakuseki, bore witness about 1710, that at the close of the reign of Iemitzu (1650) "it was ordered that the converts should all lean on their own staff". At that time an immense number, from 200,000 to 300,000, perished. Without counting the members of Third Orders and Congregations, the Jesuits had, according to the martyrology (Delplace, II, 181–195; 263–275), 55 martyrs, the Franciscans 36, the Dominicans 38, the Augustinians 20. Pius IX and Leo XIII declared worthy of public cult 36 Jesuit martyrs, 25 Franciscans, 21 Dominicans, 5 Augustinians and 107 lay victims. After 1632 it ceased to be possible to obtain reliable data or information which would lead to canonical beatification. When in 1854, Commodore Perry forced an entry to Japan, it was learned that the Christian faith, after two centuries of intolerance, was not dead. In 1865, priests of the Foreign Missions found 20,000 Christians practising their religion in secret at Kiushu. Religious liberty was not granted them by Japanese law until

1873. Up to that time in 20 provinces, 3404 had suffered for the faith in exile or in prison; 660 of these had died, and 1981 returned to their homes. In 1858, 12 Christians, among whom were two chief-baptizers, were put to death by torture. One missionary calculates that in all 1200 died for the faith.

PAGÈS, *Histoire de la religion chrétienne au Japon* (Paris, 1869); VALENTYN, *Beschryving* (Dordrecht, 1716); MONTANUS, *Gezantschappen, Japan* (Amsterdam, 1669); DELPLACE, *Le Catholicisme au Japon*, I, 1540–1593; II, 1593–1640 (Brussels, 1910); *Katholische Missionen* (Freiburg, 1894). See also works referred to in text.

LOUIS DELPLACE.

Martyrs, THE FORTY. See FORTY MARTYRS.

Martyrs, THE TEN THOUSAND.—On two days is a group of ten thousand martyrs mentioned in the Roman Martyrology. On 18 March: "At Nicomedia ten thousand holy martyrs who were put to the sword for the confession of Christ", and on 22 June: "On Mount Ararat the martyrdom of ten thousand holy martyrs who were crucified." The first entry, found in an old Greek martyrology, translated by Cardinal Sirleto and published by H. Canisius, probably notes the veneration of a number of those who gave their lives for Christ at the beginning of the persecution of Diocletian, in 303 (Acta SS., March, II, 616). That the number is not an exaggeration is evident from Eusebius ("Hist. Eccl.", VIII, vi), and Lactantius ("De morte persecut.", xv). The entry of 22 June is based upon a legend (Acta SS., June, V, 151) said to have been translated from a Greek original (which cannot, however, be found) by Anastasius Bibliothecarius (who died in 886), and dedicated to Peter, Bishop of Sabina (? d. 1221). The legend reads: The emperors Adrian and Antoninus marched at the head of a large army to suppress the revolt of the Gadarenes and the people of the Euphrates region. Finding too strong an opponent, all fled except nine thousand soldiers. After these had been converted to Christ by the voice of an angel they turned upon the enemy and completely routed them. They were then brought to the top of Mount Ararat and instructed in the faith. When the emperors heard of the victory they sent for the converts to join in sacrifices of thanksgiving to the gods. They refused, and the emperors applied to five tributary kings for aid against the rebels. The kings responded to the call, bringing an immense army. The Christians were asked to deny their faith, and, on refusal, were stoned. But the stones rebounded against the assailants, and at this miracle a thousand soldiers joined the confessors. Hereupon the emperors ordered all to be crucified. The Spanish version of the legend makes the martyrs Spaniards converted by St. Hermolaus, a supposed Bishop of Toledo. Many difficulties are created by the legend, it contains so many historical inaccuracies and utterly improbable details. The martyrs are not given by anyone before Petrus de Natalibus, Bishop of Equilio in 1371. The Greeks do not mention them in the Menæa, Menologium, or Horologium, nor do the Copts or Armenians. Surius omitted them in the first and second editions of his "Vitæ Sanctorum". Henschenius the Bollandist intended to put the group among the Prætermissi. Papebroeck admitted it to the body of the work only on the authority of Radulph de Rivo (Bibl. Patrum, XXVI, Lyons, 1677, 298) and classifies the Acts as apocryphal, while Baronius takes up their defence (Annales Eccl., ad an. 108, n. 2). The veneration of the Ten Thousand Martyrs is found in Denmark, Sweden, Poland, France, Spain, and Portugal. Relics are claimed by the church of St. Vitus in Prague, by Vienne, Scutari in Sicily, Cuenca in Spain, Lisbon and Coimbra in Portugal.

DES VAUX, *Les dix mille martyrs crucifiés sur le mont Ararat, leur culte et leurs reliques au pays d'Ouche* (Bellême, 1890); GROSSHEUTSCHI in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v. *Martyrer, zehntausend;* WEBER, *Die kath. Kirche in Armenien* (Freiburg, 1903), 90.

FRANCIS MERSHMAN.

Martyrs in China.—The first Christian martyrs in China appear to have been the missionaries of Ili Bâliq in Central Asia, Khan-Bâliq (Peking), and Zaitun (Fu-kien), in the middle of the fourteenth century. Islam had been introduced into Central Asia, and in China, the native dynasty of Ming, replacing the Mongol dynasty of Yuan, had not followed the policy of toleration of their predecessors; the Hungarian, Matthew Escandel, being possibly the first martyr.

With the revival of the missions in China with Matteo Ricci, who died at Peking in 1610, the blood of martyrs was soon shed to fertilize the evangelical field; the change of the Ming dynasty to the Manchu dynasty, giving occasion for new persecution. Andrew Xavier (better known as Andrew Wolfgang) Koffler (b. at Krems, Austria, 1603), a Jesuit, and companion of Father Michel Boym, in the Kwang-si province, who had been very successful during the Ming dynasty, was killed by the Manchu invaders on 12 Dec., 1651. On 9 May, 1665, the Dominican, Domingo Coronado, died in prison at Peking. Sometime before, a Spanish Dominican, Francisco Fernandez, of the convent of Valladolid, had been martyred on 15 Jan., 1648. Among the martyrs must be reckoned the celebrated Jesuit Johann Adam Schall von Bell (T'ang Jo-wang), who was imprisoned and ill-treated during the Manchu conquest. They were the first victims in modern times.

After the publication by a *literato*, of a libel against the Christians of Fu-ngan, in Fu-kien, the viceroy of the province gave orders to inquire into the state of the Catholic religion, the result of which was that a dreadful persecution broke out in 1746, during the reign of the Emperor K'ien lung, the victims of which were all Spanish Dominicans; the following were arrested: Juan Alcober (b. at Girone in 1694); Francisco Serrano, Bishop of Tipasa, and coadjutor to the vicar Apostolic; and Francisco Diaz (b. in 1712, at Ecija); finally the vicar Apostolic, Pedro Martyr Sanz (b. in 1680, at Asco, Tortosa), Bishop of Mauricastra, and Joachim Royo (b. at Tervel in 1690) surrendered. After they had been cruelly tortured, the viceroy sentenced them to death on 1 Nov., 1746; Sanz was martyred on 26 May, 1747; his companions shared his fate; the five Dominican martyrs were beatified by Leo XIII, on 14 May, 1893. Shortly after, a fresh persecution broke out in the Kiang-nan province, and the two Jesuit fathers, Antoine-Joseph Henriquez (b. 13 June, 1707), and Tristan de Attimis (b. in Friuli, 28 July, 1707), were thrown into prison with a great number of Christians, including young girls, who were ill-treated; finally the viceroy of Nan-king sentenced to death the two missionaries, who were strangled on 12 Sept., 1748. In 1785, the Franciscan brother, Atto Biagini (b. at Pistoia, 1752), died in prison at Peking.

Persecution was very severe during the Kia K'ing period (1796–1820); Louis-Gabriel-Taurin Dufresse (b. at Ville de Lézoux, Bourbonnais, 1751), of the Paris Foreign Missions, Bishop of Tabraca (24 July, 1800), and Vicar Apostolic of Sze ch'wan, was beheaded in this province on 14 Sept., 1815. In 1819, a new persecution took place in the Hu-pe Province; Jean-François-Regis Clet (b. at Grenoble, 19 April, 1748), an aged Lazarist, was betrayed by a renegade, arrested in Ho-nan, and thrown into prison at Wu ch'ang in Oct., 1819; he was strangled on 18 Feb., 1820, and twenty-three Christians were, at the same time, sentenced to perpetual banishment; another Lazarist, Lamiot, who had also been arrested, being the emperor's interpreter, was sent back to Peking; the Emperor Kia K'ing died shortly after; Father Clet was beatified in 1900.

Under the reign of the Emperor Tas Kwang, another Lazarist was also the victim of the Mandarin of Hu-pe; also betrayed by a Chinese renegade, Jean-Gabriel Perboyre (b. at Puech, Cahors, on 6 Jan., 1802), was transferred to Wu ch'ang like Clet; during several months,

he endured awful tortures, and was finally strangled on 11 Sept., 1840; he was beatified on 10 Nov., 1889. Father d'Addosio has written in Chinese, in 1887, a life of Perboyre; full bibliographical details are given of these two martyrs in "Bibliotheca Sinica".

Just after the French treaty of 1844, stipulating free exercise of the Christian religion, the Franciscan Vicar Apostolic of Hu-pe, Giuseppe Rizzolati, was expelled, and Michel Navarro (b. at Granada, 4 June, 1809), was arrested; a Lazarist missionary, Laurent Carayon was taken back from Chi-li to Macao (June, 1846), while Huc and Gabet were compelled to leave Lhasa, the capital of Tibet, on 26 February, 1846, and forcibly conducted to Canton. The death of Father August Chapdelaine, of the Paris Foreign Missions (b. at La Rochelle, Diocese of Coutances, 6 Jan., 1814, beheaded on 29 Feb., 1856, at Si-lin-hien, in the Kwang-si province), was the pretext chosen by France, to join England in a war against China; when peace was restored by a treaty signed at Tien-tsin in June, 1858, it was stipulated by a separate article that the Si-lin mandarin guilty of the murder of the French missionary should be degraded, and disqualified for any office in the future. On 27 Feb., 1857, Jean-Victor Müller, of the Paris Foreign Missions, was arrested in Kwang-tung; an indemnity of 200 dollars was paid to him; he was finally murdered by the rebels at Hing-yi-fu, on 24 April, 1866. On 16 August, 1860, the T'ai-p'ing rebel chief, the Chung Wang, accompanied by the Kan Wang, marched upon Shanghai; on 17th, his troops entered the village of Tsa ka wei, where the orphanage of the Jesuit Luigi de Massa (b. at Naples 3 March, 1827) was situated; the father was killed with a number of Christians; they were no less than five brothers belonging to the Neapolitan family of Massa, all Jesuit missionaries in China: Augustin (b. 16 March, 1813; d. 15 August, 1856), Nicolas (b. 30 Jan., 1815; d. 3 June, 1876), René (b. 14 May, 1817; d. 28 April, 1853), Gaetano (b. 31 Jan., 1821; d. 28 April, 1850), and Luigi. Two years later, another Jesuit father, Victor Vuillaume (b. 26 Dec., 1818), was put to death on 4 March, 1862, at Ts'ien Kia, Kiangsu province, by order of the Shanghai authorities.

At the beginning of 1861, Jean-Joseph Fenouil (b. 18 Nov., 1821 at Rudelle, Cahors), later Bishop of Tenedos, and Vicar Apostolic of Yun-nan, was captured by the Lolo savages of Ta Leang Shan, and ill-treated, being mistaken for a Chinaman. On 1 Sept., 1854, Nicolas-Michel Krick (b. 2 March, 1819, at Lixheim), of the Paris Foreign Missions, missionary to Tibet, was murdered, with Father Bourry, in the country of the Abors. On 18 Feb., 1862, Jean-Pierre Néel (b. at Sainte-Catherine-sur-Riverie, Diocese of Lyons, June, 1832), Paris Foreign Missions, was beheaded at Kai chou (Kwei chou). Gabriel-Marie-Pierre Durand (b. at Lunel, on 31 Jan., 1835), of the same order, missionary to Tibet, in trying to escape his persecutors, fell into the Salwein river and was drowned on 28 Sept., 1865.

On 29 August, 1865, François Mabileau (b. 1 March, 1829, at Paimbœuf), of the Paris Foreign Missions, was murdered at Yew yang chou, in Eastern Sze Chw'an; four years later, Jean-François Rigaud (b. at Arc-et-Senans) was killed on 2 Jan., 1869, at the same place. Redress was obtained for these crimes by the French Legation at Peking. In Kwang-tung, Fathers Verchère (1867), Dejean (1868), Delavay (1869), were persecuted; Gilles and Lebrun were ill-treated (1869–1870). Things came to a climax in June, 1870: rumours had been afloat that children had been kidnapped by the missionaries and the sisters at T'ien-tsin; the *che-fu*, instead of calming the people, was exciting them by posting bills hostile to foreigners; the infuriated mob rose on 20 June, 1870: the French consul, Fontanier, and his chancellor Simon, were murdered at the Yamun of the imperial commissioner, Ch'ung Hou; the church of the Lazarists was pillaged and burnt down: Father Chevrier was killed with a Cantonese priest, Vincent Hu, the French interpreter, Thomassin and his wife, a French merchant, Challemaison and his wife; inside the native town, ten sisters of St. Vincent of Paul were put to death in the most cruel manner, while on the other side of the river, the Russian merchants, Bassoff and Protopopoff with his wife, were also murdered.

Throughout China there was an outcry from all the foreign communities. It may be said that this awful crime was never punished; France was involved in her gigantic struggle with Germany, and she had to be content with the punishment of the supposed murderers, and with the apology brought to St-Germain by the special embassy of Ch'ung hou, who at one time had been looked upon as one of the instigators of the massacre. Jean Hue (b. 21 Jan., 1837), was massacred with a Chinese priest on 5 Sept., 1873, at Kien-Kiang in Sze chw'an; another priest of the Paris Foreign Missions, Jean-Joseph-Marie Baptifaud (b. 1 June, 1845), was murdered at Pienkio, in the Yun-nan province during the night of 16–17 September, 1874. The secretary of the French legation, Guillaume de Roquette, was sent to Sze chw'an, and after some protracted negotiations, arranged that two murderers should be executed, an indemnity paid and some mandarins punished (1875).

In the article CHINA we have related the Korean massacres of 1839, and 1866; on 14 May, 1879, Victor Marie Deguette, of the Paris Foreign Missions, was arrested in the district of Kung-tjyou, and taken to Seoul; he was released at the request of the French minister at Peking; during the preceding year the Vicar Apostolic of Korea, Mgr Ridel, one of the survivors of the massacre of 1866, had also been arrested and sent back to China. On Sunday, 29 July, 1894, Father Jean-Moïse Jozeau (b. 9 Feb., 1866), was murdered in Korea. Three priests of the Paris Foreign Missions were the next victims: Jean-Baptiste-Honoré Brieux was murdered near Ba-t'ang, on 8 Sept., 1881; in April, 1882, Eugène Charles Brugnon was imprisoned; Jean-Antoine-Louis Terrasse (b. at Lantriac, Haute-Loire) was murdered with seven Christians at Chang In, Yun-nan province, during the night of 27–28 March, 1883; the culprits were flogged and banished, and an indemnity of 50,000 taels was paid. Some time before, Louis-Dominique Conraux, of the same order (b. 1852), was arrested and tortured in Manchuria at Hou Lân. On 1 November, 1897, at eleven o'clock in the evening, a troop of men belonging to the Ta Tao Hwei, the great "Knife Association", an anti-foreign secret society, attacked the German mission (priests of Steyl), in the village of Chang Kiachwang (Chao-chou prefecture), where Fathers Francis-Xavier Nies (b. 11 June, 1859, at Recklinghausen, Paderborn), Richard Henle (b. 21 July, 1863, at Stetten, near Kaigerloch, Sigmaringen), and Stenz were asleep; the latter escaped, but the other two were killed. This double murder led to the occupation of Kiao-chou, on 14 Nov., 1897, by the German fleet: the Governor of Shan-tung, Li Ping-heng was replaced by the no less notorious Yu Hien. On 21 April, 1898, Mathieu Bertholet (b. at Charbonnier, Puy de Dôme, 12 June, 1865), was murdered in the Kwang-si province at Tong-Kiang chou; he belonged to the Paris Foreign Missions.

In July, 1898, two French missionaries were arrested at Yung chang, in Sza-ch'wan, by the bandit Yu Man-tze already sentenced to death in Jan., 1892, at the request of the French legation; one of the missionaries escaped wounded; but the other, Fleury (b. 1869), was set at liberty only on 7 Jan., 1899. On 14 October, 1898, Henri Chanès (b. 22 Sept., 1865, at Coubon-sur-Loire), of the Paris Foreign Missions, was murdered at Pak-tung (Kwang-tung), with several native Christians; the Chinese had to pay 80,000 dollars. In the same year, on 6 Dec., the Belgian

Franciscan, Jean Delbrouck (brother Victorin, b. at Boirs, 14 May, 1870), was arrested and beheaded on 11 Dec., his body being cut to pieces; by an agreement signed on 12 Dec., 1899, by the French consul at Hankou, 10,000 taels were paid for the murder, and 44,500 taels for the destruction of churches, buildings, etc. in the prefectures of I-ch'ang and Sha-nan. The most appalling disaster befell the Christian Church in 1900 during the Boxer rebellion: at Peking, the Lazarist, Jules Garrigues (b. 23 June, 1840), was burnt with his church, the Tung-Tang; Doré (b. at Paris, 15 May, 1862), was murdered, and his church, the Si Tang, destroyed; two Marist brethren were killed at Sha-la-eul; Father d'Addosio (b. at Brescia, 19 Dec., 1835), who left the French legation to look after the foreign troops who had entered Peking, was caught by the Boxers, and put to death; another priest, Chavanne (b. at St-Chamond, 20 August, 1862), wounded by a shot during the siege, died of smallpox on 26 July.

In the Chi-li province, the following Jesuits suffered for their faith: Modeste Andlauer (b. at Rosheim, Alsace, 1847); Remi Isoré (b. 22 Jan., 1852, at Bambecque, Nord); Paul Denn (b. 1 April, 1847, at Lille); Ignace Mangin (b. 30 July, 1857, at Verny, Lorraine). In the Hu-nan province: the Franciscans: Antonio Fantosati, Vicar Apostolic and Bishop of Adra (b. 16 Oct., 1842, at Sta. Maria in Valle, Trevi); Cesada; and Joseph: in the Hu-pe province, the Franciscan Ebert; in the Shan-si province, where the notorious Yu hien, subsequently beheaded, ordered a wholesale massacre of missionaries both Catholic and Protestant, at T'ai yuan: Gregorio Grassi (b. at Castellazzo, 13 Dec., 1833) vicar apostolic; his coadjutor, Francisco Fogolla (b. at Montereggio, 4 Oct., 1839), Bishop of Bagi; Fathers Facchini, Saccani, Theodoric Balat, Egide, and Brother Andrew Bauer, all Franciscans. In Manchuria: Laurent Guillon (b. 8 Nov., 1854, at Chindrieux, burnt at Mukden, 3 July, 1900), Vicar Apostolic and Bishop of Eumenia; Noël-Marie Emonet (b. at Massingy, canton of Rumilly, burnt at Mukden, 2 July, 1900); Jean-Marie Viaud (b. 5 June, 1864; murdered 11 July, 1900); Edouard Agnius (b. at Haubourdin, Nord, 27 Sept., 1874; murdered 11 July, 1900); Jules-Joseph Bayart (b. 31 March, 1877; murdered 11 July, 1900); Louis-Marie-Joseph Bourgeois (b. 21 Dec., 1863, at La Chapelle-des-Bois, Doubs; murdered 15 July, 1900); Louis Marie Leray (b. at Ligné, 8 Oct., 1872; murdered 16 July, 1900); Auguste Le Guével (b. at Vannes, 21 March, 1875; murdered, 15 July, 1900); François Georjon (b. at Marlhes, Loire, 3 August, 1869; murdered 20 July, 1900); Jean-François Régis Souvignet (b. 22 Oct., 1854, at Monistrol-sur-Loire; murdered 30 July, 1900), all priests of the Paris Foreign Missions.

The Belgian Missions (Congregation of Scheut) numbered also many martyrs: Ferdinand Hamer (b. at Nimegue, Holland, 21 August, 1840; burnt to death in Kan-su), the first Vicar Apostolic of the province; in Mongolia: Joseph Segers (b. at Saint Nicolas, Waes, 20 Oct., 1869); Heirman; Mallet; Jaspers; Zylmans; Abbeloos, Dobbe. The cemeteries, at Peking especially, were desecrated, the graves opened and, the remains scattered abroad. Seven cemeteries (one British, five French, and one mission), situated in the neighbourhood of Peking had been desecrated. By Article IV of the Protocol signed at Peking, 7 Sept., 1901, it was stipulated: "The Chinese government has agreed to erect an expiatory monument in each of the foreign or international cemeteries, which were desecrated, and in which the tombs were destroyed. It has been agreed with the Representatives of the Powers, that the Legations interested shall settle the details for the erection of these monuments, China bearing all the expenses thereof, estimated at ten thousand taels for the cemeteries at Peking and in its neighbourhood, and at five thousand taels for the cemeteries in the provinces." The amounts have been paid. Notwithstanding these negotiations, Hippolyte Julien (b. 16 July, 1874) of the Paris Foreign Missions was murdered on 16 Jan., 1902, at Ma-tze-hao, in the Kwang Tung province.

In 1904, Mgr. Theotime Verhaegen, Franciscan Vicar Apostolic of Southern Hu-pe (b. 1867), was killed with his brother, at Li-Shwan. A new massacre of several missionaries of the Paris Foreign Missions including Father Jean-André Soulié (b. 1858), took place in 1905 in the Mission of Tibet (western part of the province of Sze-chw'an). Finally we shall record the death of the Marist Brother, Louis Maurice, murdered at Nan ch'ang on 25 Feb., 1906.

A long and sad list, to which might be added the names of many others, whose sufferings for the Faith of Christ have not been recorded.

HENRI CORDIER.

Martyrs of Gorkum. See GORKUM, THE MARTYRS OF.

Martyrs of Lyons. See POTHINUS, SAINT.

Martyrs of the Commune. See COMMUNE, MARTYRS OF THE PARIS.

Maruthas, SAINT, Bishop of Tagrit or Maypherkat in Mesopotamia, friend of St. John Chrysostom, d. before 420. Feast, 4 Dec. He is honoured by the Latins, Greeks, Copts, and Syrians. He brought into his episcopal city the relics of so many martyrs that it received the name *Martyropolis*. In the interests of the Church of Persia, which had suffered much in the persecution of Sapor II, he came to Constantinople, but found Emperor Arcadius too busily engaged in the affairs of St. John Chrysostom. Later Maruthas was sent by Theodosius II to the Court of Persia, and here, in spite of the jealousy and intrigues of the Magi, he won the esteem of King Yezdigerd by his affability, saintly life, and, as is claimed, by his knowledge of medicine. He was present at the General Council of Constantinople in 381 and at a Council of Antioch in 383 (or 390), at which the Messalians were condemned. For the benefit of the Persian Church he is said to have held two synods at Ctesiphon. He must not be confounded with Maruthas (Maruta), Monophysite Bishop of Tagrit (d. 649).

His writings include: (1) "Acts of the Persian Martyrs", found partly in Assemani, "Acta SS. mart. orient. et occident.", I (Rome, 1748), and more completely in Bedjan, ibid., II (Paris, 1891), 37–396. W. Wright's English translation was printed in "Journal of Sacred Literature" (Oct., 1865–Jan., 1866). Zingerle published it in German (Innsbruck, 1836). A school edition was made by Leitzmann, "Die drei ältesten Martyrologien" (Bonn, 1903). See Achelis, "Die Martyrologien" (Berlin, 1900), 30–71. (2) "History of the Council of Nicæa", on which see Braun in "Kirchengeschichtliche Studien", IV, 3, and Harnack's "Ketzerkatalog des Bischofs Maruta" in "Texte u. Untersuchungen", XIX, 1, b. (3) "Acts of the Council of Seleucia-Ctesiphon", edited in Syriac and Latin by Lamy (Louvain, 1869), on which see Hefele, "Conciliengeschichte", II, 102. He also wrote hymns on the Holy Eucharist, on the Cross, and on saints.

BARDENHEWER, *Patrology*, tr. SHAHAN (St. Louis, 1908), 394; STOKES in *Dict. Christ. Biog.*, s. v.; ZINGERLE in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.; KIHN, *Patrologie* (Paderborn, 1908), 102; HURTER, *Nomencl.*, V (Innsbr., 1903), 326.

FRANCIS MERSHMAN.

Mary, the name of several personages in the New Testament.—MARY OF CLEOPHAS.—This title occurs only in John, xix, 25. A comparison of the lists of those who stood at the foot of the cross would seem to identify her with Mary, the mother of James the Less and Joseph (Mark, xv, 40; cf. Matt., xxvii, 56). Some have indeed tried to identify her with the Salome of Mark, xv, 40, but St. John's reticence concerning himself and his relatives seems conclusive against this (cf. John, xxi, 2).

In the narratives of the Resurrection she is named "Mary of James" (Mark, xvi, 1; Luke, xxiv, 10) and "the other Mary" (Matt., xxvii, 61; xxviii, 1). The title of "Mary of James" is obscure. If it stood alone, we should feel inclined to render it "wife of (or sister of) James", but the recurrence of the expression "Mary the mother of James and Joseph" compels us to render it in the same way when we only read "Mary of James". Her relationship to the Blessed Virgin is obscure. James is termed "of Alpheus", i. e., presumably "son of Alpheus". St. Jerome would identify this Alpheus with Cleophas who, according to Hegesippus, was brother to St. Joseph (Hist. eccl., III, xi). In this case Mary of Cleophas, or Alpheus, would be the sister-in-law of the Blessed Virgin, and the term "sister", ἀδελφή, in John, xix, 25, would cover this. But there are grave difficulties in the way of this identification of Alpheus and Cleophas. In the first place, St. Luke, who speaks of Cleophas (xxiv, 18), also speaks of Alpheus (vi, 15; Acts, i, 13). We may question whether he would have been guilty of such a confused use of names, had they both referred to the same person. Again, while Alpheus is the equivalent of the Aramaic, it is not easy to see how the Greek form of this became Cleophas, or more correctly Clopas. More probably it is a shortened form of Cleopatros.

BELSER, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (Freiburg, 1901), 661–6; CALMES, *L'Evangile de S. Jean* (Paris).

MARY OF JAMES, see MARY OF CLEOPHAS.

MARY, THE OTHER, see MARY OF CLEOPHAS.

MARY, the mother of John, who was surnamed Mark (Acts, xii, 12). We know nothing of her; but from the fact that a meeting of the Church was held in her house, we may conclude that she was possessed of some wealth. She may have been a widow, for her husband's name would presumably have been given in place of hers, had he been alive.

MARY (Rom., xvi, 6), also otherwise unknown. She had "laboured much among" the Roman Church, hence St. Paul's salutation to her. It is only a conjecture that she is the same as the mother of John Mark.

HUGH POPE.

Mary, LITTLE BROTHERS OF, generally known as Marist School Brothers. This religious teaching institute is modern in its origin, having been founded in 1817, in France, by the Venerable Benedict Marcellin Champagnat. This zealous priest, especially attracted to the care of the children of the people, worked zealously for their primary education. Besides the rules and constitutions of this society, he wrote valuable manuals and methods for the pedagogic training of his disciples. The Holy See definitively recognized and approved this educational institute by a decree of 9 January, 1863. Its development in the last sixty years has been wonderful. When the founder died (1840), his society consisted of 310 members and had charge of forty-eight schools, all in the central part of France. To-day (1910) it numbers 6000 members pursuing their educational labours in all parts of the world, as shown by the following statistics of these educational establishments: Spain, 81 schools; Belgium, 41; British Isles, 25; Italy, 16; Turkey in Europe, 9; Switzerland, 3; Bulgaria, Denmark, Greece, Hungary, 1 each. When the "secularization law" was enacted in France (1903), the Marist Brothers had charge of 750 schools in that country. Cape Colony (Africa), 9 schools; Seychelles Islands, 2; Egypt, 1; Australia, 20; New Zealand, 9; New Caledonia, 6; Fiji Islands, 4; Samoa Islands, 3; New Hebrides, 1; China, 27; Syria, 13; Turkey in Asia, 5; Ceylon, 2; Arabia, 1; Brazil, 36; Canada, 29; Mexico, 25; Colombia, 21; United States, 12; Argentina, 8; Cuba, 2; Chili, 3; Peru, 3.

The Marist Brothers were sent to Oceanica as coadjutors to the missionaries and the Marist Fathers in 1836. In 1852 they established their English province, which rapidly spread its branches throughout the United Kingdom and the British Colonies in South Africa and Australasia. The introduction of the Marist Brothers in North America (1885) was a very auspicious event for the dissemination of Catholic principles among the pupils entrusted to their charge in the field of education. The institute of the Marist Brothers is legally incorporated under the laws of the State of New York. The Marist Brothers do not limit their efforts to the ordinary work of the class room, but labour in any form for the welfare of youth. Besides primary schools, they conduct boarding schools and academies, industrial schools, homes for working boys, orphanages, etc. The Marist Brothers are not ecclesiastics. They are a congregation solely devoted to educational work. In selecting postulants for the novitiate, they never accept anyone who has aspirations for the priesthood. Their aim is to secure recruits who are likely to develop special aptitudes for the mission of teaching. For the training and education of competent subjects, the institute possesses three kinds of establishments: the junior novitiate, the novitiate, and the scholasticate or normal school. The Marist novitiate, for the American province, is at Poughkeepsie, New York, and the scholasticate in New York City.

BROTHER ZÉPHIRINY.

Mary, MISSIONARIES OF THE COMPANY OF.—The Company of Mary was founded by Blessed Louis-Marie Grignion de Montfort in 1713. As early as 1700 Montfort had conceived the idea of founding a society of missionaries. Five months after his ordination, Nov., 1700, he wrote: "I am continually asking in my prayers for a poor and small company of good priests to preach missions and retreats under the standard and protection of the Blessed Virgin". For many years he prayed, fasted and caused others to pray for the realization of his project. In 1713 he went to Paris with a view to recruit members for his community. The director of the seminary Du St-Esprit promised to send him such young priests as would feel called to do missionary work. During the intervals between his missions Montfort wrote the Rule of the Company of Mary (1713). When he died in 1716, two young priests, Father Vatel and Father Mulot, and a few lay-brothers whom Montfort had associated with himself during his missions, were the only tangible result of his prayers, travels, and austerities. Nevertheless the founder felt confident that his company was to develop at the time marked by Divine Providence, and addressing his little flock, he bade them not to fear or lose courage.

From 1718 till 1781 the "Montfortists", although few in number, gave over 430 missions, most of which lasted a month. Continuing their founder's fight against Jansenism, they preached the tender mercies of the Divine Heart, and the love of Jesus Crucified. They exhorted people to renew their baptismal vows. Above all, they strove to draw the faithful to Jesus Christ through devotion to the Blessed Virgin. They promoted everywhere the daily recital of the Rosary. Through their preaching, La Vendée and Brittany were kept free from heresy and the hearts of the brave Vendeans were strengthened for their heroic struggle, as has been asserted by the fathers of the Provincial Council of Poitiers (1868). Three priests and four brothers of the Company of Mary shared the martyr's death with the Vendean heroes. Montfort's community, debilitated by the Revolution, was reorganized by Father Deshayes, elected general in 1821. He received from Leo XII a brief of praise for the Company of Mary and for the Daughters of Wisdom. Père Dalin (1837–1855) obtained canonical approbation of both congregations. Hitherto the missionaries had but one residence, the mother-house at St. Laurent-sur-Sêvre. During Père Dalin's administration as general, several establishments were made in France. Under Père Denis (1855–1877) the community ac-

cepted at Pont-Château, Diocese of Nantes, the direction of a seminary destined to furnish priests to Haiti. Père Denis also sent several of his missionaries and brothers to Haiti. This was the company's first attempt at foreign missions.

So far the missionaries had been recruited from the secular clergy. This mode being too uncertain, too slow and more or less prejudicial to that unity of spirit which ought to characterize a religious family, Père Denis established a school in which boys, called to the missionary life, should be educated by and for the company. Together with the foreign missions and the foundation of mission schools, what hastened the spreading of the company, was the expulsion of the religious from France in 1880 and in 1901. In 1880 the French novices took refuge in the Netherlands, where a novitiate and a scholasticate were established. In 1883, a school was also begun at Schimmert. The year 1883 saw the establishment of the first house in Canada. After the election of Père Maurille as general, in 1887, the membership of the community doubled. The Beatification of Montfort, in 1888, gave a new stimulus to the company's expansion. In Canada a novitiate and a scholasticate were founded near Ottawa (1890); a mission school at Papineauville (Quebec), in 1900; in Rome, a scholasticate; several missions in Denmark. In 1901 the company took charge of the Vicariate Apostolic of Nyassa Land (Africa), which numbers at present 1 vicar Apostolic, 20 missionaries and 600 converts.

Père L'Houmeau's (1903) administration as general has been marked by the foundation of two residences in the Diocese of Brooklyn: Port Jefferson and Ozone Park (1904); the foundation of the Vicariate Apostolic of San Martino (Colombia, South America) having 1 vicar Apostolic, 12 fathers and a few brothers; the sending to Iceland of 2 priests and 2 brothers (1903), the only Catholic missionaries now evangelizing that country; several establishments in British Columbia; the definite approbation of the Constitutions in 1904; the division of the congregation into provinces; the acquisition of the Diocese of Port de Paix (Haiti), and the transfer of the French mission school to Romsey, England (1910). The company actually numbers about 500 members. The provincial of the American province resides in Montreal. The initials S. M. M. which the missionaries affix to their signature are an abbreviation of "Societatis Mariæ a Montfort", of the Company of Mary (founded) by Montfort.

Blessed Louis-Marie G. de Montfort, by a secular priest (London, 1860); PAUVERT, *Vie du vénérable Louis Marie Grignion de Montfort* (Paris and Poitiers, 1875); LAVEILLE, *Le Bienheureux L. M. Grignion de Montfort* (Paris, 1907). See ICELAND.

JOHN H. BEMELMANS.

Mary, SERVANTS OF (ORDER OF SERVITES).—This order was founded on the feast of the Assumption, 1233, when the Blessed Virgin appeared to seven noble Florentines, who had repaired to the church to follow the exercises of the Confraternity of the *Laudesi*, and bade them leave the world and live for God alone. On the following feast of her Nativity, 8 September, they retired to La Camarzia just outside the walls of the city, and later on to Monte Senario, eleven miles from Florence. Here again they had a vision of the Blessed Virgin. In her hands she held a black habit; a multitude of angels surrounded her, some bearing the different instruments of the Passion, one holding the Rule of St. Augustine, whilst another offered with one hand a scroll, on which appeared the title of Servants of Mary surrounded by golden rays, and with the other a palm branch. She addressed to them the following words: "I have chosen you to be my first Servants, and under this name you are to till my Son's Vineyard. Here, too, is the habit which you are to wear; its dark colour will recall the pangs which I suffered on the day when I stood by the Cross of my only Son. Take also this Rule of St. Augustine, and may you, bearing the title of my Servants, obtain the palm of everlasting life." Among the holy men of the order was St. Philip Benizi, who was born on the day the Blessed Virgin first appeared to the Seven Founders (15 August), and afterwards became the great propagator of the order. The order developed rapidly not only in Italy but also in France and Germany, where the holy founders themselves spread devotion to the Sorrows of Mary. Their glorious son St. Philip continued the work and thus merited the title of Eighth Founder of the Order. The distinctive spirit of the order is the sanctification of its members by meditation on the Passion of Jesus and the Sorrows of Mary, and spreading abroad this devotion.

The order consists of three branches. Concerning the First Order or Servite Fathers, see SERVITE ORDER. The Second Order (cloistered nuns) was probably founded by Blessed Helen and Blessed Rose shortly after the death of St. Philip in 1285. This branch has houses in Italy and Austria as well as one at Bognor, England. The Third Order or Mantellate was founded by St. Juliana Falconieri to whom St. Philip gave the habit in 1284. This branch occupies itself with active works after the example of its holy foundress. From Italy it spread into other countries of Europe. The Venerable Anna Juliana, Archduchess of Austria, founded several houses and became a Mantellate herself. In 1844 it was introduced into France, and was thence extended into England in 1850. The sisters were the first to wear the religious habit publicly in that country after the so-called Reformation. They are at present one of the leading religous orders for women in what was once "Mary's Dowry", having been active missionaries under Father Faber and the Oratorians for many years. In 1871 the English province sent sisters to America, but they were recalled in 1875. The superior general being very desirous to see the order established in the United States sent sisters a second time in 1893. They have now a novitiate at Cherokee, Iowa, and mission houses in other states. They devote themselves principally to the education of youth, managing academies and taking charge of parochial schools and workrooms. They also undertake works of mercy, such as the care of orphans, visiting the sick, and instructing converts etc. Above all, in imitation of their holy foundress, St. Juliana, they do all in their power to instill into the hearts of those under their care a great love for Jesus in the Blessed Sacrament. At the last general chapter held in London, 31 July, 1906, a vicaress general for America was appointed.

HEIMBUCHER, *Orden u. Kongregationen*, II (Paderborn, 1907), 218 sq.

THE SERVANTS OF MARY.

Mary, SISTER OF MARTHA. See MARY MAGDALEN, SAINT.

Mary, SOCIETY OF (initials S. M.), or MARIST FATHERS, a religious order of priests, so called on account of the special devotion they profess toward the Blessed Virgin.

I. FOUNDATION (1816–1836).—The first idea of a "Society of Mary" originated (1816) in Lyons, France, with a group of seminarians, who saw in the Restoration of 1815 an opportunity for religion, but the real founder was Jean-Claude-Marie Colin (q. v.), the most retiring of the group. He began, amid his pastoral cares, by drafting a tentative rule and founding at Cerdon, where he was pastor, the Sisters of the Holy Name of Mary; Marcellin Champagnat, another of the group, established at Lavalla the Little Brothers of Mary. On account of the cold attitude assumed by the ecclesiastical authorities in Lyons, the foundation of the missionary priests' branch could not be made till Cerdon, Colin's parish, passed from the jurisdiction of Lyons to that of Belley. Bishop Devie of the newly restored See of Belley authorized (1823) Colin and a few companions to resign their

parochial duties and form into a missionary band for the rural districts. Their zeal and success in that arduous work moved the bishop to entrust them also with the conduct of his seminary, thus enlarging the scope of their work. However, the fact that Bishop Devie wanted a diocesan institute only, and that Fr. Colin was averse to such a limitation, came near placing the nascent order in jeopardy when Pope Gregory XVI, in quest of missionaries for Oceanica, by Brief of 29 April, 1836, approved definitively the "Priests of the Society of Mary" or Marist Fathers, as a religious institute with simple vows and under a superior general. The Little Brothers of Mary and the Sisters of the Holy Name of Mary, commonly called Marist Brothers and Marist Sisters, were reserved for separate institutes. Father Colin was elected superior general on 24 Sept., 1836, on which day occurred the first Marist profession, Blessed Pierre Chanel (q. v.), Venerable Colin, and Venerable Champagnat being among the professed.

II. Development (1836–1910).—From its definitive organization to the present date (1910) the Society of Mary, under four superiors general—J. C. M. Colin (1836–54), J. Favre (1854–85), A. Martin (1885–1905), J. C. Raffin (1905—)—has developed along the various lines of its constitutions in and out of France. In France it has done work in the mission field from many missionary residences established in various centres. When educational liberty was restored to French Catholics, it also entered the field of secondary, or college education, its methods being embodied in Montfat's "Théorie et pratique de l'education chrétienne" (Paris, 1880), and moreover assumed the direction of a few diocesan seminaries together with professorships in Catholic institutes for higher education. The French houses have also supplied men for the various missions undertaken abroad by the Society of Mary.

Outside of France, the first field of labour offered the Marists (1836) was the Vicariate Apostolic of Western Oceanica, comprising New Zealand, the Friendly Islands, the Navigator Islands, the Gilbert and Marshall Islands, Fiji, New Caledonia, New Guinea, the Solomon and Caroline Islands. Under the secular bishop, Dr. Pompallier, who took up his residence in New Zealand, the Marists successively occupied Wallis (1837), soon converted by Fr. Bataillon; Futuna (1837), the place of Blessed Pierre Chanel's martyrdom; Tonga (1842), turned by Fr. Chevron into a model Christian community; New Caledonia (1843), where Bishop Douarre, Pompallier's coadjutor, met untold difficulties and Brother Blaise was massacred; and, in spite of much Protestant opposition, Fiji (1844) and Samoa (1845). The immense area of the vicariate, together with the presence at its head of a secular bishop, soon necessitated the creation of smaller districts under Marist bishops: Central Oceanica under Bishop Bataillon (1842), Melanesia and Micronesia under Bishop Epalle (1844), New Caledonia under Bishop Douarre (1847), Wellington (New Zealand) under Bishop Viard (1848), Bishop Pompallier retaining Auckland; the Navigator Islands (1851), long administered by the Vicar Apostolic of Central Oceanica; the Prefecture of Fiji (1863), etc. Of these, Melanesia and Micronesia had to be abandoned after the massacre of Bishop Epalle at Isabella Island and the sudden death of his successor, Bishop Colomb, the Solomon Islands alone reverting to the Marists in 1898. Those various missions have progressed steadily under the Marist Fathers who, beside their religious work, have largely contributed to make known the languages, fauna, and flora of the South Sea Islands (see Hervier, "Les missions Maristes en Océanie", Paris, 1902), and helped in their colonization (de Salinis, "Marins et Missionnaires", Paris, s. d.). The growth of New Zealand has been such as to call for a regular hierarchy, and the Marists were concentrated (1887) in the Archdiocese of Wellington and the Diocese of Christchurch, still governed by members of the order.

In the British Isles, the Marist foundations began as early as 1850 at the request of Cardinal Wiseman, but have not grown beyond three colleges and five parishes. In the United States, the Society of Mary has taken a firmer hold. From Louisiana, whither Archbishop Odin called them (1863) to take charge of a French parish and college, the Marists have passed into eleven states and even branched off into Mexico, and, although continuing to minister to a number of French speaking communities, they have not limited their action there, but gradually taken up, both in parishes and colleges, American work, their training houses being almost entirely recruited in this country and being located in Washington.

III. Present State (1910).—The Society of Mary is now divided into six provinces: 2 in France, 1 in the British Isles, 1 in the United States, 1 in New Zealand, and 1 in Oceanica.

The French provinces (Lyons and Paris) counted at the time of the Association Act (1901) 9 institutes for the training of aspirants or of young religious, 15 missionary residences with chapels, 9 colleges for secondary education, and three diocesan seminaries, with a total of 340 priests, 100 novices, and 34 lay-brothers. The Association Act of 1901, by dissolving religious communities and confiscating their property, told heavily on these establishments: the training-houses had to be transferred to foreign parts (Belgium, Italy, and Spain); the diocesan seminaries were taken from the religious; the residences were confiscated and their inmates compelled either to go into exile or to live separately in rented quarters; the colleges alone survived in part by becoming diocesan establishments. To the French provinces are attached, in Germany, an apostolic seminary for the German Missions in Oceanica, and, in Italy and Spain, various chaplaincies and houses of retreat for the aged or the exiled fathers.

The Anglo-Irish province, erected in 1889, comprises 5 parishes (3 in London, 1 in Devonshire, and 1 in Yorkshire) and three colleges (1 in Dublin, 1 in Dundalk, and 1 in Middlesborough) with 46 priests, 8 novices, and 6 lay-brothers.

The New Zealand province, erected in 1889, comprises, in the Archdiocese of Wellington and the Diocese of Christchurch, 1 novitiate-scholasticate, 1 second novitiate, 1 college, 20 parishes among the whites, 6 missions among the Maoris and one missionary band, with 1 archbishop, 1 bishop, 70 priests, 17 novices, 15 lay-brothers, ministering to a Catholic population of about 30,000.

The Province of Oceanica, erected in 1898, comprises, besides a procurator house at Sydney and three missions in Australia, five vicariates (Central Oceanica with 15 stations; the Navigator Islands or Samoa with 15 stations; New Caledonia with 36 stations; Fiji with 17 stations; New Hebrides with 22 stations) and two prefectures (the Southern Solomon Islands with 8 stations and the Northern Solomon Islands with 5 stations). It counts: 5 vicars Apostolic, 2 prefects Apostolic, 200 priests, 25 lay-brothers (all Marists), assisted by 115 Little Brothers of Mary, 566 native catechists, and a large number of sisters, both European and native, of the Third Order Regular of Mary and of Our Lady of the Missions, founded by the Marists. The Catholic population is about 41,885.

The province of the United States, erected in 1889, comprises two training houses in Washington, District of Columbia, 4 colleges (Jefferson College, Louisiana; All Hallows' College, Utah; St. Mary's College, Maine; Marist College, Georgia), 18 parishes in various states, and missions in West Virginia and Idaho. Its membership consists of 1 archbishop, 105 priests, 75 novices, and 5 lay-brothers. There are about 600 boys in the colleges and 70,000 Catholics in the parishes and missions. From this province has been detached (1905)

the Vice-province of Mexico which counts 26 priests working in 1 college with 350 pupils and 6 parishes with a large number of parishioners, French, American, German, and Mexican.

IV. Rule.—According to their constitutions, approved by papal Decree of 8 March, 1873, the Marists profess, besides the three simple and perpetual vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience, common to all similar institutes, a spirit of special devotion to Mary, absolute loyalty to the Holy See, reverence for the hierarchy, and the love of the hidden life, conformably to their motto: *Ignoti et quasi occulti in hoc mundo* (see G. Goyau, "Le rôle de l'humilité dans la fondation d'un Ordre", Paris, 1910). The work of the order includes missions, both domestic and foreign; colleges for the education of youth, and, in a less degree, seminaries for the training of clerics. Its members are either priests or lay-brothers. The candidates for the priesthood are prepared, once their classical course is over, by one year of novitiate, two years of philosophy, four years of theology, additional opportunities being given to those especially gifted. After ten years of profession and after the age of thirty-five, the priests are allowed to take the vow of stability, which renders them eligible for the chapters and the high offices of the society. The lay-brothers after a long probation take the same vows as the priests, and devote themselves to the care of temporalities. Its government is in the hands of general officers and of chapters. The general officers, whose official residence is in Rome, are the superior general, his four assistants, the general procurator, the procurator *apud Sanctam Sedem*, all elected by the chapter general—the first for life, the others till the following chapter. The provincial and local superiors are appointed by the superior general and his counsel. The general chapters, wherein all the provinces are represented in proportion to their membership, meet regularly every seven years, and, besides electing the general officers, issue statutes for the good of the whole order. Provincial chapters are convened every three years for the purpose of electing representatives to the chapters general, auditing the finances, and ensuring the discipline of each province. As the general statutes take effect only after due approbation by the Holy See, so the provincial statutes are in vigour only when and as approved by the superior council. By Apostolic Brief of 8 Sept., 1850, a Third Order of Mary for persons living in the world was canonically established and has a large membership wherever the Marists are found.

Constitutiones S. M. (Lyons, 1873); *Statuta Capitulorum Generalium S. M.* (Lyons, 1907); *Esprit de la Société de Marie* (Paris, 1905); *Life of Venerable Fr. Colin* (St. Louis, 1909); *La Société de Marie* in *Recrutement Sacerdotal* (Paris, 1906–7); *Chroniques et annales de la Société de Marie* (Luçon, 1903—; Roulers, 1908—); Baunard, *Un siècle de l'Eglise de France* (Paris, 1902), 49. For the Missions: Aubry, *Missions of the Society of Mary* in *Annals of the Propagation of the Faith* (Baltimore, 1905); Hervier, *Les Missions Maristes en Océanie* (Paris, 1902); Mayet, *Mgr Douarre . . . en Nouvelle-Calédonie* (Lyons, 1884); Mangeret, *Mgr Bataillon* (Lyons, 1884); Monfat, *Mgr. Elloy . . . en Océanie centrale* (Lyons, 1890); Idem, *Les Samoa* (Lyons, 1891); Idem, *Dix ans en Mélanésie* (Lyons, 1891); Idem, *Les Tonga* (Lyons, 1893). See also *Lettres des Missionnaires S. M.* and *Annales des Missions S. M.* (Lyons). For English speaking countries: Mangeret, *Les origines de la foi Catholique en Nouvelle-Zélande* (Lyons, 1892); *La Société de Marie en Amérique* (Montreal, 1907); MacCaffrey, *History of the Catholic Church in the Nineteenth Century* (2 vols., Dublin, 1909), passim; *Tablet* (London) and *Tablet* (New Zealand), passim.

J. F. Sollier.

Mary, Society of, of Paris, founded in 1817 by Very Reverend William Joseph Chaminade at Bordeaux, France. In 1839 Gregory XVI issued a decree of commendation to the society in praise of the work done by its members. Pius IX recognized it as a religious body in 1865, and finally in 1891, after a careful examination of the special features in which the society differed notably from other orders, Leo XIII gave canonical approbation to its constitutions. In accordance with this Brief, the Society of Mary of Paris is a religious society of clerical and lay members, who make the usual simple vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience, to which at the time of their final profession they add the fourth vow of stability in the service of the Blessed Virgin. Its members are officially designated by the Roman Curia as Marianists, to distinguish them from the Marists of the Society of Mary of Lyons, founded at Lyons in 1816.

William Joseph Chaminade was born at Perigueux, France, in 1761. After his ordination, he taught in the college of Mussidan until the outbreak of the French Revolution, which drove most of the clergy from France. During this terrible period he continued the exercise of his sacred ministry in spite of the gravest dangers of arrest and death, from which, indeed, he escaped only by adopting numerous disguises and changing continually his hiding-places. At the renewal of the persecution in 1797, he was driven into exile at Saragossa, Spain, where he remained for three years. It was during this period of retreat and meditation on the needs of the Church that he matured his plans for the restoration of the Christian spirit of France. After his return to Bordeaux in 1800, his first efforts resulted in the formation of two sodalities or congregations of men and women, whose faith and zeal prompted them to co-operate with him in his efforts to repair the losses sustained by the Church in France during the Revolution. The religious influence of these sodalities was soon felt, and Father Chaminade quickly gathered around him a number of holy souls, bound to him by no other ties than those of their zeal and piety, but all eager to consecrate themselves to God under his direction for the salvation of souls. Their desires culminated in the foundation of the Daughters of Mary in 1816, and of the Society of Mary in 1817. The constitutions of the Society of Mary specify the salvation of its own members as its primary end. Its secondary end includes all works of zeal. However, Christian education specially appeals to it, and for this reason it has devoted most of its energies to the management of schools of every kind.

A distinctive feature of the Society of Mary is the composition of its membership, which, as stated above, consists of both clerical and lay members who make profession of the same four vows. Except the functions of the sacred ministry, which are necessarily restricted to the priests, and a limited number of other functions which are reserved by the constitutions, some to the priests and some to the lay members, all members may be employed, according to their ability but without distinction of class, in the various works of the order as well as in its government. In this combination of the forces of priests and laymen the founder sought to remove the limitations of usefulness to which each category would be subject without the co-operation of the other. The general superior and his assistants resided at Bordeaux until 1860, when they removed to Paris, where the headquarters of the order were maintained until the expulsion of the society from France in 1903. Since then the seat of the general administration has been at Nivelles, Belgium. The increase and expansion of the order has been rapid. In 1908 it comprised seven provinces and one vice-province, with houses in Belgium, France, Germany, Austria, Switzerland, Italy, Spain, Africa, China, Japan, the Hawaiian Islands, Canada, Mexico, and the United States. The Society of Mary was introduced into the United States in 1849, when its first house was founded in the Archdiocese of Cincinnati. In 1908 it had increased to 53 establishments, comprising 2 normal schools, 4 colleges, 3 high schools, and 44 parochial schools. Thirty-five of these communities belong to the Cincinnati province, with the residence of the provincial at Nazareth, Dayton, Ohio; the remaining eighteen form the St. Louis province, with the residence of the provincial at Chaminade College, Clayton, Missouri.

George Meyer.

Typ.-gravure Goupil of Paris (France) *Alinari, photo.*

THE VIRGIN OF THE ROCKS

LEONARDO DA VINCI, LOUVRE, PARIS

Mary, THE BLESSED VIRGIN. See VIRGIN MARY, THE BLESSED.

Mary, THE NAME OF, in Scripture and in Catholic use. New Testament, Μαριάμ and sometimes Μαρία—it seems impossible, in the present state of the text, to say whether the form *Mariam* was reserved by the Evangelists for the Mother of Christ, and the form *Maria* used for all others of the name. The form Μαριάμ undoubtedly represents the Hebrew מרים, the name of the sister of Moses and Aaron (Num., xii, 1 sqq.). In I Par., iv, 17, it occurs presumably as the name of a man, but the Septuagint has τὸν Μαρών. The etymology of the name מרים (Miriam) is exceedingly doubtful. Two roots are proposed: (a) מרה meaning "to rebel", in which connexion some have endeavoured to derive the name of the sister of Moses from her rebellion against him (Num., xii, 1). But this seems far-fetched, as her murmuring is by no means the only, or the principal event, recorded of her; (b) מרא meaning "to be fat"; it is thought that, since the possession of this quality was, to the Semitic mind, the essence of beauty, the name Miriam may have meant "beautiful". But the meaning "lady", which is so common among the Fathers of the Church, and which is enshrined in the Catholic expression "Our Lady", has much to support it. The Aramaic מרא means "Lord" as we see in St. Paul's *Maranatha*—i.e. "Come, Lord", or "the Lord is nigh". It is true that the name Miriam has no א in our Hebrew text; but, though the Aramaic word for "lord" always has an א in the older inscriptions (e. g. those of Zenjirli of the eighth century, B. C.), yet in later inscriptions from Palmyra the א has gone. Besides, the presence of the י may well be due to the formative ending ם, which is generally a sign of abstract nouns. The rendering "star of the sea" is without foundation except in a tropological sense; Cornelius à Lapide would render "lady, or teacher, or guide of the sea", the sea being this world, of which Christ Himself (Num., xxiv, 17) is the Star. The frequency with which the name occurs in the New Testament (cf. infra) shows that it was a favourite one at the time of Christ. One of Herod's wives was the ill-fated Mariamne, a Jewess; Josephus gives us this name sometimes as Mariamme, at others as Mariame or Mariamne. The favour in which the name was then held is scarcely to be attributed to the influence her fate had on the Jews (Stanley, "Jewish Church", III, 429); it is far more likely that the fame of the sister of Moses contributed to this result—cf. Mich., vi, 4, where Miriam is put on the same footing as Moses and Aaron: "I sent before thy face Moses and Aaron and Mary." At a time when men like Simeon were "looking for the Consolation of Israel", their minds would naturally revert to the great names of the Exodus. For extra-Biblical instances of the name at this time see Josephus, "Antiquities", iv, 6; XVIII, v, 4, and "Jewish War", VI, iv. In Christian times the name has always been popular; no less than seven historically famous Marys are given in the "Dictionary of Christian Biography". Among Catholics it is one of the commonest of baptismal names; and in many religious orders, both of men and of women, it is the practice to take this name in addition to some other distinctive name, when entering the religious state.

Besides the Biblical dictionaries and the ordinary commentaries, see BARDENHEWER, *Der Name Maria* in *Bibl. Studien* (Freiburg, 1895).

HUGH POPE.

Mary Anne de Paredes, BLESSED, b. at Quito, Ecuador, 31 Oct., 1618; d. at Quito, 26 May, 1645. On both sides of her family she was sprung from an illustrious line of ancestors, her father being Don Girolamo Flores Zenel de Paredes, a nobleman of Toledo, and her mother Doña Mariana Cranobles di Xaramilo, a descendant of one of the best Spanish families. Her birth was accompanied by most unusual phenomena in the heavens, clearly connected with the child and juridically attested at the time of the process of beatification. Almost from infancy she gave signs of an extraordinary attraction for prayer and mortification, of love for God and devotion to the Blessed Virgin; and besides being the recipient of many other remarkable manifestations of divine favour was a number of times miraculously preserved from death. At the age of ten years she made the vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience. She was very desirous of conveying the light of faith to the peoples sitting in darkness, and later of entering a monastery; but when God made it plain to her that He wished neither the one nor the other of these pious designs, she acquiesced in the Divine will, and made for herself a solitude in her own home where, apart from all worldly cares and closely united to God, she gave herself up to the practice of unheard-of corporal austerities. The fast which she kept was so strict that she took scarcely an ounce of dry bread every eight or ten days. The food which miraculously sustained her life, as in the case of St. Catherine and St. Rose of Lima, was, according to the sworn testimony of many witnesses, the Eucharistic Bread alone which she received every morning in Holy Communion. She possessed an ecstatic gift of prayer, predicted the future, saw distant events as if they were passing before her, read the secrets of hearts, cured diseases by a mere sign of the Cross, or by sprinkling the sufferer with holy water, and at least once she restored a dead person to life. The very day she died her sanctity was shown in a wonderful manner, for immediately after her death there sprang up from her blood and blossomed and bloomed a pure white lily, a prodigy which has given her the title of "The Lily of Quito".

The first preliminary steps towards the beatification were taken by Monsignor Alfonso della Pegna, who instituted the process for inquiring into and collecting evidence for the sanctity of her life, her virtues and her miracles; but the authenticated copy of the examination of the witnesses was not forwarded to Rome until 1754. The Sacred Congregation of Rites, having discussed and approved of this process, decided in favour of the formal introduction of the cause, and Benedict XIV signed the commission for introducing the cause 17 Dec., 1757. The Apostolic process concerning the virtues of the Venerable Mary Anne de Paredes was drawn up and examined in due form by the two Preparatory Congregations and by the General Congregation of Rites, and orders were given by Pius VI for the publication of the decree attesting the heroic character of her virtues. The process concerning the two miracles wrought through the intercession of the servant of God was subsequently prepared and, at the request of the Very Rev. John Roothaan, General of the Society of Jesus, was examined and accepted by the three congregations, and was formally approved 11 Jan., 1847, by Pius IX. The General Congregation having decided in favour of proceeding to the beatification, Pius IX commanded the Brief of Beatification to be prepared. Very Rev. Peter Beckx, General of the Society of Jesus, petitioned Cardinal Patrizi to order the publication of the Brief; his request was granted. The Brief was read and the solemn beatification took place in the Vatican Basilica 10 Nov., 1853. Many miracles have been the reward of those who have invoked her intercession, especially in America, of which she seems pleased to show herself the especial patroness.

BOERO, *Blessed Mary Ann of Jesus; The Roman Breviary.*

J. H. FISHER.

Mary de Cervellione (or DE CERVELLO), popularly styled "de Socos" (of Help) Saint, b. about 1230 at Barcelona; d. there 19 September, 1290. She was a daughter of a Spanish nobleman named William de

Cervellon. One day she heard a sermon preached by Blessed Bernard de Corbarie, the superior of the Brotherhood of Our Lady of Ransom at Barcelona, and was so deeply affected by his pleading for the Christian slaves and captives in the hands of the Turks that she resolved to do all in her power for their alleviation. In 1265 she joined a little community of pious women who lived near the monastery of the Mercedarians and spent their lives in prayer and good works under the direction of Blessed Bernard de Corbarie. They obtained permission to constitute a Third Order of Our Lady of Ransom (*de Mercede*) and to wear the habit of the Brotherhood of Our Lady of Ransom. In addition to the usual vows of tertiaries, they promised to pray for the Christian slaves. Mary was unanimously elected the first superior. On account of her great charity towards the needy she began to be called Maria de Socos (Mary of Help) a name under which she is still venerated in Catalonia. Her cult, which began immediately after her death, was approved by Innocent XII in 1692. She is invoked especially against shipwreck and is generally represented with a ship in her hand. Her feast is celebrated on 25 September.

Acta SS., September, VII, 152–171; DUNBAR, *Dictionary of Saintly Women*, II (London, 1905), 56–7; ULATE, *Vita Cathalauniæ virginis Mariæ de Cervellon* (Madrid, 1712); AYALA, *Vida de s. Maria del Socos de la orden de N. S. de las Mercedes* (Salamanca, 1695); CORBERA, *Vida y hechos maravillosas de d. Maria de Cervelon, clamado Maria Socos* (Barcelona, 1639): a Life written by her contemporary JOHN DE LAES is printed in *Acta SS.*, loc. cit.

MICHAEL OTT.

Mary de Sales Chappuis (MARIE-THÉRÈSE CHAPPUIS), VENERABLE, of the Order of the Visitation of Holy Mary, b. at Soyhières, a village of the Bernese Jura (then French territory), 16 June, 1793; d. at Troyes, 6 October, 1875. Her parents were excellent Christians: her father had seen service in the regular Guard (the *Cent-Suisses* corps) of the King of France. Her mother, *née* Catherine Fleury, was the sister of the Curé of Soyhières. Out of eleven children born of this union, six entered religion. From infancy Marie-Thérèse was remarkable for her piety. She made her First Communion in 1802 and at the age of twelve years entered as an intern pupil in the Visitation Convent at Fribourg, where she remained three years. In June, 1811, she returned to the convent as a postulant, but left it again in three months. Three years later she came back, took the religious habit on 3 June, 1815, and made her profession on 9 June, 1816. A year after taking her vows she was sent to Metz, but reasons of health compelled her to return to Fribourg. In 1826 she became superior of the monastery at Troyes, and in 1833 spent six months in the second monastery in Paris, where she was afterwards to be superior (1838–44). The greater part of her life was spent at Troyes, where she was elected superior eleven times, and where she celebrated in 1866 the golden anniversary of her religious profession. Her last illness attacked her in September, 1875.

Mother Mary de Sales is celebrated chiefly for her zeal in spreading a certain kind of spirituality which she called "The Way" (*La Voie*). Her principal biographer, Father Brisson, who had been for thirty years confessor to the Visitandines of Troyes, and was her director, writes that by this expression—*La Voie*—"she understood a state of soul which consisted in depending upon the actual will of God, relishing whatever was His good pleasure, and imitating the life of the Saviour externally" (Vie de la Vénérée Mère, Marie-de-Sales Chappuis, Paris, 1886, p. 591). The English edition of her life (London, 1900), in translating this sentence, overlooks the word *actuelle* (actual): "What did the good Mother mean by this Word, 'The Way'? She meant a state of soul which consists in an entire dependence on the Will of God, by an interior consent to all that is according to His good pleasure, and an exterior imitation of our Saviour" (p. 261). It adds: "Chosen by God to propagate and spread abroad this Way, the good Mother consecrated her whole life to it" (p. 262). To spread this Way, she, with Father Brisson, founded the Oblates of St. Francis de Sales.—"It was in order to extend this Way that she made choice of others like herself, whom she might inspire with zeal, and point out the means for attaining the desired end. She solemnly asserted that they would participate in the grace which she had herself received from God, by which they would understand how to deal with souls, and how to lead them to a love of this resemblance to their Saviour. This, she said, would be the characteristic work of their apostleship" (ibid.). She and her disciples proclaimed the marvellous efficacity of "The Way".—"She added that this Divine action would not be confined merely to a certain number of privileged souls, but that it would be brought within the reach of the most abandoned. Nor would it be confined to souls who dwell under the light and influence of the Gospel, but would reach those who are the farthest from it, and penetrate even to the uttermost parts of the world" (p. 263). "'Wishing to save the world over again,' says one of the leading oblates, Father Rollin, in giving the ideas of the Good Mother, 'Our Lord had to use means until then unknown' . . ." (Brisson, op. cit., p. 661). The English "Life" (p. 275) attenuates this passage: "In His insatiable desire to save the world, He willed to employ a means hitherto unknown; a means by which all the glory would redound unto Himself alone, since, being merely His agents, man would claim no part therein . . ."

For some years past there have been controversies as to the doctrinal value of Venerable Mary de Sales' "Way"; it will be enough to indicate, in the bibliography at the end of this article, some of the various writings which have treated the subject. It seems, indeed, that many of her disciples have exaggerated the purport of the approbation accorded to her writings (2 June, 1892). That approbation is not absolutely definitive, in that it implies many restrictions, and that, even when joined with beatification, it does not forbid the exercise of a respectful criticism. Benedict XIV says (De Serv. Beatif., II, Prato, 1839, p. 312): "This much, it seems, should be added by way of corollary: It can never be said that the doctrine of a servant of God has been approved by the Holy See, but, at the most, that it has not been condemned. There has been controversy also as to the marvellous deeds attributed to Venerable Mary de Sales. This much is certain: that an ecclesiastical commission appointed by the Bishop of Troyes has declared, after canonical investigation, that the facts alleged in the 'Abrégé de la vie', can be explained naturally or in other cases are not sufficiently established" (Rev. des Sciences Ecclés., Sept., 1901, pp. 260–65). Nevertheless, examination of these miracles results in evidence of the personal sanctity of Mother Mary de Sales. The cause of her beatification was introduced at Rome, 27 July, 1897. The Sacred Congregation of Rites will decide as to the doctrine of "The Way", or, at least, as to the miracles, virtues, and perfection of the Venerable Mary de Sales.

Abrégé de la vie et des vertus de notre très-honorée et vénérée Mère Marie de Sales Chappuis (Paris, s. d.); BRISSON, *Vie de la vénérée mère Marie de Sales Chappuis* (Paris, 1891); *Life of the Venerable Mother Mary de Sales Chappuis* (London, 1900); *Annales salésiennes* (Paris), passim; *Positio super introductione causæ beatificationis servæ Dei Mariæ Franciscæ Salesiæ Chappuis* (Rome, 1897); *Positio super fama in genere* (Rome, 1902).

SPIRITUAL TEACHING.—*Pensées de la ven. Mère Marie de Sales* (Paris, 1897); FRAGNIÈRE, *La Voie:* sermon preached at Fribourg, 19 November, 1897 (Paris, 1898); WATRIGANT, *Une nouvelle école de spiritualité* in *Etudes religieuses* (Paris, June, 1899); FRAGNIÈRE, *Réponse au Rd. Watrigant et justification de la voie de charité de la vénérée Mère Marie de Sales Chappuis* (Fribourg, 1900); WATRIGANT, *Les deux méthodes de spiritualité* (Lille, 1900); HAGEN, *Die ehw. Mutter Marie von Sales Chappuis* in *Sendbote des gottlichen Herzens Jesu* (Cincinnati, 1900); *Méthodes de spiritualité* in *Ami du clergé* (6 February, 1902);

CORTET, *Lettre sur les vies de la V. Mère Chappuis* (12 January, 1887), see *Revue des sciences ecclésiastiques* (Lille, September, 1900), 260; CHOLLET, *La cause de béatification de la Mère Marie de Sales Chappuis* (on the decision concerning the writings of the venerable mother) in the same review (July, 1902); WATRIGANT, *L'Ecole de la spiritualité simplifiée* (Lille, 1903); *Il modernismo ascetico* in *Civiltà Cattolica* (8 May, 1908); CHOLLET, *L'ascétique moderniste* in *Questions ecclésiastiques* (Lille, June, July, August, 1909).

H. WATRIGANT.

Mary Frances of the Five Wounds of Jesus, SAINT, of the Third Order of St. Francis, b. at Naples, 25 March, 1715; d. there, 6 October, 1791. Her family belonged to the middle class. Her father, Francesco Gallo, was a severe, avaricious man with a passionate temper, and from him the saint had much to suffer. He subjected her to much ill-treatment and hard, incessant labour which often brought her to the verge of the grave. Barbara Basinsin, her mother, however, was gentle, pious, and patient in bearing with the brutal conduct of her husband. Before her birth St. John Joseph of the Cross, O.F.M., and St. Francis de Geronimo, S.J., are said to have predicted Mary's future sanctity. At the age of seven she was admitted to Holy Communion, which she was subsequently in the habit of receiving daily. When Mary Frances was sixteen years old, her father sought to force her into a marriage with a rich young man, but the saint firmly refused, and instead asked leave to enter the Third Order of St. Francis. This request was at length granted her through the influence of Father Theophilus, a Friar Minor. At her reception among the Tertiaries of St. Peter of Alcantara, 8 September, 1731, she took the name of "Mary Frances of the Five Wounds of Jesus" out of devotion to the Blessed Virgin, St. Francis, and the Sacred Passion. Her body is said to have been signed with the stigmata, which, at her prayer, took no outward, visible appearance, and on Fridays, especially the Fridays of Lent, she felt in her body the very pains of the Passion. During her whole life the saint had much to suffer from bodily ills, and to her physical suffering was added mental pain from the persecution of her father, sisters, and other persons. Even her confessors, to test her sanctity, made her suffer by the severity of their direction. But over and above these mental and physical sufferings she imposed upon herself voluntary penances, strict fasts, hair-shirts, and disciplines. Her prayers and advice saved many souls from dangers. Priests, religious, and pious persons went to her for light and counsel. Her charity and compassion, especially towards the afflicted and miserable, knew no bounds. Like St. Francis, Mary Frances had a tender devotion to the Infant Jesus, the Holy Eucharist, and the Blessed Virgin. The last thirty-eight years of her life were spent in the house of a pious priest, Giovanni Pessiri. She was buried in the church of the Alcantarines, Sta. Lucia del Monte, at Naples, which contains the tomb of St. John Joseph of the Cross. She was declared Venerable by Pius VII, 18 May, 1803, beatified by Gregory XVI, 12 November, 1843, and canonized by Pius IX, 29 June, 1867. Her feast on 6 October is kept by the Friars Minor and Capuchins as a double of the second class, and by the Conventuals as a double major.

CLARY, *Lives of the Saints and Blessed of the Three Orders of St. Francis*, III (Taunton, 1886), 278–86; STOCK, *Legende der Heiligen und Seligen aus dem dritten Orden des hl. Vaters Franziskus* (Ratisbon, 1886), 447–88; LAVIOSA-STROZZI, *Vita della b. Maria Francesca, terziaria professa alcantarina* (Rome, 1843); PALMIERI, *Compendio della vita della b. Maria Francesca* (Rome, 1844); *Nos Saints* (Quebec, 1899), 241–2; RICHARD, *Leben der hl. Maria Franziska* (2 ed. Mainz, 1881); also *Lives* by MONTELLA, (Naples, 1867); ZAGARI (Milan, 1892).

FERDINAND HECKMANN.

Maryland.—One of the thirteen English colonies which after the Revolution of 1776 became the original States of the American Union. Its total area is 13,327 square miles, of which 3386 square miles are water. The total population (1906) was 1,275,434; of this total 37·1 per cent was reported in the census as claiming to be church-members (23·7 per cent Protestants; 13·1 per cent Catholics; 0·3 per cent all others), and 62·9 per cent not reported as church members. The numerical rank of the state has decreased in every census period, being sixth in 1790 and twenty-sixth in 1900. The foreign population is small, and the negro population about 248,000. Baltimore, the chief city, increased 9 per cent in population during the census decade 1900–1910. The federal census of 1910 gives it 558,485 inhabitants as against 508,957 in 1900.

The state census of 1908 shows 401 church organizations with a membership (communicants) of 473,257. In this enumeration the Catholics are set down at 166,941, which is, owing to the government method of computation, 15 per cent less than the actual claim of the church authorities. Other totals are: Baptists, 30,928; Disciples, or Christians, 2984; Dunkers, 4450; Friends, 2079; German Evangelicals, 8384; Lutheran bodies, 32,246; Methodists, 137,156; Presbyterians, 17,895; Reformed Presbyterians, 13,461; United Brethren, 6541. The total number of church edifices reported was 2814, with a seating capacity of 810,701 and a valuation of $23,765,172.

SEAL OF MARYLAND

COLONIAL PERIOD.—"On 25 March, 1634", says the Jesuit Father Andrew White, in his "Relatio Itineris in Marylandiam", or "Narrative of the Voyage of The Ark and The Dove", "we celebrated Mass for the first time in the island (St. Clement's). This had never been done before in this part of the world", and it was the beginning of the Maryland colony. The expedition, the landing of which on the shores of St. Mary's is thus described, was organized and sent out by Cecilius Calvert (q. v.), the second Lord Baltimore, and the first Proprietary of Maryland, under a charter issued to him, 20 June, 1632, by Charles I of England. This charter was the handiwork of George Calvert, the first Lord Baltimore, the father of Cecilius, and was intended to be issued to himself, but, as he died on the fifteenth of the preceding April, the charter went out to his son Cecilius, the heir to his title and estates and to his long-cherished scheme of English Catholic colonization in the Western Hemisphere. The charter contained the grant of an extensive territory, which was set out and defined by clear and explicit metes and bounds, containing nearly double the present land area of Maryland, embracing what is now the State of Delaware, a tract of Southern Pennsylvania, 15 miles wide by 138 miles long, and the fertile valley lying between the north and south branches of the Potomac River. The means by which the lords proprietary were deprived of so large a part of the territory given to them by the express language of the charter does not belong to this article. [See Russell, "Land of Sanctuary" (Baltimore, 1907), *passim.*] The charter also contained the most comprehensive grant of civil and political authority and jurisdiction that ever emanated from the English Crown. It was a palatinate that was created with all the royal and viceregal rights pertaining to the unique and exceptional kind of government then existing in the Bishopric of Durham. The grantee appointed the governor and all the civil and military officers of the province. The writs ran in his name.

He had power of life and death over the inhabitants as regards punishments for crime. He could erect manors, the grantees of which enjoyed all the rights and privileges belonging to that kind of estate in England. Many of them were created. He could confer titles of honour and thus establish a colonial aristocracy. Of all the territory embraced within the boundaries clearly set out in the charter, "the grantee, his heirs, successors and assigns, were made and constituted the true and absolute lords and proprietaries".

Sir George Calvert (q. v.), having become a convert to the Catholic faith in 1625, with his son Cecilius, then nineteen years of age, withdrew from public office, and sailed for Avalon in Newfoundland, a charter for which province had been granted him by King James. He carried with him a secular priest to attend to the spiritual wants of the Catholic colonists, and also a Protestant minister to supply those of the Protestant members of the expedition. In this act Sir George gave practical evidence of his recognition and acceptance of the principle of religious freedom and of the rights of conscience, of which his son Cecilius was to be so illustrious and shining a supporter. After a year's residence in Avalon, Sir George sailed south in quest of a more genial climate and a more kindly soil. He reached Jamestown, Virginia, but the authorities of that English settlement refused him permission to land unless he would take the oath of supremacy as well as that of allegiance. The latter he was willing to take, the former, as a Catholic, he declined. Returning to England he sought and obtained from Charles I the charter of Maryland. Dying before it passed the great seal, the charter was issued to his son Cecilius, the second Lord Baltimore and the first Lord Proprietary of the Province of Maryland.

The charter to Cecilius was opposed by the agents of the Virginia colonists, on the ground that the grant was an encroachment on the territory of Virginia. This contention was untenable. For, by the judgment of the King's Bench in 1624, eight years before the issuing of the Baltimore Charter, in certain *quo warranto* proceedings instituted in the King's Bench, the Virginia colony was converted into a royal colony, and the king revested with the title to all the territory embraced in the charter of the London or Virginia Company, with full power and authority to grant all or any part of it to whomsoever he pleased, which he subsequently freely exercised without question in the cases of the grants of New Jersey, Pennsylvania, the Carolinas and the northern neck of Virginia. The question was only raised as to the grant of Maryland, and that solely and avowedly because it was a grant to a Catholic nobleman for the purpose of establishing a Catholic colony. The committee of the Privy Council on American plantations, after a full hearing of both parties, unanimously decided "to leave the Lord Baltimore to his charter, and the Protestants to their remedy at law". Not having any such remedy, they did not, as they could not, resort to it. After numerous delays and detentions caused by its enemies, the expedition sailed from Southampton, 22 November, 1633. By an arrangement previously made by Lord Baltimore the expedition stopped at Cowes, in the Isle of Wight, and took on board the Jesuit Fathers Andrew White and John Altham (*alias* Gravenor) with some lay brothers and servants. The general description of the personnel of the expedition is that it consisted of "twenty gentlemen adventurers", all of whom, with perhaps one exception, were Catholics and of good families. With these were associated a number of artisans, mechanics, and labourers estimated at 250, the greater part of whom, it is said, were Protestants.

Cecilius Calvert carefully prepared and delivered to his brother Leonard (q. v.), whom he appointed governor, and to the two commissioners, Hawley and Cornwaleys, associated with him in the government of his province, a body of instructions for their conduct while on the voyage, and when and after they should reach their destination. In this first article he enjoins, both on shipboard and on land, an abstinence from all religious controversies, "to preserve peace and unity amongst all the passengers and to suffer no scandal or offence, whereby just complaint may be made by them in Virginia or in England . . . and to treat the Protestants with as much mildness and favour as justice will require". During the voyage, among the passengers, embracing men of opposite creeds and separated by widely different social conditions, confined for four tedious months on the crowded decks of the Ark and the Dove, there occurred nothing to mar and disturb its harmony. On landing, the colonists were kindly received by the Indians. Governor Calvert purchased from the tribe of the Piscataways, who occupied this land, the possession of a considerable tract. The aborigines gave to the colonists as a temporary shelter one of their principal villages. The wigwam of the chief was assigned to the two priests as a residence and a chapel, and they immediately began their apostolical labours, first among the Protestant colonists, most of whom in a short time accepted the true Faith. Father White prepared a grammar, a dictionary, and a catechism in the language of the Piscataways which was destroyed at the time of the Ingle invasion (see below). Tayac, the chief of this powerful tribe, was converted, with his wife, his family, and many of his tribe, as well as a princess of the Patuxents, a neighbouring tribe, and a number of her people.

The genial climate, the fertile soil, the liberal conditions of plantation promulgated by the lord proprietary, the security and safety enjoyed by the colonists, the religious freedom and equality secured to the members of every Christian denomination, soon attracted a numerous immigration, and the colony grew apace.

But a change came. The inhabitants of Virginia had abated none of their hostility to a Catholic colony in their neighbourhood and of their determination if possible to break up and destroy it. William Claiborne, a member of the Council of Government of that colony, had, under a licence he had obtained from Governor Harvey of Virginia to trade with the Indians, and a licence from Sir William Alexander, the Secretary of State for Scotland, to trade with the Dutch at Manhattan and the people of Newfoundland, established a trading post on Kent Island in the Chesapeake Bay within the boundaries of Lord Baltimore's grant, for the purpose of carrying on his business as a trader. He had never obtained a grant of any lands whatever. He was a mere squatter on the island, without a title to a single acre of it. He refused to acknowledge Lord Baltimore's charter and rights, and to submit to his authority, referring the matter to the Council of Virginia which upheld him. Governor Calvert thereupon proceeded to reduce the island to submission. Claiborne, with the aid of some of the Virginians, but without any authority of the Virginian government, organized an expedition to recapture the island. He was met by a force of Governor Calvert, commanded by Captain Cornwaleys, and defeated, but escaped capture, to be for the rest of his lawless and incendiary career a thorn in the side of Calvert and the unrelenting foe of the Catholic colonists.

In 1644 Richard Ingle, instigated and aided by Claiborne, made a sudden descent upon the province in a vessel named the Reformation, compelled Governor Calvert and some of the principal persons of the colony, including two of the Jesuit Fathers, to fly to Virginia, captured and burned St. Mary's, destroyed valuable records, plundered and destroyed the residences of many of the inhabitants, especially the houses and chapels of the missionaries, and took Father White a prisoner in chains to London, where he had him indicted as a returned Jesuit priest, an offence

for which death was the punishment. Father White pleaded, however, that his return was not voluntary, and escaped.

The avowed object of both these piratical raids was the destruction of the Catholic colony of Maryland. Lord Baltimore, seeing the disturbed condition of things, wrote to his brother the governor to save what he could out of the wreck of his fortunes and retire from the province. Leonard Calvert had, however, already taken steps to recover possession, and, returning with a small force of friends and adherents, drove out the marauders and re-established his authority. While Cecilius Calvert was thus confronting his enemies, who with untiring industry were seeking to involve his charter, his province, his colonists and the Jesuit fathers in a common ruin, he became engaged in an unfortunate controversy with the Jesuits over a tract of land they had received as a gift from some of their Indian converts without the knowledge or consent of the Proprietary, and the surrender of which the governor demanded. The priests refused to give it up until, after several years of somewhat acrimonious controversy, the father general of the order decided in Lord Baltimore's favour. Lord Baltimore did not object so much to the acquisition of lands by the fathers, but to the method and manner of that acquisition by grants or gifts from the Indians, in derogation of what he regarded his right and his title to these lands, under the express provisions of his charter. In 1651 Cecilius Calvert set apart 10,000 acres of land near Calverton Manor for the benefit of the Indian converts, under the care and direction of the fathers, the first fund established within the English possessions in America for the support of Indian missions.

Peace and order being restored by the return of Governor Leonard Calvert to the province, and the re-establishment of Lord Baltimore's authority, Maryland entered on a brief period of prosperity and began to grow in population and wealth. There are no statistics on which to base an opinion as to the number of the inhabitants of the province at this period (1645), but the best opinion puts it at between four and five thousand. Three-fourths of this number were Catholics. They held most of the offices under the appointment of the proprietary, and constituted a majority of the legislative body, and continued to do so until the Puritan Rebellion. The number of Jesuits serving the Maryland Missions averaged four annually from 1634 to 1650. Among them were Fathers Andrew White, Thomas Copley (*alias* Philip Fisher), and Ferdinand Poulton (*alias* John Brock and Morgan). These missionaries converted nearly if not quite all of the Protestant colonists who came out in the Ark and the Dove, and many of those who had come into the province afterwards from England and Virginia. To these were added, pending the difficulty between the fathers and Lord Baltimore, four Franciscans, who soon retired, however, and left the field to the Jesuits.

In 1649 the General Assembly of the province passed the celebrated Toleration Act. From the foundation of the colony, therefore, religious freedom had been the inviolable rule and practice of the provincial government. Under a provision in the charter giving to the Lords Baltimore the initiation of legislation in the province, Cecilius Calvert had drawn up a body of laws, sixteen in number, to be adopted by the Assembly, and among them was this famous Act. It was passed by that body, the majority of whom were Catholics, without a dissenting voice. "And whereas", it reads, "the enforcing of the conscience in matters of religion hath frequently fallen out to be of dangerous consequence in those commonwealths where it hath been practised, and for the more quiet and peaceable government of the province and the better to preserve mutual love and amity amongst the inhabitants thereof: Be it therefore enacted that noe person or persons whatsoever within this province .... professing to believe in Jesus Christ, shall henceforth be in any waies troubled, molested or discountenanced for or in respect of his or her religion or in the free exercise thereof within this province nor in anything compelled to the belief or exercise of any other religion against his or her consent." The act then provides penalties for violation of its provisions. In the controversies about this celebrated Act of Toleration, efforts have been made by many Protestant writers to deprive Cecilius Calvert of the merit of its authorship, but the judgment of all fair historians gives to Cecilius Calvert, and to him alone, following the example of his father, the honour of "being the first in the annals of mankind", as Bancroft says in his "History of the United States", "to make religious freedom the basis of the State".

Cecilius Calvert was a conscientious Catholic. Indeed, "it was to that fact that he owed the continuous hostility he had to meet with", says Prof. William Hand Browne of Johns Hopkins University in his "History of a Palatinate": "He had only to declare himself a Protestant and all this hostility would have ceased. This he did not do." In 1643, the House of Burgesses of Virginia passed a stringent law requiring of all persons a strict conformity with the worship and discipline of the Church of England, the established Church of that colony. This act was put into vigorous execution by the governor, and a considerable body of Puritans were driven out of Virginia into Maryland. At their solicitation Governor Stone gave them a large tract of land on the Severn, where they made a settlement, calling it Providence (now Annapolis). Soon they began to complain that their consciences would not allow them to acknowledge the authority of a Catholic proprietary, and in 1650 they started a rebellion, and seized the government of the colony. They convened a General Assembly to which Catholics were declared to be ineligible either as members or electors. The first thing this illegal and revolutionary body did was to repeal the Act of Toleration of 1649, and to enact another "Concerning Religion" which contained this provision: "That none who profess and exercise the Papistic, commonly known as the Roman Catholic religion, can be protected in this province." By this act Catholics and Church of England adherents were expressly proscribed, and the profession of any other religion could be included as the caprice or intolerance of its authors should at any time require.

During the Puritan usurpation the Catholic Church suffered greatly. Swashbucklers paraded the province, breaking into the chapels and mission houses and destroying property. Three of the Jesuit priests fled to Virginia, where they kept themselves in hiding for two or three years, enduring great privations. One only remained in Maryland. In 1658 the government of the province was restored to Lord Baltimore. A General Assembly was convoked which re-enacted the Toleration Act of 1649. This Act remained on the statute book under the Catholic proprietaries until the Protestant Revolution of 1689. Maryland now enjoyed another era of quiet and prosperity, and the Jesuits returning to the province resumed their missionary labours. In 1660 the population of the province numbered 12,000; in 1665, 16,000; and in 1671, 20,000. This rapid increase is a proof of the wisdom and liberality of the proprietary's rule. The Catholic inhabitants during this period, the majority of whom were in St. Mary's and Charles Counties, were estimated to be between 4000 and 5000, served by two, sometimes three, Jesuits and two Franciscans who arrived in 1673.

Philip Calvert, brother of Cecilius, was governor from 1660 to 1662, when he was succeeded by Charles Calvert, the son and heir of Cecilius, who, on the death of his father in 1675, became the third Lord Baltimore and second proprietary of the province. Charles

married and settled in the province, and lived there several years, discharging the duties of governor as well as of proprietary according to liberal and enlightened principles and with consideration for the welfare of the inhabitants. In 1683 the General Assembly voted him 100,000 lbs. of tobacco as an expression of "the duty gratitude and affection" of the people of the province. This he declined on the ground that it would impose too great a tax burden on the people.

PURITAN USURPATION.—Charles was not, however, without his troubles. Attempts were made in 1676 to force him to make public provision for the clergymen of the Church of England. This, following his father's example, he declined to do, and with the approval of the inhabitants, because of the worthless character and scandalous conduct of most of the ministers of that denomination sent over from England. In 1676 a proclamation was issued by the Protestant malcontents denouncing the government of the Catholic Proprietary, demanding its extinction, and the appointment of a royal governor. They assembled in arms in Calvert County to carry out their programme, but Governor Notley, in the absence of Sir Charles Calvert in England, quickly suppressed the movement and hanged two of the ringleaders. Later on the malcontents availed themselves of the opportunity created by the Revolution in England to raise the standard of revolt against the government of Lord Baltimore, and to call upon all good Protestants to aid in its overthrow. Under the leadership of one John Coode, an apostate Catholic, a Colonel Jowles and others formed "The Protestant Association in arms to defend the Protestant religion". All sorts of lying charges against the Catholics were scattered broadcast through the community. They were accused among other things of forming an alliance with the Indians for the massacre of the Protestants. The Government of the proprietary was overthrown, and a Committee of Public Safety was installed in its place. This Committee appealed to William and Mary for a recognition, and to the discredit of those monarchs it was given.

Lord Baltimore, without the charge of a single offence being brought against him, except that he was a Catholic, without a trial by a jury of his peers, against his earnest protest, and notwithstanding the remonstrances of large numbers of respectable Protestants in several of the counties, was deprived of all the civil and political authority conferred upon him in the charter, and remained so deprived until his death in 1715. William and Mary without a scruple took over the province, made it a royal colony, and appointed Lionel Copley governor. And now began the reign of religious intolerance and bigotry. William and Mary, although they deprived Lord Baltimore of his government of the province in violation of the express provisions of the charter, refused to sanction the repeated attempts made by the Maryland usurpers to rob him of his proprietary rights. These rights he retained until his death in 1715, administering his land office, appointing his surveyors, collecting his rents and issuing, as the only recognized source of title, grants and patents for lands to claimants under the conditions of plantation promulgated by his father Cecilius. This retention of his territory enabled the proprietary to save his province and the future State of Maryland from absorption by either Virginia or Pennsylvania colonies. Encouraged by the Government both in England and in the colony, and by the sympathy and support of the Protestant inhabitants of Maryland, the revolutionists began an era of religious persecution.

In 1692 an "Act of Religion" was passed whereby all the penal laws of England existing at that time against the Catholics were declared to be in force in the colony. This Act established the Church of England as the Church of the province, and provided for conformity with its worship and discipline. To Episcopal clergymen was given jurisdiction in testamentary causes. The members of the Church of England at that time constituted but a small minority of the people. To the Dissenters and the Quakers, who together with the Catholics formed a considerable majority of the people, this act was very obnoxious. Under the rule of the Catholic proprietaries there was no Established Church, no tax imposed for its support, no conformity with its worship and discipline required under penalties for non-compliance. In 1702 an Act was passed exempting Puritans and Quakers and all other kinds of Dissenters from the provisions of this law, except the one imposing an annual tax of 40 pounds of tobacco per poll on all the inhabitants for the support of the Establishment. To the Catholics no relief whatever from these burdens was extended. They and they alone remained subject to the pains, penalties, disabilities, and taxes provided in this Act. By the Test Oath of 1692 Catholic attorneys were debarred from practising in the provincial courts. By the Act of 1704 Catholics were prohibited from practising their religion; priests were debarred from the exercise of their functions; priests and parents forbidden to teach Catholic children their religion, and the children encouraged to refuse obedience to the rule and authority of their parents.

Charles, Lord Baltimore, died 20 February, 1715. His son Benedict Leonard now succeeded to the title and estates. This son, a few years before the death of his father, had renounced the Catholic Faith, and with his family had conformed to the Church of England. His father, incensed by this conduct, had cut off his allowance. To replace this, Queen Anne had, on the petition of Benedict, directed Governor Hart to provide for him an annuity of £500 out of the revenue of the province. This apostasy proved an injury to the Catholics of Maryland. Benedict died 5 April, 1715. His son Charles II, who had conformed with his father, became the fifth Lord Baltimore and the fourth proprietary, and received from Queen Anne the government of the province. In 1718 a more stringent law was passed barring Catholics from the exercise of the franchise and the holding of any office in the province. In 1715 a law was adopted providing that if a Protestant should die leaving a widow and children, and such widow should marry a Catholic, or be herself of that opinion, it should be the duty of the governor and council to remove such child or children out of the custody of such parents and place them where they might be securely educated in the Protestant religion. This Act was amended and re-enacted in 1729 by an Act which in the case mentioned gave the power to take the child to any justice of the county court. Without regard to sex or age the child or children should be put wherever the justice pleased. There was no appeal.

In all this proscriptive legislation there are evidences of a latent ill-concealed purpose which in 1756 was boldly announced in petitions to the Lower House, and in a series of articles from correspondents in the "Maryland Gazette" published in Annapolis.

The Jesuits owned and cultivated several large manors and other tracts of fertile lands, the revenues of which were devoted to religion, charity, education, and their missionary work. The Assembly was therefore prayed to enact that all manors, tenements, etc., possessed by the priests should on 1 October, 1756, be taken from them, and vested in a commission appointed for that purpose and sold, the proceeds of the sale to be devoted to the protection of the inhabitants from the French and Indians. Priests were to be required to take all the test oaths and on their refusal banished, and, as "Romish recusants", their lands to be forfeited. In the same year the Upper House, as the Governor's Council was called, framed a bill with the title "To

prevent the growth of Popery within this province", which provided that priests were to be made incapable of holding any lands, to be obliged to register their names, and give bond for their good conduct; were prohibited from converting Protestants under the penalty of high treason, and further that any person educated at a foreign Catholic seminary could not inherit or hold lands in the province. There were other equally severe disabilities and penalties imposed. But a controversy arose between the two Houses over the bill during which it was dropped. To render the province no longer a desirable place of residence to the loyal Catholic gentlemen and their families was the object of these propositions and laws. Charles Carroll, the father of the signer of the Declaration of Independence, wrote to his son that Maryland was no longer a fit place for a Catholic to reside, and he felt inclined to dispose of his great landed estate and leave the province. Fortunately his son earnestly persuaded him not to do so. Some families sought refuge from these intolerant laws and the more intolerant sentiments of the people under the milder rule of Pennsylvania. In 1752 the same Charles Carroll, after consultation with some of the principal Catholic families of Maryland, went to France to obtain from Louis XV a tract of land in the Louisiana territory for the purpose of transporting the Catholics of the province in a body to that country. He failed in his mission. Maryland Catholics began to emigrate to Kentucky in 1774, and in 1785 twenty-five Catholic families set out from St. Mary's County for Pottinger's Creek (see KENTUCKY).

In the absence of reliable statistics it is difficult to ascertain the growth of the population in the colony during the period elapsing from 1634 to 1690; according to the estimate already given, in 1671, it was 20,000. The Protestant Revolution exercised a deterring influence, so that in 1708, it was only 33,000, of whom 3000 were Catholics. In 1754 the population was placed at 153,000, of whom the Catholics numbered about 8000. During the early part of this period, the number of priests—mostly, sometimes exclusively, Jesuits—serving this Catholic population averaged four or five; during the latter part ten to twelve. In 1759 the estimated Catholic population of the province was 9000, and the number of priests, all Jesuits, eight to fifteen. In 1756 Bishop Challoner, vicar apostolic in England, places the number of priests at twelve. In 1763 the Catholic population was estimated to be between 8000 and 10,000, whose spiritual needs were supplied by fourteen Jesuits. By 1769 this population had increased to 12,000. Numerous conversions had been made. The proclamation of independence and the Revolution which followed it put an end to the royal authority in the American colonies, and to the proprietary rule in Maryland, and struck the shackles from the Catholics of that province. Henceforth a new order of things was to prevail. Daniel Dulany, an eminent lawyer and the attorney general of the province under the last proprietary governor, had addressed a letter to the people of Maryland earnestly urging them to remain steadfast in their loyalty to the King of England and to the provincial authority. He pointed out as a dissuasive to Maryland from joining her sister colonies in the revolt the fact that under Section XX of the Maryland Charter the province enjoyed the right of absolute exemption from all taxation by king or Parliament. The authority of Mr. Dulany was high, and his argument strong. Another letter was calculated to exert an influence unfavourable to the patriot cause. The fact was, the royal authority had been exerted in Maryland only to a limited extent. No royal governors had been appointed except during the usurpation of the Protestant ascendency, when the government of the province, and the appointment of governors, was taken temporarily out of the hands of Charles, Lord Baltimore, because he was a Catholic. The proprietary rule, notwithstanding the clamours of the malcontents and revolutionists of 1689, was acceptable to the people. The only ground of objection, indeed, ever urged against the government of either Cecilius or Charles Calvert was that they were Catholics.

WAR FOR INDEPENDENCE.—Maryland did not at first contemplate or favour independence, and had so instructed her delegates to the Continental Congress. While the public mind was in this uncertain and unbalanced state, Dulany's letter appeared and produced considerable effect. The patriot cause, the cause of independence, found a champion in the disfranchised Catholic, Charles Carroll of Carrollton (q. v.), the wealthiest landowner in the province. Four letters passed between the controversialists. By general acknowledgment the triumph of Carroll was complete. Carroll's letters met with an enthusiastic reception by the patriots, and the cause of independence was won. Throwing all selfish considerations aside, Maryland, henceforth a state and no longer a province, cast her lot with the other colonies. Subsequently, two other Catholic Carrolls took prominent parts in the revolutionary struggle: Rev. John Carroll (q. v.), afterwards the first bishop of the United States, and Daniel Carroll of Duddington (q. v.).

The name of Daniel Carroll is little known, and his patriotic services have never been sufficiently recognized. While a member of the Congress from Maryland, he took a leading and prominent part in the settlement of a question of profound significance and importance to his country. Under language of a very vague character in their charters, as colonies, from the king, several of the states laid claim to large stretches of the territory west of the Alleghanies. Virginia asserted a blanket claim to the whole territory under the charter of 1607. Very early in the sessions of the Congress Maryland had introduced through her representatives a resolution to the effect that if, as a result of the war then being waged, these lands should be acquired by the Confederation from Great Britain, they should become the common property of all the states, free to the entrance of the inhabitants of all the states, and regulated and governed by the Congress as the trustee of all the states, and declared she would not sign the Articles of Confederation until the states claiming these lands should make a surrender of them to Congress to become in time independent states and members of the Union. The resolution met with great opposition from the landed states, especially from Virginia. Alone and unsupported by any other state, Maryland remained firm and ultimately triumphed. John Fiske, in his "Critical Period of American History", does not hesitate to say that but for the position taken by Maryland on this question the Union would not have been formed; or, if formed, would soon have been broken in pieces by the conflicting pretensions of the landed states.

The Catholics of Maryland, both clergy and laity, warmly espoused the patriot cause. On the roster of the Maryland Line are to be found the names of representatives of the Catholic families of Maryland. The important services of the Carrolls, the loyalty of the Catholic clergy and laity to the patriot cause, coupled with the fact that the whole body of the Anglican clergy had almost to a man adhered to King George, had somewhat ameliorated the old intolerant sentiments of the people of colonial Maryland towards the Catholic religion and its professors. This change of sentiment found expression in Section XXXIII of the Bill of Rights of the Constitution of the new State of Maryland, adopted in November, 1776. In this article it is declared that all persons professing the Christian religion are equally entitled to protection . . that no person ought to be compelled to frequent or maintain any particular place of worship or any particular ministry. Still it provided that the legislature

might in its discretion lay a general and equal tax for the support of the Christian religion, leaving to each individual taxpayer the right to designate to what particular place of worship or to what particular minister his portion of the tax should be applied. By this article also the churches, chapels, parsonages, and glebe lands of the Church of England in the province were secured to that Church forever. It further provided that all Acts of the General Assembly passed for collecting money for building or repairing of churches or chapels (that is for the Protestant Episcopal Church) shall continue in force until repealed by the legislature. This article, adopted in 1776, fell far short of that full and just measure of religious freedom announced a century and a half before by Cecilius Calvert in his instructions to Governor Leonard Calvert and the Toleration Act of 1649. It remained on the statutes until the first Congress of the United States passed its first amendment, to the effect that "Congress shall make no laws respecting the establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof".

The success of the Revolution rendered necessary new arrangements and adjustments of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and authority in the Catholic Church of the United States. In a population of about 200,000, the Catholics of Maryland numbered at the close of the revolution 15,000: 9000 adults, 3000 children, and 3000 slaves. The number of Catholic priests at the same time in Maryland was twenty-one. The vicars Apostolic of London had jurisdiction over the English colonies in America, and this jurisdiction was confirmed to Bishop Challoner on his appointment. Writing to Propaganda in 1759 he urged that a bishop or vicar Apostolic be appointed for the Catholics in our [i. e., British] American settlements. In 1765 he favoured the idea of two or three vicariates and wrote in this sense to his agent in Rome.

In Rome, however, the Cardinal of York, brother of Charles Edward Stuart, pretender to the English throne, was thought to control the nomination of bishops within British dominions. The Catholics of Maryland were not partisans of the House of Stuart, and, furthermore, the sympathies of the Cardinal of York were known to be not on the side of the Society of Jesus, to which the Maryland missionaries almost all belonged. Bishop Challoner then suggested that the Sacrament of Confirmation be conferred on the Catholics of Pennsylvania and Maryland by the Bishop of Quebec, but there is no evidence that this ever took place, or that Confirmation was administered prior to the War of Independence. On 27 June, 1783, a meeting of the Catholic clergy of Maryland was held at White Marsh, Prince George's County, to take into consideration the status and the wants of the Church under the new political order brought about by the war. This meeting addressed a petition to His Holiness Pius VI, requesting the appointment of a prefect Apostolic clothed with episcopal powers. In response to this petition, on 9 June, 1784 a Decree of the Propaganda was issued organizing the Catholic Church in the United States, and appointing the Rev. John Carroll superior of the missions in the thirteen United States of America. Father Carroll at once entered on the duties of his office, but it required but little experience to demonstrate that the appointment of a "Superior of Missions" was wholly inadequate to meet the wants of the Church in the United States, and that a bishop with full authority and jurisdiction was necessary. In 1788 a petition to that effect, signed by John Carroll, Robert Molyneux, and John Ashton, and representing the almost unanimous opinion of the rest of the clergy in Maryland, was presented to Pope Pius VI. His Holiness approved the recommendation, and a Bull was issued on 6 November, 1788, establishing Baltimore as a see and appointing Rev. John Carroll its first bishop. The authority and jurisdiction of the bishop was co-extensive with the limits of the country. (See BALTIMORE, ARCHDIOCESE OF; CARROLL, JOHN.)

In the War of 1812 with England, a number of localities suffered from the attacks of the British fleet. The bombardment of Fort McHenry, Baltimore, 13 Sept., 1814, was the occasion of the composition of the National anthem, "The Star-Spangled Banner". On 12 Sept., 1814, the Maryland troops under General Stricker checked the British forces commanded by General Ross at the Battle of North Point. This victory saved the Republic from being cut in two by the British and resulted in the Treaty of Ghent, which was signed on 2 December, 1814. The defeat and death of General Ross at the Battle of North Point was a vital moment in the history of the United States. During the Civil War, 1861–65, as a border state Maryland had many citizens who favoured secession. In October, 1864, a new constitution abolished slavery and disfranchised all who had aided the rebellion against the United States.

EDUCATION.—The percentage of illiterate native whites, 4·1, is the lowest, and of negroes, 35·1, the second lowest of any state having a large negro population. From the time of the first Jesuit missionaries Catholic effort for sound education has been constant. To further the organization of a native clergy Bishop Carroll secured the services of a number of Sulpicians, who on 3 October, 1791, began St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore. In January, 1805, the State legislature gave it the charter of a university. Up to 1910, 1800 priests had been educated there. Many distinguished laymen also studied within its walls. Under the same direction St. Charles College, Ellicott City, was founded in 1830. Georgetown University (q. v.) was founded in 1778, and in its first years some of the Sulpicians assisted as professors in the work of the institution, carried on by the Society of Jesus. Other notable institutions are Mount St. Mary's Seminary and College, Emmitsburg (1808); Loyola College, Baltimore (1852); Rock Hill College, Ellicott City (Christian Brothers, 1865).

For women the most modern educational advantages are supplied by the Sisters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul in St. Joseph's College, founded by Mother Seton at Emmitsburg in 1808, and in the Academy of Notre Dame of Maryland at Baltimore. The College of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, the philosophical and theological House of Studies of the Society of Jesus, is at Woodstock; the Redemptorist House of Studies is at Illchester, and the normal school and novitiate of the Christian Brothers at Ammendale. Nearly one-half the parishes of the State have Catholic schools. The boys' parochial schools are under the charge of the Christian Brothers and the Xaverian Brothers. The girls' schools are under the charge of the Sisters of Mercy, the Sisters of Charity, and the School Sisters of Notre Dame. The governor, principal of the State Normal School and state superintendent, with four members appointed by the governor, make up the State Board of Education. The governor and Senate name a Board of School Commissioners for each county, and this board selects three school trustees in each district. The law makes the annual school term last ten months.

CHARITIES.—A Board of State Aid and Charities appointed by the governor and the Senate receives all applications for state aid, and recommends to the legislature the amount to be granted and its recipient. There are 6 Catholic hospitals; 2 homes for aged poor; 2 industrial and reform schools; 4 homes and 2 orphan asylums in the state; 1 foundling hospital. The property of charitable and religious institutions, as well as churches and cemeteries, is exempt from taxation. Burial plots in cemeteries are not liable for debts, etc.

LAWS AFFECTING RELIGION.—All Sundays, besides New Year's Day, Christmas, and Good Friday, are

CHRIST AND MARY MAGDALEN

CORREGGIO, THE PRADO, MADRID

legal holidays. Incorporation of Catholic churches is made according to a special law by the body composed of the bishop of the diocese, his vicar-general, the pastor of the parish and two other persons elected annually by the male pewholders. The form of the judicial or other oath not provided for in the State Constitution is: "In the presence of Almighty God I do solemnly promise", or "declare", etc. It is not lawful to add to any oath the words "So help me God", or any imprecatory words whatever. Affirmation is sufficient if the conscience of the person is against an oath. The manner is by holding up the right hand, unless this is not practical or some other way is considered more binding.

No one who takes part in, or aids or abets a duel, or sends or accepts a challenge, can hold office. No minister of the Gospel is eligible for election to the Legislature. Murder in the first degree is punishable with death; arson, rape, and treason with death or imprisonment at the discretion of the court. The chief grounds of divorce are adultery, abandonment for three years, impotency at time of marriage, and misconduct of wife before marriage unknown to husband. Separation from bed and board is granted for cruel treatment, excessively vicious conduct, or desertion.

RUSSELL, *The Land of Sanctuary* (Baltimore, 1907); HUGHES, *The History of the Society of Jesus in North America* (Cleveland, 1907–10); BOZMAN, *History of Maryland 1633-60* (Baltimore, 1861); MCSHERRY, *History of Maryland . . . to the Year 1848* (Baltimore, 1848); BROWNE, *Maryland, History of a Palatinate* (Boston, 1884); MCMAHON, *History of Maryland to 1776* (Baltimore, 1831); SCHARFF, *History of Maryland* (Baltimore, 1879); DAVIS, *The Day-Star of American Freedom* (New York, 1855); MORRIS, *The Lords Baltimore* (Baltimore, 1874); HALL, *The Lords Baltimore and the Maryland Palatinate* (Baltimore, 1902); *Calvert Papers; Maryland Archives;* KILTY, *Landholder's Assistant* (Baltimore, 1808); BACON, *Laws of Maryland* (Annapolis, 1765); *Bulletins of the Maryland Original Research Society;* FISKE, *Old Virginia and her Neighbors* (Boston, 1897); ADAMS, *Village Communities of Cape Anne and Salem* (Baltimore, 1883); GAMBRALL, *History of Early Maryland* (New York, 1893); JOHNSON, *Old Maryland Manors* (Baltimore, 1883); WHITE, *Relatio Itineris in Marylandiam* in *Hist. Soc. Publ.;* ZWIERLEIN, *Religion in New Netherland* (Rochester, 1910). See also bibliography of CARROLL, JOHN.

A. LEO KNOTT.

Mary Magdalen, so called either from Magdala near Tiberias, on the west shore of Galilee, or, possibly from a Talmudic expression מגדלא שיערא נשייא, i. e. "curling women's hair", which the Talmud explains as of an adulteress. In the New Testament she is mentioned among the women who accompanied Christ and ministered to Him (Luke, viii, 2–3), where it is also said that seven devils had been cast out of her (Mark, xvi, 9). She is next named as standing at the foot of the cross (Mark, xv, 40; Matt., xxvii, 56; John, xix, 25; Luke, xxiii, 49). She saw Christ laid in the tomb, and she was the first recorded witness of the Resurrection. The Greek Fathers, as a whole, distinguish the three persons: the "sinner" of Luke, vii, 36–50; the sister of Martha and Lazarus, Luke, x, 38–42, and John, xi; and Mary Magdalen. On the other hand most of the Latins hold that these three were one and the same. Protestant critics, however, believe there were two, if not three, distinct persons. It is impossible to demonstrate the identity of the three; but those commentators undoubtedly go too far who assert, as does Westcott (on John, xi, 1), "that the identity of Mary with Mary Magdalene is a mere conjecture supported by no direct evidence, and opposed to the general tenour of the gospels". It is the identification of Mary of Bethany with the "sinner" of Luke, vii, 37, which is most combatted by Protestants (see Plummer, "International Critical Comment. on St. Luke", p. 209). It almost seems as if this reluctance to identify the "sinner" with the sister of Martha were due to a failure to grasp the full significance of the forgiveness of sin. (See Mayor in Hastings, "Dictionary of the Bible", III, 284.) The harmonizing tendencies of so many modern critics, too, are responsible for much of the existing confusion.

The first fact mentioned in the Gospel relating to the question under discussion is the anointing of Christ's feet by a woman, a "sinner" in the city (Luke, vii, 37–50). This belongs to the Galilean ministry, it precedes the miracle of the feeding of the five thousand and the third Passover. Immediately afterwards St. Luke describes a missionary circuit in Galilee and tells us of the women who ministered to Christ, among them being "Mary who is called Magdalen, out of whom seven devils were gone forth" (Luke, viii, 2); but he does not tell us that she is to be identified with the "sinner" of the previous chapter. In x, 38–42, he tells us of Christ's visit to Martha and Mary "in a certain town"; it is impossible to identify this town, but it is clear from ix, 53, that Christ had definitively left Galilee, and it is quite possible that this "town" was Bethany. This seems confirmed by the preceding parable of the good Samaritan, which must almost certainly have been spoken on the road between Jericho and Jerusalem. But here again we note that there is no suggestion of an identification of the three persons, viz., the "sinner", Mary Magdalen, and Mary of Bethany; and if we had only St. Luke to guide us we should certainly have no grounds for so identifying them. St. John, however, clearly identifies Mary of Bethany with the woman who anointed Christ's feet (xii; cf. Matt., xxvi, and Mark, xiv). It is remarkable that already in xi, 2, St. John has spoken of Mary as "she that anointed the Lord's feet", ἡ ἀλείψασα; it is commonly said that he refers to the subsequent anointing which he himself describes in xii, 3–8; but it may be questioned whether he would have used ἡ ἀλείψασα if another woman, and she a "sinner" in the city, had done the same. It is conceivable that St. John, just because he is writing so long after the event and at a time when Mary was dead, wishes to point out to us that she was really the same as the "sinner". In the same way St. Luke may have veiled her identity precisely because he did not wish to defame one who was yet living; he certainly does something similar in the case of St. Matthew whose identity with Levi the publican (v, 7) he conceals.

If the foregoing argument holds good, Mary of Bethany and the "sinner" are one and the same. But an examination of St. John's Gospel makes it almost impossible to deny the identity of Mary of Bethany with Mary Magdalen. From St. John we learn the name of the "woman" who anointed Christ's feet previous to the last supper. We may remark here that it seems unnecessary to hold that because St. Matthew and St. Mark say "two days before the Passover", while St. John says "six days" there were, therefore, two distinct anointings following one another. St. John does not necessarily mean that the supper and the anointing took place six days before, but only that Christ came to Bethany six days before the Passover. At that supper, then, Mary received the glorious encomium, "she hath wrought a good work upon Me . . . in pouring this ointment upon My body she hath done it for My burial . . . wheresoever this Gospel shall be preached . . . that also which she hath done shall be told for a memory of her." Is it credible, in view of all this, that this Mary should have no place at the foot of the cross, nor at the tomb of Christ? Yet it is Mary Magdalen who, according to all the Evangelists, stood at the foot of the cross and assisted at the entombment and was the first recorded witness of the Resurrection. And while St. John calls her "Mary Magdalen" in xix, 25, xx, 1, 18, he calls her simply "Mary" in xx, 11 and 16.

In the view we have advocated the series of events forms a consistent whole; the "sinner" comes early in the ministry to seek for pardon; she is described immediately afterwards as Mary Magdalen "out of whom seven devils were gone forth"; shortly after, we find her "sitting at the Lord's feet and hearing His

words". To the Catholic mind it all seems fitting and natural. At a later period Mary and Martha turn to "the Christ, the Son of the Living God", and He restores to them their brother Lazarus; a short time afterwards they make Him a supper and Mary once more repeats the act she had performed when a penitent. At the Passion she stands near by; she sees Him laid in the tomb; and she is the first witness of His Resurrection—excepting always His Mother, to whom He must needs have appeared first, though the New Testament is silent on this point. In our view, then, there were two anointings of Christ's feet—it should surely be no difficulty that St. Matthew and St. Mark speak of His head—the first (Luke, vii) took place at a comparatively early date; the second, two days before the last Passover. But it was one and the same woman who performed this pious act on each occasion.

SUBSEQUENT HISTORY OF ST. MARY MAGDALEN.—The Greek Church maintains that the saint retired to Ephesus with the Blessed Virgin and there died, that her relics were transferred to Constantinople in 886 and are there preserved. Gregory of Tours, "De miraculis", I, xxx, supports the statement that she went to Ephesus. However, according to a French tradition (see LAZARUS OF BETHANY, SAINT), Mary, Lazarus, and some companions came to Marseilles and converted the whole of Provence. Magdalen is said to have retired to a hill, La Sainte-Baume, near by, where she gave herself up to a life of penance for thirty years. When the time of her death arrived she was carried by angels to Aix and into the oratory of St. Maximinus, where she received the viaticum; her body was then laid in an oratory constructed by St. Maximinus at Villa Lata, afterwards called St. Maximin. History is silent about these relics till 745, when, according to the chronicler Sigebert, they were removed to Vézelay through fear of the Saracens. No record is preserved of their return, but in 1279, when Charles II, King of Naples, erected a convent at La Sainte-Baume for the Dominicans, the shrine was found intact, with an inscription stating why they were hidden. In 1600 the relics were placed in a sarcophagus sent by Clement VIII, the head being placed in a separate vessel. In 1814 the church of La Ste Baume, wrecked during the Revolution, was restored, and in 1822 the grotto was consecrated afresh. The head of the saint now lies there, where it has lain so long, and where it has been the centre of so many pilgrimages.

Acta SS., 22 July; FAILLON, *Monuments inédits sur l'apostolat de Ste-Marie-Madeline en Provence* (2 vols., Paris, 1859), I, 1–282, where a full discussion of the identity of the saint is to be found; also 878–9; BARONIUS, *Ann. Eccl.*, I, 117–121, 251; BAILLET, *Vies des Saints* (Paris, 1724). For the common non-Catholic opinion cf. SIMPSON in *Expositor* (Oct., 1900).

HUGH POPE.

Mary Magdalen de' Pazzi, SAINT, Carmelite Virgin, b. 2 April, 1566; d. 25 May, 1607. Of outward events there were very few in the saint's life. She came of two noble families, her father being Camillo Geri de' Pazzi and her mother a Buondelmonti. She was baptized, and named Caterina, in the great baptistery. Her childhood much resembled that of some other women saints who have become great mystics, in an early love of prayer and penance, great charity to the poor, an apostolic spirit of teaching religious truths, and a charm and sweetness of nature that made her a general favourite. But above all other spiritual characteristics was Caterina's intense attraction towards the Blessed Sacrament, her longing to receive It, and her delight in touching and being near those who were speaking of It, or who had just been to Communion. She made her own First Communion at the age of ten, and shortly afterwards vowed her virginity to God. At fourteen she was sent to school at the convent of the Cavalaresse, where she lived in so mortified and fervent a manner as to make the sisters prophesy that she would become a great saint; and, on leaving it, she told her parents of her resolve to enter the religious state. They were truly spiritual people; and, after a little difficulty in persuading them to relinquish their only daughter, she finally entered in December, 1582, the Carmelite convent of Santa Maria degl' Angeli, founded by four Florentine ladies in 1450 and renowned for its strict observance. Her chief reason for choosing this convent was the rule there followed of daily Communion.

Caterina was clothed in 1583, when she took the name of Maria Maddalena; and on 29 May, 1584, being then so ill that they feared she would not recover, she was professed. After her profession, she was subject to an extraordinary daily ecstasy for forty consecutive days, at the end of which time she appeared at the point of death. She recovered, however, miraculously; and henceforth, in spite of constant bad health, was able to fill with energy the various offices to which she was appointed. She became, in turn, mistress of externs—i. e. of girls coming to the convent on trial—teacher and mistress of the juniors, novice mistress (which post she held for six years), and finally, in 1604, superior. For five years (1585–90) God allowed her to be tried by terrible inward desolation and temptations, and by external diabolic attacks; but the courageous severity and deep humility of the means that she took for overcoming these only served to make her virtues shine more brilliantly in the eyes of her community.

From the time of her clothing with the religious habit till her death the saint's life was one series of raptures and ecstasies, of which only the most notable characteristics can be named in a short notice. First, these raptures sometimes seized upon her whole being with such force as to compel her to rapid motion (e. g. towards some sacred object). Secondly, she was frequently able, whilst in ecstasy, to carry on work belonging to her office—e. g., embroidery, painting, etc.—with perfect composure and efficiency. Thirdly—and this is the point of chief importance—it was whilst in her states of rapture that St. Mary Magdalen de' Pazzi gave utterance to those wonderful maxims of Divine Love, and those counsels of perfection for souls, especially in the religious state, which a modern editor of a selection of them declares to be "more frequently quoted by spiritual writers than those even of St. Teresa". These utterances have been preserved to us by the saint's companions, who (unknown to her) took them down from her lips as she poured them forth. She spoke sometimes as of herself, and sometimes as the mouthpiece of one or other of the Persons of the Blessed Trinity. These maxims of the saint are sometimes described as her "Works", although she wrote down none of them herself.

This ecstatic life in no wise interfered with the saint's usefulness in her community. She was noted for her strong common-sense, as well as for the high standard and strictness of her government, and was most dearly loved to the end of her life by all for the spirit of intense charity that accompanied her somewhat severe code of discipline. As novice-mistress she was renowned for a miraculous gift of reading her subjects' hearts—which gift, indeed, was not entirely confined to her community. Many miracles, both of this and of other kinds, she performed for the benefit either of her own convent or of outsiders. She often saw things far off, and is said once to have supernaturally beheld St. Catherine de' Ricci in her convent at Prato, reading a letter that she had sent her and writing the answer; but the two saints never met in a natural manner. To St. Mary Magdalen's numerous penances, and to the ardent love of suffering that made her genuinely wish to live long in order to suffer with Christ, we can here merely refer; but it must not be forgotten that she was one of the strongest upholders of the value of suffering for the love of God and the

salvation of our fellow-creatures, that ever lived. Her death was fully in accordance with her life in this respect, for she died after an illness of nearly three years' duration and of indescribable painfulness, borne with heroic joy to the end. Innumerable miracles followed the saint's death, and the process for her beatification was begun in 1610 under Paul V, and finished under Urban VIII in 1626. She was not, however, canonized till sixty-two years after her death, when Clement IX raised her to the altars on 28 April, 1669. Her feast is kept on 27 May.

(1) The Oratorian *Life* (1849), translated from the Italian *Life* by CEPARI, for a long time confessor to the saint and her community; the edition translated is that of 1669, published in Rome by BERNABO. (2) A MS. *Life*—of which copies exist in England, only in several convents—compiled by PANTING from the above-named work of CEPARI's, and from another Italian *Life* by PUCCINI, who was the saint's confessor for about two years before her death. (3) *Œuvres de S. M. M. de' Pazzi*, compiled in French by LAURENT MARIA BRANCACCIO, a Neapolitan Carmelite, from Puccini's work. This book consists of her maxims, aspirations, etc., as collected by the Community. (4) A small *Manual* of the saint's counsels on the Religious Life, translated from the French by FARRINGTON (Dublin, 1891).

F. M. CAPES.

Mary of Egypt, SAINT, b. probably about 344; d. about 421. At the early age of twelve Mary left her home and came to Alexandria, where for upwards of seventeen years she led a life of public prostitution. At the end of that time, on the occasion of a pilgrimage to Jerusalem for the Feast of the Exaltation of the Holy Cross, she embarked for Palestine, not however with the intention of making the pilgrimage, but in the hope that life on board ship would afford her new and abundant opportunities of gratifying an insatiable lust. Arrived in Jerusalem she persisted in her shameless life, and on the Feast of the Exaltation of the Cross joined the crowd towards the church where the sacred relic was venerated, hoping to meet in the gathering some new victims whom she might allure into sin. And now came the turning-point in her career. When she reached the church door, she suddenly felt herself repelled by some secret force, and having vainly attempted three or four times to enter, she retired to a corner of the churchyard, and was struck with remorse for her wicked life, which she recognized as the cause of her exclusion from the church. Bursting into bitter tears and beating her breast, she began to bewail her sins. Just then her eyes fell upon a statue of the Blessed Virgin above the spot where she was standing, and in deep faith and humility of heart she besought Our Lady for help, and permission to enter the church and venerate the sacred wood on which Jesus had suffered, promising that if her request were granted, she would then renounce forever the world and its ways, and forthwith depart whithersoever Our Lady might lead her. Encouraged by prayer and counting on the mercy of the Mother of God, she once more approached the door of the church, and this time succeeded in entering without the slightest difficulty. Having adored the Holy Cross and kissed the pavement of the church, she returned to Our Lady's statue, and while praying there for guidance as to her future course, she seemed to hear a voice from afar telling her that if she crossed the Jordan, she would find rest. That same evening Mary reached the Jordan and received Holy Communion in a church dedicated to the Baptist, and the day following crossed the river and wandered eastward into the desert that stretches towards Arabia.

ST. MARY OF EGYPT
Ribera, The Prado, Madrid

Here she had lived absolutely alone for forty-seven years, subsisting apparently on herbs, when a priest and monk, named Zosimus, who after the custom of his brethren had come out from his monastery to spend Lent in the desert, met her and learned from her own lips the strange and romantic story of her life. As soon as they met, she called Zosimus by his name and recognized him as a priest. After they had conversed and prayed together, she begged Zosimus to promise to meet her at the Jordan on Holy Thursday evening of the following year and bring with him the Blessed Sacrament. When the appointed evening arrived, Zosimus, we are told, put into a small chalice a portion of the undefiled Body and the Precious Blood of Our Lord Jesus Christ (P. L., LXXIII, 686: "Mittens in modico calice intemerati corporis portionem et pretiosi sanguinis D.N.J.C." But the reference to both species is less clear in Acta SS., IX, 82: "Accipiens parvum poculum intemerati corporis ac venerandi sanguinis Christi Dei nostri"), and came to the spot that had been indicated. After some time Mary appeared on the eastern bank of the river, and having made the sign of the cross, walked upon the waters to the western side. Having received Holy Communion, she raised her hands towards heaven, and cried aloud in the words of Simeon: "Now thou dost dismiss thy servant, O Lord, according to thy word in peace, because my eyes have seen thy salvation". She then charged Zosimus to come in the course of a year to the spot where he had first met her in the desert, adding that he would find her then in what condition God might ordain. He came, but only to find the poor saint's corpse, and written beside it on the ground a request that he should bury her, and a statement that she had died a year before, on the very night on which he had given her Holy Communion, far away by the Jordan's banks. Aided, we are told, by a lion, he prepared her grave and buried her, and having commended himself and the Church to her prayers, he returned to his monastery, where now for the first time he recounted the wondrous story of her life.

The saint's life was written not very long after her death by one who states that he learned the details from the monks of the monastery to which Zosimus had belonged. Many authorities mention St. Sophronius, who became Patriarch of Jerusalem in 635, as the author; but as the Bollandists give good reasons for believing that the Life was written before 500, we may conclude that it is from some other hand. The

date of the saint is somewhat uncertain. The Bollandists place her death on 1 April, 421, while many other authorities put it a century later. The Greek Church celebrates her feast on 1 April, the Latin on 9 April, while the Roman Martyrology assigns it to 2 April, and the Roman Calendar to 3 April. The Greek date is more likely to be correct; the others may be due to the fact that on those days portions of her relics reached the West. Relics of the saint are venerated at Rome, Naples, Cremona, Antwerp, and some other places.

Acta SS., IX, 67–90; MIGNE, *P. L.*, LXXIII, 671–90; ASSEMANI,, *Kalendaria Ecclesiæ Universæ*, VI, 218–20; BUTLER, *Lives of the Saints*, April 9.

J. MACRORY.

Mary Queen of Scots (MARY STUART), b. at Linlithgow, 7 Dec., 1542; d. at Fotheringay, 8 Feb., 1587. She was the only legitimate child of James V of Scotland. His death (14 December) followed immediately after her birth, and she became queen when only six days old.

The Tudors endeavoured by war to force on a match with Edward VI of England. Mary, however, was sent to France, 7 August, 1548, where she was excellently educated, as is now admitted by both friend and foe. On 24 April, 1558, she married the Dauphin Francis and, on the death of Henri II, 10 July, 1559, became Queen Consort of France. This apparent good fortune was saddened by the loss of Scotland. Immediately after the accession of Elizabeth, her council made plans to "help the divisions" of Scotland by aiding those "inclined to true religion". The revolution broke out in May, and with Elizabeth's aid soon gained the upper hand. There were dynastic, as well as religious, reasons for this policy. Elizabeth's birth being illegitimate, Mary, though excluded by the will of Henry VIII, might claim the English Throne as the legitimate heir. As the state of war still prevailed between the two countries, there was no chance of her being accepted, but her heralds did, later on, emblazon England in her arms, which deeply offended the English Queen. Mary's troubles were still further increased by the Huguenot rising in France, called *le tumulte d'Amboise* (6–17 March, 1560), making it impossible for the French to succour Mary's side in Scotland. At last the starving French garrison of Leith was obliged to yield to a large English force, and Mary's representatives signed the Treaty of Edinburgh (6 July, 1560). One clause of this treaty might have excluded from the English throne all Mary's descendants, amongst them the present reigning house, which claims through her. Mary would never confirm this treaty. Francis II died, 5 December, and Mary, prostrate for a time with grief, awoke to find all power gone and rivals installed in her place. Though the Scottish reformers had at first openly plotted her deposition, a change was making itself felt, and her return was agreed to. Elizabeth refused a passport, and ordered her fleet to watch for Mary's vessel. She sailed in apprehension of the worst, but reached Leith in safety, 19 Aug., 1561.

The political revolution, the vast appropriations of church property, and the frenzied hatred of Knox's followers for Catholicism made any restoration of the old order impossible. Mary contented herself with the new and, by her moderation and management, left time for a gradual return of loyalty. But though she ruled, she did not yet govern. She issued, and frequently repeated, a proclamation accepting religion as she had found it—the first edict of toleration in Great Britain. A slow but steady amelioration of the lot of Catholics took place. At the end of her reign there were no fewer than 12,606 Easter communions at Edinburgh. (See Pollen, "Papal Negociations", 520.) In 1562 Father Nicholas de Gouda visited her from Pope Pius IV, not without danger to his life. He reported himself sadly disappointed in the Scottish bishops, but was almost enthusiastic for the "devout young queen," who "numbers scarce twenty summers" and "is without a single protector or good councillor". Though she still "counteracts the machinations of the heretics to the best of her power . . . there is no mistaking the imminent danger of her position". That was true. Mary was a woman who leant on her advisers with full and wife-like confidence. But, living as she did amongst false friends, she became an utterly bad judge of male advisers. All her misfortunes may be traced to her mistaking flashy attractions for solid worth. Other sovereigns have indeed made favourites of objectionable persons, but few or none have risked or sacrificed everything for them, as Mary did, again and again.

Henry Stuart, Lord Darnley, a great-grandson of Henry VII of England, with claims to both English and Scottish crowns, had always been a possible candidate for Mary's hand, and, as more powerful suitors fell out, his chances improved. He was, moreover, a Catholic, though of an accommodating sort, for he had been brought up at Elizabeth's court, and she in February, 1565, let him go to Scotland. Mary, at first cool, soon fell violently in love. The Protestant lords rose in arms, and Elizabeth backed up their rebellion, but Mary drove them victoriously from the country and married Darnley before the dispensation required to remove the impediment arising from their being first cousins had arrived from Rome. But she did leave enough time for a dispensation to be granted, and it was eventually conceded in a form that would suffice, if that were necessary, for a *sanatio in radice* ("Scottish Historical Review", April, 1907). As soon as the victory had been won, Darnley was found to be changeable, quarrelsome, and, presumably, also vicious. He became violently jealous of David Rizzio, who, so far as we can see, was perfectly innocent and inoffensive, a merry fellow who helped the queen in her foreign correspondence and sometimes amused her with music. Darnley now entered into a band with the same lords who had lately risen in rebellion against him: they were to seize Rizzio in the queen's presence, put him to death, and obtain the crown matrimonial for Darnley, who would secure a pardon for them, and reward them. The plot succeeded: Rizzio, torn from Mary's table, was poignarded outside her door (9 March, 1566). Mary, though kept a prisoner, managed to escape, and again triumphed over her foes; but respect for her husband was no longer possible. Her favourite was now James Hepburn, Earl of Bothwell, who had served her with courage and fidelity, in the late crisis. Then a band for Darnley's murder was signed at Ainsley by most of the nobles who had been implicated in the previous plots. Darnley, who had been ill at Glasgow, was brought back to Edinburgh by his wife, and lay that night in her lodgings at Kirk o' Field. At two next morning (10 February, 1567) the house was blown up by powder, and the boy (he had only just come of age) was killed. Inquiry into the murder was most perfunctory. Bothwell, who was charged with it, was found not guilty by his peers (12 April), and on the 24th he carried Mary off by force to Dunbar, where she consented to marry him. Bothwell thereupon, with scandalous violence, carried a divorce from his wife through both Protestant and Catholic courts, and married Mary (15 May). Exactly a month later the same lords as before raised forces against their whilom confederate and the queen, whom they met at Carberry Hill. Bothwell was allowed to escape, but Mary, who surrendered on the understanding that she should be treated as a queen, was handled with rough violence, and immured in Lochleven Castle.

The original documents on which a verdict as to her guilt should be formed have perished, and a prolonged controversy has arisen over the evidence still acces-

MARY QUEEN OF SCOTS

MARY AS DAUPHINESS (ABOUT 1558)
ASCRIBED TO CLOUET
PICTURE NOW AT STE. GENEVIÈVE

MARY WHILE QUEEN (ABOUT 1562)
PAINTER UNKNOWN
OWNER, THE EARL OF LEVEN AND MELVILLE

MARY IN CAPTIVITY (ABOUT 1578)
THE "BROCAS PORTRAIT"—SHEFFIELD TYPE. PAINTER UNKNOWN
PICTURE NOW IN THE NATIONAL GALLERY, LONDON

MEMORIAL PORTRAIT
PAINTER UNKNOWN
THE ORIGINAL IS AT BLAIRS COLLEGE, ABERDEEN, SCOTLAND

sible. This confusion, however, is largely due to prepossessions. Of late, with the diminution of Protestant rancour and of enthusiasm for the Stuarts, the conflict of opinions has much diminished. The tendency of modern schools is to regard Mary as a participant, though in a minor and still undetermined degree, in the above-mentioned crimes. The arguments are far too complicated to be given here, but that from authority may be indicated. There were several well-informed representative Catholics at Edinburgh during the critical period. The pope had sent Father Edmund Hay, a Jesuit; Philibert Du Croc was there for France, Rubertino Solaro Moretta represented Savoy, while Roche Mamerot, a Dominican, the queen's confessor, was also there. All these, as also the Spanish ambassador in London, represent the Bothwell match as a disgrace involving a slur on her virtue. Her confessor only defends her from participation in the murder of her husband (see Pollen, op. cit., cxxix). The most important documentary evidence is that of the so-called "casket letters", said to have been written by Mary to Bothwell during the fatal crisis. If, on the one hand, their authenticity still lacks final proof, no argument yet brought forward to invalidate them has stood the test of modern criticism.

The defeat at Carberry Hill and the imprisonment at Lochleven were blessings in disguise. The Protestant lords avoided a searching inquiry as much as Mary had done; and she alone suffered, while the others went free. This attracted sympathy once more to her cause. She managed to escape, raised an army, but was defeated at Langside (13 May, 1568) and fled into England, where she found herself once more a prisoner. She did not now refuse to justify herself, but made it a condition that she should appear before Elizabeth in person. But Cecil schemed to bring about such a trial as should finally embroil Mary with the king's lords, as they were now called (for they had crowned the infant James), and so keep the two parties divided, and both dependent on England. This was eventually accomplished in the conferences at York and Westminster before a commission of English peers under the Duke of Norfolk. The casket letters were then produced against Mary, and a thousand filthy charges, afterwards embodied in Buchanan's "Detectio". Mary, however, wisely refused to defend herself, unless her dignity as queen was respected. Eventually an open verdict was found. "Nothing has been sufficiently proved, whereby the Queen of England should conceive an evil opinion of her good sister" (10 January, 1569). Cecil's astuteness had overreached itself. Such a verdict, from an enemy, was everywhere regarded as one of Not Guilty, and Mary's reputation, which had everywhere fallen after the Bothwell match, now quickly revived. Her constancy to her faith, which was clearly the chief cause of her sufferings, made a deep impression on all Catholics, and St. Pius V wrote her a letter, which may be regarded as marking her reconciliation with the papacy (9 January, 1570).

Even before this, a scheme for a declaration of nullity of the marriage with Bothwell, and for a marriage with the Duke of Norfolk, had been suggested and had been supported by what we should now call the Conservative Party among the English peers, a sign that they were not very much impressed by the charges against the Scottish queen, which they had just heard. Norfolk, however, had not the initiative to carry the scheme through. The Catholics in the North rose in his support, but, having no organization, the rising at once collapsed (14 November to 21 December, 1569). Mary had been hurried south by her gaolers, with orders to kill her rather than allow her to escape. So slowly did posts travel in those days that the pope, two months after the collapse of the rising, but not having yet heard of its commencement, excommunicated Elizabeth (25 Feb., 1570) in order to pave the way for the appeal to arms. Both the rising and the excommunication were so independent of the main course of affairs that, when the surprise they caused was over the scheme for the Norfolk marriage resumed its previous course, and an Italian banker, Ridolfi, promised to obtain papal support for it. Lord Acton's erroneous idea, that Ridolfi was employed by Pius V to obtain Elizabeth's assassination, seems to have arisen from a mistranslation of Gabutio's Latin Life of St. Pius in the Bollandists (cf. "Acta SS.", May, IV, 1680, pp. 657, 658, with Catena, "Vita di Pio V", Mantua, 1587, p. 75). Cecil eventually discovered the intrigue; Norfolk was beheaded, 2 June, 1572, and the Puritans clamoured for Mary's blood, but in this particular Elizabeth would not gratify them.

After this Mary's imprisonment continued with great rigour for yet fourteen years, under the Earl of Shrewsbury and Sir Amias Paulet, at Sheffield Castle, Tutbury, Wingfield, and Chartley. But she had so many sympathizers that notes were frequently smuggled in, despite all precautions, and Mary's hopes of eventual release never quite died. The frequent plots of which our Protestant historians so often speak are empty rumours which will not stand historical investigation. Elizabeth's life was never in danger for a moment. Plans for Mary's liberation were indeed occasionally formed abroad, but none of them approached within any measurable distance of realization. Her eventual fall was due to her excessive confidence in Thomas Morgan, an agent, who had shown great skill and energy in contriving means of passing in letters, but who was also a vain, quarrelsome, factious man, always ready to talk treason against Elizabeth. Walsingham's spies therefore frequently offered to carry letters for him, and eventually the treacherous Gilbert Gifford (a seminarist who afterwards got himself made priest in order to carry on his deceits with less suspicion) contrived a channel of correspondence, in which every letter that was sent to or from Mary passed through the hands of Elizabeth's decipherer Thomas Phellips, and was copied by him. As Morgan was now in communication with Ballard, the only priest, so far as we know, who fell a victim to the temptation to plot against Elizabeth, Mary's danger was now grave. In due course Ballard, through Anthony Babington, a young gentleman of wealth, wrote, by Gifford's means, to Mary. It seems that the confederates refused to join the plot unless they had Mary's approval, and Babington wrote to inquire whether Mary would reward them if they "despatched the usurper", and set her free. As Walsingham had two or three *agents provocateurs* keeping company with the conspirators, the suspicion is vehement that Babington was persuaded by them to ask this perilous question, but positive proof of this has not yet been found. Against the advice of her secretaries, Mary answered this letter, promising to reward those who aided her escape, but saying nothing of the assassination (17 July, 1586). Babington and his fellows were now arrested, tried and executed, then Mary's trial began (14 and 15 October). A death sentence was the object desired, and it was of course obtained. Mary freely confessed that she always had sought and always would seek means of escape. As to plots against the life of Elizabeth, she protested "her innocence, and that she had not procured or encouraged any hurt against her Majesty", which was perfectly true. As to the allegation of bare knowledge of treason without having manifested it, the prosecution would not restrict itself to so moderate a charge. Mary, moreover, always contended that the Queen of Scotland did not incur responsibility for the plottings of English subjects, even if she had known of them. Indeed, in those days of royal privilege, her rank would, in most men's minds, have excused her in any case. But Lord Burghley, seeing how much turned on this point of privilege, refused

her all signs of royalty, and she was condemned as "Mary Stuart, commonly called Queen of Scotland". During the whole process of her trial and execution, Mary acted with magnificent courage worthy of her noble character and queenly rank. There can be no question that she died with the charity and magnanimity of a martyr; as also that her execution was due, on the part of her enemies, to hatred of the Faith. Pope Benedict XIV gives it as his opinion that on these two heads no requisite seems wanting for a formal declaration of martyrdom, if only the charges connected with the names of Darnley and Bothwell could be entirely eliminated ("Opera omnia", Prato, 1840, III, c. xiii, s. 10).

At first glance the portraits of Mary appear to be inconsistent with one another and with any handsome original. But modern criticism has reduced genuine portraits to a comparatively small number and shown how they may be reconciled, while their stiff appearance is probably only the result of the unskilful painter's endeavour to represent the quality of majesty. Three chalk sketches by Clouet (Jeanet), representing her at the ages of 9, 16, and 19, are the most reliable for outline. The third, "Le Deuil Blanc", has been several times copied in oil or miniature. For her reign in Scotland no picture seems to be known, except, perhaps, Lord Leven and Melville's, which is interesting as the only one that gives us an idea of life. During her captivity it seems that she was painted in miniatures only, and that from these descend the so-called "Sheffield" type of portraits. A very valuable picture was painted after her death, showing the execution; this, now at Blairs, and its copies (at Windsor, etc.) are called "memorial pictures".

MARY QUEEN OF SCOTS
Hamilton Type, 1700-1710

Documents: Calendars of State Papers (for Scotland, Spain, Venice, and the Foreign Series); TEULET, *Relations politiques de la France et de l'Espagne avec l'Ecosse* (Paris, 1862); LABANOFF, *Lettres . . . de M. S.* (London, 1844); GOODALL, *Examination of the letters said to have been written by M. Q. S.* (Edinburgh, 1754); ANDERSON, *Collections relating to the history of M. Q. S.* (Edinburgh, 1727); STEVENSON, *History of M. S. by Claude Nau* (Edinburgh, 1883); CHANTELAUZE, *M. S., son Procès . . . d'après le journal de Bourgoing* (Paris, 1876); POLLEN, *Papal Negociations with Queen Mary* (Edinburgh, 1901); IDEM, *Letter to Guise* (Edinburgh, 1904); BRESSLAU, *Die Kassettenbriefe*, in SYBEL, *Historische Zeitschrift* (1884), 290–310; SEPP in *Tagebuch*, II, *Anklöger zu York*, etc., III, *Anthony Babington*, and IV, *Process* (Munich, 1822–86); MORRIS, *Letter Books of Sir Amias Poulet* (London, 1874).

Histories: besides LINGARD, TYTLER (P. F.), FROUDE, etc., FLEMING, *Mary Queen of Scots* (London, 1897); HOSACK, *Mary Stuart and her Accusers* (Edinburgh, 1870); LANG, *Mystery of Mary Stuart* (London, 1901); PHILIPPSON, *Règne de Marie Stuart* (Paris, 1891); POLLEN, *Babington Plot*, in *The Month* (London, 1906); STRICKLAND, *Queens of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1850).

Special on Portraits: FOSTER, *Concerning the True Portraiture of M. Q. S.* (London, 1804); CUST, *Notes on the Authentic Portraits of M. Q. S.* (London, 1903); LANG, *Portraits and Jewels of M. S.* (Glasgow, 1906).

J. H. POLLEN.

Mary Tudor, Queen of England from 1553 to 1558; b. 18 Feb., 1516; d. 17 November, 1558. Mary was the daughter and only surviving child of Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon. Cardinal Wolsey was her godfather, and amongst her most intimate friends in early life were Cardinal Pole (q. v.) and his mother, the Countess of Salisbury, put to death in 1539 and now beatified. We know from the report of contemporaries that Mary in her youth did not lack charm. She was by nature modest, affectionate, and kindly. Like all the Tudor princesses she had been well educated, speaking Latin, French, and Spanish with facility, and she was in particular an accomplished musician. Down to the time of the divorce negotiations, Mary was recognised as heir to the throne, and many schemes had been proposed to supply her with a suitable husband. She was indeed affianced for some time to the Emperor Charles V, the father of the man she was afterwards to marry. When, however, Henry VIII became inflexibly determined to put away his first wife, Mary, who was deeply attached to her mother, also fell into disfavour, and shortly afterwards, in 1531, to their great mutual grief, the mother and daughter were forcibly separated. During Anne Boleyn's lifetime as queen, the harshest treatment was shown to "the Lady Mary, the King's natural daughter", and wide-spread rumours affirmed that it was intended to bring both the princess and her mother to the gallows. However, after Queen Catherine's death in January, 1536, and Anne Boleyn's execution, which followed in a few months, the new queen, Jane Seymour, seems to have shown willingness to befriend the king's eldest daughter. Meanwhile very strong pressure was brought to bear by the all-powerful Cromwell, and Mary was at last induced to sign a formal "submission", in which she begged pardon of the king whom she had "obstinately and disobediently offended", renounced "the Bishop of Rome's pretended authority", and acknowledged the marriage between her father and mother to have been contrary to the law of God. It should be noted, however, that Mary signed this paper without reading it (Gairdner, "Lollardy", I, 312; Stone, "Mary I, Queen of England", 125), and by the advice of Chapuys, the imperial ambassador, made a private protestation that she had signed it under compulsion. The degree of favour to which Mary was restored was at first but small, and even this was jeopardized by the sympathy shown for her in the Pilgrimage of Grace, but after the king's marriage to his sixth wife, Catherine Parr, Mary's position improved, and she was named in Henry's will, next to the little Edward, in the succession to the throne.

When Henry died it was inevitable that under the influences which surrounded the young king, Mary should retire into comparative obscurity. She chiefly resided at her manors of Hunsdon, Kenninghall, or Newhall, but during Somerset's protectorate she was not ill-treated. When the celebration of Mass was prohibited, she summoned up courage to take a strong line. She wrote to the Council and appealed to the emperor, and it seemed at one time as if Charles V would actually declare war. Throughout, Mary remained firm, and despite repeated monitions from the Council and a visit from Bishop Ridley, she to all intents and purposes set the government at defiance, so far, at least, as regarded the religious observances followed in her own household. At the same time her relations with her brother remained outwardly friendly, and she paid him visits of state from time to time.

At Edward's death on 6 July, 1553, the news was for some days kept from Mary, Northumberland, the Lord President of the Council, having contrived that the young king should disinherit both his sisters in favour of Northumberland's own daughter-in-law, Lady Jane Grey. The Lord President, backed at first by the Council, made a resolute attempt to secure the

Typogravure Gaupil of Paris (France). *W. A. Mansell & Co., photo.*

MARY STUART, QUEEN OF SCOTLAND, AS WIDOW OF FRANCIS II OF FRANCE

CLOUET, WALLACE GALLERY, LONDON

succession for Lady Jane, but Mary acted promptly and courageously, setting up her standard at Framlingham, where the men of the eastern counties rallied round her and where she was soon joined by some members of the Council. By 19 July Mary had been proclaimed in London, and a few days later Northumberland was arrested.

Mary's success was highly popular, and the friends of the late administration, seeing that resistance was hopeless, hastened to make their peace with her. Her own inclinations were all in favour of clemency, and it was only in deference to the remonstrances of her advisers that she ultimately consented to the execution of the arch-traitor Northumberland with two of his followers. In his hour of distress Northumberland, apparently in all sincerity, professed himself a Catholic. Lady Jane Grey was spared, and even in matters of religion, Mary, perhaps by the advice of Charles V, showed no wish to proceed to extremities. The Catholic bishops of Henry's reign, like Bonner, Tunstall, and Gardiner, were restored to their sees, the intruded bishops were deprived, and some of them, like Ridley, Coverdale, and Hooper, were committed to custody. Cranmer, after he had challenged the Catholic party to meet him and Peter Martyr in disputation, was committed to the Tower upon a by no means frivolous charge of having participated in the late futile rebellion. But no blood was shed for religion at this stage.

In September Mary was crowned with great pomp at Westminster by Gardiner, in spite of the excommunication which still lay upon the country, but this act was only due to the constitutional *impasse* which would have been created had this sanction to the royal authority been longer delayed. Mary had no wish to refuse obedience to papal authority. On the contrary, negotiations had already been opened with the Holy See which resulted in the nomination of Pole as legate to reconcile the kingdom. Parliament met, 5 October, 1553. It repealed the savage Treason Act of Northumberland's government, passed an Act declaring the queen legitimate, another for the restitution of the Mass in Latin, though without penalties for non-conformity, and another for the celibacy of the clergy. Meanwhile Mary, owing perhaps partly to the fact that she fell much under the influence of the Spanish ambassador, Renard, had made up her mind to marry Philip of Spain. The suggestion was not very palatable to the nation as represented by the lower house of Parliament, but the queen persisted, and a treaty of marriage was drawn up in which English liberties were carefully safeguarded. All the Spanish influence was exercised to carry this scheme safely through, and at the emperor's instigation Pole was deliberately detained on his way to England under the apprehension that he might oppose the match. The unpopularity of the projected alliance encouraged Sir Thomas Wyatt to organize a rebellion, which at one time, 29 Jan., 1554, looked very formidable. Mary behaved with conspicuous courage, addressed the citizens of London at the Guildhall, and when they rallied round her the insurrection was easily crushed. The security of the State seemed now to require stern measures. The leaders of the revolt were executed and with them the unfortunate Lady Jane Grey. Whether Mary's sister Elizabeth was implicated in this movement has never quite been made clear, but mercy was shown to her as well as to many others.

Meanwhile the restoration of the old religion went on vigorously. The altars were set up again, the married clergy were deprived, High Mass was sung at St. Paul's, and new bishops were consecrated according to the ancient ritual. In Mary's second Parliament the title of supreme head was formally abrogated, and an attempt was made to re-enact the statutes against heresy, but was defeated by the resistance of the Lords. Some of this resistance undoubtedly came from the apprehension which prevailed that the complete re-establishment of Catholicism could only be effected at the price of the restitution of the abbey lands to the Church. When, however, the marriage of Mary and Philip had taken place (25 July), and the Holy See had given assurances that the impropriators of Church property would not be molested, Pole towards the end of November was at last allowed to make his way to London. On 30 Nov., he pronounced the absolution of the kingdom over the king and queen and Parliament all kneeling before him. In was this same Parliament which in December, 1554, re-enacted the ancient statutes against heresy and repealed the enactments which had been made against Rome in the last two reigns.

All this seems to have excited much feeling among the more fanatical of the Reformers, men who for some years past had railed against the pope and denounced Transubstantiation with impunity. Mary and her advisers were probably right in thinking that religious peace was impossible unless these fanatics were silenced, and they started once more to enforce those penalties for heresy which after all had never ceased to be familiar. Both under Henry VIII and Edward VI men had been burned for religion, and Protestant bishops like Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley had had a principal hand in their burning. It seems to be generally admitted now that no vindictive thirst for blood prompted the deplorable severities which followed, but they have weighed heavily upon the memory of Mary, and it seems on the whole most probable that in her conscientious but misguided zeal for the peace of the Church, she was herself principally responsible for them. In less than four years 277 persons were burned to death. Some, like Bishops Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley, were men of influence and high position, but the majority belonged to the lower orders. Still these last were dangerous, because, as Dr. Gairdner has pointed out, heresy and sedition were at that time almost convertible terms. In regard to these executions, a much more lenient and at the same time more equitable judgment now prevails than was formerly the case. As one recent writer observes, Mary and her advisers "honestly believed themselves to be applying the only remedy left for the removal of a mortal disease from the body politic. . . . What they did was on an unprecedented scale in England because heresy existed on an unprecedented scale" (Innes, "England under the Tudors", 232; and cf. Gairdner, "Lollardy", I, 327).

Something, perhaps, of Mary's severity, which was in contradiction to the clemency and generosity uniformly shown in the rest of her life, may be attributed to the bitterness which seems to have been concentrated into these last years. Long an invalid, she had had more than one serious illness during the reign of her brother. But the dropsy had now become chronic, and she was in truth a doomed woman. Again it was her misfortune to have conceived a passionate love for her husband. Philip had never returned this affection, and when the hope of her bearing him an heir proved illusory, he treated her with scant consideration and quitted England forever. Then in Mary's last year of life came the loss of Calais, and this was followed by misunderstandings with the Holy See for which she had sacrificed so much. No wonder the Queen sank under this accumulated weight of disappointments. Mary died most piously, as she had always lived, a few hours before her staunch friend, Cardinal Pole. Her good qualities were many. To the very end she was a woman capable of inspiring affection in those who came in contact with her. Modern historians are almost unanimous in regarding the sad story of this noble but disappointed woman as one of the most tragic in history.

STONE, *Mary I, Queen of England* (London, 1901); ZIMMERMANN, *Maria die Katholische* (Freiburg, 1896); LINGARD, *Hist. of*

England, V; INNES, *England under the Tudors* (London, 1905); GAIRDNER, *Lollardy* (2 vols., London, 1908); IDEM, *History of the Eng. Church in the sixteenth Century* (London, 1902); BASS-MULLINGER in *Cambridge Modern History*, II (Cambridge, 1905); SIDNEY LEE in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*; STRICKLAND, *Lives of the Queens of England*, II.

HERBERT THURSTON.

Masaccio (TOMMASO), Italian painter, b. about 1402, at San Giovanni di Valdarno, a stronghold situated between Arezzo and Florence; d., probably at Rome, in 1429. His correct name was Tommaso di ser Giovanni di Simone dei Guidi, which may be translated "Thomas, son of Sir John, grandson of Simon, of the Guidi clan." His family had given many magistrates to the Republic of Florence in earlier days, but when Thomas was born prosperity had forsaken them: his father was a poor notary in a small country community. His familiar name of *Masaccio* is an augmented form of *Maso* (short for *Tommaso*) and means "Big Tom", with a shade of depreciation. By this name, if we are to believe Vasari, his Florentine contemporaries indicated after their fashion the oddities of his character—"He was absent-minded, whimsical, as one who, having fastened his whole mind and will upon the things of art, paid little attention to himself and still less to other people."

Masaccio's master was Tommaso di Cristofano di Fino, known as Masolino da Panicale, *Masolino* meaning "Little Tom" (see MASOLINO). Masaccio was very precocious: we find him at the age of nineteen already enrolled among the *Speziali* (Grocers, or Spicers), one of the "arts", or guilds. The *Speziali* included painters among its members. After a few essays which earned him some degree of reputation, he was commissioned to continue the decoration of the Brancacci chapel at Florence, which his master, Masolino, had begun. This was, according to some authorities, in 1424; according to others in 1426; so that he cannot have been more than twenty-four years old. The work did not make him rich. Absorbed in the things that pertain to art, he knew nothing about sublunary business matters. The state register of property for 1427 shows that Masaccio "possesses nothing of his own, owes one hundred and two *lire* to one painter, and six florins to another; that nearly all his clothing is in pawn at the Lion and the Cow loan-offices". Suddenly he left Florence, and there is evidence of his presence at Rome in 1428 The cause of this precipitate departure is unknown; in any case, the unhappy man did not succeed in bettering his material condition, for he died of grief and want in 1429 or later.

Many of Masaccio's works are lost. In the Spada chapel, in the Church of Santa Maria Novella at Florence, he painted a "Trinity" between the Virgin and St. John, with kneeling portraits of the two donors at the sides. This grandiose work is, unfortunately, much damaged. In the Academy of Florence is to be seen a "St. Anne with Madonna and Infant Jesus". A. F. Rio discovered in the Naples Museum a small Masaccio which Vasari had heard Michelangelo praise very highly, but of which all trace had been lost. "Here we have Pope Liberius, represented under the lineaments of Martin V, outlining on the snow-covered ground the foundations of the Basilica of Sta. Maria Maggiore, in the midst of an imposing *cortège* of cardinals and other personages, all painted from life" (Rio, "L'Art chrétien", II, Paris, 1861, p. 13). This picture is known as "The Founding of St. Mary of the Snows at Rome". Some portraits in the Uffizi—notably one of a frail, melancholy youth—which were for a long time attributed to Masaccio, have now, and correctly, been assigned to Filippino Lippi and other later masters. But Masaccio's chief work is the pictorial decoration of the Brancacci chapel, in the south transept of the Church of Sta. Maria del Carmine. In this work, begun by Masolino and finished by Filippino Lippi, the intermediate portion is Masaccio's—"Adam and Eve driven out of Paradise", "Christ ordering St. Peter to pay the Tribute", "St. Peter and St. John healing the Sick", "St. Peter giving Alms", "St. Peter Baptizing", "St. Peter restoring a King's Son to Life". This last fresco was finished by Filippino. While Masaccio worked at the paintings in the Brancacci chapel, the church of which it was a part was consecrated: he "represents this ceremony in chiaroscuro over the door leading from the church to the cloister" (Vasari) and introduces a great many portraits of important persons in the group of citizens who follow the procession. Here, too, he has painted the convent porter, with his bunch of keys. This famous "Procession" perished when the church was reconstructed in 1612, but the old porter has survived, a marvellously executed portrait still to be seen in the Uffizi. It seems that the fashion of painting liknesses of contemporaries was set by Masaccio. He has not forgotten to give his own portrait a good place, in the fresco where St. Peter is paying the tribute.

Moderately esteemed in his own time, Masaccio was accorded enthusiastic admiration only after his death; but—as is only rarely the case—the enthusiasm has not cooled in the duration of five centuries: it has even degenerated into excessive adulation. Masaccio is preached as a "Messias without a Precursor", an "autodidact", a self-teacher, without an ancestor in the past. His insight into nature, his scientific perspective and foreshortening have been loudly acclaimed, and with reason. But Giotto and his faithful disciples, before Masaccio, had given Florentine painting the impulse towards an intelligent representation of nature which necessarily produced great results. His admirers justly vaunt the noble gravity of his figures, the suppleness and simplicity of his draperies, the harmony of his compositions, and his grasp of light and shadow; but the germs of these precious qualities had already existed in the frescoes of Masolino, his master and initiator, and Florentine artists before him had wrought with the double ambition of expressing the real and the ideal—the visible element and the invisible. Between these two opposite aims they were more or less distracted; the difficult thing—and the vital—is to so associate the two that in subordinating the accessory to the principal—the expressive form to the substance it expresses—the union may result in a puissant and well-ordered work of art. It is Masaccio's glory to have succeeded in doing this almost superlatively well; this explains his lasting fame and his unfailing influence. All through the fifteenth century and after it, the Brancacci chapel was the chosen rendezvous of artists: as Ingres said, "It should be regarded and venerated as the paternal mansion of the great schools."

VASARI, *Le vite de' più eccellenti pittori, scultori e architettori*, ed. MILANESI, II (Florence, 1878), 287–325; BALDINUCCI, *Opere*, I (Milan, 1808–12), I, 460 sqq., CROWE AND CAVALCASELLE, *A New History of Painting in Italy*, I (London, 1864), XXV, 519–50; BLANC, *Histoire des peintres de toutes les Écoles; École Florentine* (Paris, 1865–1877; THAUSING, *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst herausgegeben von Dr. Carl von Lutzoro*, XI, 225; XII, 175 sqq.; LAYARD, *The Brancaccio Chapel* (Arundel Society, 1868); DELABORDE, *Des œuvres et de la manière de Masaccio* in *Gazette des Beaux-Arts* (Paris, 1876); LÜBKE, *Geschichte der italienischen Malerei*, I (Stuttgart, 1878), 285 sqq.; MÜNTZ, *Histoire de l'art pendant la Renaissance*, I, Bk. V, ii, 603–19. SCHMARZOW, *Masaccio-Studien* (Cassel, 1895–1900); *Masaccio. Ricordo delle onoranze rese in San Giovanni di Valdarno in occasione del V centenario della sua nascita* (Florence, 1904); JODOCO DELLA BADIA, *Masaccio e Giovanni suo fratello* in *Rassegna Nazionale* (Nov., 1904), 143–46; SORTAIS, *Études philosophiques et sociales: L'esthétique de Masaccio*, VIII (Paris, 1907), 371–409; VENTURI, *Storia dell' Arte italiana; La pittura del Quattrocento*, VII (Milan, 1910).

G. SORTAIS.

Mascoutens Indians.—A Wisconsin tribe of Algonquian stock, of considerable missionary importance in the seventeenth century, but long since entirely extinct. Their language was a dialect of that common to the Sauk, Fox, and Kickapoo, with whom, as also with the Miami, they were usually in close alliance, while maintaining hereditary warfare with the Iro-

MARY TUDOR, QUEEN OF ENGLAND

ANTONIO MORO, THE PRADO, MADRID

quois and Sioux. The Algonquian name by which they are generally known signifies "people of the little prairie". In the earlier French records they are known as the "Fire Nation" (*Gens de Feu*), from the Huron name Asistazeronon (people at the fireplace), properly a rendering of the tribal name of the Potawatomi. The mistake arose from the fact of the close proximity of the two tribes, and the further fact of the resemblance of the Algonquian roots for fire (*ishkoté*) and prairie (*mashkoté*). It is certain, as shown by Hewitt, that the Fire Nation of some of the earliest notices are the Potawatomi. The confusion persisted until the Western tribes had become better known. The Mascoutens were first visited by Champlain's venturesome interpreter, Jean Nicolet, in 1634, at their town on upper Fox River. In 1654–55 the explorers, Radisson and Groseilliers, also stopped at the same town, which, as later, the Mascoutens occupied jointly with the Miami. The location of this town is a matter of dispute, but it is generally agreed to have been near Fox River, within the present limits of Green Lake County or the northern part of Columbia county.

In 1669, the pioneer Jesuit explorer, Father Claude Allouez, established the mission of Saint-François-Xavier at the rapids of Fox River, about the present Depere, Wisconsin, as a central station for the evangelization of the tribes between Lake Michigan and the Mississippi. In the spring of the next year, 1670, with two French companions, he visited the "Mahoutensak", partly to compose some differences which the tribe already had with the French traders. He was received as an actual manitou, with ceremonial feasts, anointing of the limbs of himself and his companions, and "a veritable sacrifice like that which they made to their false gods", being invoked at the same time to give them victory against their enemies, abundant crops, and immunity from disease and famine. The missionary at once let them know that he was not a god, but a servant of the True God, proceeding with an explanation of the Christian doctrine, to which they listened with reverence. In September of the same year, in company with the Jesuit Father Claude Dablon, he made a second missionary visit to the town, preaching to the Indians, who crowded to hear them both day and night, with the greatest eagerness and attention. The teaching was given in the Miami language.

The town was a frequent rendezvous for several tribes, and on some occasions must have had several thousand Indians assembled in its neighbourhood. Its regular occupants were the Mascoutens, and a part of the Miami, estimated by Dablon, in 1670, at about four hundred warriors each, or, as he says, over three thousand souls. The Mascoutens may have numbered fifteen hundred souls. He describes the town as beautifully situated on a small hill in the midst of extensive prairies, interspersed with groves and abounding in herds of buffalo. It was palisaded for defence against the Iroquois, who carried their destructive raids even to the Mississippi. Besides the buffalo, there were fields of corn, squashes, and tobacco, with an abundance of wild grapes, and plums, and probably also stores of wild rice. Notwithstanding all this, their natural improvidence made life an alternation of feasting and famine. Of the two tribes the Miami were the more polished. The houses were light structures covered with mats of woven rushes. The people were given to heathenism, offering almost daily sacrifices to the sun, the thunder, the buffalo, the bear, and to the special manitou which came to them in dreams. Sickness was attributed to evil spirits or witchcraft, to be exorcised by their medicine-men. In their cabins they kept buffalo skulls to which they made sacrifice, and sometimes the stuffed skin of a bear erected upon a pole. Like the other tribes of the region, they sometimes ate prisoners of war.

In 1672, Allouez established in the town a regular mission which he named Saint-Jacques, building a special cabin for a chapel, and setting up two large crosses, which the Indians decorated with offerings of dressed skins and beaded belts. For lack of missionaries, however, he was only able to serve it through occasional visits from Saint-François-Xavier near Green Bay, in consequence of which its growth was slow. In the next year Marquette and Joliet stopped there and procured guides for their voyage of discovery. In 1678, Allouez was transferred to the Illinois mission, while his assistant, Father Antoine Silvy, was recalled to Canada, his place being filled by Father André Bonnault. Up to this time there had been over five hundred baptisms of various tribes at the Mascoutens mission. In 1692, the heroic Father Sebastien Rasles also stopped there on his way to the Illinois station, and reported the mission as still dependent on occasional visits from Green Bay. This is apparently the last notice of the Mascoutens mission, which seems to have dwindled out from neglect, and from the growing hostility manifested toward the French by the Sauk, Foxes, and Kickapoo, with whom the Mascoutens were so closely connected. In 1702, a band of the tribe had drifted down into Southern Illinois, and had their village on the Ohio near to the French post of Fort Massac. Here Father Jean Mermet, stationed at the post, attempted to minister to them, but found them entirely under the influence of their medicine men and opposed to Christianity. In the meantime an epidemic visited the village, killing many daily. The missionary did what he could to relieve the sick, even baptizing some of the dying at their own request, his only reward being abuse and attempts upon his life. To appease the disease-spirit the Indians organized dances at which they sacrificed some forty dogs, carrying them at the ends of poles while dancing. They were finally driven to ask the aid and prayers of the priest, but in spite of all more than half the band perished.

In 1712, the Mascoutens, with the Kickapoo and Sauk, joined the Foxes in the war which the latter inaugurated against the French, and continued in desultory fashion for some thirty years. In 1728 Father Michel (or Louis-Ignace) Guignas, while descending the Mississippi, was taken near the mouth of the Wisconsin by a party of Mascoutens and Kickapoo, held for several months, and finally condemned to be burnt, but rescued by being adopted by an old man. Through his mediation they made peace with the French, and afterwards took him to spend the winter of 1729–30 with them (Le Petit). It is evident that by this time the Mascoutens were near their end, reduced partly by wars, but more by the great epidemics which wiped out the tribes of the Illinois country. In 1736 they are officially reported by Chauvignerie as eighty warriors, about three hundred souls, still on Fox River, in connexion with the Kickapoo and Foxes, with whom they were probably finally incorporated. They are not named in Sir William Johnson's list of Western tribes in 1763, and are last mentioned by Hutchins in 1778, as living then on the Wabash in company with the Kickapoo, Miami, and Piankishaw.

Jesuit Relations, Thwaites ed., especially vols. I, V, VIII, XXVIII, XLIV, LIV (*Allouez*), LV (*Dablon*), LVIII (*Allouez*), LIX (*Marquette and Allouez*), LX, LXI, LXVI (*Marest, Mermet*), LXVIII (*Le Petit*) (Cleveland, 1896–1901); Chauvignerie's list in Schoolcraft, *Ind. Tribes*, III (Philadelphia, 1853); Hutchins, *Topographical Description* (London, 1778); Shea, *Catholic Ind. Missions* (New York, 1855).

James Mooney.

Mashonaland, Ruins of. See Solomon.

Masolino da Panicale, son of Cristoforo Fini; b. in the suburb of Panicale di Valdese, near Florence, 1383; d. c. 1440. It is said that he was a pupil of Starnina, several of whose frescoes in charming taste heralding the Renaissance are in the Cathedral of Prato. Established at Florence Masolino was received in 1423 a member of the corporation of druggists or grocers

(*speziali*) which then included painters. A document discovered by Milanesi informs us that in July, 1423, he was occupied on the celebrated paintings of the Brancacci chapel in the Church of the Carmine. Here he was again at work in 1426. In 1427 he was in Hungary in the service of the famous Florentine adventurer, Filipo Scolari (Pippo Spano as he is surnamed). Between 1428 and 1435 he executed near Varese, at Castiglione d'Olona, paintings discovered forty years since in the baptistery and collegiate church. He died four or five years later aged, not 37 as Vasari states, but 57 years. Masolino's glory is to have collaborated in the Carmine and to be also the master and forerunner of Masaccio. He played an important part in the development of the Renaissance, but it is far from being as considerable or as "providential" as ancient historians have claimed.

At the beginning of the fifteenth century the Renaissance was at hand; in all countries simultaneously and nearly everywhere it had the same characteristics. For example the work of the Limbourgs belongs to 1416, and some miniatures of their calendar might almost be mistaken for certain pictures of Gentile da Fabriano, whose "Adoration of the Kings" belongs to 1423. Similar figures are found in Masolino's work in the Brancacci Chapel, such as the pretty group of Florentine gentlemen in the "Preaching of St. Peter". The delicate taste of the architecture, the pleasing sense of the landscape are still general traits of the art of this period. When Masolino came to Florence he was more than forty years old. All agree at present in attributing to him the frescoes in the Church of San Clemente at Rome, which Vasari regards as the work of Masaccio's youth. They may be placed about 1415. They represent scenes from the life of St. Ambrose and the life of St. Catherine. The latter have been often restored. What is remarkable about these frescoes is not that they differ from many Giottesque works (nearly all the traditional ideas and customs have been followed), neither is it that the painter shows great skill, but he has a wholly new sense of grace and beauty, an innate gift of elegance, and that inexpressible quality which we call "charm." It seems as though a breath of youth passed over the art of painting and thawed the ancient formulas. There is nothing more ravishing than the figures of the women, especially the young girls. The little Catherine, converting the wife of the Emperor Maxentius, is a virginal vision of childish beauty whose sweetness has only been surpassed by Angelico. It is especially in the large "Calvary" behind the altar that this atmosphere of ingenuousness is felt. The immense landscape of undulating hills, on which is unfolded the feebly composed scene, redeems all the defects of composition such as absence of the pathetic and lack of unity in the grouping. One is conscious only of a peace, an enchantment of nature which resembles the state of grace.

Some of these merits are found in the frescoes in the Carmine. As indicated by its reputation this celebrated work must be its author's most considerable composition. He painted only three of these compositions: on one of the pillars in the entrance the "Temptation of Adam and Eve", and in the chapel itself the "Preaching and the Miracles of St. Peter", which is the best of all, and comprises two distinct episodes: the "Cure of the Paralytic" and the "Resurrection of Tabitha". Deserving of admiration are the figures of the Apostles and the accuracy of observation in the attitude of the cripple and the risen woman. But what constitutes the value of these works, and is also found in the frescoes of San Clemente, is a sober and spiritual grace and a delightful sense, at once familiar and refined, of life. It is this quality, also, that imparts value to the frescoes at Castiglione d'Olona, the last and most animated of his works. His "Life of St. John the Baptist" abounds in lively traits. The beautiful costumes and portraits, the graceful attire of the women, his Herodiases and Salomes, are charming. At need the painter gives proof of technical knowledge; he develops fair perspectives composed of delicate architecture in the antique manner. But all this for him is but the frame, full of fancy and taste, wherein transpire charming scenes of Florentine life. Thus in the "Baptism of Christ" the group of neophytes robing, the man seated putting on his shoes, and the one who, bare-limbed awaiting his turn, shivers in his cloak, form a *genre* picture which is full of spirit and charm.

Masaccio treated the same subject at the Carmine with his customary grandeur; Masolino sees in it only a familiar study, similar to the "Baths" or "Studies" of the German prints, but in which only a Florentine could put such a lively sense of beauty. Opposite, the trio of angels bearing the garments of Christ recall the most exquisite figures of the "Life of St. Catherine". But above all there is that general air of spring and adolescence, that unique feeling of youth which is the charm of that age, and which we find in Gentile and Pesellino, but which lasted only a moment and was seen no more. Vasari realized this: "He was the first to impart more sweetness to his figures of women, to give more graceful demeanour to his young men. . . . He treated skilfully the play of light and shade. . . . His pictures are blended with such grace that they have all the suppleness imaginable. . . . It is very difficult to say whether Masaccio really owes anything to Masolino. The genius of this sublime young man transcends ordinary rules; he brought about a revolution in the school, and hastened by fifty years the development of the Renaissance. But without the interference of this sudden and tremendous force the Renaissance would have arrived of itself, less great perhaps, less learned, but more gently. Masolino shows us what the blossoming would have been had it not been for Masaccio's *coup d'état.*"

VASARI, ed. MILANESI (Florence, 1878, 1885); CROWE AND CAVALCASALLE, *History of painting in Italy* (London, 1864–66); LÜBKE, *Masolino and Masaccio* in *Jahrbücher für Kunstwissenschaft* (1870), 75–79; 280–286; SCHMARZOW, *Masaccio: Studien* (Cassel, 1895–1900); WICKHOFF, *Die Fresken der Katharinekapelle in S. Clemente zu Rom.* in *Zeitschrift für Bildende Kunst* (1889), 306; MÜNTZ, *Histoire de l'Art pendant la Renaissance*, Vol. I, *Les Primitives* (Paris, 1888); GUTHMANN, *Die Landschaftmalerei . . . von Giotto bis Rafael* (Leipzig, 1902); ROSEN, *Die Natur in der Kunst* (Leipzig, 1903); BERENSON, *Florentine Painters of the Renaissance* (London, 2nd ed., 1904).

LOUIS GILLET.

Mason, RICHARD ANGELUS A S. FRANCISCO, English—or Irish—Franciscan writer; b. in Wiltshire, 1599; d. at Douai, 30 Dec., 1678. There is some dispute as to the nationality of his extraction: while it is agreed that he was a native of the English county of Wiltshire, a Franciscan MS. record, dated 1721, mentions his having been "for some time dean of a Catholick deanery in Ireland", conveying a suggestion that his family may have been Irish: Gillow (Bibl. Dict. of the English Catholics) thinks that if Mason ever held a deanery in Ireland, it must have been under the Protestant Establishment, in which case Father Angelus, as he was known among his contemporaries, would have to be reckoned among the seventeenth-century converts. The MS. mention of his "Catholick deanery", however, was written forty-three years after Mason's death, and there is evidence that he was ordained priest at Douai four years after his profession in the Seraphic Order, the latter event having taken place in 1629. In any case he rapidly became eminent in the order, being created a doctor of divinity and appointed successively to the high administrative offices of definitor, guardian, and visitor of the province of Brabant. Elected provincial in 1659, he visited Paris in an unsuccessful attempt to obtain permission for the settlement there of a colony of Franciscan sisters from the convent at Nieuport (Flanders) to which he had been confessor. From

1662 to 1675 he lived in England, as domestic chaplain to Lord Arundell of Wardour, after which period he retired to the convent at Douai to prepare for death.

Father Angelus displayed, in the course of his long, and otherwise busy, religious life, a remarkable industry in both original composition and the compilation of devotional manuals. The latter include his "Manuale Tertii Ordinis S. Francisci", with a commentary on the Rule, and meditations (Douai, 1643), "The Rule of Penance of the Seraphical Father St. Francis" (Douai, 1644); "Sacrarium privilegiorum quorundam Seraphico P. S. Francisco . . . indultorum" (Douai, 1636). Among his historical writings are "Certamen Seraphicum Provinciæ Angliæ pro Sancta Dei Ecclesia" (Douai, 1649), a review of distinguished English Franciscan martyrs and polemical writers, and "Apologia pro Scoto Anglo" (Douai, 1656).—The last-named work has for its main scope the establishment, against Colgan, of the thesis that the great Franciscan philosopher, Duns Scotus, was not an Irishman, but an Englishman: it may be fairly inferred that its author, if he himself was of Irish descent, was not fully conscious of the fact.—His "Liturgical Discourse of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass" (s. l., 1670, dedicated to Henry, Lord Arundell of Wardour, "Master of the Horse to our late Queen Mother Henrietta Maria"), was abridged in the "Holy Altar and Sacrifice Explained" which Father Pacificus Baker, O. S. F., published at the request of Bishop James Talbot (London, 1768).

GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.*; HARRIS, *Ware's Writers of Ireland*, 336; OLIVER, *Collections* (London, 1845), 193, 229, 541, 554, 568; WADDING, *Script. Ord. Minor.*

E. MACPHERSON.

Masonry (FREEMASONRY).—The subject is treated under the following heads: I. Name and Definition; II. Origin and Early History; III. Fundamental Principles and Spirit; IV. Propagation and Evolution; V. Organization and Statistics; VI. Inner Work; VII. Outer Work; VIII. Action of State and Church.

The following are the abbreviations of masonic terms used in this article:—Fy, Fs, My, Ms, Mn, mas.= Freemasonry, Freemasons, Freemason, Masonry, masonic, etc; L., Ls., GL, GLs, GO, GOs, Supr. Counc., GBs=Lodge, Lodges, Grand Lodge, Gr. Orient, Supreme Council, Gr. Bodies, etc.—GM, GC.,=Grandmaster, Grand Commander.

Abbreviations of more frequently quoted books and magazines: K.=Keystone (Philadelphia). V= "Voice of Masonry", later on: "Masonic Voice and Review" (Chicago). Chr.="Freemason's Chronicle" (London); A. Q. C.="Ars Quatuor Coronatorum". Transactions (London), the best scientific mas. magazine; Bauh.=Bauhütte; Sign.="Signale für die deutsche Maurerwelt" (Leipzig); Enc., Cycl., Handb.= Encyclopedia, "Allgemeines Handbuch der Freimaurerei" (Universal Manual of Freemasonry) Leipzig. This latter German encyclopedia, in its three editions, quite different from each other, but all of them containing valuable and accurate information, is considered even by English and American masonic criticism (A. Q. C., XI, 1898, 64) as far and away the best masonic encyclopedia ever published.

Abbreviation of name of author: Ol.=Oliver.

Key to numbers: An Arabic number after the name of an author of several works indicates the work marked with the same number in the bibliography closing the article.

Other numbers are to be judged according to the general rules maintained throughout the ENCYCLOPEDIA.

I. NAME AND DEFINITION.—Leaving aside various fanciful derivations we may trace the word *mason* to the French *maçon* (Latin *matio* or *machio*), "a builder of walls" or "a stone-cutter" (cf. German *Steinmetz*, from *metzen*, "to cut"; and Dutch *vrijmetselaar*). The compound term *Freemason* occurs first in 1375—according to a recently found writing, even prior to 1155 (The Freemason's Chronicle, 1908, I, 283, frequently referred to in this article as Chr.)—and, contrary to Gould (Concise Hist., 109, 122), means primarily a mason of superior skill, though later it also designated one who enjoyed the freedom, or the privilege, of a trade guild (Gould, "Hist.", I, 378, 379, 410; II, 153 sqq.). In the former sense it is commonly derived from *freestone-mason*, a mason hewing or building in free (ornamental) stone in opposition to a rough (stone) mason (A. Q. C., VIII, 35, 155 sq.; Boos, 104 sqq.). This derivation, though harmonizing with the meaning of the term, seemed unsatisfactory to some scholars. Hence Speth proposed to interpret the word *freemasons* as referring to those masons claiming exemption from the control of the local guilds of the towns, where they temporarily settled (A. Q. C., X, 10–30; IX, 167). In accordance with this suggestion the "New English Dictionary of the Philological Society" (Oxford, 1898) favours the interpretation of *freemasons* as skilled artisans, emancipated according to the medieval practice from the restrictions and control of local guilds in order that they might be able to travel and render services, wherever any great building (cathedral, etc.) was in process of construction. These freemasons formed a universal craft for themselves, with a system of secret signs and passwords by which a craftsman, who had been admitted on giving evidence of competent skill, could be recognized. On the decline of Gothic architecture this craft coalesced with the mason guilds (A. Q. C., XI, 166–168).

Quite recently W. Begemann (Vorgeschichte, I, 1909, 42–58) combats the opinion of Speth (A. Q. C., X, 20–22) as purely hypothetical, stating that the name *freemason* originally designated particularly skilled freestone-masons, needed at the time of the most magnificent evolution of Gothic architecture, and nothing else. In English law the word *freemason* is first mentioned in 1495, while *frank-mason* occurs already in an Act of 1444–1445 (Gould, "Concise History", 166 sq.). Later, *freemason* and *mason* were used as convertible terms. The modern signification of Freemasonry in which, since about 1750, the word has been universally and exclusively understood, dates only from the constitution of the Grand Lodge of England, 1717. In this acceptation Freemasonry, according to the official English, Scottish, American, etc., craft rituals, is most generally defined: "A peculiar [some say "particular" or "beautiful"] system of morality veiled in allegory and illustrated by symbols." Mackey (Symbolism of Freemasonry, 1869, 303) declares the best definition of Freemasonry to be: "A science which is engaged in the search after the divine truth." The German encyclopedia of Freemasonry, "Handbuch" (1900, I, 320 sq.), defines Freemasonry as "the activity of closely united men who, employing symbolical forms borrowed principally from the mason's trade and from architecture, work for the welfare of mankind, striving morally to ennoble themselves and others and thereby to bring about a universal league of mankind [*Menschheitsbund*], which they aspire to exhibit even now on a small scale". The three editions which this "Handbuch" (Universal Manual of Freemasonry) has had since 1822 are most valuable, the work having been declared by English-speaking Masonic critics "by far the best Masonic Encyclopedia ever published" ["Transactions of the Lodge Ars Quatuor Coronatorum", XI (London, 1898), 64].

II. ORIGIN AND EARLY HISTORY.—Before entering upon this and the following divisions of our subject it is necessary to premise that the very nature of Freemasonry as a secret society makes it difficult to be sure even of its reputed documents and authorities, and therefore we have consulted only those which are acknowledged

and recommended by responsible members of the craft, as stated in the bibliography appended to this article. "It is the opprobrium of Freemasonry", says Mackey (Encyclopedia, 296), "that its history has never yet been written in a spirit of critical truth; that credulity . . . has been the foundation on which all masonic historical investigations have been built, . . . that the missing links of a chain of evidence have been frequently supplied by gratuitous invention and that statements of vast importance have been carelessly sustained by the testimony of documents whose authenticity has not been proved." "The historical portion of old records", he adds, "as written by Anderson, Preston, Smith, Calcott and other writers of that generation, was little more than a collection of fables, so absurd as to excite the smile of every reader" (Chr., 1890, II, 145). The germs of nearly all these fantastic theories are contained in Anderson's "The Constitutions of Free Masons" (1723, 1738) which makes Freemasonry coextensive with geometry and the arts based on it; insinuates that God, the Great Architect, founded Freemasonry, and that it had for patrons, Adam, the Patriarchs, the kings and philosophers of old. Even Jesus Christ is included in the list as Grand Master of the Christian Church. Masonry is credited with the building of Noah's Ark, the Tower of Babel, the Pyramids, and Solomon's Temple. Subsequent authors find the origin of Masonry in the Egyptian, Dionysiac, Eleusinian, Mithraic, and Druidic mysteries; in sects and schools such as the Pythagoreans, Essenes, Culdees, Zoroastrians, and Gnostics; in the Evangelical societies that preceded the Reformation; in the orders of knighthood (Johannites, Templars); among the alchemists, Rosicrucians, and Cabbalists; in Chinese and Arabic secret societies. It is claimed also that Pythagoras founded the Druidic institution and hence that Masonry probably existed in England 500 years before the Christian Era. Some authors, considering geological finds as Masonic emblems, trace Masonry to the Miocene (?) Period (Donnelly, "Atlantis the Antediluvian World"); while others pretend that Masonic science "existed before the creation of this globe, diffused amidst the numerous systems with which the grand empyreum of universal space is furnished" (Oliver, I, 20, sq.).

It is not then difficult to understand that the attempt to prove the antiquity of Freemasonry with evidence supplied by such monuments of the past as the Pyramids and the Obelisk (removed to New York in 1879) should have resulted in an extensive literature concerning these objects (Chr., 1880, I, 148; II, 139; 1884, II, 130; Gruber, 5, 122–128). Though many intelligent Masons regard these claims as baseless, the majority of the craft (see, for instance, "The Voice" of Chicago, Chr., 1885, I, 226) still accept the statement contained in the "Charge" after initiation: "Ancient no doubt it is, having subsisted from time immemorial. In every age monarchs [American rituals: "the greatest and best men of all ages"] have been promoters of the art, have not thought it derogatory to their dignity to exchange the sceptre for the trowel, have participated in our mysteries and joined in our assemblies" (English ritual, 1908, almost identical with other English, Irish, Scottish, and American rituals). It is true that in earlier times gentlemen who were neither operative masons nor architects, the so-called geomatic Masons (see Gould, "Hist.", I, 408, 473, etc.) joined with the operative, or domatic, Masons in their lodges, observed ceremonies of admission, and had their signs of recognition. But this Masonry is by no means the "speculative" Masonry of modern times, i. e., a systematic method of teaching morality by means of such symbols according to the principles of modern Freemasonry after 1723. As the best German authorities admit ("Handbuch", 3rd ed., I, 321; Begemann, "Vorgeschichte, etc.", 1909, I, 1 sqq.), speculative Masonry began with the foundation of the Grand Lodge of England, 24 June, 1717, and its essential organization was completed in 1722 by the adoption of the new "Book of Constitutions" and of the three degrees:—apprentice, fellow, master. All the ablest and most conscientious investigations by competent Masonic historians show, that in 1717 the old lodges had almost ceased to exist. The new lodges began as convivial societies, and their characteristic Masonic spirit developed but slowly. This spirit, finally, as exhibited in the new constitutions was in contradiction to that which animated the earlier Masons. These facts prove that modern Masonry is not, as Gould (History, II, 2, 121), Hughan (A. Q. C., X, 128) and Mackey (Encyclopedia, 296 sq.) contend, a revival of the older system, but rather that it is a new order of no greater antiquity than the first quarter of the eighteenth century.

III. Fundamental Principles and Spirit.—There have been many controversies among Masons as to the essential points of Masonry. English-speaking Masons style them "landmarks", a term taken from Deut., xix, 14, and signifying "the boundaries of Masonic freedom", or the unalterable limits within which all Masons have to confine themselves. Mackey (3, 17–39) specifies no less than twenty-five landmarks. The same number is adopted by Whitehead (Chr., 1878, I, 187, 194 sqq.) "as the pith of the researches of the ablest masonic writers". The principal of them are: the method of recognition by secret signs, words, grips, steps, etc.; the three degrees including the Royal Arch; the Hiram legend of the third degree; the proper "tiling" of the lodge against "raining" and "snowing", i. e., against male and female "cowans", or eavesdroppers, i. e., profane intruders; the right of every regular Mason to visit every regular lodge in the world; a belief in the existence of God and in future life; the Volume of the Sacred Law; equality of Masons in the lodge; secrecy; symbolical method of teaching; inviolability of landmarks (Mackey, "Jurisprudence", 17–39; Chr., 1878, I, 194 sqq.; 1888, I, 11). In truth there is no authority in Freemasonry to constitute such "unchangeable" landmarks or fundamental laws. Strictly judicially, even the "Old Charges", which, according to Anderson's "Constitutions", contain the unchangeable laws, have a legal obligatory character only as far as they are inserted in the "Book of Constitution" of each Grand Lodge (Fischer, I, 14 sq.; Groddeck, 1 sqq., 91 sqq.; "Handbuch", 3rd ed., II, 154). But practically there exist certain characteristics which are universally considered as essential. Such are the fundamental principles described in the first and sixth articles of the "Old Charges" concerning religion, in the texts of the first two English editions (1723 and 1738) of Anderson's "Constitutions". These texts, though differing slightly, are identical as to their essential tenor. That of 1723, as the original text, restored by the Grand Lodge of England in the editions of the "Constitutions", 1756–1813, and inserted later in the "Books of Constitutions" of nearly all the other Grand Lodges, is the most authoritative; but the text of 1738, which was adopted and used for a long time by many Grand Lodges, is also of great importance in itself and as a further illustration of the text of 1723.

In the latter, the first article of the "Old Charges" containing the fundamental law and the essence of modern Freemasonry runs (the text is given exactly as printed in the original, 1723):—I. Concerning *God* and *Religion*. A *Mason* is obliged by his Tenure, to obey the moral law; and if he rightly understands the Art, he will never be a stupid *Atheist* [Gothic letters] nor an irreligious *Libertine* [Gothic letters]. But though in ancient times Masons were charged in every country to be of the religion of that country or nation, whatever it was, yet 'tis now thought more expedient only to oblige them to that religion in which all men agree, leaving their particular Opinions to them-

selves: that is, to be *good men and true* or Men of Honour and Honesty, by whatever Denominations or Persuasions they may be distinguished; whereby Masonry becomes the *Centre* of *Union* and the Means of conciliating true Friendship among Persons that must have remained at a perpetual Distance."

Under Article VI, 2 (Masons' behaviour after the Lodge is closed and the Brethren not gone) is added: "In order to preserve peace and harmony no private piques or quarrels must be brought within the door of the Lodge, far less any quarrels about Religion or Nations or State Policy, we being only, as Masons, of the Catholick Religion above mentioned, we are also of all Nations, Tongues, Kindreds and Languages and are resolved against all Politicks [printed in the original in Gothic letters] as what never yet conduced to the welfare of the Lodge nor ever will. This charge has been always strictly enjoin'd and observ'd; but especially ever since the Reformation in Britain or the dissent and *secession* of these Nations *from the communion of Rome*."

In the text of 1738 the same articles run (variation from the ed. of 1723 are given in italics):—1. Concerning God and Religion. A Mason is obliged by his Tenure to observe the moral law as *true Noahida* (sons of Noah, the first name of Freemasons) and if he rightly understands the craft, he will never be a stupid atheist or an irreligious libertine *nor act against conscience*. In ancient times the *Christian* masons were charged to comply with the *Christian usages* of each country where they travelled or worked; but Masonry being found in all nations, *even of diverse religions*, they are now generally charged to adhere to that religion, in which all men agree, (*leaving each Brother* his own particular opinion), that is, to be good men and true, men of honour and honesty, by whatever *names, religions* or persuasions they may be distinguished; *for they all agree in the three great articles of Noah, enough to preserve the cement of the lodge*. Thus Masonry is the centre of *their* union and the *happy* means of conciliating true friendship among persons who *otherwise* must have remained at a perpetual distance. VI. 1. Behaviour in the Lodge before closing: . . . No private piques nor quarrels about nations, *families*, religions or politics must *by any means or under any colour or pretence whatsoever* be brought within the doors of the lodge; for as Masons we are of *the most ancient catholic religion*, above mentioned and *of all nations upon the square, level and plumb;* and *like our predecessors in all ages*, we are resolved against political disputes, *as* contrary to the peace and welfare of the Lodge.

In order to appreciate rightly these texts characterizing modern "speculative" Freemasonry it is necessary to compare them with the corresponding injunction of the "Gothic" (Christian) Constitutions regulating the old lodges of "operative" Masonry till and after 1747. These injunctions are uniformly summed up in the simple words: "The first charge is this that you be true to God and Holy Church and use no error or heresy" (Grand Lodge Ms. No. 1, Gould, "Concise History", 236; Thorp, Ms. 1629, A. Q. C., XI, 210; Rawlinson Ms. 1729–39 A. Q. C., XI, 22; Hughan, "Old Charges"). The radical contrast between the two types is obvious. While a Mason according to the old Constitution was above all obliged to be true to God and Church, avoiding heresies, his "religious" duties, according to the new type, are essentially reduced to the observation of the "moral law" practically summed up in the rules of "honour and honesty" as to which "all men agree". This "universal religion of Humanity" which gradually removes the accidental divisions of mankind due to particular opinions "or religious", national, and social "prejudices", is to be the bond of union among men in the Masonic society, conceived as the model of human association in general. "Humanity" is the term used to designate the essential principle of Masonry (Groddeck; "Handbuch", 3rd ed., I, 466 sqq.). It occurs in a Masonic address of 1747 (Oliver, "Remains", I, 96; 332). Other watchwords are "tolerance", "unsectarian", "cosmopolitan". The Christian character of the society under the operative régime of former centuries, says Hughan (Chr., 1876, I, 113), "was exchanged for the unsectarian regulations which were to include under its wing the votaries of all sects, without respect to their differences of colour or clime, provided the simple conditions were observed of morality, mature age and an approved ballot" (see also Chr., 1878, I, 180; 1884, II, 38; etc., Gould, "Conc. Hist.", 289 sq.) In Continental Masonry the same notions are expressed by the words "neutrality", "laïcité", "Confessionslosigkeit", etc. In the text of 1738 particular stress is laid on "freedom of conscience" and the universal, non-Christian character of Masonry is emphasized. The Mason is called a "true Noahida", i. e. an adherent of the pre-Christian and pre-Mosaic system of undivided mankind. The "3 articles of Noah" are most probably "the duties towards God, the neighbour and himself" inculcated from older times in the "Charge to a newly made Brother". They might also refer to "brotherly love, relief and truth", generally with "religion" styled the "great cement" of the fraternity and called by Mackey (Lexicon, 42) "the motto of our order and the characteristic of our profession".

Of the ancient Masons it is no longer said, that they were obliged to "be of the religion" but only "to comply with the Christian usages of each Country". The designation of the said "unsectarian" religion as the "ancient catholick" betrays the attempt to oppose this religion of "Humanity" to the Roman Catholic as the only true, genuine, and originally Catholic. The unsectarian character of Masonry is also implied in the era chosen on the title page: "In the year of Masonry 5723" and in the "History". As to the "History" Anderson himself remarks in the preface (1738): "Only *an expert Brother*, by the true light, *can* readily *find many useful hints in almost every page of this book* which Cowans and others not initiated (also among Masons) *cannot* discern." Hence, concludes Krause (Kunsturkunden, 1810, I, 525), Anderson's "History" is allegorically written in "cipher language". Apart, then, from "mere childish allusions to the minor secrets", the general tendency of this "History" is to exhibit the "unsectarianism" of Masonry.

Two points deserve special mention: the utterances on the "Augustan" and the "Gothic" style of architecture and the identification of Masonry with geometry. The "Augustan" which is praised above all other styles alludes to "Humanism", while the "Gothic" which is charged with ignorance and narrow-mindedness, refers to Christian and particularly Roman Catholic orthodoxy. The identification of Masonry with geometry brings out the naturalistic character of the former. Like the Royal Society, of which a large and most influential proportion of the first Freemasons were members (Begemann, "Vorgeschichte," II, 1910, 127 sq., 137 sq.), Masonry professes the empiric or "positivist" geometrical method of reason and deduction in the investigation of truth (Calcott, "A Candid Disquisition, etc.", 1769; Oliver, "Remains", II, 301.) In general it appears that the founders of Masonry intended to follow the same methods for their social purposes which were chosen by the Royal Society for its scientific researches (Gould, "History", II, 400). "Geometry *as a method* is particularly recommended to the attention of Masons." "In this light, Geometry may very properly be considered as a *natural logic;* for as truth is ever consistent, invariable and uniform, all truths may be investigated in the same manner. Moral and religious definitions, axioms and propositions have as regular and certain dependence upon each other as any in physics or mathematics." "Let

me recommend you to pursue such knowledge and cultivate such dispositions as will secure you the Brotherly respect of this society and the honour of your further advancement in it" (Calcott; Oliver, ibid., II, 301-303). It is merely through inconsistency that some Grand Lodges of North America insist on belief in the Divine inspiration of the Bible as a necessary qualification and that not a few Masons in America and Germany declare Masonry an essentially "Christian institution". According to the German Grand Lodges, Christ is only "the wise and virtuous pure man" *par excellence*, the principal model and teacher of "Humanity" ("Sign.", 1904, 45 sq., 54; Gruber (5), 49 sqq.; Idem (4), 23 sq.). In the Swedish system, practised by the German Country Grand Lodge, Christ is said to have taught besides the exoteric Christian doctrine, destined for the people and the duller mass of his disciples, an *esoteric* doctrine for his chosen disciples, such as St. John, in which He denied that He was God (Findel, "Die Schule der Hierarchie, etc.", 1870, 15 sqq.; Schiffmann, "Die Entstehung der Rittergrade", 1882, 85, 92, 95 sq.). Freemasonry, it is held, is the descendant of the Christian secret society, in which this esoteric doctrine was propagated. It is evident, however, that even in this restricted sense of "unsectarian" Christianity, Freemasonry is not a Christian institution, as it acknowledges many pre-Christian models and teachers of "Humanity". All instructed Masons agree in the objective import of this Masonic principle of "Humanity", according to which belief in dogmas is a matter of secondary importance, or even prejudicial to the law of universal love and tolerance. Freemasonry, therefore, is opposed not only to Catholicism and Christianity, but also to the whole system of supernatural truth.

The only serious discrepancies among Masons regarding the interpretation of the texts of 1723 and 1738 refer to the words: "And if he rightly understands the Art, *he will never be a stupid Atheist* or an irreligious *Libertine*". The controversy as to the meaning of these words has been particularly sharp since 13 September, 1877, when the Grand Orient of France erased the paragraph, introduced in 1854 into its Constitutions, by which the existence of God and the immortality of soul were declared the basis of Freemasonry (Bulletin du Grand Orient de France, 1877, 236–50) and gave to the first article of its new Constitutions the following tenor: "Freemasonry, an essentially philanthropic, *philosophic* (naturalist, adogmatic) and *progressive* institution, has for its object the search after truth, the study of *universal morality*, of the sciences and arts and the practice of beneficence. It has for its principles *absolute liberty of conscience* and *human solidarity*. *It excludes none on account of his belief*. Its device is Liberty, Equality, Fraternity." On 10 September, 1878, the Grand Orient, moreover, decreed to expunge from the Rituals and the lodge proceedings all allusions to religious dogmas as the symbols of the Grand Architect, the Bible, etc. These measures called out solemn protests from nearly all the Anglo-American and German organs and led to a rupture between the Anglo-American Grand Lodges and the Gr.·. Or.·. of France. As many freethinking Masons both in America and in Europe sympathize in this struggle with the French, a world-wide breach resulted. Quite recently many Grand Lodges of the United States refused to recognize the Grand Lodge of Switzerland as a regular body, for the reason that it entertains friendly relations with the atheistical Grand Orient of France ("Intern. Bull.", Berne, 1908, No. 2). This rupture might seem to show, that in the above paragraph of the "Old Charges" the belief in a personal God is declared the most essential prerequisite and duty of a Mason and that Anglo-American Masonry, at least, is an uncompromising champion of this belief against the impiety of Latin Masonry.

But in truth all Masonry is full of ambiguity. The texts of 1723 and 1738 of the fundamental law concerning Atheism are purposely ambiguous. Atheism is not positively condemned, but just sufficiently disavowed to meet the exigencies of the time, when an open admission of it would have been fatal to Masonry. It is not said that Atheists cannot be admitted, or that no Mason can be an Atheist, but merely that *if* he *rightly understands the Art*, he will never be a *stupid* Atheist, etc., i. e., he will not hold or profess Atheism in a stupid way, by statements, for instance that shock religious feeling and bring Masonry into bad repute. And even such a stupid Atheist incurs no stronger censure than the simple ascertaining of the fact that he does not rightly understand the art, a merely theoretical judgment without any practical sanction. Such a disavowal tends rather to encourage modern positivist or scientific Atheism. Scarcely more serious is the rejection of Atheism by the British, American and some German Grand Lodges in their struggle with the Grand Orient of France. The English Grand Lodge, it is true, in its quarterly communication of 6 March, 1878 (Chr., 1878, I, 161) adopted four resolutions, in which belief in the Great Architect of the Universe is declared to be the most important ancient landmark of the order, and an explicit profession of that belief is required of visiting brethren belonging to the Grand Orient of France, as a condition for entrance into the English lodges. Similar measures were taken by the Irish, Scottish, and North American Grand Lodges. But this belief in a Great Architect is so vague and symbolical, that almost every kind of Atheism and even of "stupid" Atheism may be covered by it. Moreover, British and American Grand Lodges declare that they are fully satisfied with such a vague, in fact merely verbal declaration, without further inquiry into the nature of this belief, and that they do not dream of claiming for Freemasonry that it is a "church", a "council", a "synod". Consequently even those are acknowledged as Masons who with Spencer and other Naturalist philosophers of the age call God the hidden all-powerful principle working in nature, or, like the followers of "Handbuch" (3rd ed., II, 231), maintain as the two pillars of religion "the sentiment of man's littleness in the immensity of space and time", and "the assurance that whatever is real has its origin from the good and whatever happens must be for the best".

An American Grand Orator Zabriskie (Arizona) on 13 November, 1889, proclaimed, that "individual members may believe in many gods, if their conscience and judgment so dictate" (Chr., 1890, I, 243). Limousin (Acacia, 1907, I, 48), approved by German Masons (Sign., 1907, 133 sq.), says: "The majority of men conceive God in the sense of exoteric religions as an all-powerful man; others conceive God as the highest idea a man can form in the sense of esoteric religions." The latter are called Atheists according to the exoteric notion of God repudiated by science, but they are not Atheists according to the esoteric and true notion of God. On the contrary, add others (Sign., 1905, 54), they are less Atheists than churchmen, from whom they differ only by holding a higher idea of God or the Divine. In this sense Thevenot, Grand Secretary of the Grand Orient of France, in an official letter to the Grand Lodge of Scotland (30 January, 1878), states: "French Masonry does not believe that there exist Atheists in the absolute sense of the word" (Chr., 1878, I, 134); and Pike himself (Morals and Dogma, 643 sqq.) avows: "A man who has a higher conception of God than those about him and who denies that their conception is God, is very likely to be called an Atheist by men who are really far less believers in God than he", etc. Thus the whole controversy turns out to be merely nominal and formal. Moreover, it is to be noticed that the clause declaring belief in the great Architect a condition of admission, was introduced into the text of the Constitutions of the Grand Lodge

of England, only in 1815 and that the same text says: "A Mason therefore is *particularly* bound never to act against the dictates of his conscience", whereby the Grand Lodge of England seems to acknowledge that liberty of conscience is the sovereign principle of Freemasonry prevailing over all others when in conflict with them. The same supremacy of the liberty of conscience is implied also in the unsectarian character, which Anglo-American Masons recognize as the innermost essence of Masonry. "Two principles", said the German Emperor Frederick III, in a solemn address to Masons at Strasburg on 12 September, 1886, "characterize above all our purposes, viz., liberty of conscience and tolerance"; and the "Handbuch" (3rd ed., II, 200) justly observes that liberty of conscience and tolerance were thereby proclaimed the foundation of Masonry by the highest Masonic authority in Germany.

Thus the Grand Orient of France is right from the Masonic point of views to the substance of the question; but it has deviated from tradition by discarding symbols and symbolical formulæ, which, if rightly understood, in no way imply dogmatic assertions and which cannot be rejected without injuring the work of Masonry, since this has need of ambiguous religious formulæ adaptable to every sort of belief and every phase of moral development. From this point of view the symbol of the Grand Architect of the Universe and of the Bible are indeed of the utmost importance for Masonry. Hence, several Grand Lodges which at first were supposed to imitate the radicalism of the French, eventually retained these symbols. A representative of the Grand Lodge of France writes in this sense to Findel: "We entirely agree with you in considering all dogmas, either positive or negative, as radically contradictory to Masonry, the teaching of which must only be propagated by symbols. And the symbols may and must be explained by each one according to his own understanding; thereby they serve to maintain concord. Hence our G. L. facultatively retains the Symbol of the Gr. Arch. of the Universe, because every one can conceive it in conformity with his personal convictions. [Lodges are allowed to retain the symbols, but there is no obligation at all of doing so, and many do not.] To excommunicate each other on account of metaphysical questions, appears to us the most unworthy thing Masons can do" (Sign., 1905, 27). The official organ of Italian Masonry even emphasizes: "The formula of the Grand Architect, which is reproached to Masonry as ambiguous and absurd, is the most large-minded and righteous affirmation of the immense principle of existence and may represent as well the (revolutionary) God of Mazzini as the Satan of Giosue Carducci (in his celebrated hymn to Satan); God, as the fountain of love, not of hatred; Satan, as the genius of the good, not of the bad" (Rivista, 1909, 44). In both interpretations it is in reality the principle of Revolution that is adored by Italian Masonry.

IV. Propagation and Evolution of Masonry.— The members of the Grand Lodge formed in 1717 by the union of four old lodges, were till 1721 few in number and inferior in quality. The entrance of several members of the Royal Society and of the nobility changed the situation. Since 1721 it has spread over Europe (Gould, "History", II, 284 sq.). This rapid propagation was chiefly due to the spirit of the age which, tiring of religious quarrels, restive under ecclesiastical authority and discontented with existing social conditions, turned for enlightenment and relief to the ancient mysteries and sought, by uniting men of kindred tendencies, to reconstruct society on a purely human basis. In this situation Freemasonry with its vagueness and elasticity, seemed to many an excellent remedy. To meet the needs of different countries and classes of society, the original system (1717–23) underwent more or less profound modifications. In 1717, contrary to Gould (Concise History, 309), only one simple ceremony of admission or one degree seems to have been in use (A. Q. C., X, 127 sqq.; XI, 47 sqq.; XVI, 27 sqq.); in 1723 two appear as recognized by the Grand Lodge of England: "Entered Apprentice" and "Fellow Craft or Master". The three degree system, first practised about 1725, became universal and official only after 1730 (Gould, "Conc. Hist., 272; 310–17). The symbols and ritualistic forms, as they were practised from 1717 till the introduction of further degrees after 1738, together with the "Old Charges" of 1723 or 1738, are considered as the original pure Freemasonry. A fourth, the "Royal Arch" degree (ibid., 280) in use at least since 1740, is first mentioned in 1743, and though extraneous to the system of pure and ancient Masonry (ibid., 318) is most characteristic of the later Anglo-Saxon Masonry. In 1751 a rival Grand Lodge of England "according to the Old Institutions" was established, and through the activity of its Grand Secretary, Lawrence Dermott, soon surpassed the Grand Lodge of 1717. The members of this Grand Lodge are known by the designation of "Ancient Masons". They are also called "York Masons" with reference, not to the ephemeral Grand Lodge of all England in York, mentioned in 1726 and revived in 1761, but to the pretended first Grand Lodge of England assembled in 926 at York (Handbuch, 3rd ed., I, 24 sqq.; II, 559 sqq.). They finally obtained control, the United Grand Lodge of England adopting in 1813 their ritualistic forms.

In its religious spirit Anglo-Saxon Masonry after 1730 undoubtedly retrograded towards biblical Christian orthodoxy (Chr., 1906, II, 19 sq.; 1884, II, 306). This movement is attested by the Christianization of the rituals and by the popularity of the works of Hutchinson, Preston, and Oliver with Anglo-American Masons. It is principally due to the conservatism of English-speaking society in religious matters, to the influence of ecclesiastical members and to the institution of "lodge chaplains" mentioned in English records since 1733 (A. Q. C., XI, 43). The reform brought by the articles of union between the two Grand Lodges of England (1 December, 1813) consisted above all in the restoration of the unsectarian character, in accordance with which all allusions to a particular (Christian) religion must be omitted in lodge proceedings. It was further decreed "there shall be the most perfect unity of obligation of discipline, or working . . . according to the genuine landmarks, laws and traditions . . . throughout the masonic world, from the day and date of the said union (1 December, 1813) until time shall be no more" (Preston, "Illustrations", 296 seq.). In taking this action the United Grand Lodge overrated its authority. Its decree was complied with, to a certain extent, in the United States, where Masonry, first introduced about 1730, followed in general the stages of Masonic evolution in the mother country.

The title of Mother-Grand Lodge of the United States was the object of a long and ardent controversy between the Grand Lodges of Pennsylvania and Massachusetts. The prevailing opinion at present is, that from time immemorial, i. e., prior to Grand Lodge warrants (Chr., 1887, II, 313), there existed in Philadelphia a regular lodge with records dating from 1731 (Drummond, "Chr.", 1884, II, 227; 1887, I, 163; II, 178; Gould, "Concise History", 413). In 1734 Benjamin Franklin published an edition of the English "Book of Constitutions". The principal agents of the modern Grand Lodge of England in the United States were Coxe and Price. Several lodges were chartered by the Grand Lodge of Scotland. After 1758, especially during the War of Independence, 1773–83, most of the lodges passed over to the "Ancients". The union of the two systems in England (1813) was followed by a similar union in America. The actual form of the American rite since then prac-

tised is chiefly due to Webb (1771–1819), and to Cross (1783–1861).

In France and Germany, at the beginning Masonry was practised according to the English ritual (Prichard, "Masonry Dissected", 1730); but so-called "Scottish" Masonry soon arose. Only nobles being then reputed admissible in good society as fully qualified members, the Masonic gentlemen's society was interpreted as a society of *Gentilshommes*, i. e., of noblemen or at least of men ennobled or knighted by their very admission into the order, which according to the old English ritual still in use, is "more honourable than the Golden Fleece, or the Star or Garter or any other Order under the Sun". The pretended association of Masonry with the orders of the warlike knights and of the religious was far more acceptable than the idea of development out of stone-cutters' guilds. Hence an oration delivered by the Scottish Chevalier Ramsay before the Grand Lodge of France in 1737 and inserted by Tierce into his first French edition of the "Book of Constitutions" (1743) as an "oration of the Grand Master", was epoch-making (Gould, "Concise History", 274 sq., 357 sq.; Boos, 174 sq.). In this oration Masonry was dated from "the close association of the order with the Knights of St. John in Jerusalem" during the Crusades; and the "old lodges of Scotland" were said to have preserved this genuine Masonry, lost by the English. Soon after 1750, however, as occult sciences were ascribed to the Templars, their system was readily adaptable to all kinds of Rosicrucian purposes and to such practices as alchemy, magic, cabbala, spiritism, and necromancy. The suppression of the order together with the story of the Grand Master James Molay and its pretended revival in Masonry, reproduced in the Hiram legend, representing the fall and the resurrection of the just or the suppression and the restoration of the natural rights of man, fitted in admirably with both Christian and revolutionary high grade systems. The principal Templar systems of the eighteenth century were the system of the "Strict Observance", organized by the swindler Rosa and propagated by the enthusiast von Hundt; and the Swedish system, made up of French and Scottish degrees in Sweden.

In both systems obedience to unknown superiors was promised. The supreme head of these Templar systems, which were rivals to each other, was falsely supposed to be the Jacobite Pretender, Charles Edward, who himself declared in 1777, that he had never been a Mason (Handbuch, 2nd ed., II, 100). Almost all the lodges of Germany, Austria, Hungary, Poland, and Russia were, in the second half of the eighteenth century, involved in the struggle between these two systems. In the lodges of France and other countries (Abafi, I, 132) the admission of women to lodge meetings occasioned a scandalous immorality (Boos, 170, 183 sqq., 191). The revolutionary spirit manifested itself early in French Masonry. Already in 1746 in the book "La Franc-Maçonnerie écrasée", an experienced ex-Mason, who, when a Mason, had visited many lodges in France and England, and consulted high Masons in official position, described as the true Masonic programme a programme which, according to Boos, the historian of Freemasonry (p. 192), in an astonishing degree coincides with the programme of the great French Revolution of 1789. In 1776 this revolutionary spirit was brought into Germany by Weisshaupt through a conspiratory system, which soon spread throughout the country (see ILLUMINATI, and Boos, 303). Charles Augustus of Saxe-Weimar, Duke Ernest of Gotha, Duke Ferdinand of Brunswick, Goethe, Herder, Pestalozzi, etc., are mentioned as members of this order of the Illuminati. Very few of the members, however, were initiated into the higher degrees. The French Illuminati included Condorcet, the Duke of Orleans, Mirabeau, and Sieyès (Robertson, "Chr.", 1907, II, 95; see also Engel, "Gesch. des Illuminatenordens", 1906). After the Congress of Wilhelmsbade (1782) reforms were made both in Germany and in France. The principal German reformers, L. Schröder (Hamburg) and I. A. Fessler, tried to restore the original simplicity and purity. The system of Schröder is actually practised by the Grand Lodge of Hamburg, and a modified system (Schröder-Fessler) by the Grand Lodge Royal York (Berlin) and most lodges of the Grand Lodge of Bayreuth and Dresden. The Grand Lodges of Frankfort-on-the-Main and Darmstadt practise an eclectic system on the basis of the English ritual (Bauhütte, 1908, 337 sqq.). Except the Grand Lodge Royal York, which has Scottish "Inner Orients" and an "Innermost Orient", the others repudiate high degrees. The largest Grand Lodge of Germany, the National (Berlin), practises a rectified Scottish (Strict Observance) system of seven degrees and the "Landes Grossloge" and Swedish system of nine degrees. The same system is practised by the Grand Lodge of Sweden, Norway, and Denmark. These two systems still declare Masonry a Christian institution and with the Grand Lodge Royal York refuse to initiate Jews. Findel states that the principal reason is to prevent Masonry from being dominated by a people whose strong racial attachments are incompatible with the unsectarian character of the institution (Sign., 1898, 100; 1901, 63 sqq.; 1902, 39; 1905, 6).

The principal system in the United States (Charleston, South Carolina) is the so-called Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite, organized in 1801 on the basis of the French Scottish Rite of perfection, which was established by the Council of the Emperors of the East and West (Paris, 1758). This system, which was propagated throughout the world, may be considered as the revolutionary type of the French Templar Masonry, fighting for the natural rights of man against religious and political despotisms, symbolized by the papal tiara and a royal crown. It strives to exert a preponderant influence on the other Masonic bodies, wherever it is established. This influence is insured to it in the Grand Orient systems of Latin countries; it is felt even in Britain and Canada, where the supreme chiefs of craft Masonry are also, as a rule, prominent members of the Supreme Councils of the Scottish Rite. There are at the present time (1908) twenty-six universally recognized Supreme Councils of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite: U. S. of America: Southern Jurisdiction (Washington), established in 1801; Northern Jurisdiction (Boston), 1813; Argentine Republic (Buenos Aires), 1858; Belgium (Brussels), 1817; Brazil (Rio de Janeiro), 1829; Chile (Santiago), 1870; Colon, for West India Islands (Havana), 1879; Columbia (Cartagena); Dominican Republic (S. Domingo); England (London), 1845; Egypt (Cairo), 1878; France (Paris), 1804; Greece (Athens), 1872; Guatemala (for Central American), 1870; Ireland (Dublin), 1826; Italy (Florence), 1858; Mexico (1868); Paraguay (Asuncion); Peru (Lima), 1830; Portugal (Lisbon), 1869; Scotland (Edinburgh), 1846; Spain (Madrid), 1811; Switzerland (Lausanne), 1873; Uruguay (Montevideo); Venezuela (Caracas). Supreme Councils not universally recognized exist in Hungary, Luxemburg, Naples, Palermo, Rome, Turkey. The founders of the rite, to give it a great splendour, invented the fable that Frederick II, King of Prussia, was its true founder, and this fable upon the authority of Pike and Mackey is still maintained as probable in the last edition of Mackey's "Encyclopedia" (1908), 292 sq.

V. ORGANIZATION AND STATISTICS.—The characteristic feature of the organization of speculative Masonry is the Grand Lodge system founded in 1717. Every regular Grand Lodge or Supreme Council in the Scottish, or Grand Orient in the mixed system, constitutes a supreme independent body with legislative, judicial, and executive powers. It is composed of the lodges or

inferior bodies of its jurisdiction or of their representatives regularly assembled and the grand officers whom they elect. A duly constituted lodge exercises the same powers, but in a more restricted sphere. The indispensable officers of a lodge are the Worshipful Master (French *Vénérable;* German *Meister von Stuhl*), the Senior and Junior Warden, and the Tiler. The master and the wardens are usually aided by two deacons and two stewards for the ceremonial and convivial work and by a treasurer and a secretary. Many lodges have a Chaplain for religious ceremonies and addresses. The same officers in large numbers and with sounding titles (Most Worshipful Grand Master, Sovereign Grand Commander, etc.) exist in the Grand Lodges. As the expenses of the members are heavy, only wealthy persons can afford to join the fraternity. The number of candidates is further restricted by prescriptions regarding their moral, intellectual, social, and physical qualifications, and by a regulation which requires unanimity of votes in secret balloting for their admission. Thus, contrary to its pretended universality, Freemasonry appears to be a most exclusive society, the more so as it is a secret society, closed off from the profane world of common mortals. "Freemasonry", says the "Keystone" of Phladelphia (Chr., 1885, I, 259), "has no right to be popular. It is a secret society. It is for the few, not the many, for the select, not for the masses." Practically, it is true, the prescriptions concerning the intellectual and moral endowments are not rigourously obeyed. "Numbers are being admitted . . . whose sole object is to make their membership a means for advancing their pecuniary interest" (Chr., 1881, I, 66). "There are a goodly number again, who value Freemasonry solely for the convivial meetings attached to it." "Again I have heard men say openly, that they had joined to gain introduction to a certain class of individuals as a trading matter and that they were forced to do so because every one did so. Then there is the great class who join it out of curiosity or perhaps, because somebody in a position above them is a mason." "Near akin to this is that class of individuals who wish for congenial society" (Chr., 1884, II, 196). "In Masonry they find the means of ready access to society, which is denied to them by social conventionalities. They have wealth but neither by birth nor education are they eligible for polite and fine intercourse." "The shop is never absent from their words and deeds." "The Masonic body includes a large number of publicans" (Chr., 1885, I, 259), etc., etc.

Of the Masonic rule—brotherly love, relief, and truth —certainly the two former, especially as understood in the sense of mutual assistance in all the emergencies of life, is for most of the candidates the principal reason for joining. This mutual assistance, especially symbolized by the five points of fellowship and the "grand hailing sign of distress" in the third degree, is one of the most fundamental characteristics of Freemasonry. By his oath the Master Mason is pledged to maintain and uphold the five points of fellowship in act as well as in words, i. e., to assist a Master Mason on every occasion according to his ability, and particularly when he makes the sign of distress. In Duncan, "American Ritual" (229), the Royal Arch-Mason even swears: "I will assist a companion R. A.-Mason, when I see him engaged in any difficulty and will espouse his cause so as to extricate him from the same whether he be right or wrong." It is a fact attested by experienced men of all countries that, wherever Masonry is influential, non-Masons have to suffer in their interests from the systematical preferment which Masons give each other in appointment to offices and employment. Even Bismarck (Gedanken und Erinnerungen, 1898, I, 302 sq.) complained of the effects of such mutual Masonic assistance, which is detrimental alike to civic equality and to public interests. In Masonic books and magazines unlawful and treacherous acts, performed in rendering this mutual assistance, are recommended and praised as a glory of Freemasonry. "The inexorable laws of war themselves", says the official orator of the Grand Orient de France, Lefèbvre d'Aumale (Solstice, 24 June, 1841, Procès-verb., 62), "had to bend before Freemasonry, which is perhaps the most striking proof of its power. A sign sufficed to stop the slaughter; the combatants threw away their arms, embraced each other fraternally and at once became friends and Brethren as their oaths prescribed", and the "Handbuch", 3rd ed., II, 109, declares: "this sign has had beneficial effect, particularly in times of war, where it often disarms the bitterest enemies, so that they listen to the voice of humanity and give each other mutual assistance instead of killing each other" (see also Freemason, Lond., 1901, 181; Clavel, 288 sqq.; Ragon, "Cours", 164; Herold, 191, no. 10; "Handbuch", 2nd ed., II, 451 sqq.). Even the widely spread suspicion, that justice is sometimes thwarted and Masonic criminals saved from due punishment, cannot be deemed groundless. The said practice of mutual assistance is so reprehensible that Masonic authors themselves (e. g., Krause, ibid., 2nd ed., I, 2, 429; Marbach, "Freimaurer-Gelübde", 22–35) condemn it severely. "If", says Bro. Marbach (23), "Freemasonry really could be an association and even a secret one of men of the most different ranks of society, assisting and advancing each other, it would be an iniquitous association, and the police would have no more urgent duty than to exterminate it."

Another characteristic of Masonic law is that "treason" and "rebellion" against civil authority are declared only political crimes, which affect the good standing of a Brother no more than heresy, and furnish no ground for a Masonic trial (Mackey, "Jurisprudence", 509). The importance which Masonry attaches to this point is manifest from the fact that it is set forth in the Article II of the "Old Charges", which defines the duties of a Freemason with respect to the State and civil powers. Compared with the corresponding injunction of the "Gothic" constitutions of operative masonry, it is no less ambiguous than Article I concerning God and religion. The old Gothic Constitutions candidly enjoined: "Also you shall be true liegemen to the King without treason or falsehood and that you shall know no treason but you mend it, if you may, or else warn the King or his council thereof" (Thorp, Ms., 1629, A. Q. C., XI, 210; Rawlinson, Ms. 1900, A. Q. C., XI, 22; Hughan, "Old Charges"). The second article of modern speculative Freemasonry (1723) runs: "Of the civil magistrates, supreme and subordinate. A Mason is a peaceable subject to the Civil Powers, wherever he resides or works, and is never to be concerned in Plots and Conspiracies against the peace and welfare of the Nation, nor to behave himself undutifully to inferior Magistrates; for as Masonry hath always been injured by War, Bloodshed and Confusion so ancient Kings and Princes have been much disposed to encourage the craftsmen, because of their Peaceableness and Loyalty, whereby they practically answer'd the Cavils of their adversaries and promoted the Honour of Fraternity, who ever flourished in Times of Peace. So that if a Brother should be a Rebel against the State, he is not to be countenanc'd in his Rebellion, however he may be pitied as an unhappy man; and, if convicted of no other Crime, though the loyal Brotherhood must and ought to disown his Rebellion, and give no Umbrage or Ground of political Jealousy to the Government for the time being; they cannot expel him from the Lodge and his Relation to it remains indefeasible."

Hence rebellion by modern speculative Masonry is only disapproved when plots are directed against the peace and welfare of the nation. The brotherhood ought to disown the rebellion, but only in order to preserve the fraternity from annoyance by the civil au-

thorities. A brother, then, guilty of rebellion cannot be expelled from the lodge; on the contrary, his fellow Masons are particularly obliged to have pity on his misfortune when he (in prison or before the courts) has to suffer from the consequences of his rebellion, and give him brotherly assistance as far as they can. Freemasonry itself as a body is very peaceable and loyal, but it does not disapprove; on the contrary, it commends those brethren who through love of freedom and the national welfare successfully plot against monarchs and other despotic rulers, while as an association of public utility it claims privilege and protection through kings, princes, and other high dignitaries for the success of its peaceful work. "Loyalty to freedom", says Chr., 1875, I, 81, "overrides all other considerations". The wisdom of this regulation, remarks Mackey (Jurisprudence, 510, note 1), "will be apparent when we consider, that if treason or rebellion were masonic crimes, almost every mason in the United Colonies, in 1776, would have been subject to expulsion and every Lodge to a forfeiture of its warrant by the G. LL. of England and Scotland, under whose jurisdiction they were at the time".

A misleading adage is "once a Mason always a Mason". This is often taken to mean that "the Masonic tie is indissoluble, that there is no absolution from its consequences" (Chr., 1885, I, 161) or "Obligations" (Chr., 1889, II, 58), that not even death can sever the connexion of a Mason with Freemasonry (Chr., 1883, II, 331). But certainly a Mason has the "right of demission" (Mackey, "Jurisprudence, 232 sq.), and this right, whatever be the opinion of Masonic jurisprudence, according to the inalienable natural rights of man, extends to a complete withdrawal not only from the lodge but also from the brotherhood. In the scale of Masonic penalties, "expulsion" is the most severe (Mackey, op. cit., 514 sqq.). Besides those who have been expelled or have resigned there are many "unaffiliated" Masons who have ceased to be "active" members of a lodge, but, according to Masonic law, which, of course, can oblige no more than is authorized by the general rules of morality, they remain subject to the lodge within the jurisdiction of which they reside.

As to unity, Masonic authorities unanimously affirm that Freemasonry throughout the world is one, and that all Freemasons form in reality but one lodge; that distinct lodges exist only for the sake of convenience, and that consequently every regular Mason is entitled to be received in every regular lodge of the world as a brother, and, if in distress, to be relieved. The good understanding among Masons of different countries is furthered by personal intercourse and by correspondence, especially between the grand secretary offices and international congresses (Paris, 1889; Antwerp, 1894; Hague, 1896; Paris, 1900; Geneva, 1902; Brussels, 1904; Rome, intended for Oct., 1911) which led to the establishment, in 1903, of a permanent international office at Neuchâtel, Switzerland (Chr., 1907, II, 119). There is no general Grand Lodge or direction of Freemasonry, though various attempts have been made in nearly every larger state or country to establish one. Incessant dissensions between Masonic systems and bodies are characteristic of Freemasonry in all countries and times. But the federative unity of Freemasonry suffices to prove a true solidarity among Masons and Masonic bodies throughout the world; hence the charge of complicity in the machinations which some of them carry on. This solidarity is openly avowed by Masonic authorities. Pike, for instance, writes (Off. Bull., 1885, VII, 29): "When the journal in London which speaks of the freemasonry of the G. L. of England, deprecatingly protested that the English Freemasonry was innocent of the charges preferred by the Papal Bull (Encycl. 1884) against Freemasonry, when it declared that English Freemasonry had no opinions political or religious, and that it did not in the least degree sympathize with the loose opinions and extravagant utterances of part of the Continental Freemasonry, it was very justly and very conclusively checkmated by the Romish Organs with the reply, 'It is idle for you to protest. You are Freemasons and you recognize them as Freemasons. You give them countenance, encouragement and support and you are jointly responsible with them and cannot shirk that responsibility'".

As accurate statistics are not always to be had and the methods of enumeration differ in different countries, total numbers can only be approximated. Thus in most of the Lodges of the United States only the Masters (third degree) are counted, while in other countries the apprentices and fellows are added. There are besides many unaffiliated Masons (having ceased to be members of a lodge) who are not included. Their number may be estimated at two-thirds of that of the active Masons. In England a Mason may act as member of many lodges. Confirming our statement as to the active members of the strictly Masonic bodies, which in calendars and year books are registered as such, we may, upon recent and reliable sources (Mackey, "Encyclopedia", 1908, 1007 sq.: "Annual of Universal Masonry", Berne, 1909; "Mas. Year-Book 1909", London; "Kalender für Freimaurer", Leipzig, 1909), estimate the actual state of Freemasonry as follows: Grand O's, G. L's, Supr. Couns., and other Scottish G. bodies, 183; lodges 26,500; Masons, about 2,000,000; the number of the Grand Chapters of Royal Arch is: in the United States, 2968 subordinate chapters, under one General Grand Chapter; England, 46 Grand Chapters with 1015 subordinate chapters; English colonies and foreign Masonic centres, 18 Grand Chapters with 150 subordinate chapters. The census of craft masonry is as follows:

Countries	Lodges	Members
Great Britain and Colonies (exc. Canada)	4,670	262,651
Canada	727	60,728
United States: White	12,916	1,203,159
Colored	1,300	28,000
Latin Countries (Europe and S. America)	2,500	120,000
Other European countries	771	90,700
Africa	53	2,150
Total	22,937	1,767,388

VI. Inner Work of Freemasonry: Masonic Symbolism and Oaths.—"From first to last", says Pike (I, 340), "Masonry is work". The Masonic "work", properly so called, is the inner secret ritualistic work by which *Masons* are made and educated for the outer work, consisting in action for the welfare of mankind according to Masonic principles. Masons are made by the three ceremonies of initiation (first degree), passing (second degree), and raising (third degree). The symbols displayed in these ceremonies and explained according to the Masonic principles and to the verbal hints given in the rituals and lectures of the three degrees, are the manual of Masonic instruction. The education thus begun is completed by the whole lodge life, in which every Mason is advised to take an active part, attending the lodge meetings regularly, profiting, according to his ability, by the means which Masonry affords him, to perfect himself in conformity with Masonic ideals, and contributing to the discussions of Masonic themes and to a good lodge government, which is represented as a model of the government of society at large. The lodge is to be a type of the world (Chr., 1890, I, 99) and Masons are intended to take part in the regeneration of the human race (Chr., 1900, II, 3). "The symbolism of Freemasonry", says Pike in a letter to Gould, 2 December, 1888 (A. Q. C., XVI, 28), "is the very soul of Ma-

sonry." And Boyd, the Grand Orator of Missouri, confirms: "It is from the beginning to the end symbol, symbol, symbol" (Chr., 1902, I, 167).

The principal advantages of this symbolism, which is not peculiar to Freemasonry but refers to the mysteries and doctrines of all ages and of all factors of civilization, are the following: (1) As it is adaptable to all possible opinions, doctrines, and tastes, it attracts the candidate and fascinates the initiated. (2) It preserves the unsectarian unity of Freemasonry in spite of profound differences in religion, race, national feeling, and individual tendencies. (3) It sums up the theoretical and practical wisdom of all ages and nations in a universally intelligible language. (4) It trains the Mason to consider existing institutions, religious, political, and social, as passing phases of human evolution and to discover by his own study the reforms to be realized in behalf of Masonic progress, and the means to realize them. (5) It teaches him to see in prevailing doctrines and dogmas merely subjective conceptions or changing symbols of a deeper universal truth in the sense of Masonic ideals. (6) It allows Freemasonry to conceal its real purposes from the profane and even from those among the initiated, who are unable to appreciate those aims, as Masonry intends. "Masonry", says Pike, "jealously conceals its secrets and intentionally leads conceited interpreters astray" [(1), 105]. "Part of the Symbols are displayed . . . to the Initiated, but he is intentionally misled by false interpretations" [(1), 819]. "The initiated are few though many hear the Thyrsus" [(1), 355]. "The meaning of the Symbols is not unfolded at once. We give you hints only in general. You must study out the recondite and mysterious meaning for yourself" [(3), 128]. "It is for each individual Mason to discover the secret of Masonry by reflection on its symbols and a wise consideration of what is said and done in the work" [(1), 218]. "The universal cry throughout the Masonic world", says Mackey (Inner Sanctuary I, 311), "is for light; our lodges are henceforth to be schools, our labour is to be study, our wages are to be learning; the types and symbols, the myths and allegories of the institution are only beginning to be investigated with reference to the ultimate meaning and Freemasons now thoroughly understand that often quoted definition, that Masonry is a science of morality veiled in allegory and illustrated by symbols."

Masonic symbols can be and are interpreted in different senses. By orthodox Anglican ecclesiastics the whole symbolism of the Old and New Testament connected with the symbolism of the Temple of Solomon was treated as Masonic symbolism and Masonry as the "handmaid of religion" (Oliver, Hist. Landmarks, I, 128) which, "in almost every part of every degree refers distinctly and plainly to a crucified Saviour" (Oliver, ibid., I, 146, 65; II, 7 sq.). Many Masonic authors in the Latin countries (Clavel, Ragnon, etc.) and some of the principal Anglo-American authors (Pike, Mackey, etc.) declare, that Masonic symbolism in its original and proper meaning refers above all to the solar and phallic worship of the ancient mysteries, especially the Egyptian [Pike (1), 771 sq.]. "It is in the antique symbols and their occult meaning", says Pike [(4), 397], "that the true secrets of Freemasonry consist. These must reveal its nature and true purposes." In conformity with this rule of interpretation, the letter G in the symbol of Glory (Blazing Star) or the Greek Gamma (square), summing up all Masonry is very commonly explained as meaning "generation"; the initial letter of the tetragrammaton יהוה and the whole name is explained as male or male-female principle [Pike (1), 698 sq., 751, 849; (4), IV, 342 sq.; Mackey, "Symbolism", 112 sqq., 186 sqq.; see also Preuss, "American Freemasonry", 175 sqq.]. In the same sense according to the ancient interpretation are explained the two pillars Boaz and Jachin; the Rosecroix (a cross with a rose in the centre); the point within the circle; the "vesica piscis", the well-known sign for the Saviour; the triple Tau; Sun and Moon; Hiram and Christ (Osiris); the coffin; the Middle Chamber and even the Sancta Sanctorum, as adyta or most holy parts of each temple, usually contained hideous objects of phallic worship (Mackey, "Dictionary", s. v. *Phallus;* Oliver, "Signs", 206–17; V. Longo, La Mass. Specul.).

As Masons even in their official lectures and rituals, generally claim an Egyptian origin for Masonic symbolism and a close "affinity" of "masonic usages and customs with those of the Ancient Egyptians" [Ritual, I (first) degree], such interpretations are to be deemed officially authorized. Pike says, moreover, that "almost every one of the ancient Masonic symbols" has "four distinct meanings, one as it were within the other, the moral, political, philosophical and spiritual meaning" [Pike (3), 128]. From the political point of view Pike with many other Anglo-American Scotch Masons interprets all Masonic symbolism in the sense of a systematic struggle against every kind of political and religious "despotism". Hiram, Christ, Molay are regarded only as representatives of "Humanity" the "Apostles of Liberty, Equality, Fraternity" [Pike (4), 141]. The Cross (a double or quadruple square) is "no specific Christian symbol", "to all of us it is an emblem of Nature and of Eternal life; whether of them only let each say for himself" (Pike, ibid., 100 sq.). The Cross X (Christ) was the Sign of the Creative Wisdom or Logos, the Son of God. Mithraism signed its soldiers on the forehead with a cross, etc. [(1), 291 sq.]. I. N. R. I., the inscription on the Cross is, Masonically read: "Igne Natura Renovatur Integra". The regeneration of nature by the influence of the sun symbolizes the spiritual regeneration of mankind by the sacred fire (truth and love) of Masonry, as a purely naturalistic institution [Pike (4), III, 81; (1), 291; Ragon, l. c., 76–86]. "The first assassin of Hiram is *Royalty* as the common type of tyranny", striking "with its rule of iron at the throat of Hiram and making freedom of speech treason." The second assassin is the Pontificate (Papacy) "aiming the square of steel at the heart of the victim" [(4), I, 288 sq.]. Christ dying on Calvary is for Masonry "the greatest among the apostles of Humanity, braving Roman despotism and the fanaticism and bigotry of the priesthood" (ibid., III, 142 sq.). Under the symbol of the Cross, "the legions of freedom shall march to victory" (ibid., III, 146).

The Kadosh (thirtieth degree), trampling on the papal tiara and the royal crown, is destined to wreak a just vengeance on these "high criminals" for the murder of Molay (ibid., IV, 474 sq.), and "as the apostle of truth and the rights of man" (ibid., IV, 478), to deliver mankind "from the bondage of Despotism and the thraldom of spiritual Tyranny" (ibid., IV, 476). "In most rituals of this degree everything breathes vengeance" against religious and political "Despotism" (ibid., IV, 547). Thus Masonic symbols are said to be "radiant of ideas, which should penetrate the soul of every Mason and be clearly reflected in his character and conduct, till he become a pillar of strength to the fraternity" ("Masonic Advocate" of Indianapolis, Chr., 1900, I, 296). "There is no iota of Masonic Ritual", adds the "Voice" of Chicago, "which is void of significance" (Chr., 1897, II, 83). These interpretations, it is true, are not officially adopted in Anglo-American craft rituals; but they appear fully authorized, though not the only ones authorized even by its system and by the first two articles of the "Old Charge" (1723), which contains the fundamental law of Freemasonry. As to the unsectarian character of Masonry and its symbolism, Pike justly remarks: "Masonry propagates no creed, except its own most simple and sublime one taught by Nature and Reason. There has never been a false Religion in the world. The permanent one universal revelation is written in visible Nature and explained by the Reason and is completed by the wise analogies of faith. There is but

one true religion, one dogma, one legitimate belief" [(4), I, 271]. Consequently, also, the Bible as a Masonic symbol, is to be interpreted as a symbol of the Book of Nature or the Code of human reason and conscience, while Christian and other dogmas have for Freemasonry but the import of changing symbols veiling the one permanent truth, of which Masonic "Science" and "Arts" are a "progressive revelation", and application [ibid., I, 280; (1), 516 sq.].

It should be noted, that the great majority of Masons are far from being "initiated" and "are grovelling in Egyptian darkness" (Chr., 1878, II, 28). "The Masonry of the higher degrees", says Pike [(4), I, 311], "teaches the great truths of intellectual science; but as to these, even as to the rudiments and first principles, Blue Masonry is absolutely dumb. Its dramas seem intended to teach the resurrection of the body." "The pretended possession of mysterious secrets, has enabled Blue Masonry to number its initiates by tens of thousands. Never were any pretences to the possession of mysterious knowledge so baseless and so absurd as those of the Blue and Royal Arch Chapter Degrees" (ibid., IV, 388 sq.). "The aping Christianity of Blue Masonry made it simply an emasculated and impotent society with large and sounding pretences and slender performances. And yet its multitudes adhere to it, because initiation is a necessity for the Human Soul; and because it instinctively longs for a union of the many under the control of a single will, in things spiritual as well as in things temporal, for a Hierarchy and a Monarch" (ibid., IV, 389 sq.). "It is for the Adept to understand the meaning of the Symbols" [(1), 849]; and Oliver declares: "Brethren, high in rank and office, are often unacquainted with the elementary principles of the science" (Oliver, "Theocratic Philosophy", 355). Masons "may be fifty years Masters of the Chair and yet not learn the secret of the Brotherhood. This secret is, in its own nature, invulnerable; for the Mason, to whom it has become known, can only have guessed it and certainly not have received it from any one; he has discovered it, because he has been in the lodge, marked, learned and inwardly digested. When he arrives at the discovery, he unquestionably keeps it to himself, not communicating it even to his most intimate Brother, because, should this person not have capability to discover it of himself, he would likewise be wanting in the capability to use it, if he received it verbally. For this reason it will forever remain a secret" (Oliver, Hist. Landmarks, I, 11, 21; "Freemasons' Quarterly Rev.", I, 31; Casanova in Ragon, "Rit. 3rd Degree", 35).

In view of the fact that the secrets of Masonry are unknown to the bulk of Masons, the oaths of secrecy taken on the Bible are all the more startling and unjustifiable. The oath, for instance, of the first degree is as follows: "I, in the presence of the Great Architect of the Universe, . . . do hereby and hereon solemnly and sincerely swear, that I will always hide, conceal and never reveal any part or parts, any point or points of the secrets or mysteries of or belonging to Free and Accepted Masons in Masonry which may heretofore have been known by, shall now or may at any future time be communicated to me" etc. "These several points I solemnly swear to observe under no less *penalty*, than to have *my throat cut across*, my tongue torn out by the root and my body buried in the sands of the sea", "or the more efficient punishment of being branded as a wilfully perjured individual, void of all moral worth". "So help me God", etc. Similar oaths, but with severer penalties attached, are taken in the advanced degrees. The principal contents of the promises are according to Pike: eighteenth degree: "I obligate and pledge myself always to sustain, that it belongs to Masonry to teach the great unsectarian truths, that do not exclusively belong to any religion and acknowledge that I have no right whatever to exact from others the acceptation of any particular interpretation of masonic symbols, that I may attribute to them by the virtue of my personal belief. I obligate and solemnly pledge myself to respect and sustain by all means and under any circumstances Liberty of Speech, Liberty of Thought and Liberty of Conscience in religious and political matters" [Pike (4), III, 68]. Thirtieth Degree: A.— "I solemnly and freely vow obedience to all the laws and regulations of the Order, whose belief will be my belief, I promise obedience to all my regular superiors. . . . I pledge myself to be devoted, soul and body, to the protection of innocence, the vindication of right, the crushing of oppression and the punishment of every infraction against the law of Humanity and of Man's rights . . . never, either by interest or by fear, or even to save my existence, to submit to nor suffer any material despotism, that may enslave or oppress humanity by the usurpation or abuse of power. I vow never to submit to or tolerate any intellectual Despotism, that may pretend to chain or fetter free thought, etc." B. "I solemnly vow to consecrate my life to the ends of the Order of Knights of Kadosh, and to co-operate most efficaciously by all means prescribed by the constituted authorities of the order to attain them. I solemnly vow and consecrate, to these ends, my words, my power, my strength, my influence, my intelligence and my life. I vow to consider myself henceforward and forever as the Apostle of Truth and of the rights of man." C. "I vow myself to the utmost to bring due punishment upon the oppressors, the usurpers and the wicked; I pledge myself never to harm a Knight Kadosh, either by word or deed . . .; I vow that if I find him as a foe in the battlefield, I will save his life, when he makes me the Sign of Distress, and that I will free him from prison and confinement upon land or water, even to the risk of my own life or my own liberty. I pledge myself to vindicate right and truth even by might and violence, if necessary and duly ordered by my regular superiors." D. "I pledge myself to obey without hesitation any order whatever it may be of my regular Superiors in the Order" (ibid., IV, 470, 479, 488, 520).

VII. Outer Work of Freemasonry: Its Achievements, Purposes and Methods.—The outer work of Freemasonry, though uniform in its fundamental character and its general lines, varies considerably in different countries and different Masonic symbols. "*Charitable*" or "*philanthropic*" purposes are chiefly pursued by English, German, and American Masonry, while practically at least, they are neglected by Masons in the Latin countries, who are absorbed by political activity. But even in England, where relatively the largest sums are spent for charitable purposes, Masonic philanthropy does not seem to be inspired by very high ideals of generosity and disinterestedness, at least with respect to the great mass of the brethren; the principal contributions are made by a few very wealthy brethren and the rest by such as are well-to-do. Moreover, in all countries it is almost exclusively Masons and their families that profit by Masonic charity. Masonic beneficence towards the "profane" world is little more than figurative, consisting in the propagation and application of Masonic principles by which Masons pretend to promote the welfare of mankind; and if Masons, particularly in Catholic countries, occasionally devote themselves to charitable works as ordinarily understood, their aim is to gain sympathy and thereby further their real purposes. In North America, especially in the United States, a characteristic feature of the outer work is the tendency toward display in the construction of sumptuous Masonic "temples", in Masonic processions, at the laying of cornerstones and the dedication of public buildings and even of Christian churches. This tendency has frequently been rebuked by Masonic writers. "The Masonry of this continent has gone mad after high degreeism and grand titleism. We tell the

brethren, that if they do not pay more attention to the pure, simple, beautiful symbolism of the Lodge and less to the tinsel, furbelow, fuss and feathers of Scotch Ritism and Templarism, the Craft will yet be shaken to its very foundations!" "Let the tocsin be sounded" (Chr., 1880, II, 179). "Many masons have passed through the ceremony without any inspiration; but, in public parades of the Lodges (also in England) they may generally be found in the front rank and at the masonic banquets they can neither be equalled nor excelled" (ibid., 1892, I, 246). For similar criticism see Chr., 1880, II, 195; 1875, I, 394.

But the real object of both inner and outer work is the propagation and application of the Masonic principles. The truly Masonic method is, that the lodge is the common ground on which men of different religions and political opinions, provided they accept the general Masonic principles, can meet; hence, it does not directly and actively interfere with party politics, but excludes political and religious discussions from the meetings, leaving each Mason to apply the principles to problems of the day. But this method is openly disowned by contemporaneous Masonry in the Latin countries and by many Supreme Councils of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish system, by the Grand Lodge of Hungary, the Grand Orient of Belgium, etc. It was and is practically rejected also by German and even by American and English Masonry. Thus American Masonic lodges, at least so leading Masonic authors openly claim, had a preponderant part in the movement for independence, the lodges of the "Ancients" in general promoting this movement and those of the "moderns" siding with Great Britain (Gould, "Concise History" 419). According to the "Masonic Review" Freemasonry was instrumental in forming the American Union (1776), claiming fifty-two (Chr., 1893, I, 147), or even fifty-five (Chr., 1906, I, 202), out of the fifty-six of the "signers of the Declaration of Independence as members of the Order". Other Masonic periodicals, however, claim that only six of the signers ("New Age", May, 1910, 464), and only nine of the presidents of the United States were Freemasons ("Acacia", II, 409). In the French Revolution (1789) and the later revolutionary movements in France, Italy, Spain, Portugal, Central and South America, Masonic bodies, it is claimed, took a more or less active part, as is stated by prominent representatives of the Grand Lodges in the several countries and in many cases by "profane" impartial historians (see Congrés Intern. of Paris, 1889, in "Compte rendu du Grand Orient de France", 1889; Browers, "L'action, etc."; Brück, "Geh. Gesellsch. in Spanien"; "Handbuch"; articles on the different countries, etc.). In Russia also Freemasonry finally turned out to be a "political conspiracy" of Masonically organized clubs that covered the land.

Even with regard to the most recent Turkish Revolution, it seems certain, that the Young Turkish party, which made and directed the Revolution, was guided by Masons, and that Masonry, especially the Grand Orients of Italy and France, had a preponderant rôle in this Revolution (see "Rivista", 1909, 76 sqq.; 1908, 394; "Acacia," 1908, II, 36; "Bauhütte", 1909, 143; "La Franc-Maçonnerie démasquée", 1909, 93–96; "Compte rendu du Convent. du Gr.·. Or.·. de France", 21–26 Sept., 1908, 34–38). In conducting this work Freemasonry propagates principles which, logically developed, as shown above, are essentially revolutionary and serve as a basis for all kinds of revolutionary movements. Directing Masons to find out for themselves practical reforms in conformity with Masonic ideals and to work for their realization, it fosters in its members and through them in society at large the spirit of innovation. As an apparently harmless and even beneficent association, which in reality is, through its secrecy and ambiguous symbolism, subject to the most different influences, it furnishes in critical times a shelter for conspiracy, and, even when its lodges themselves are not transformed into conspiracy clubs, Masons are trained and encouraged to found new associations for such purposes or to make use of existing associations. Thus, Freemasonry in the eighteenth century, as a powerful ally of infidelity, prepared the French Revolution. The alliance of Freemasonry with philosophy was publicly sealed by the solemn initiation of Voltaire, the chief of these philosophers, 7 February, 1778, and his reception of the Masonic garb from the famous materialist Bro.·. Helvetius (Handbuch, 3rd ed., II, 517). Prior to the Revolution various conspiratory societies arose in connexion with Freemasonry from which they borrowed its forms and methods; Illuminati, clubs of Jacobins, etc. A relatively large number of the leading revolutionists were members of Masonic lodges, trained by lodge life for their political career. Even the programme of the Revolution expressed in the "rights of man" was, as shown above, drawn from Masonic principles, and its device: "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity" is the very device of Freemasonry. Similarly, Freemasonry, together with the Carbonari, cooperated in the Italian revolutionary movement of the nineteenth century. Nearly all the prominent leaders and among them Mazzini and Garibaldi, are extolled by Masonry as its most distinguished members. In Germany and Austria, Freemasonry during the eighteenth century was a powerful ally of the so-called party of "Enlightenment" (*Aufklaerung*), and of Josephinism; in the nineteenth century of the pseudo-Liberal and of the anti-clerical party.

In order to appreciate rightly the activity of Freemasonry in Germany, Sweden, Denmark and England, and in France under the Napoleonic regime, the special relations between Freemasonry and the reigning dynasties must not be overlooked. In Germany two-thirds of the Masons are members of the old Prussian Grand Lodges under the protectorship of a member of the Royal Dynasty, which implies a severe control of all lodge activity in conformity with the aims of the Government. Hence German Freemasons are scarcely capable of independent action. But they certainly furthered the movement by which Prussia gradually became the leading state of Germany, considered by them as the "representative and the protector of modern evolution" against "Ultramontanism", "bigotry", and "Papal usurpations". They also instigated the "Kulturkampf". The celebrated jurisconsult and Mason, Grandmaster Bluntschli, was one of the foremost agitators in this conflict; he also stirred up the Swiss "Kulturkampf". At his instigation the assembly of the "Federation of the German Grand Lodges", in order to increase lodge activity in the sense of the "Kulturkampf", declared, 24 May, 1874: "It is a professional duty for the lodges to see to it, that the brethren become fully conscious of the relations of Freemasonry to the sphere of ethical life and cultural purposes. Freemasons are obliged to put into effect the principles of Freemasonry in practical life and to defend the ethical foundations of human society, whensoever these are assailed. The Federation of the German Grand Lodges will provide, that every year questions of actuality be proposed to all lodges for discussion and uniform action" [Gruber (5), 6; Ewald, "Loge und Kulturkampf"]. German Freemasons put forth untiring efforts to exert a decisive influence on the whole life of the nation in keeping with Masonic principles, thus maintaining a perpetual silent "Kulturkampf". The principal means which they employ are popular libraries, conferences, the affiliation of kindred associations and institutions, the creation, where necessary, of new institutions, through which the Masonic spirit permeates the nation (see Herold, No. 37 and 33 sqq.). A similar activity is displayed by the Austrian Freemasons.

The chief organization which in France secured the

success of Freemasonry was the famous "League of instruction" founded in 1867 by Bro.·. F. Macé, later a member of the Senate. This league affiliated and imbued with its spirit many other associations. French Masonry and above all the Grand Orient of France has displayed the most systematic activity as the dominating political element in the French "Kulturkampf" since 1877 (see also Chr., 1889, I, 81 sq.). From the official documents of French Masonry contained principally in the official "Bulletin" and "Compte-rendu" of the Grand Orient it has been proved that all the anti-clerical measures passed in the French Parliament were decreed beforehand in the Masonic lodges and executed under the direction of the Grand Orient, whose avowed aim is to control everything and everybody in France ("que personne ne bougera plus en France en dehors de nous", "Bull. Gr. Or.", 1890, 500 sq.). "I said in the assembly of 1898", states the deputy Massé, the official orator of the Assembly of 1903, "that it is the supreme duty of Freemasonry to interfere each day more and more in political and profane struggles". "Success (in the anti-clerical combat) is in a large measure due to Freemasonry; for it is its spirit, its programme, its methods, that have triumphed." "If the *Bloc* has been established, this is owing to Freemasonry and to the discipline learned in the lodges. The measures we have now to urge are the separation of Church and State and a law concerning instruction. Let us put our trust in the word of our Bro .·. Combes". "For a long time Freemasonry has been simply the republic in disguise", i. e., the secret parliament and government of Freemasonry in reality rule France; the profane State, Parliament, and Government merely execute its decrees. "We are the conscience of the country"; "we are each year the funeral bell announcing the death of a cabinet that has not done its duty but has betrayed the Republic; or we are its support, encouraging it by saying in a solemn hour: I present you the word of the country . . . its *satisfecit* which is wanted by you, or its reproach that to-morrow will be sealed by your fall". "We need vigilance and above all mutual confidence, if we are to accomplish our work, as yet unfinished. This work, you know . . . the anti-clerical combat, is going on. The Republic must rid itself of the religious congregations, sweeping them off by a vigorous stroke. The system of half measures is everywhere dangerous; the adversary must be crushed with a single blow" (Compte-rendu Gr. Or., 1903, Nourrisson, "Les Jacobins", 266–271). "It is beyond doubt", declared the President of the Assembly of 1902, Bro .·. Blatin, with respect to the French elections of 1902, "that we would have been defeated by our well-organized opponents, if Freemasonry had not spread over the whole country" (Compte-rendu, 1902, 153).

Along with this political activity Freemasonry employed against its adversaries, whether real or supposed, a system of spying and false accusation, the exposure of which brought about the downfall of the Masonic cabinet of Combes. In truth all the "anti-clerical" Masonic reforms carried out in France since 1877, such as the secularization of education, measures against private Christian schools and charitable establishments, the suppression of the religious orders and the spoliation of the Church, professedly culminate in an anti-Christian and irreligious reorganization of human society, not only in France but throughout the world. Thus French Freemasonry, as the standard-bearer of all Freemasonry, pretends to inaugurate the golden era of the Masonic universal republic, comprising in Masonic brotherhood all men and all nations. "The triumph of the Galilean", said the president of the Grand Orient, Senator Delpech, on 20 September, 1902, "has lasted twenty centuries. But now he dies in his turn. The mysterious voice, announcing (to Julian the Apostate) the death of Pan, to-day announces the death of the impostor God who promised an era of justice and peace to those who believe in him. The illusion has lasted a long time. The mendacious God is now disappearing in his turn; he passes away to join in the dust of ages the other divinities of India, Egypt, Greece, and Rome, who saw so many deceived creatures prostrate before their altars. Bro .·. Masons, we rejoice to state that we are not without our share in this overthrow of the false prophets. The Romish Church, founded on the Galilean myth, began to decay rapidly from the very day on which the Masonic Association was established" (Compte-rendu Gr. Or. de France, 1902, 381).

The assertion of the French Masons: "We are the conscience of the country", was not true. By the official statistics it was ascertained, that in all elections till 1906 the majority of the votes were against the Masonic *Bloc*, and even the result in 1906 does not prove that the *Bloc*, or Masonry, in its anti-clerical measures and purposes represents the will of the nation, since the contrary is evident from many other facts. Much less does it represent the "conscience" of the nation. The fact is, that the *Bloc* in 1906 secured a majority only because the greater part of this majority voted against their "conscience". No doubt the claims of Freemasonry in France are highly exaggerated, and such success as they have had is due chiefly to the lowering of the moral tone in private and public life, facilitated by the disunion existing among Catholics and by the serious political blunders which they committed. Quite similar is the outer work of the Grand Orient of Italy which likewise pretends to be the standard-bearer of Freemasonry in the secular struggle of Masonic light and freedom against the powers of "spiritual darkness and bondage", alluding of course to the papacy, and dreams of the establishment of a new and universal republican empire with a Masonic Rome, supplanting the papal and Cæsarean as metropolis. The Grand Orient of Italy has often declared that it is enthusiastically followed in this struggle by the Freemasonry of the entire world and especially by the Masonic centres at Paris, Berlin, London, Madrid, Calcutta, Washington ("Riv.", 1892, 219; Gruber, "Mazzini", 215 sqq. and *passim*). It has not been contradicted by a single Grand Lodge in any country, nor did the German and other Grand Lodges break off their relations with it on account of its shameful political and anti-religious activity. But though the aims of Italian Masons are perhaps more radical and their methods more cunning than those of the French, their political influence, owing to the difference of the surrounding social conditions, is less powerful. The same is to be said of the Belgian and the Hungarian Grand Lodges, which also consider the Grand Orient of France as their political model.

Since 1889, the date of the international Masonic congress, assembled at Paris, 16 and 17 July, 1889, by the Grand Orient of France, systematic and incessant efforts have been made to bring about a closer union of universal Freemasonry in order to realize efficaciously and rapidly the Masonic ideals. The special allies of the Grand Orient in this undertaking are: the Supreme Council and the Symbolical Grand Lodge of France and the Masonic Grand Lodges of Switzerland, Belgium, Italy, Spain, Hungary, Portugal, Greece; the Grand Lodges of Massachusetts and of Brazil were also represented at the congress. The programme pursued by the Grand Orient of France, in its main lines, runs thus: "Masonry, which prepared the Revolution of 1789, has the duty to continue its work" (circular of the G. O. of France, 2 April, 1889). This task is to be accomplished by the thoroughly and rigidly consistent application of the principles of the Revolution to all the departments of the religious, moral, judicial, legal, political, and social order. The necessary political reforms being realized in most of their essential points, henceforth the consistent appli-

cation of the revolutionary principles to the social conditions of mankind is the main task of Masonry. The universal social republic, in which, after the overthrow of every kind of spiritual and political tyranny", of "theocratical" and dynastical powers and class privileges, reigns the greatest possible individual liberty and social and economical equality conformably to French Masonic ideals, is the real ultimate aim of this social work.

The following are deemed the principal means: (1) To destroy radically by open persecution of the Church or by a hypocritical fraudulent system of separation between State and Church, all social influence of the Church and of religion, insidiously called "clericalism", and, as far as possible, to destroy the Church and all true, i. e., superhuman religion, which is more than a vague cult of fatherland and of humanity; (2) To laicize, or secularize, by a likewise hypocritical fraudulent system of "unsectarianism", all public and private life and, above all, popular instruction and education. "Unsectarianism" as understood by the Grand Orient party is anti-Catholic and even anti-Christian, atheistic, positivistic, or agnostic sectarianism in the garb of unsectarianism. Freedom of thought and conscience of the children has to be developed systematically in the child at school and protected, as far as possible, against all disturbing influences, not only of the Church and priests, but also of the children's own parents, if necessary, even by means of moral and physical compulsion. The Grand Orient party considers it indispensable and an infallibly sure way to the final establishment of the universal social republic and of the pretended world peace, as they fancy them, and of the glorious era of human solidarity and of unsurpassable human happiness in the reign of liberty and justice (see "Chaîne d'Union," 1889, 134, 212 sqq., 248 sqq., 291 sqq.; the official comptes rendus of the International Masonic Congress of Paris, 16–17 July, 1889, and 31 August, 1 and 2 September, 1900, published by the Grand Orient of France, and the regular official "Comptes rendus des travaux" of this Grand Orient, 1896–1910, and the "Rivista massonica", 1880–1910).

The efforts to bring about a closer union with Anglo-American and German Freemasonry were made principally by the Symbolical Grand Lodge of France and the "International Masonic Agency" at Neuchâtel (directed by the Swiss Past Grand Master Quartier-La Tente), attached to the little Grand Lodge "Alpina" of Switzerland. These two Grand Lodges, as disguised agents of the Grand Orient of France, act as mediators between this and the Masonic bodies of English-speaking and German countries. With English and American Grand Lodges their efforts till now have had but little success (see Internat. Bulletin, 1908, 119, 127, 133, 149, 156; 1909, 186). Only the Grand Lodge of Iowa seems to have recognized the Grand Lodge of France (Chr. 1905, II, 58, 108, 235). The English Grand Lodge not only declined the offers, but, on 23 September, 1907, through its registrar even declared: "We feel, that we in England are better apart from such people. Indeed, Freemasonry is in such bad odour on the Continent of Europe, by reason of its being exploited by Socialists and Anarchists, that we may have to break off relations with more of the Grand Bodies who have forsaken our Landmarks" (from a letter of the Registrator J. Strahan, in London, to the Grand Lodge of Massachusetts: see "The New Age", New York, 1909, I, 177). The American Grand Lodges (Massachusetts, Missouri, etc.), in general, seem to be resolved to follow the example of the English Grand Lodges.

The German Grand Lodges, on the contrary, at least most of them, yielded to the pressure exercised on them by a great many German brothers. Captivated by the Grand Orient party on 3 June, 1906, the Federation of the eight German Grand Lodges, by 6 votes to 2, decreed to establish official friendly relations with the Grand Lodge, and on 27 May, 1909, by 5 votes to 3, to restore the same relations with the Grand Orient of France. This latter decree excited the greatest manifestations of joy, triumph and jubilation in the Grand Orient party, which considered it as an event of great historic import. But in the meantime a public press discussion was brought about by some incisive articles of the "Germania" (Berlin, 10 May, 1908; 9 June, 12 November, 1909; 5, 19 February, 1910) with the result, that the three old Prussian Grand Lodges, comprising 37,198 brothers controlled by the protectorate, abandoned their ambiguous attitude and energetically condemned the decree of 27 May, 1909, and the attitude of the 5 other so-called "humanitarian" German Grand Lodges, which comprise but 16,448 brothers. It was hoped, that the British and American Grand Lodges, enticed by the example of the German Grand Lodges, would, in the face of the common secular enemy in the Vatican, join the Grand Orient party before the great universal Masonic congress, to be held in Rome in 1911. But instead of this closer union of universal Freemasonry dreamt of by the Grand Orient party, the only result was a split between the German Grand Lodges by which their federation itself was momentarily shaken to its foundation.

But in spite of the failure of the official transactions, there are a great many German and not a few American Masons, who evidently favour at least the chief anti-clerical aims of the Grand Orient party. Startling evidence thereof was the recent violent world-wide agitation, which, on occasion of the execution of the anarchist, Bro. ∴ Ferrer, 31 ∴, an active member of the Grand Orient of France (Barcelona, 13 October, 1909), was set at work by the Grand Orient of France (Circular of 14 October, 1909; "Franc-Maç. dém.", 1906, 230 sqq.; 1907, 42, 176; 1909, 310, 337 sqq.; 1910, an "International Masonic Bulletin", Berne, 1909, 204 sq.), and of Italy (Rivista massonica, 1909, 337 sqq., 423), in order to provoke the organization of an international *Kulturkampf* after the French pattern. In nearly all the countries of Europe the separation between State and Church and the laicization or neutralization of the popular instruction and education, were and are still demanded by all parties of the Left with redoubled impetuosity.

The fact that there are also American Masons, who evidently advocate the *Kulturkampf* in America and stir up the international *Kulturkampf*, is attested by the example of Bros. ∴ J. D. Buck, 33 and A. Pike, 33.∴. Buck published a book, "The Genius of Freemasonry", in which he advocates most energetically a *Kulturkampf* for the United States. This book, which in 1907, was in its 3rd edition, is recommended ardently to all American Masons by Masonic journals. A. Pike, as the Grand Commander of the Mother Supreme Council of the World (Charleston, South Carolina) lost no opportunity in his letters to excite the anti-clerical spirit of his colleagues. In a long letter of 28 December, 1886, for instance, he conjures the Italian Grand Commander, Timoteo Riboli, 33.∴. the intimate friend of Garibaldi, to do all in his power, in order to unite Italian Masonry against the Vatican. He writes: "The Papacy . . . has been for a thousand years the torturer and curse of Humanity, the most shameless imposture, in its pretence to spiritual power of all ages. With its robes wet and reeking with the blood of half a million of human beings, with the grateful odour of roasted human flesh always in its nostrils, it is exulting over the prospect of renewed dominion. It has sent all over the world its anathemas against Constitutional government and the right of men to freedom of thought and conscience". Again, "In presence of this spiritual 'Cobra di capello', this deadly, treacherous, murderous enemy, the most formidable power in the world, the unity of Italian Masonry is of absolute and supreme necessity;

and to this paramount and omnipotent necessity all minor considerations ought to yield; dissensions and disunion, in presence of this enemy of the human race are criminal". "There must be no unyielding, uncompromising insistence upon particular opinions, theories, prejudices, professions: but, on the contrary, mutual concessions and harmonious co-operation". "The Freemasonry of the world will rejoice to see accomplished and consummated the Unity of the Italian Freemasonry" (Official Bulletin, September, 1887, 173 sqq.). Important Masonic journals, for instance, "The American Tyler-Keystone" (Ann Arbor), openly patronize the efforts of the French Grand Orient Party. "The absolute oneness of the Craft", says the Past Grand Master Clifford P. MacCalla (Pennsylvania), "is a glorious thought." "Neither boundaries of States nor vast oceans separate the Masonic Fraternity. Everywhere it is one." "There is no universal church, no universal body of politic; but there is an universal Fraternity, that Freemasonry; and every Brother who is a worthy member, may feel proud of it" (Chr., 1906, II, 132). Owing to the solidarity existing between all Masonic bodies and individual Masons, they are all jointly responsible for the evil doings of their fellow-members.

Representative Masons, however, extol the pretended salutary influence of their order on human culture and progress. "Masonry", says Frater, Grand Orator, Washington, "is the shrine of grand thoughts, of beautiful sentiments, the seminary for the improvement of the moral and the mental standard of its members. As a storehouse of morality it rains benign influence on the mind and heart" (Chr., 1897, II, 148). "Modern Freemasonry", according to other Masons, "is a social and moral reformer" (Chr., 1888, II, 99). "No one", says the "Keystone" of Chicago, "has estimated or can estimate the far reaching character of the influence of Masonry in the world. It by no means is limited to the bodies of the Craft. Every initiate is a light bearer, a center of light" (Chr., 1889, II, 146). "In Germany as in the United States and Great Britain those who have been leaders of men in intellectual, moral and social life, have been Freemasons. Eminent examples in the past are the Brothers ∴ Fichte, Herder, Wieland, Lessing, Goethe. Greatest of them all was I. W. von Goethe. Well may we be proud of such a man" ("Keystone", quoted in Chr., 1887, II, 355), etc. German Masons (see Boos, 304–63) claim for Freemasonry a considerable part in the splendid development of German literature in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. These claims, however, when critically examined, prove to be either groundless or exaggerated. English Freemasonry, being then at a low intellectual and moral level and retrograding towards orthodoxy, was not qualified to be the originator or a leading factor in the freethinking "Culture of Enlightenment." German Masonry, then dominated by the Swedish system and the Strict Observance and intellectually and morally degenerated, as Masonic historians themselves avow, was in no better plight. In truth the leading literary men of the epoch, Lessing, Goethe, Herder, etc. were cruelly disabused and disappointed by what they saw and experienced in their lodge life [Gruber (6), 141–236]. Lessing spoke with contempt of the lodge life; Goethe characterized the Masonic associations and doings as "fools and rogues"; Herder wrote, 9 January, 1786, to the celebrated philologist Bro.∴ Heyne; "I bear a deadly hatred to all secret societies and, as a result of my experience, both within their innermost circles and outside, I wish them all to the devil. For persistent domineering intrigues and the spirit of cabal creep beneath the cover" (Boos, 326).

Freemasonry, far from contributing to the literary greatness of these or other leading men, profited by the external splendour which their membership reflected on it. But the advantage was by no means deserved, for even at the height of their literary fame, not they, but common swindlers, like Johnson, Cagliostro, etc., were the centres round which the Masonic world gravitated. All the superior men belonging to Freemasonry: Fichte, Fessler, Krause, Schröder, Mossdorf, Schiffman, Findel, etc., so far as they strove to purge lodge life from humbug, were treated ignominiously by the bulk of the average Masons and even by lodge authorities. Men of similar turn of mind are stigmatized by English and American Masonic devotees as "materialists" and "iconoclasts" (Chr., 1885, I, 85; 1900, II, 71). But true it is that the lodges work silently and effectually for the propagation and application of "unsectarian" Masonic principles in human society and life. The Masonic magazines abound in passages to this effect. Thus Bro.∴ Richardson of Tennessee avers: "Freemasonry does its work silently, but it is the work of a deep river, that silently pushes on towards the ocean, etc." (Chr., 1889, I, 308). "The abandonment of old themes and the formation of new ones", explained Grand High Priest, J. W. Taylor (Georgia), "do not always arise from the immediately perceptible cause which the world assigns, but are the culmination of principles which have been working in the minds of men for many years, until at last the proper time and propitious surroundings kindle the latent truth into life, and, as the light of reason flows from mind to mind and the unity of purpose from heart to heart, enthusing all with a mighty common cause and moving nations as one man to the accomplishment of great ends. On this principle does the Institution of Freemasonry diffuse its influence to the world of mankind. It works quietly and secretly, but penetrates through all the interstices of society in its many relations, and the recipients of its many favors are awed by its grand achievements, but cannot tell whence it came" (Chr., 1897, II, 303). The "Voice" (Chicago) writes: "Never before in the history of ages has Freemasonry occupied so important a position, as at the present time. Never was its influence so marked, its membership so extensive, its teaching so revered." "There are more Masons outside the great Brotherhood than within it." Through its "pure morality" with which pure Freemasonry is synonomous, it "influences society, and, unperceived, sows the seed that brings forth fruit in wholesome laws and righteous enactments. It upholds the right, relieves the distressed, defends the weak and raises the fallen (of course, all understood in the masonic sense above explained). So, silently but surely and continually, it builds into the great fabric of human society" (Chr. 1889, II, 257 sq.).

The real force of Freemasonry in its outer work is indeed, that there are more Masons and oftentimes better qualified for the performance of Masonic work, outside the brotherhood than within it. Freemasonry itself in Europe and in America founds societies and institutions of similar form and scope for all classes of society and infuses into them its spirit. Thus according to Gould (Concise History, 2) Freemasonry since about 1750 "has exercised a remarkable influence over all other oath-bound societies". The same is stated by Bro.∴ L. Blanc, Deschamps, etc. for Germany and other countries. In the United States, according to the "Cyclopedia of Fraternities", there exist more than 600 secret societies, working more or less under the veil of forms patterned on Masonic symbolism and for the larger part notably influenced by Freemasonry, so that every third male adult in the United States is a member of one or more of such secret societies. "Freemasonry", says the "Cyclopedia", p. v, "of course, is shown to be the mother-Fraternity in fact as well as in name." "Few who are well informed on the subject, will deny that the masonic Fraternity is directly or indirectly the parent organization of all modern secret societies, good, bad and indifferent" (ibid., p. xv).

Many Anglo-American Freemasons are wont to protest strongly against all charges accusing Freemasonry of interfering with political or religious affairs or of hostility to the Church or disloyalty to the public authorities. They even praise Freemasonry as "one of the strongest bulwarks of religion" (Chr., 1887, II, 340), "the handmaid of religion" (Chr., 1887, I, 119) and the "handmaid of the church" (Chr., 1885, II, 355). "There is nothing in the nature of the Society", says the "Royal Craftsman", New York, "that necessitates the renunciation of a single sentence of any creed, the discontinuance of any religious customs or the obliteration of a dogma of belief. No one is asked to deny the Bible, to change his Church relations or to be less attentive to the teaching of his spiritual instructors and counsellors" (Chr., 1887, II, 49). "Masonry indeed contains the pith of Christianity" (Chr., 1875, I, 113). "It is a great mistake to suppose it an enemy of the Church." "It does not offer itself as a substitute of that divinely ordained institution." "It offers itself as an adjunct, as an ally, as a helper in the great work of the regeneration of the race, of the uplifting of man" (Chr., 1890, II, 101). Hence, "we deny the right of the Romish Church to exclude from its communion those of its flock who have assumed the responsibility of the Order of Freemasonry" (Chr., 1875, I, 113). Though such protestations seem to be sincere and to reveal even a praiseworthy desire in their authors not to conflict with religion and the Church, they are contradicted by notorious facts. Certainly Freemasonry and "Christian" or "Catholic" religion are not opposed to each other, when Masons, some erroneously and others hypocritically understand "Christian" or "Catholic" in the above described Masonic sense, or when Masonry itself is mistakenly conceived as an orthodox Christian institution. But between "Masonry" and "Christian" or "Catholic" religion, conceived as they really are: between "unsectarian" Freemasonry and "dogmatic, orthodox" Christianity or Catholicism, there is a radical opposition. It is vain to say: though Masonry is officially "unsectarian", it does not prevent individual Masons from being "sectarian" in their non-Masonic relations; for in its official "unsectarianism" Freemasonry necessarily combats all that Christianity contains beyond the "universal religion in which all men agree", consequently all that is characteristic of the Christian and Catholic religion. These characteristic features Freemasonry combats not only as superfluous and merely subjective, but also as spurious additions disfiguring the objective universal truth, which it professes. To ignore Christ and Christianity, is practically to reject them as unessential framework.

But Freemasonry goes farther and attacks Catholicism openly. The "Voice" (Chicago), for instance, in an article which begins: "There is nothing in the Catholic religion which is adverse to Masonry", continues, "for the truth is, that masonry embodies that religion in which all men agree. This is as true as that all veritable religion, wherever found, is in substance the same. Neither is it in the power of any man or body of men to make it otherwise. Doctrines and forms of observance conformable to piety, imposed by spiritual overseers, may be as various as the courses of wind; and like the latter may war with each other upon the face of the whole earth, but they are not religion. Bigotry and zeal, the assumptions of the priestcraft, with all its countless inventions to magnify and impress the world . . . are ever the mainsprings of strife, hatred and revenge, which defame and banish religion and its inseparable virtues, and work unspeakable mischief, wherever mankind are found upon the earth. Popery and priestcraft are so allied, that they may be called the same; the truth being, that the former is nothing more nor less than a special case of the latter, being a particular form of a vicious principle, which itself is but the offspring of the conceit of self-sufficiency and the lust of dominion. Nothing which can be named, is more repugnant to the spirit of masonry, nothing to be more carefully guarded against, and this has been always well understood by all skillful masters, and it must in truth be said, that such is the wisdom of the lessons, i. e. of masonic instruction *in* Lodges, etc." (Chr., 1887, I, 35). In similar discussions, containing in almost every word a hidden or open attack on Christianity, the truly Masonic magazines and books of all countries abound. Past Grand Deacon J. C. Parkinson, an illustrious English Mason, frankly avows: "The two systems of Romanism and Freemasonry are not only incompatible, but they are radically opposed to each other" (Chr., 1884, II, 17): and American Masons say: "We won't make a man a Freemason, until we know that he isn't a Catholic." (Chr., 1890, II, 347: see also 1898, I, 83).

With respect to loyalty towards "lawful government" American Masons pretend that "everywhere Freemasons, individually and collectively, are loyal and active supporters of republican or constitutional governments" ("Voice" quoted in Chr., 1890, I, 98). "Our principles are all republican" ("Voice" in Chr., 1893, I, 130). "Fidelity and Loyalty, and peace and order, and subordination to lawful authorities are household gods of Freemasonry" ("Voice" in Chr., 1890, I, 98); and English Freemasons declare, that, "the loyalty of English Masons is proverbial" (Chr., 1899, I, 301). These protestations of English and American Freemasons in general may be deemed sincere, as far as their own countries and actual governments are concerned. Not even the revolutionary Grand Orient of France thinks of overthrowing the actual political order in France, which is in entire conformity with its wishes. The question is, whether Freemasons respect a lawful Government in their own and other countries, when it is not inspired by Masonic principles. In this respect both English and American Freemasons, by their principles and conduct, provoke the condemnatory verdict of enlightened and impartial public opinion. We have already above hinted at the whimsical Article II of the "Old Charges", calculated to encourage rebellion against Governments which are not according to the wishes of Freemasonry. The "Freemason's Chronicle" but faithfully expresses the sentiments of Anglo-American Freemasonry, when it writes: "If we were to assert that under no circumstances had a Mason been found willing to take arms against a bad government, we should only be declaring that, in trying moments, when duty, in the masonic sense, to state means antagonism to the Government, they had failed in the highest and most sacred duty of a citizen. Rebellion in some cases is a sacred duty, and none, but a bigot or a fool, will say, that our countrymen were in the wrong, when they took arms against King James II. Loyalty to freedom in a case of this kind overrides all other considerations, and when to rebel means to be free or to perish, it would be idle to urge that a man must remember obligations which were never intended to rob him of his status of a human being and a citizen" (Chr., 1875, I, 81).

Such language would equally suit every anarchistic movement. The utterances quoted were made in defence of plotting Spanish Masons. Only a page further the same English Masonic magazine writes: "Assuredly Italian Masonry, which has rendered such invaluable service in the regeneration of that magnificent country", "is worthy of the highest praise" (Chr., 1875, I, 82). "A Freemason, moved by lofty principles", says the "Voice" (Chicago), "may rightly strike a blow at tyranny and may consort with others to bring about needed relief, in ways that are not ordinarily justifiable. History affords numerous instances of acts which have been justified by subsequent events, and none of us, whether Masons or not,

are inclined to condemn the plots hatched between Paul Revere, Dr. J. Warren and others, in the old Green Dragon Tavern, the headquarters of Colonial Freemasonry in New England, because these plots were inspired by lofty purpose and the result not only justified them, but crowned these heroes with glory" (Chr., 1889, I, 178). "No Freemason" said Right Rev. H. C. Potter on the centenary of the Grand Chapter of Royal Arch, New York, "may honourably bend the knee to any foreign potentate (not even to King Edward VII of England) civil or ecclesiastical (the Pope) or yield allegiance to any alien sovereignty, temporal or spiritual" (Chr., 1889, II, 94). From this utterance it is evident that according to Potter no Catholic can be a Mason. In conformity with these principles American and English Freemasons supported the leaders of the revolutionary movement on the European continent. Kossuth, who "had been leader in the rebellion against Austrian tyranny", was enthusiastically received by American Masons, solemnly initiated into Freemasonry at Cincinnati, 21 April, 1852, and presented with a generous gift as a proof "that on the altar of St. John's Lodge the fire of love burnt so brightly, as to flash its light even into the deep recesses and mountain fastnesses of Hungary" ("Keystone" of Philadelphia quoted by Chr., 1881, I, 414; the "Voice" of Chicago, ibid., 277). Garibaldi, "the greatest freemason of Italy" ("Intern. Bull.", Berne, 1907, 98) and Mazzini were also encouraged by Anglo-American Freemasons in their revolutionary enterprises (Chr., 1882, I, 410; 1893, I, 185; 1899, II, 34). "The consistent Mason", says the "Voice" (Chicago), "will never be found engaged in conspiracies or plots for the purpose of overturning and subverting a government based upon the masonic principles of liberty and equal rights" (Chr., 1892, I, 259). "But" declares Pike, "with tongue and pen, with all our open and secret influences, with the purse, and if need be, with the sword, we will advance the cause of human progress and labour to enfranchise human thought, to give freedom to the human conscience (above all from papal 'usurpations') and equal rights to the people everywhere. Wherever a nation struggles to gain or regain its freedom, wherever the human mind asserts its independence and the people demand their inalienable rights, there shall go our warmest sympathies" [Pike (4), IV, 547].

VIII. Action of State and Church Authorities. —Curiously enough, the first sovereign to join and protect Freemasonry was the Catholic German Emperor Francis I, the founder of the actually reigning line of Austria, while the first measures against Freemasonry were taken by Protestant Governments: Holland, 1735; Sweden and Geneva, 1738; Zurich, 1740; Berne, 1745. In Spain, Portugal and Italy, measures against Masonry were taken after 1738. In Bavaria Freemasonry was prohibited 1784 and 1785; in Austria, 1795; in Baden, 1813; in Russia, 1822. Since 1847 it has been tolerated in Baden, since 1850 in Bavaria, since 1868 in Hungary and Spain. In Austria Freemasonry is still prohibited because as the Superior Court of Administration, 23 January, 1905, rightly declared, a Masonic association, even though established in accordance with law, "would be a member of a large (international) organization (in reality ruled by the 'Old Charges', etc. according to general Masonic principles and aims), the true regulations of which would be kept secret from the civil authorities, so that the activity of the members could not be controlled" (Bauhütte, 1905, 60). It is indeed to be presumed that Austro-Hungarian Masons, whatever statutes they might present to the Austrian Government in order to secure their authorization, would in fact continue to regard the French Grand Orient as their true pattern, and the Brothers∴Kossuth, Garibaldi, and Mazzini as the heroes, whom they would strive to imitate. The Prussian edict of 1798 interdicted Freemasonry in general, excepting the three old Prussian Grand Lodges which the protectorate subjected to severe control by the Government. This edict, though juridically abrogated by the edict of 6 April, 1848, practically, according to a decision of the Supreme Court of Administration of 22 April, 1893, by an erroneous interpretation of the organs of administration, remained in force till 1893. Similarly, in England an Act of Parliament was passed on 12 July, 1798 for the "more effectual suppression of societies established for seditions and treasonable purposes and for preventing treasonable and seditious practices". By this Act Masonic associations and meetings in general were interdicted, and only the lodges existing on 12 July, 1798, and ruled according to the old regulations of the Masonry of the kingdom were tolerated, on condition that two representatives of the lodge should make oath before the magistrates, that the lodge existed and was ruled as the Act enjoined (Preston, "Illustrations of Masonry", 251 sqq.). During the period 1827–34, measures were taken against Freemasonry in some of the United States of America. As to European countries it may be stated, that all those Governments, which had not originated in the revolutionary movement, strove to protect themselves against Masonic secret societies.

The action of the Church is summed up in the papal pronouncements against Freemasonry since 1738, the most important of which are:—

Clement XII, Const. "In Eminenti", 28 April, 1738; Benedict XIV, "Providas", 18 May, 1751; Pius VII, "Ecclesiam", 13 September, 1821; Leo XII, "Quo graviora", 13 March, 1825; Pius VIII, Encycl. "Traditi", 21 May, 1829; Gregory XVI, "Mirari", 15 August, 1832; Pius IX, Encycl. "Qui pluribus", 9 November, 1846; Alloc. "Quibus quantisque malis", 20 April, 1849; Encycl. "Quanta cura", 8 December, 1864; Alloc. "Multiplices inter", 25 September, 1865; Const. "Apostolicæ Sedis", 12 October, 1869; Encycl. "Etsi multa", 21 November, 1873; Leo XIII, Encycl. "Humanum genus", 20 April, 1884; "Præclara", 20 June, 1894; "Annum ingressi", 18 March, 1902 (against Italian Freemasonry); Encycl. "Etsi nos", 15 February, 1882; "Ab Apostolici", 15 October, 1890. These pontifical utterances from first to last are in complete accord, the latter reiterating the earlier with such developments as were called for by the growth of Freemasonry and other secret societies.

Clement XII accurately indicates the principal reasons why Masonic associations from the Catholic, Christian, moral, political, and social points of view, should be condemned. These reasons are: — (1) The peculiar, "unsectarian" (in truth, anti-Catholic and anti-Christian) naturalistic character of Freemasonry, by which theoretically and practically it undermines the Catholic and Christian faith, first in its members and through them in the rest of society, creating religious indifferentism and contempt for orthodoxy and ecclesiastical authority. (2) The inscrutable secrecy and fallacious ever-changing disguise of the Masonic association and of its "work", by which "men of this sort break as thieves into the house and like foxes endeavour to root up the vineyard", "perverting the hearts of the simple", ruining their spiritual and temporal welfare. (3) The oaths of secrecy and of fidelity to Masonry and Masonic work, which cannot be justified in their scope, their object, or their form, and cannot, therefore, induce any obligation. The oaths are condemnable, because the scope and object of Masonry are "wicked" and condemnable, and the candidate in most cases is ignorant of the import or extent of the obligation which he takes upon himself. Moreover the ritualistic and doctrinal "secrets" which are the principal object of the obligation, according to the highest Masonic authorities, are either trifles or no longer exist (Handbuch, 3rd ed., I, 219). In either case the oath is a condemna-

ble abuse. Even the Masonic modes of recognition, which are represented as the principal and only essential "secret" of Masonry, are published in many printed books. Hence the real "secrets" of Masonry, if such there be, could only be political or anti-religious conspiracies like the plots of the Grand Lodges in Latin countries. But such secrets, condemned, at least theoretically, by Anglo-American Masons themselves, would render the oath or obligation only the more immoral and therefore null and void. Thus in every respect the Masonic oaths are not only sacrilegious but also an abuse contrary to public order which requires that solemn oaths and obligations as the principal means to maintain veracity and faithfulness in the State and in human society, should not be vilified or caricatured. In Masonry the oath is further degraded by its form which includes the most atrocious penalties, for the "violation of obligations" which do not even exist; a "violation" which, in truth may be and in many cases is an imperative duty. (4) The danger which such societies involve for the security and "tranquility of the State" and for "the spiritual health of souls", and consequently their incompatibility with civil and canonical law. For even admitting that some Masonic associations pursued for themselves no purposes contrary to religion and to public order, they would be nevertheless contrary to public order, because by their very existence as secret societies based on the Masonic principles, they encourage and promote the foundation of other really dangerous secret societies and render difficult, if not impossible, efficacious action of the civil and ecclesiastical authorities against them.

Of the other papal edicts only some characteristic utterances need be mentioned. Benedict XIV appeals more urgently to Catholic princes and civil powers to obtain their assistance in the struggle against Freemasonry. Pius VII condemns the secret society of the Carbonari which, if not an offshoot, is "certainly an imitation of the Masonic society" and, as such, already comprised in the condemnation issued against it. Leo XII deplores the fact, that the civil powers had not heeded the earlier papal decrees, and in consequence out of the old Masonic societies even more dangerous sects had sprung. Among them the "Universitarian" is mentioned as most pernicious. "It is to be deemed certain", says the pope, "that these secret societies are linked together by the bond of the same criminal purposes." Gregory XVI similarly declares that the calamities of the age were due principally to the conspiracy of secret societies, and like Leo XII, deplores the religious indifferentism and the false ideas of tolerance propagated by secret societies. Pius IX (Allocution, 1865) characterizes Freemasonry as an insidious, fraudulent and perverse organization injurious both to religion and to society; and condemns anew "this Masonic and other similar societies, which differing only in appearance coalesce constantly and openly or secretly plot against the Church or lawful authority". Leo XIII (1884) says: "There are various sects, which although differing in name, rite, form, and origin, are nevertheless so united by community of purposes and by similarity of their main principles as to be really one with the Masonic sect, which is a kind of centre, whence they all proceed and whither they all return." The ultimate purpose of Freemasonry is "the overthrow of the whole religious, political, and social order based on Christian institutions and the establishment of a new state of things according to their own ideas and based in its principles and laws on pure Naturalism."

In view of these several reasons Catholics since 1738 are, under penalty of excommunication, incurred *ipso facto*, and reserved to the pope, strictly forbidden to enter or promote in any way Masonic societies. The law now in force (Const. "Apostolicæ Sedis", 1869, Cap. ii, n. 24) pronounces excommunication upon "those who enter Masonic or Carbonarian or other sects of the same kind, which, openly or secretly, plot against the Church or lawful authority and those who in any way favour these sects or do not denounce their leaders and principal members." Under this head mention must also be made of the "Practical Instruction of the Congreg. of the Inquisition, 7 May, 1884 'de Secta Massonum'" (Acta Sanctæ Sedis, XVIII, 43–47) and of the decrees of the Provincial Councils of Baltimore, 1840; New Orleans, 1856; Quebec, 1851, 1868; of the first Council of the English Colonies, 1854; and particularly of the Plenary Councils of Baltimore, 1866 and 1884 (see "Collect. Lacensis", III, 1875 and "Acta et decr. Concil. plen. Balt. III", 1884). These documents refer mainly to the application of the papal decrees according to the peculiar condition of the respective ecclesiastical provinces. The Third Council of Baltimore, n. 254 sq., states the method of ascertaining whether or not a society is to be regarded as comprised in the papal condemnation of Freemasonry. It reserves the final decision thereon to a commission consisting of all the archbishops of the ecclesiastical provinces represented in the council, and, if they cannot reach a unanimous conclusion, refers to the Holy See.

These papal edicts and censures against Freemasonry have often been the occasion of erroneous and unjust charges. The excommunication was interpreted as an "imprecation" that cursed all Freemasons and doomed them to perdition. In truth an excommunication is simply an ecclesiastical penalty, by which members of the Church should be deterred from acts that are criminal according to ecclesiastical law. The pope and the bishops, therefore, as faithful pastors of Christ's flock, cannot but condemn Freemasonry. They would betray, as Clement XII stated, their most sacred duties, if they did not oppose with all their power the insidious propagation and activity of such societies in Catholic countries or with respect to Catholics in mixed and Protestant countries. Freemasonry systematically promotes religious indifferentism and undermines true, i. e., orthodox Christian and Catholic Faith and life. Freemasonry is essentially Naturalism and hence opposed to all supernaturalism. As to some particular charges of Leo XIII (1884) challenged by Freemasons, e. g., the atheistical character of Freemasonry, it must be remarked, that the pope considers the activity of Masonic and similar societies as a whole, applying to it the term which designates the most of these societies and among the Masonic groups those, which push the so-called "anticlerical", in reality irreligious and revolutionary, principles of Freemasonry logically to their ultimate consequences and thus, in truth, are, as it were, the advanced outposts and standard-bearers of the whole immense anti-Catholic and anti-papal army in the world-wide spiritual warfare of our age. In this sense also the pope, in accordance with a fundamental biblical and evangelical view developed by St. Augustine in his "De civitate Dei", like the Masonic poet Carducci in his "Hymn to Satan", considers Satan as the supreme spiritual chief of this hostile army. Thus Leo XIII (1884) expressly states: "What we say, must be understood of the Masonic sect in the universal acceptation of the term, as it comprises all kindred and associated societies, but not of their single members. There may be persons amongst these, and not a few, who, although not free from the guilt of having entangled themselves in such associations, yet are neither themselves partners in their criminal acts nor aware of the ultimate object which these associations are endeavouring to attain. Similarly some of the several bodies of the association may perhaps by no means approve of certain extreme conclusions, which they would consistently accept as necessarily following from the general principles common to all, were they not deterred by the vicious character of the conclusions." "The

Masonic federation is to be judged not so much by the acts and things it has accomplished, as by the whole of its principles and purposes."

The Freemason's Chronicle (Chr.), of which two volumes have been published every year in London since 1875, reproducing on a large scale also the principal articles published by the best American Masonic journals, offers the best and most authorized general survey of Anglo-American Freemasonry. R. Fr. Gould styles it: "A first class Masonic newspaper" (*Chr.*, 1893, I, 339). The principal Masonic author quoted by us is the late Albert Pike, Grand Commander of the Mother-Supreme Council (Charleston, South Carolina—Washington), acknowledged as the greatest authority in all Masonic matters. According to Norton "the world-renowned Bro. Pike (*Chr.*, 1888, II, 179) is generally admitted as the best authority on Masonic jurisprudence in America" (*Chr.*, 1876, II, 243). According to the Grand Orator Robert (Indian Territory) he "was the greatest Masonic scholar and writer of this (19th) century, whose name has been a household word wherever Masonry is known" (*Chr.*, 1893, I, 25). According to the *New Age*, New York, he was "regarded as the foremost figure in the Freemasonry of the world" (1909, II, 456), "the greatest Freemason of the Nineteenth Century", "the Prophet of Freemasonry" (1910, I, 52). "His great work—his Magnum Opus—as he called it", says the *New Age* (1910, I, 54), "was *The Scottish Rite Rituals*, as they were revised and spiritualized by him." And his book *Morals and Dogma*, currently quoted by us, is highly recommended to all Masons searching for serious and sure information, by the celebrated Masonic scholars Temple (Brussels) and Speth, the late secretary of the learned Quatuor-Coronati Lodge at London (*Chr.*, 1888, I, 389). The circulars (letters) of Pike, according to the *Bulletin of the Supreme Council of Belgium* (1888, 211) were "true codes of Masonic Wisdom". The well-known English Bro. Yarker, 33, says: "The late A. Pike . . . was undoubtedly a Masonic Pope, who kept in leading strings all the Supreme Councils of the world, including the Supr. Councils of England, Ireland, and Scotland, the first of which includes the Prince of Wales (now King Edward VII) Lord Lathom and other Peers, who were in alliance with him and in actual submission" (A. E. Waite, *Devil-Worship in France*, 1896, 215). The German *Handbuch* (2nd ed., 1879, IV, 138) calls Pike: "The supreme General of the Order", and T. G. Findel, the German historian of Masonry: "the uncrowned king of the High Degrees" (*Bauhütte*, 1891, 126).

Masonic Publications. Encyclopedias: Mackey, (1) *Encyclopedia of Freemasonry* (London, 1908), even this recent edition, according to American authorities, is thoroughly antiquated and scarcely an improvement on that of 1860; Idem, (2) *Lexicon of Freemasonry* (London, 1884); Oliver, *Dict. of Symbolic Freemasonry* (London, 1853); Mackenzie, *The Royal Masonic Cycl.* (1875–7); Woodford, *Kenning's Cycl.* (1878); Lenning, *Encycl. der Freimaurerei* (1822–1828); Idem and Henne am Rhyn, *Allgemeines Handbuch der Fr.*, 2nd ed. (1863–79); Fischer, *Allg. Handb. d. Fr.*, 3rd ed. (1900); these editions contain valuable information and answer scientific requirements far more than all the other Masonic cyclopedias (A. Q. C., XI, 64); Stevens, *Cyclopedia of Fraternities* (New York, 1907).

Masonic Law and Jurisprudence: *The Constitutions of the Freemasons, 1723, 1738*; *Neues Constitutionen Buch*, etc. (1741); de La Tierce, *Histoire, Obligations, et Statuts*, etc. (Frankfort, 1742); Oliver, *Masonic Jurisprudence* (1859, 1874); Chase, *Digest of Masonic Law* (1866); Mackey, *Text Book of Mason. Jurisprudence* (1889); van Groddeck, etc., *Versuch einer Darstellung des positiven innern Freimaurer. Rechts* (1877), the best general survey of Masonic laws of all countries.

Historical: Anderson, *Hist. of Freemasonry* in the first editions and translations of the *Book of Constitutions* (most unreliable, even after 1717); Preston, *Illustrations of Masonry* (1772), ed. Oliver (1856), though not reliable in some historical particulars, contains much valuable information of historical and ritualistic character; Fort, *Early Hist. and Antiquities of Freemasonry* (Philadelphia, 1875); Rowbottom, *Origin of Freemasonry as manifested by the Great Pyramid* (1880); Holland, *Freemasonry from the Great Pyramid historically illustrated* (1885); Chapman, *The Great Pyramid, etc.* (1886); Weisse, *The Obelisk and Freemasonry, according to the discoveries of Belzoni and Gorringe* (New York, 1880); Katsch, *Die Entstehung und wahre Endzweck der Freimaurerei* (1897); Findel, *History of Freemasonry* (1861–2; 1905), translated and revised by Lyon, 1869; influential in spreading more accurate historical notions among Masons; Gould, *Hist. of Freemasonry* (3 vols., 1883–1887), now reputed the best historical work on Freemasonry; Chetwode Crawley, *Cœmentaria Hibernica* (1895–1900); Hughan, *Origin of the English Rite of Freemasonry* (1884); *The Old Charges of British Freemasons* (London, 1872; 1895); Kloss, *Gesch. der Fr. in Engl., Irland und Schottland 1685–1784* (1847); Boos, *Gesch. der Freimaurerei* (1896); Hascall, *Hist. of Freemasonry* (1891); *Early Hist. and Transactions of Masons of New York* (1876); McClenachan, *Hist. of the Frat. in New York* (1888–94); Ross Robertson, *Hist. of Freemasonry in Canada* (1899); Drummond, *Hist. and Bibliogr. Memoranda and Hist. of Symb. and Royal Arch Masonry in the U. S.; Supplement to* Gould, *Hist.* (1889); Thory, *Annales, etc., du Grand Orient de France* (1812); Kloss, *Gesch. der Freimaurerei in Frankr.* (1852–3); Jouast, *Hist. du Grand Orient Fr.* (1865); Lewis, *Gesch. d. Freimaurerei i. Oesterreich* (1861); Abafi, *Gesch. d. Freimaurerei in Oesterreich-Ungarn* (1890 sqq.), *Principles, Spirit, Symbolism of Freemasonry*. Chief Sources:—*The Constitutions of the Freemasons*, 1723 and 1738; Hutchinson, *Spirit of Freemasonry* (1775); Town, *System of Spec. Masonry* (1822, New York); Oliver, *Antiquities of Freemasonry* (1823); *The Star in the East* (1827); *Signs and Symbols* (1830, 1857); Pike, (1) *Morals and Dogma of the A. A. Scot. Rite of Fy. 5632* (1882); Idem, (2) *The Book of the Words 5638* (1878); Idem, (3) *The Porch and the Middle Chamber. Book of the Lodge 5632* (1872); Idem, (4) *The Inner Sanctuary* (1870–79); Krause, *Die drei ältesten Kunsturkunden der Frmrei* (1810), still much esteemed, in spite of historical errors, as a critical appreciation of Freemasonry; Findel (best German authority), *Geist und Form der Fr.* (1874, 1898); Idem, *Die Grundsätze der Fr. im Volkerleben* (1892); Idem, *Die moderne Weltanschauung und die Fr.* (1885); Idem, *Der frmische Gedanke* (1898); *Bauhütte* (1858–1891) and *Signale* (1895–1905).

Anti-masonic publications: From 1723–1743, English Freemasonry and Anderson, *History*, were derided in many publications (Gould, 2, 294, 327); against French Freemasonry appeared: *L'Ordre des Freemasons trahi 1738* (A. Q. C., IX, 85) and *Le Secret des Mopses révélé* (1745); *Sceau rompu* (1745); on the occasion of the French Revolution: Lefranc, *Le voile levé* (1792). In the United States the anti-Masonic movement began 1783: Creigh, *Masonry and Antimasonry* (1854); Stone, *Letters on Masonry and Antimasonry* (1832); Fenkin, *Downfall of Masonry* (1838); *Catalogue of anti-Masonic books* (Boston, 1862); *Sechs Stimmen über geheime Gesellschaften und Frmrei* (1824); Eckert, *Der Frmrorden in seiner wahren Bedeutung* (1852); Hengstenberg, *Die Frmrei und das evang. Pfarramt* (1854–56); *Civiltà Cattolica* since 1866; Negroni, *Storia passata e presente della setta anticristiana. ed antisociale* (1876); Mencacci, *Memorie documentate della rivoluzione italiana* (1882); Rinieri, *Cozetti masonici* (1900–01); Enigma, *La setta verde* (1906–7); Gruber, *Mazzini; Massoneria e Rivoluzione* (1901), traces the revolutionary work of Italian Masonry from 1870 till 1900; Gautrelet, *La Franc-maçonnerie et la Révolution* (1872); Janet, *Les sociétés secrètes et la société* (3rd ed., 1880–83), best general survey of the revolutionary work of secret societies in all countries; Browers, *L'Action de la Franc-m. dans l'hist. moderne* (1892); Lerouse, *La Franc-m. sous la 3e République* (1886); Copin-Albancelli, *La Franc-m.* (1892); Goyau, *La Franc-m. en France* (1899); Nourrisson, *Le club des Jacobins* (1900); Idem, *Les Jacobins au pouvoir* (1904); Bidegain, *Le Grand Orient de France* (1905); Neut, *La F.-m. soumise au grand jour de la publicité* (1866), contains valuable documents on French, Belgian, and German Masonry; Mallie, *La Maçonnerie Belge* (1906), documents on the most recent political activity of Belgian Masonry; de La Fuerte, *Historia de las Sociedades secretas antiquas y modernas en España*, etc. (1870–71); Brück, *Die geheimen Gesellschaften in Spanien* (1881); Trado y Royas, *La Masonería en España* (1892–3); de Rafael, *La Masonería pintada por si misma* (1883); Pachtler, *Der stille Krieg gegen Thron und Altar* (1876); Beuren (M. Raich), *Die innere Unwahrheit der Frmrei* (1884); Gruber, (4) *Die Frmrei und die öffent. Ordnung* (1893); Idem, (5) *Einigungsbestrebungen*, etc. (1898); Idem, (6) *Der "giftige Kern"*, etc. (1899); Idem, (7) *Frmrei und Umsturzbewegung* (1901); *Streifzüge durch das Reich der Frmrei* (1897); Ewald, *Loge und Kulturkampf* (1899); Osseg, *Der Hammer d. Frmrei*, etc. (1875); W. B., *Beiträge zur Geschichte der F. in Oesterreich* (1868); *Die Frmrei in Oesterreich Ungarn* (1897). In Poland: Michalow, *Die geh. Werkstätte der Poln. Erhebung* (1830; 1877); Zaleski, *O Masonii w Polsce 1738–1820* (Cracow, 1908); for Anglo-Saxon and French Masonry see Preuss, *A Study in American Freemasonry* (St. Louis, 1908), a careful discussion on the basis of the standard works of Mackey and Pike.

Hermann Gruber.

Maspha.—Name of several places in the Bible. The Septuagint transcribes Μασφά, Μασσηφά, Μασσηφάτ; Vulg.: *Maspha* and *Masphath* (once *Masphe, Masepha, Mesphe*); Hebrew: *Miçpeh* and *Miçpah;* the latter almost invariably in pause. The word, with many other proper names, is derived from √ÇPH= watch, observe, and means "watch-tower" (*speculum*, σκοπία), which sense it bears twice in the Bible (Is., xxi, 8; II Par., xx, 24). Josephus interprets by κατοπτευόμενον or (Antt. VI, ii, 1). It is thus a natural name for a town in a commanding position (cf. the Crusading Belvoir, and el-Múshrífeh (Palmer, Desert of the Exodus, II, 513). Like the latter it almost invariably has the article.

Maspha of Galaad.—*History.*—Jacob to ratify his compact with Laban, "took a stone and set it up for a title, and he said to his brethren 'Bring hither stones'. And they, gathering stones together, made a heap and they ate upon it (or *by* it R. V.). And Laban said, 'This heap (gal) shall be a witness ('ēd) between me and thee this day, and therefore the name thereof was called Galaad (gal'ēd) and Míçpah (so R. V. with Hebrew) for he said 'The Lord watch (yeçef √ÇPH) between me and thee when we are absent one from another'" (Gen. XXXI, 45 ff.). Here the Vulgate omits *hám-Miçpah*, the Septuagint translates ἡ δρησις, Targums of Onkelos and Sifre, Sĕkûthâ, i. e. view. The

play on the Hebrew words is not unnatural if we suppose that the spot itself or some neighbouring height was already called Maspha. The name seems to have gradually extended from the height to the whole region (Judges, xi, 29). The monument was probably a cairn or a dolmen. While the latter is suggested by the flat surface on which they ate (verse 46; Josephus, "Ant.", I, xix, 11; Conder, "Heth and Moab," 241), the sepulchral destination of the dolmens and the ambiguity of the Hebrew militate against this view (Schumacher, "Across the Jordan pass.").

Around Jacob's monument Israel assembled to repel Ammon (Judges, x, 17). Thither they summoned Jephte, "and Jephte spoke all his words before the Lord at Maspha" (Judges, xi, 11). By Maspha of Galaad (a region?) he marched against Ammon, and after victory "to Maspha to his house". The Septuagint translates by σκοπία the rendezvous of Israel, and the place by which Jephte passed over against Ammon. They thus distinguish between the sanctuary and town, and a watch-tower on the height above (cf. Palmer, op. cit., II, 512–513); but in Osee, v, 1, they likewise use the common noun when parallelism manifestly requires the proper name. At Maspha probably Jephte was buried (Judges, xii, 7, and variants in Kittel, and perhaps Josephus, "Antiquities", V, vii, 12).

Identification.—We cannot decide whether the Maspha of Jacob and Jephte is identical with Rāmáth hám-Míçpéh (Jos., xiii, 26), or both with Râmoth Gil'ed (III Kings, iv, 13), nor even whether Maspha refers to one or many places. In Jephte's history it seems near the borders of Ammon, in that of Judas Maccabæus far to the N. E., and, if we place here the events of Judges, xxi–xxii, near the Western frontier (G. A. Smith, "Hist. Geog. of H. Land", 586). Jacob was coming from Padan Aram and probably approached Galaad by the Hajj route. Turning westward N. of Jabeoc he would traverse the valley of Jerash. About four miles from Jerash, S. E. of Maḥneh (before Mahanaim?), on a high mountain overhanging the valley, is the village of Sûf in a locality rich in dolmens. Many identify with Maspha this place whose derivation may be identical with and whose name recalls the Σεβεήν of Josephus, l. c. But Dr. Schumacher discovered N. E. of Jerash Tell Máṣfah, whose summit dominating all the surrounding heights is strewn with dolmens and stone-hewn altars. The ideal site, exact preservation of the ancient name and the veneration still attaching to the spot (it is still a *ma'bad*) all justify its identification with Maspha.

For identification with Ramath Gilead and es-Salt cf.:—Schwartz, *Tebuoth ha-Arez*, 269, 270 (Jerusalem, 1900); v. Riess, *Biblische Geographie* (Freiburg im Br., 1872), 64. Against it cf. Driver, *Commentary on Deuteronomy* (Edinburgh, 1902).

For Sûf: etc.:—Conder, *Heth and Moab* (London, 1889), 181; Armstrong, *Names and Places in the Old Testament* (London, 1887); Oliphant, *Land of Galaad* (London, 1880), 209–18; Buhl, *Geographie des Alten Palästina* (Freiburg im Br., '96); Merrill, *East of Jordan*, 365–374; Smith, *Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, 487, 679 (London, 1907); *Mittheilungen und Nachrichten des deut. paläst. Vereins*, 1897, 66; 1899, 1f, 66.

Maspha of Benjamin.—*History.*—Maspha was assigned to Benjamin by Josue (Jos., xviii, 26). Here, according to many, Israel assembled to avenge the outrage on the Levite's wife, and swore not to give their daughters in marriage to the survivors. But as they would scarcely have gathered in the heart of the enemy's country, others place the events of Judges, xx–xxi, at Maspha of Galaad. Note that Jabes Galaad is mentioned in close connexion with the camp of Israel. Further, Judges, xx, 3, implies that Maspha was outside the borders of Benjamin. To Maspha Samuel when Judge convoked all Israel, prayed for them there while they defeated the Philistines, and erected a monument to commemorate the victory between Maspha and Sen (I Kings, vii, 5–12). Here he held some of his chief assizes (Kings, x, 13–16), and his final assembly for the election of Saul (ibid., 17). Two hundred and fifty years later Maspha was fortified by Asa, King of Juda, with the materials left behind at Rama by King Baasa in his hasty march northwards against the Syrians (III Kings, xv, 22; II Par., xvi, 6). Jerusalem destroyed (586 B. C.) Godolias, Governor of Juda, made Maspha his headquarters (Jer., xli, 6; IV Kings, xxv, 23 sq.) and there the tragic events of Jer., xlii, took place. In the rebuilding of the walls of Jerusalem the lords of Maspha took an active part (II Esd., iii, 7, 15, 17). Some infer from verse 7 that Maspha was the seat of government (Hölscher, "Palästina in der Pers. und Hellen. Zeit", 29); but this is unlikely (Smith, "Jerusalem", II, 354 n.). Judas Machabeus, preparing for war with the Syrians, gathered his men "to Maspha, over against Jerusalem: for in Maspha was a place of prayer heretofore in Israel" (I Mach., iii, 46), and transported thither the ritualistic observances.

Identification:—(a) Many moderns suggest Nebî-Sámwîl, the most striking position around Jerusalem, and identify Maspha with Rama and Ramathaim-Sophim, relying chiefly on the connexion with Samuel implied by the modern name. In that case the rendezvous for the Benjaminite war must be sought in Galaad or Ephraim, perhaps near Silo, and the "house of the Lord" (Jer., xli, 6) cannot refer to Jerusalem. (b) Guérin (Judée, I, 395–402) placed Maspha at Shâfat, a village on high ground overlooking Jerusalem, but his etymology is suspect, and Shâfat suits neither III Kings, xv, 22, nor I Mach., iii, 46. The same objections hold for Tell el-Fûl only three miles N. of Jerusalem. (c) Others suggest Tell en-Nâsbeh, which commands a narrow defile on the high road two miles S. of el-Bîreh. (d) Perhaps the best conjecture is el-Bîreh, which has a copious water supply, is sufficiently northerly to permit of a camp there against Benjamin, lies on the road from Silo to Jerusalem, and is near Bethel (cf. Josephus, "Antiq.", V, ii, 10). This identification was expressly made by Surius ("Le Pieux Pèlerin", III, ii, 547, Brussels, 1660), and by some copies of the map of Sanuto (1306) (Röhricht "Zeitschr. des deut. paläst. Vereins," 1898, Map 6). Near the village is a large spring, 'în Mísbâh, whose name may be a modernization of Maspha. Burchard (1283), indeed, identifies el-Bîreh with Machmas ("Peregrinationes medii ævi quatuor", Leipzig, 1873, p. 56), and similarly others [e. g. Maundrell (1697) in "Pinkerton Voyages", X, 337]; but Machmas was certainly elsewhere, and the identification serves only to show that the homophony of Beroth and Bîreh is not conclusive.

For the testimony of Eusebius and the Franks cf. Heidet in Vigouroux, *Dict. de la Bible*, s. v. For identification with (a) cf., Schwartz, *op. cit.*, 152, 492; Armstrong, *op. cit.*, 127; Robinson, *Biblical Researches*, II (Boston, 1841), 139–149; *Survey of Western Palestine, Memoirs*, III, 144; Buhl, *op. cit.*, 167; Fischer Guthe, *Map of Palestine*; (b) Shâfat:—v. Riess, *op. cit.*, p. 64; Gatt in *Das heilige Land* (Cologne, 1879), 119–126; 154–160; 184–194; Stanley, *Sinai and Palestine*, (London, 1871) 226; Hagen, *Index Topographicus* (Paris, 1908); de Saulcy, *Voyage autour de la Mer Morte*, I (Paris, 1883), 112–115; (c) Vincent, *Revue Biblique* (1898), 630; (1899), 315–316; (1901), 151; (1902), 458; Conder, *Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly* (1898), 169, 251; Raboisson, *Les Mizpeh* (Paris, 1897); (d) Heidet in *Revue Biblique*, 1894, 321–356, 450; 1895, 97; Idem in *Revue d'Orient*, 1898, 295–300; *La Palestine, Guide historique et pratique* (Paris, 1904), 317 sqq.

Maspha of Juda (ham-Miçpeh, Masepha, Μασφα) is placed in the Sephela, in the second group of towns "in the lot of Juda", between Delea and Jechtel (Jos., xv, 38). Eusebius and Jerome place it in the territory of Eleutheropolis near the road to Elia. William of Tyre mentions a crusading fortress eight miles N. of Ascalon near the frontiers of Palestine and Simeon, called Tell es-Saphi-Blanche Garde-Alba Specula. This is undoubtedly Tell es-Sâfîyeh and is commonly identified with Maspha. Both places served to watch Ascalon. The map of Madaba calls the place Σαφίθα.

As however this can scarcely be other than Sephata (cf. II Par., xiv, 10; List of Thotmes III in "Mittheil. der Deut. Vorderas. Gessell.", 1907 pl.; "Rev. Bib.", 1908, 516), the question arises whether Masepha and Sepheta can refer to the same place.

Survey of Western Palestine, Memoirs, II, 440; ROBINSON, *op. cit.*, II, 31; GUÉRIN, *op. cit.*, II, 92; DE SAULCY, *Dictionnaire topographique abrégé* 220 (Paris, '71); V. RIESS, *op cit.*, 64; BUHL, *op. cit.*, 196.

LAND OF MASPHA, near Hermon. "The Hevite, who dwelt at the foot of Hermon in the land of Maspha", was amongst the foes on whom Josue fell at Lake Merom and chased to "the great Sidon and the waters of Maserephoth, and the field of Maspha" eastward (Jos., xi, 8). Probably the two names here mentioned indicate one place despite the variations of the versions (Heb., Miçpah, Miçpeh; LXX, Μασσυμα, Μασσώχ; Alex., Μασσηφάθ, Μασσηφά; Vulg., Maspha, Masphe).

Identifications.—Suggestions differ according as "eastward" is referred to Sidon or Merom. Hence west of Hermon either (a) The Merj 'úyûn, a fertile plain, the Litâny and the Nahr Hasbâny, with Metúllah replacing Maspha, or (b), the plain from Metúllah to Banias, with es-Súbêbeh as Maspha, or (c) the valley of the Litâny, actually called el-Buqâ'. If "eastward" refers to Merom (which is more probable) then Maspha may be the Wâdŷ el-'ájám, stretching south of Hermon and traversed by the Roman road (Via Maris) from Damascus.

At the western end of the valley is the village of el-Búqâ'ty, perhaps an echo of Bíq'át Miçpeh.

ARMSTRONG, *op. cit.*, 127; SCHWARTZ, *op. cit.*, 74; v. RIESS, *Bible Atlas*, 20, 1887; BUHL, *op. cit.*, 240; DILLMANN, *Commentarium in Josue.*

MASPHA OF MOAB, whither David fled with his parents from Adullam (I Kings, xxii, 3 sq.). We have no clue to its identification, save that it was, temporarily, at least, a royal residence.

SCHWARTZ, *op. cit.*, 254. For general reference:—HASTINGS, *Dictionary of the Bible*, s. v.; VIGOUROUX, *Dictionnaire de la Bible*, s. v.; BAEDEKER, *Syria and Palestine*, 4th ed. (Leipzig, 1906).

J. A. HARTIGAN.

Mass, CHAPTER AND CONVENTUAL.—As a general rule, churches in which the Divine office is to be said publicly every day must also have Mass said daily. This Mass is the "conventual" Mass (*missa conventualis*); it completes, with the canonical Hours, the official public service of God in such a church. A conventual Mass then is to be sung or said in all cathedrals and collegiate churches that have a chapter; in this case it is often called the "chapter" Mass (*missa capituli*), though the official books constantly use the general name "conventual" for this Mass too. A conventual (not chapter) Mass must also be celebrated daily in churches of regulars who have the obligation of the public recitation of the office, therefore certainly in churches of monks and canons regular. Whether mendicant friars have this obligation is disputed. Some authors consider them obliged by common law, others admit only whatever obligation they may have from their special constitutions or from custom. Some extend the obligation even to churches of nuns who say the office in choir. That friars may celebrate a daily conventual Mass according to the rule of monastic churches is admitted by every one (de Herdt., I, 14). A chapter Mass then is a kind of conventual Mass, and falls under the same rules.

The obligation of procuring the conventual Mass rests with the corporate body in question and so concerns its superiors (Dean, Provost, Abbot, etc.). Normally it should be said by one of the members, but the obligation is satisfied as long as some priest who may celebrate lawfully undertakes it. The conventual Mass should always, if possible, be a high Mass; but if this is impossible, low Mass is still treated as a high Mass with regard to the number of collects said, the candles, absence of prayers at the end, and so on. It may not be said during the recitation of the office, but at certain fixed times between the canonical Hours, as is explained below. The general rule is that the conventual Mass should correspond to the office with which it forms a whole. It is not allowed to sing two high Masses both conformed to the office on the same day. On the other hand, there are cases in which two different conventual Masses are celebrated. The cases in which the Mass does not correspond to the office are these: on Saturdays in Advent (except Ember Saturday and a Vigil), if the office is ferial the Mass is of the Blessed Virgin. On Vigils in Advent that are not also Ember days, if the office is ferial the Mass is of the Vigil commemorating the feria. On Maundy Thursday and Holy Saturday the Mass does not conform to the office. On Rogation Tuesday, if the office is ferial the Mass is of Rogation. On Whitsun Eve the office is of the Ascension, but the Mass a Whitsun Mass. When a Vigil, an Ember day or Rogation Monday falls within an octave (except that of the Blessed Sacrament) the office is of the octave, and the Mass of the feria, commemorating the octave. Except in Advent and Lent, on Ember days, Rogation days and Vigils, if the office is ferial and the Sunday Mass has already been said that week, the conventual Mass may be one of the Votive Masses in the Missal appointed for each day in the week. Except in Advent, Lent and Paschal time, on the first day of the month not prevented by a double or semi-double, the conventual Mass is a Requiem for deceased members and benefactors of the community.

On doubles, semi-doubles, Sundays, and during octaves, the conventual Mass is said after Terce, on simples and ferias after Sext, on ferias of Advent and Lent, on Vigils and Ember days after None. There are also occasions on which several conventual Masses are said on the same day. On ferias of Lent, on Ember days, Rogation days and Vigils when a double or semi-double occurs, or during an octave or when a Votive office is said, the Mass corresponding to the office is said after Terce, that of the feria after None. On Ascension eve, if a double or semi-double occurs, the Mass of the feast is said after Terce, that of the Vigil after Sext, that of Rogation after None. In the case of the conventual Requiem mentioned above, if a simple occurs or if the Mass of the preceding Sunday has not yet been said, the Requiem is celebrated after the Office of the Dead, or if that is not said, after Prime, the Mass of the simple or Sunday after Sext. On All Souls' day (2 Nov.) the Mass of the octave (or feast) is said after Terce, the Requiem after None. When an additional Votive Mass has to be said (for instance for the Forty Hours or for the anniversary of the bishop's consecration or enthronement, etc.) it is said after None. On the Monday of each week (except in Lent and Paschal time) if the office is ferial the conventual Mass may be a Requiem. But if it is a simple or a feria with a proper Mass, or if the Sunday Mass has not been said, the collect for the dead (*Fidelium*) is added to that of the day instead. These rules concerning the celebration of two or more conventual Masses apply as laws only to chapters. Regulars are not bound to celebrate more than one such Mass each day (corresponding always to the office), unless the particular constitutions of their order impose this obligation.

See the Rubrics of the Missal (*Rubr. gen. tit. I–VII*), where the Mass in question is primarily the conventual Mass, and any authorized book of ceremonial; DE HERDT, *S. Liturgiæ Praxis* (Louvain, 1894), 14–17; LE VAVASSEUR, *Manuel de Liturgie* (10th ed., Paris, 1910), 205–221; DALE, *Ceremonial according to the Roman Rite* (London, 1906).

ADRIAN FORTESCUE.

Mass, LITURGY OF THE.—A. *Name and Definition.*—The Mass is the complex of prayers and ceremonies that make up the service of the Eucharist in the Latin

rites. As in the case of all liturgical terms the name is less old than the thing. From the time of the first preaching of the Christian Faith in the West, as everywhere, the Holy Eucharist was celebrated as Christ had instituted it at the Last Supper, according to His command, in memory of Him. But it was not till long afterwards that the late Latin name *Missa*, used at first in a vaguer sense, became the technical and almost exclusive name for this service.

In the first period, while Greek was still the Christian language at Rome, we find the usual Greek names used there, as in the East. The commonest was *Εὐχαριστία*, used both for the consecrated bread and wine and for the whole service. Clement of Rome (d. about 101) uses the verbal form still in its general sense of "giving thanks", but also in connexion with the Liturgy (I Clem., Ad Cor., xxxviii, 4: *κατὰ πάντα εὐχαριστεῖν αὐτῷ*). The other chief witness for the earliest Roman Liturgy, Justin Martyr (d. c. 167), speaks of *eucharist* in both senses repeatedly (Apol., I, lxv, 3, 5; lxvi, §1; lxvii, 5). After him the word is always used, and passes into Latin (*eucharistia*) as soon as there is a Latin Christian Literature [Tertullian (d. c. 220), "De præscr.", xxxvi, in P. L., II, 50; St. Cyprian (d. 258), Ep., liv, etc.]. It remains the normal name for the sacrament throughout Catholic theology, but is gradually superseded by *Missa* for the whole rite. Clement calls the service *Λειτουργία* (I Cor., xl, 2, 5; xli, 1) and *προσφορά* (ibid., 2, 4), with, however, a shade of different meaning ("rite", "oblation"). These and the other usual Greek names (*κλάσις ἄρτου* in the Catacombs; *κοινωνία, σύναξις, συνέλευσις* in Justin, "I Apol.", lxvii, 3), with their not yet strictly technical connotation, are used during the first two centuries in the West as in the East. With the use of the Latin language in the third century came first translations of the Greek terms. While *eucharistia* is very common, we find also its translation *gratiarum actio* (Tertullian, "Adv. Marcionem", I, xxiii, in P. L., II, 274); *benedictio* (= *εὐλογία*) occurs too (ibid., III, xxii; "De idolol.", xxii); *sacrificium*, generally with an attribute (*divina sacrificia, novum sacrificium, sacrificia Dei*), is a favourite expression of St. Cyprian (Ep. liv, 3; "De orat. dom.", iv; "Test. adv. Iud.", I, xvi; Ep. xxxiv, 3; lxiii, 15, etc.). We find also *Solemnia* (Cypr., "De lapsis", xxv), "Dominica solemnia" (Tert., "De fuga", xiv), *Prex, Oblatio, Cœna Domini* (Tert., "Ad uxor.", II, iv, in P. L., I, 1294), *Spirituale ac cæleste sacramentum* (Cypr., Ep., lxiii, 13), *Dominicum* (Cypr., "De opere et eleem.", xv; Ep. lxiii, 16), *Officium* (Tert., "De orat.", xiv), even *Passio* (Cypr., Ep. xlii), and other expressions that are rather descriptions than technical names.

All these were destined to be supplanted in the West by the classical name *Missa*. The first certain use of it is by St. Ambrose (d. 397). He writes to his sister Marcellina describing the troubles of the Arians in the years 385 and 386, when the soldiers were sent to break up the service in his church: "The next day (it was a Sunday) after the lessons and the tract, having dismissed the catechumens, I explained the creed [*symbolum tradebam*] to some of the competents [people about to be baptized] in the baptistery of the basilica. There I was told suddenly that they had sent soldiers to the Portiana basilica. . . . But I remained at my place and began to say Mass [*missam facere cœpi*]. While I offer [*dum offero*], I hear that a certain Castulus has been seized by the people" (Ep., I, xx, 4–5). It will be noticed that *missa* here means the Eucharistic Service proper, the Liturgy of the Faithful only, and does not include that of the Catechumens. Ambrose uses the word as one in common use and well known. There is another, still earlier, but very doubtfully authentic instance of the word in a letter of Pope Pius I (from c. 142 to c. 157): "Euprepia has handed over possession of her house to the poor, where . . . we make Masses with our poor" (*cum pauperibus nostris . . . missas agimus*"—Pii I, Ep. I, in Galland, "Bibl. vet. patrum", Venice, 1765, I, 672). The authenticity of the letter, however, is very doubtful. If *Missa* really occurred in the second century in the sense it now has, it would be surprising that it never occurs in the third. We may consider St. Ambrose as the earliest certain authority for it.

From the fourth century the term becomes more and more common. For a time it occurs nearly always in the sense of *dismissal*. St. Augustine (d. 430) says: "After the sermon the dismissal of the catechumens takes place" (*post sermonem fit missa catechumenorum*—Serm., xlix, 8, in P. L., XXXVIII, 324). The Synod of Lerida in Spain (524) declares that people guilty of incest may be admitted to church "usque ad missam catechumenorum", that is, till the catechumens are dismissed (Can., iv, Hefele-Leclercq, "Hist. des Conciles", II, 1064). The same expression occurs in the Synod of Valencia at about the same time (Can., i, ibid., 1067), in Hincmar of Reims (d. 882) ("Opusc. LV capitul.", xxiv, in P. L., CXXVI, 380), etc. Etheria (fourth century) calls the whole service, or the Liturgy of the Faithful, *missa* constantly ("Peregr. Silviæ", e. g., xxiv, 11, *Benedicit fideles et fit missa*, etc.). So also Innocent I (401–17) in Ep., xvii, 5, P. L., XX, 535, Leo I (440–61), in Ep., ix, 2, P. L., LIV, 627. Although from the beginning the word *Missa* usually means the Eucharistic Service or some part of it, we find it used occasionally for other ecclesiastical offices too. In St. Benedict's (d. 543) Rule *fiant missæ* is used for the dismissal at the end of the canonical hours (chap., xvii, passim). In the Leonine Sacramentary (sixth cent. See LITURGICAL BOOKS), the word in its present sense is supposed throughout. The title, "Item alia", at the head of each Mass means "Item alia missa". The Gelasian book (sixth or seventh cent. Cf. ibid.) supplies the word: "Item alia missa", "Missa Chrismatis", "Orationes ad missa [*sic*] in natale Sanctorum", and so on throughout. From that time it becomes the regular, practically exclusive, name for the Holy Liturgy in the Roman and Gallican Rites.

The origin and first meaning of the word, once much discussed, is not really doubtful. We may dismiss at once such fanciful explanations as that *missa* is the Hebrew *missah* ("oblation"—so Reuchlin and Luther), or the Greek *μύησις* ("initiation"), or the German *Mess* ("assembly", "market"). Nor is it the participle feminine of *mittere*, with a noun understood ("oblatio missa ad Deum", "congregatio missa", i. e., *dimissa*—so Diez, "Etymol. Wörterbuch der roman. Sprachen", 212, and others). It is a substantive of a late form for *missio*. There are many parallels in medieval Latin, *collecta, ingressa, confessa, accessa, ascensa*—all for forms in *-io*. It does not mean an offering (*mittere*, in the sense of handing over to God), but the dismissal of the people, as in the versicle: "Ite missa est" (Go, the dismissal is made). It may seem strange that this unessential detail should have given its name to the whole service. But there are many similar cases in liturgical language. *Communion, confession, breviary* are none of them names that express the essential character of what they denote. In the case of the word *missa* we can trace the development of its meaning step by step. We have seen it used by St. Augustine, synods of the sixth century, and Hincmar of Reims for "dismissal". *Missa Catechumenorum* means the dismissal of the catechumens. It appears that *missa fit* or *missa est* was the regular formula for sending people away at the end of a trial or legal process. Avitus of Vienne (d. 523) says: "In churches and palaces or law-courts the dismissal is proclaimed to be made [*missa fieri pronuntiatur*] when the people are dismissed from their attendance" (Ep. i). So also St. Isidore of Seville: "At the time of the

sacrifice the dismissal is [*missa tempore sacrificii est*] when the catechumens are sent out, as the deacon cries: If any one of the catechumens remain, let him go out: and thence it is the dismissal [*et inde missa*]" ("Etymol.", VI, xix, in P. L., LXXXII, 252). As there was a dismissal of the catechumens at the end of the first part of the service, so was there a dismissal of the faithful (the baptized) after the Communion. There were, then, a *missa catechumenorum* and a *missa fidelium*, both, at first, in the sense of dismissals only. So Florus Diaconus (d. 860): "*Missa* is understood as nothing but *dimissio*, that is, *absolutio*, which the deacon pronounces when the people are dismissed from the solemn service. The deacon cried out and the catechumens were sent [*mittebantur*], that is, were dismissed outside [*id est, dimittebantur foras*]. So the *missa catechumenorum* was made before the action of the Sacrament (i. e., before the *Canon Actionis*), the *missa fidelium* is made "—note the difference of tense; in Florus's time the dismissal of the catechumens had ceased to be practised—"after the consecration and communion" [*post confectionem et participationem*] (P. L., CXIX, 72).

How the word gradually changed its meaning from dismissal to the whole service, up to and including the dismissal, is not difficult to understand. In the texts quoted we see already the foundation of such a change. To stay till the *missa catechumenorum* is easily modified into: to stay for, or during, the *missa catechumenorum*. So we find these two *missæ* used for the two halves of the Liturgy. Ivo of Chartres (d. 1116) has forgotten the original meaning, and writes: "Those who heard the *missa catechumenorum* evaded the *missa sacramentorum*" (Ep. ccxix, in P. L., CLXII, 224). The two parts are then called by these two names; as the discipline of the catechumenate is gradually forgotten, and there remains only one connected service, it is called by the long familiar name *missa*, without further qualification. We find, however, through the Middle Ages the plural *missæ*, *missarum solemnia*, as well as *missæ sacramentum* and such modified expressions also. Occasionally the word is transferred to the feast-day. The feast of St. Martin, for instance, is called *Missa S. Martini*. It is from this use that the German *Mess*, *Messtag*, and so on are derived. The day and place of a local feast was the occasion of a market (for all this see Rottmanner, op. cit., in bibliography below). *Kirmess* (Flemish *Kermis*, Fr. *kermesse*) is *Kirch-mess*, the anniversary of the dedication of a church, the occasion of a fair. The Latin *missa* is modified in all Western languages (It. *messa*, Sp. *misa*, Fr. *messe*, Germ. *Messe*, etc.). The English form before the Conquest was *maesse*, then Middle Engl. *messe*, *masse*—"It nedith not to speke of the masse ne the seruise that thei hadde that day" ("Merlin" in the Early Engl. Text Soc., II, 375) —"And whan our parish masse was done" ("Sir Cauline", Child's Ballads, III, 175). It also existed as a verb: "to mass" was to say mass; "massing-priest" was a common term of abuse at the Reformation.

It should be noted that the name *Mass* (*missa*) applies to the Eucharistic service in the Latin rites only. Neither in Latin nor in Greek has it ever been applied to any Eastern rite. For them the corresponding word is *Liturgy* (*liturgia*). It is a mistake that leads to confusion, and a scientific inexactitude, to speak of any Eastern Liturgy as a Mass.

B. *The Origin of the Mass.*—The Western Mass, like all Liturgies, begins, of course, with the Last Supper. What Christ then did, repeated as he commanded in memory of Him, is the nucleus of the Mass. As soon as the Faith was brought to the West the Holy Eucharist was celebrated here, as in the East. At first the language used was Greek. Out of that earliest Liturgy, the language being changed to Latin, developed the two great parent rites of the West, the Roman and the Gallican (see LITURGY). Of these two the Gallican Mass may be traced without difficulty. It is so plainly Antiochene in its structure, in the very text of many of its prayers, that we are safe in accounting for it as a translated form of the Liturgy of Jerusalem-Antioch, brought to the West at about the time when the more or less fluid universal Liturgy of the first three centuries gave place to different fixed rites (see LITURGY; GALLICAN RITE). The origin of the Roman Mass, on the other hand, is a most difficult question. We have here two fixed and certain data: the Liturgy in Greek described by St. Justin Martyr (d. c. 165), which is that of the Church of Rome in the second century, and, at the other end of the development, the Liturgy of the first Roman Sacramentaries in Latin, in about the sixth century. The two are very different. Justin's account represents a rite of what we should now call an Eastern type, corresponding with remarkable exactness to that of the Apostolic Constitutions (see LITURGY). The Leonine and Gelasian Sacramentaries show us what is practically our present Roman Mass. How did the service change from the one to the other? It is one of the chief difficulties in the history of liturgy. During the last few years, especially, all manner of solutions and combinations have been proposed. We will first note some points that are certain, that may serve as landmarks in an investigation.

Justin Martyr, Clement of Rome, Hippolytus (d. 235), and Novatian (c. 250) all agree in the Liturgies they describe, though the evidence of the last two is scanty (Probst, "Liturgie der drei ersten christl. Jahrhdte"; Drews, "Untersuchungen über die sogen. clement. Liturgie"). Justin gives us the fullest liturgical description of any Father of the first three centuries (Apol., I, lxv, lxvi, quoted and discussed in LITURGY). He describes how the Holy Eucharist was celebrated at Rome in the middle of the second century; his account is the necessary point of departure, one end of a chain whose intermediate links are hidden. We have hardly any knowledge at all of what developments the Roman Rite went through during the third and fourth centuries. This is the mysterious time where conjecture may, and does, run riot. By the fifth century we come back to comparatively firm ground, after a radical change. At this time we have the fragment in Pseudo-Ambrose, "De sacramentis" (about 400. Cf. P. L., XVI, 443), and the letter of Pope Innocent I (401–17) to Decentius of Eugubium (P. L., XX, 553). In these documents we see that the Roman Liturgy is said in Latin and has already become in essence the rite we still use. A few indications of the end of the fourth century agree with this. A little later we come to the earliest Sacramentaries (Leonine, fifth or sixth century; Gelasian, sixth or seventh century) and from then the history of the Roman Mass is fairly clear. The fifth and sixth centuries therefore show us the other end of the chain. For the interval between the second and fifth centuries, during which the great change took place, although we know so little about Rome itself, we have valuable data from Africa. There is every reason to believe that in liturgical matters the Church of Africa followed Rome closely. We can supply much of what we wish to know about Rome from the African Fathers of the third century, Tertullian (d. c. 220), St. Cyprian (d. 258), the Acts of St. Perpetua and St. Felicitas (203), St. Augustine (d. 430) (see Cabrol, "Dictionnaire d' archéologie", I, 591–657). The question of the change of language from Greek to Latin is less important than it might seem. It came about naturally when Greek ceased to be the usual language of the Roman Christians. Pope Victor I (190–202), an African, seems to have been the first to use Latin at Rome. Novatian writes Latin. By the second half of the third century the usual liturgical language at Rome seems to have been Latin (Kattenbusch, "Symbolik", II, 331), though fragments of Greek remained

for many centuries. Other writers think that Latin was not finally adopted till the end of the fourth century (Probst, "Die abendländ. Messe", 5; Rietschel, "Lehrbuch der Liturgik", I, 337). No doubt, for a time both languages were used. The question is discussed at length in C. P. Caspari, "Quellen zur Gesch. des Taufsymbols u. der Glaubensregel" (Christiania, 1879), III, 267 sq. The Creed was sometimes said in Greek, some psalms were sung in that language, the lessons on Holy Saturday were read in Greek and Latin as late as the eighth century (Ordo Rom., I, P. L., LXXVIII, 966–68, 955). There are still such fragments of Greek ("Kyrie eleison", "Agios O Theos") in the Roman Mass. But a change of language does not involve a change of rite. Novatian's Latin allusions to the Eucharistic prayer agree very well with those of Clement of Rome in Greek, and with the Greek forms in Apost. Const., VIII (Drews, op. cit., 107–22). The Africans, Tertullian, St. Cyprian, etc., who write Latin, describe a rite very closely related to that of Justin and the Apostolic Constitutions (Probst, op. cit., 183–206; 215–30). The Gallican Rite, as in Germanus of Paris (Duchesne, "Origines du Culte", 180–217), shows how Eastern—how "Greek"—a Latin Liturgy can be. We must then conceive the change of language in the third century as a detail that did not much affect the development of the rite. No doubt the use of Latin was a factor in the Roman tendency to shorten the prayers, leave out whatever seemed redundant in formulas, and abridge the whole service. Latin is naturally terse, compared with the rhetorical abundance of Greek. This difference is one of the most obvious distinctions between the Roman and the Eastern Rites.

If we may suppose that during the first three centuries there was a common Liturgy throughout Christendom, variable, no doubt, in details, but uniform in all its main points, which common Liturgy is represented by that of the eighth book of the Apostolic Constitutions, we have in that the origin of the Roman Mass as of all other liturgies (see LITURGY). There are, indeed, special reasons for supposing that this type of liturgy was used at Rome. The chief authorities for it (Clement, Justin, Hippolytus, Novatian) are all Roman. Moreover, even the present Roman Rite, in spite of later modifications, retains certain elements that resemble those of the Apost. Const. Liturgy remarkably. For instance, at Rome there neither is nor has been a public Offertory prayer. The "Oremus" said just before the Offertory is the fragment of quite another thing, the old prayers of the faithful, of which we still have a specimen in the series of collects on Good Friday. The Offertory is made in silence while the choir sings part of a psalm. Meanwhile the celebrant says private Offertory prayers which in the old form of the Mass are the Secrets only. The older Secrets are true Offertory prayers. In the Byzantine Rite, on the other hand, the gifts are prepared beforehand, brought up with the singing of the Cherubikon, and offered at the altar by a public Synapte of deacon and people, and a prayer once sung aloud by the celebrant (now only the Ekphonesis is sung aloud). The Roman custom of a silent offertory with private prayer is that of the Liturgy of the Apostolic Constitutions. Here too the rubric says only: "The deacons bring the gifts to the bishop at the altar" (VIII, xii, 3) and "The Bishop, praying by himself [*καθ' ἑαυτόν*, "silently"] with the priests . . ." (VIII, xii, 4). No doubt in this case, too, a psalm was sung meanwhile, which would account for the unique instance of silent prayer. The Apostolic Constitutions order that at this point the deacons should wave fans over the oblation (a practical precaution to keep away insects, VIII, xii, 3); this, too, was done at Rome down to the fourteenth century (Martène, "De antiquis eccl. ritibus", Antwerp, 1763, I, 145). The Roman Mass, like the Apostolic Constitutions (VIII, xi, 12), has a washing of hands just before the Offertory. It once had a kiss of peace before the Preface. Pope Innocent I, in his letter to Decentius of Eugubium (416), remarks on this older custom of placing it *ante confecta mysteria* (before the Eucharistic prayer—P. L., XX, 553). That is its place in the Apost. Const. (VIII, xi, 9). After the Lord's Prayer, at Rome, during the fraction, the celebrant sings: "Pax Domini sit semper vobiscum." It seems that this was the place to which the kiss of peace was first moved (as in Innocent I's letter). This greeting, unique in the Roman Rite, occurs again only in the Apost. Const. (*ἡ εἰρήνη τοῦ θεοῦ μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν*). Here it comes twice: after the Intercession (VIII, xiii, 1) and at the kiss of peace (VIII, xi, 8). The two Roman prayers after the Communion, the Postcommunion and the *Oratio super populum* (*ad populum* in the Gelasian Sacramentary) correspond to the two prayers, first a thanksgiving, then a prayer over the people, in Apost. Const., VIII, xv, 1–5 and 7–9.

There is an interesting deduction that may be made from the present Roman Preface. A number of Prefaces introduce the reference to the angels (who sing the Sanctus) by the form *et ideo*. In many cases it is not clear to what this *ideo* refers. Like the *igitur* at the beginning of the Canon, it does not seem justified by what precedes. May we conjecture that something has been left out? The beginning of the Eucharistic prayer in the Apost. Const., VIII, xii, 6–27 (the part before the Sanctus, our Preface, it is to be found in Brightman, "Liturgies, Eastern and Western", I, Oxford, 1896, 14–18), is much longer, and enumerates at length the benefits of creation and various events of the Old Law. The angels are mentioned twice, at the beginning as the first creatures and then again at the end abruptly, without connexion with what has preceded, in order to introduce the Sanctus. The shortness of the Roman Prefaces seems to make it certain that they have been curtailed. All the other rites begin the Eucharistic prayer (after the formula: "Let us give thanks") with a long thanksgiving for the various benefits of God, which are enumerated. We know, too, how much of the development of the Roman Mass is due to a tendency to abridge the older prayers. If then we suppose that the Roman Preface is such an abridgement of that in the Apost. Const., with the details of the Creation and Old Testament history left out, we can account for the *ideo*. The two references to the angels in the older prayer have met and coalesced. The *ideo* refers to the omitted list of benefits, of which the angels, too, have their share. The parallel between the orders of angels in both liturgies is exact:—

ROMAN MISSAL	APOST. CONST.
. . . . . cum Angelis	. . . . . *στρατιαὶ ἀγγέλων,*
et Archangelis, cum Thronis	*ἀρχαγγέλων,* . . . . . *θρόνων,*
et Dominationibus, cumque	*κυριοτήτων,* . . . . .
omni militia cælestis exer-	. . . . . *στρατιῶν*
citus	*αἰωνίων,* . . . . .
sine fine dicentes.	*λέγοντα ἀκατάπαυστως.*

Another parallel is in the old forms of the "Hanc igitur" prayer. Baumstark ("Liturgia romana", 102–07) has found two early Roman forms of this prayer in Sacramentaries at Vauclair and Rouen, already published by Martène ("Voyage littéraire", Paris, 1724, 40) and Delisle (in Ebner, "Iter italicum", 417), in which it is much longer and has plainly the nature of an Intercession, such as we find in the Eastern rites at the end of the Anaphora. The form is: "Hanc igitur oblationem servitutis nostræ sed et cunctæ familiæ tuæ, quæsumus Domine placatus accipias, quam tibi devoto offerimus corde pro pace et caritate et unitate sanctæ ecclesiæ, pro fide catholica . . . pro sacerdotibus et omni gradu ecclesiæ, pro regibus . . . " (Therefore, O Lord, we beseech Thee, be pleased to accept this offering of our service and of all Thy household, which we offer Thee with devout

heart for the peace, charity, and unity of Holy Church, for the Catholic Faith . . . for the priests and every order of the Church, for kings . . .) and so on, enumerating a complete list of people for whom prayer is said. Baumstark prints these clauses parallel with those of the Intercesison in various Eastern rites; most of them may be found in that of the Apost. Const. (VIII, xii, 40–50, and xiii, 3–9). This, then, supplies another missing element in the Mass. Eventually the clauses enumerating the petitions were suppressed, no doubt because they were thought to be a useless reduplication of the prayers "Te igitur", "Communicantes", and the two Mementos (Baumstark, op. cit., 107), and the introduction of this Intercession (Hanc igitur . . . placatus accipias) was joined to what seems to have once been part of a prayer for the dead (diesque nostros in tua pace disponas, etc.).

We still have a faint echo of the old Intercession in the clause about the newly-baptized interpolated into the "Hanc igitur" at Easter and Whitsuntide. The beginning of the prayer has a parallel in Apost. Const., VIII, xiii, 3 (the beginning of the deacon's Litany of Intercession). Drews thinks that the form quoted by Baumstark, with its clauses all beginning *pro*, was spoken by the deacon as a litany, like the clauses in Apost. Const. beginning *ὑπέρ* (Untersuchungen über die sog. clem. Lit., 139). The prayer containing the words of Institution in the Roman Mass (Qui pridie . . in mei memoriam facietis) has just the constructions and epithets of the corresponding text in Apost. Const., VIII, xii, 36–37. All this and many more parallels between the Mass and the Apost. Const. Liturgy may be studied in Drews (op. cit.). It is true that we can find parallel passages with other liturgies too, notably with that of Jerusalem (St. James). There are several forms that correspond to those of the Egyptian Rite, such as the Roman "de tuis donis ac datis" in the "Unde et memores" (St. Mark: *ἐκ τῶν σῶν δώρων*; Brightman, "Eastern Liturgies", p. 133, l. 30); "offerimus præclaræ maiestati tuæ de tuis donis ac datis" is found exactly in the Coptic form ("before thine holy glory we have set thine own gift of thine own", ibid., p. 178, l. 15). But this does not mean merely that there are parallel passages between any two rites. The similarities of the Apost. Const. are far more obvious than those of any other. The Roman Mass, even apart from the testimony of Justin Martyr, Clement, Hippolytus, Novatian, still bears evidence of its development from a type of liturgy of which that of the Apostolic Constitutions is the only perfect surviving specimen (see LITURGY). There is reason to believe, moreover, that it has since been influenced both from Jerusalem-Antioch and Alexandria, though many of the forms common to it and these two may be survivals of that original, universal fluid rite which have not been preserved in the Apost. Const. It must always be remembered that no one maintains that the Apost. Const. Liturgy is word for word the primitive universal Liturgy. The thesis defended by Probst, Drews, Kattenbusch, Baumstark, and others is that there was a comparatively vague and fluid rite of which the Apost. Const. have preserved for us a specimen.

But between this original Roman Rite (which we can study only in the Apost. Const.) and the Mass as it emerges in the first sacramentaries (sixth to seventh century) there is a great change. Much of this change is accounted for by the Roman tendency to shorten. The Apost. Const. has five lessons; Rome has generally only two or three. At Rome the prayers of the faithful after the expulsion of the catechumens and the Intercession at the end of the Canon have gone. Both no doubt were considered superfluous since there is a series of petitions of the same nature in the Canon. But both have left traces. We still say *Oremus* before the Offertory, where the prayers of the faithful once stood, and still have these prayers on Good Friday in the collects. And the "Hanc Igitur" is a fragment of the Intercession. The first great change that separates Rome from all the Eastern rites is the influence of the ecclesiastical year. The Eastern liturgies remain always the same except for the lessons, *Prokeimenon* (Gradual-verse), and one or two other slight modifications. On the other hand the Roman Mass is profoundly affected throughout by the season or feast on which it is said. Probst's theory was that this change was made by Pope Damasus (366–84; "Liturgie des vierten Jahrh.", pp. 448–72). This idea is now abandoned (Funk in "Tübinger Quartalschrift", 1894, pp. 683 sq.). Indeed, we have the authority of Pope Vigilius (540–55) for the fact that in the sixth century the order of the Mass was still hardly affected by the calendar ("Ep. ad Eutherium" in P. L., LXIX, 18). The influence of the ecclesiastical year must have been gradual. The lessons were of course always varied, and a growing tendency to refer to the feast or season in the prayers, Preface, and even in the Canon, brought about the present state of things, already in full force in the Leonine Sacramentary. That Damasus was one of the popes who modified the old rite seems, however, certain. St. Gregory I (590–604) says he introduced the use of the Hebrew *Alleluia* from Jerusalem ("Ep. ad Ioh. Syracus." in P. L., LXXVII, 956). It was under Damasus that the Vulgate became the official Roman version of the Bible used in the Liturgy; a constant tradition ascribes to Damasus's friend St. Jerome (d. 420) the arrangement of the Roman Lectionary. Mgr Duchesne thinks that the Canon was arranged by this pope (Origines du Culte, 168–9). A curious error of a Roman theologian of Damasus's time, who identified Melchisedech with the Holy Ghost, incidentally shows us one prayer of our Mass as existing then, namely the "Supra quæ" with its allusion to "summus sacerdos tuus Melchisedech" ("Quæst. V. et N. Test." in P. L., XXXV, 2329).

C. *The Mass from the Fifth to the Seventh Century.*— By about the fifth century we begin to see more clearly. Two documents of this time give us fairly large fragments of the Roman Mass. Innocent I (401–17), in his letter to Decentius of Eugubium (about 416; P. L., XX, 553), alludes to many features of the Mass. We notice that these important changes have already been made: the kiss of peace has been moved from the beginning of the Mass of the Faithful to after the Consecration, the Commemoration of the Living and Dead is made in the Canon, and there are no longer prayers of the faithful before the Offertory (see CANON OF THE MASS). Rietschel (Lehrbuch der Liturgik, I, 340–1) thinks that the Invocation of the Holy Ghost has already disappeared from the Mass. Innocent does not mention it, but we have evidence of it at a later date under Gelasius I (492–6: see CANON OF THE MASS, s. v. *Supplices te rogamus*, and EPIKLESIS). Rietschel (loc. cit.) also thinks that there was a dogmatic reason for these changes, to emphasize the sacrificial idea. We notice especially that in Innocent's time the prayer of Intercession follows the Consecration (see CANON OF THE MASS). The author of the treatise "De Sacramentis" (wrongly attributed to St. Ambrose, in P. L., XVI, 418 sq.) says that he will explain the Roman Use, and proceeds to quote a great part of the Canon (the text is given in CANON OF THE MASS, II). From this document we can reconstruct the following scheme: The Mass of the Catechumens is still distinct from that of the faithful, at least in theory. The people sing "Introibo ad altare Dei" as the celebrant and his ministers approach the altar (the Introit). Then follow lessons from Scripture, chants (Graduals), and a sermon (the Catechumens' Mass). The people still make the Offertory of bread and wine. The Preface and Sanctus follow (*laus Deo defertur*), then the prayer of Intercession (*oratione petitur pro populo, pro regibus, pro ceteris*) and the Consecration by the words of Institution (*ut conficitur ven. sacra-*

mentum . . . utitur sermonibus Christi). From this point (Fac nobis hanc oblationem ascriptam, ratam, rationabilem . . .) the text of the Canon is quoted. Then come the *Anamnesis* (Ergo memores . . .), joined to it the prayer of oblation (offerimus tibi hanc immaculatam hostiam . . .), i. e., practically our "Supra quæ" prayer, and the Communion with the form: "Corpus Christi. R. Amen", during which Ps. xxii is sung. At the end the Lord's Prayer is said.

In the "De Sacramentis", then, the Intercession comes before the Consecration, whereas in Innocent's letter it came after. This transposition should be noted as one of the most important features in the development of the Mass. The "Liber Pontificalis" (ed. Duchesne, Paris, 1886–92) contains a number of statements about changes in and additions to the Mass made by various popes, as for instance that Leo I (440–61) added the words "sanctum sacrificium, immaculatam hostiam" to the prayer "Supra quæ", that Sergius I (687–701) introduced the Agnus Dei, and so on. These must be received with caution; the whole book still needs critical examination. In the case of the Agnus Dei the statement is made doubtful by the fact that it is found in the Gregorian Sacramentary (whose date, however, is again doubtful). A constant tradition ascribes some great influence on the Mass to Gelasius I (492–6). Gennadius (De vir. illustr., xciv) says he composed a sacramentary; the Liber Pontificalis speaks of his liturgical work, and there must be some basis for the way in which his name is attached to the famous *Gelasian* Sacramentary. What exactly Gelasius did is less easy to determine.

We come now to the end of a period at the reign of St. Gregory I (590–604). Gregory knew the Mass practically as we still have it. There have been additions and changes since his time, but none to compare with the complete recasting of the Canon that took place before him. At least as far as the Canon is concerned, Gregory may be considered as having put the last touches to it. His biographer, John the Deacon, says that he "collected the Sacramentary of Gelasius in one book, leaving out much, changing little, adding something for the exposition of the Gospels" (Vita S. Greg., II, xvii). He moved the Our Father from the end of the Mass to before the Communion, as he says in his letter to John of Syracuse: "We say the Lord's Prayer immediately after the Canon [*mox post precem*] . . . It seems to me very unsuitable that we should say the Canon [*prex*] which an unknown scholar composed [*quam scholasticus composuerat*] over the oblation and that we should not say the prayer handed down by our Redeemer himself over His body and blood" (P. L., LXXVII, 956). He is also credited with the addition: "diesque nostros etc." to the "Hanc igitur" (ibid.; see CANON OF THE MASS). Benedict XIV says that "no pope has added to, or changed the Canon since St. Gregory" (De SS. Missæ sacrificio, p. 162). There has been an important change since, the partial amalgamation of the old Roman Rite with Gallican features; but this hardly affects the Canon. We may say safely that a modern Latin Catholic who could be carried back to Rome in the early seventh century would—while missing some features to which he is accustomed—find himself on the whole quite at home with the service he saw there.

This brings us back to the most difficult question: Why and when was the Roman Liturgy changed from what we see in Justin Martyr to that of Gregory I? The change is radical, especially as regards the most important element of the Mass, the Canon. The modifications in the earlier part, the smaller number of lessons, the omission of the prayers for and expulsion of the catechumens, of the prayers of the faithful before the Offertory and so on, may be accounted for easily as a result of the characteristic Roman tendency to shorten the service and leave out what had become superfluous. The influence of the calendar has already been noticed. But there remains the great question of the arrangement of the Canon. That the order of the prayers that make up the Canon is a cardinal difficulty is admitted by every one. The old attempts to justify their present order by symbolic or mystic reasons have now been given up. The Roman Canon as it stands is recognized as a problem of great difficulty. It differs fundamentally from the Anaphora of any Eastern rite and from the Gallican Canon. Whereas in the Antiochene family of liturgies (including that of Gaul) the great Intercession follows the Consecration, which comes at once after the Sanctus, and in the Alexandrine class the Intercession is said during what we should call the Preface before the Sanctus, in the Roman Rite the Intercession is scattered throughout the Canon, partly before and partly after the Consecration. We may add to this the other difficulty, the omission at Rome of any kind of clear Invocation of the Holy Ghost (*Epiklesis*). Paul Drews has tried to solve this question. His theory is that the Roman Mass, starting from the primitive vaguer rite (practically that of the Apostolic Constitutions), at first followed the development of Jerusalem-Antioch, and was for a time very similar to the Liturgy of St. James. Then it was recast to bring it nearer to Alexandria. This change was made probably by Gelasius I under the influence of his guest, John Talaia of Alexandria. The theory is explained at length in the article CANON OF THE MASS. Here we need only add that it has received in the main the support of F. X. Funk (who at first opposed it; see "Histor. Jahrbuch der Görresgesellschaft", 1903, pp. 62, 283; but see also his "Kirchengesch. Abhandlungen", III, Paderborn, 1907, pp. 85–134, in which he will not admit that he has altogether changed his mind), A. Baumstark ("Liturgia romana e Liturgia dell' Esarcato", Rome, 1904), and G. Rauschen ("Eucharistie und Bussakrament", Freiburg, 1908, p. 86). But other theories have been suggested. Baumstark does not follow Drews in the details. He conceives (op. cit.) the original Canon as consisting of a Preface in which God is thanked for the benefits of creation; the Sanctus interrupts the prayers, which then continue (Vere Sanctus) with a prayer (now disappeared) thanking God for Redemption and so coming to the Institution (Pridie autem quam pateretur . . .). Then follow the *Anamnesis* (Unde et memores), the "Supra quæ", the "Te igitur", joined to an *Epiklesis* after the words "hæc sancta sacrificia illibata". Then the Intercession (In primis quæ tibi offerimus . . .), "Memento vivorum", "Communicantes", "Memento defunctorum" (Nos quoque peccatores . . . intra sanctorum tuorum consortium non æstimator meriti sed veniæ quæsumus largitor admitte, per Christum Dominum nostrum).

This order then (according to Baumstark) was dislocated by the insertion of new elements, the "Hanc Igitur", "Quam oblationem", "Supra quæ" and "Supplices", the list of saints in the "Nobis quoque", all of which prayers were in some sort reduplications of what was already contained in the Canon. They represent a mixed influence of Antioch and Alexandria, which last reached Rome through Aquilea and Ravenna, where there was once a rite of the Alexandrine type. St. Leo I began to make these changes; Gregory I finished the process and finally recast the Canon in the form it still has. It will be seen that Baumstark's theory agrees with that of Drews in the main issue—that at Rome originally the whole Intercession followed the Canon. Dom Cagin (Paléographie musicale, V, 80 sq.) and Dom Cabrol (Origines liturgiques, 354 sq.) propose an entirely different theory. So far it has been admitted on all sides that the Roman and Gallican rites belong to different classes; the Gallican Rite approaches that of Antioch very closely, the origin of the Roman one being the

great problem. Cagin's idea is that all that must be reversed, the Gallican Rite has no connexion at all with Antioch or any Eastern Liturgy; it is in its origin the same rite as the Roman. Rome changed this earlier form about the sixth or seventh century. Before that the order at Rome was: Secrets, Preface, Sanctus, "Te igitur"; then "Hanc igitur", "Quam oblationem", "Qui pridie" (these three prayers correspond to the Gallican Post-Sanctus). Then followed a group like the Gallican Post-Pridie, namely "Unde et memores", "Offerimus praeclaræ", "Supra quæ", "Supplices", "Per eundem Christum etc.", "Per quem hæc omnia", and the Fraction. Then came the Lord's Prayer with its embolism, of which the "Nobis quoque" was a part. The two Mementos were originally before the Preface. Dom Cagin has certainly pointed out a number of points in which Rome and Gaul (that is all the Western rites) stand together as opposed to the East. Such points are the changes caused by the calendar, the introduction of the Institution by the words "Qui pridie", whereas all Eastern Liturgies have the form "In the *night* in which he was betrayed", Moreover the place of the kiss of peace (in Gaul before the Preface) cannot be quoted as a difference between Rome and Gaul, since, as we have seen, it stood originally in that place at Rome too. The Gallican diptychs come before the Preface; but no one knows for certain where they were said originally at Rome. Cagin puts them in the same place in the earlier Roman Mass. His theory may be studied further in Dom Cabrol's "Origines liturgiques", where it is very clearly set out (pp. 353–64). Mgr Duchesne has attacked it vigorously and not without effect in the "Revue d'histoire et de littérature ecclésiastiques" (1900), pp. 31 sq. Mr. Edmund Bishop criticizes the German theories (Drews, Baumstark etc.), and implies in general terms that the whole question of the grouping of liturgies will have to be reconsidered on a new basis, that of the form of the words of Institution (Appendix to Dom R. Connolly's "Liturgical Homilies of Narsai" in "Cambridge Texts and Studies", VIII, I, 1909). It is to be regretted that he has not told us plainly what position he means to defend, and that he is here again content with merely negative criticism. The other great question, that of the disappearance of the Roman Epiklesis, cannot be examined here (see CANON OF THE MASS and EPIKLESIS). We will only add to what has been said in those articles that the view is growing that there was an Invocation of the Second Person of the Holy Trinity, an Epiklesis of the Logos, before there was one of the Holy Ghost. The Anaphora of Serapion (fourth century in Egypt) contains such an Epiklesis of the Logos only (in Funk, "Didascalia", II, Paderborn, 1905, pp. 174–6). Mr. Bishop (in the above-named Appendix) thinks that the Invocation of the Holy Ghost did not arise till later (Cyril of Jerusalem, about 350, being the first witness for it), that Rome never had it, that her only Epiklesis was the "Quam oblationem" before the words of Institution. Against this we must set what seems to be the convincing evidence of Gelasius I's letter (quoted in CANON OF THE MASS, s. v. *Supplices te rogamus*).

We have then as the conclusion of this paragraph that at Rome the Eucharistic prayer was fundamentally changed and recast at some uncertain period between the fourth and the sixth and seventh centuries. During the same time the prayers of the faithful before the Offertory disappeared, the kiss of peace was transferred to after the Consecration, and the Epiklesis was omitted or mutilated into our "Supplices" prayer. Of the various theories suggested to account for this it seems reasonable to say with Rauschen: "Although the question is by no means decided, nevertheless there is so much in favour of Drews's theory that for the present it must be considered the right one. We must then admit that between the years 400 and 500 a great transformation was made in the Roman Canon" (Euch. u. Busssakr., 86).

D. *From the Seventh Century to Modern Times.*— After Gregory the Great (590–604) it is comparatively easy to follow the history of the Mass in the Roman Rite. We have now as documents first the three well-known sacramentaries. The oldest, called *Leonine*, exists in a seventh-century manuscript. Its composition is ascribed variously to the fifth, sixth, or seventh century (see LITURGICAL BOOKS). It is a fragment, wanting the Canon, but, as far as it goes, represents the Mass we know (without the later Gallican additions). Many of its collects, secrets, post-communions, and prefaces are still in use. The *Gelasian* book was written in the sixth, seventh, or eighth century (ibid.); it is partly Gallicanized and was composed in the Frankish Kingdom. Here we have our Canon word for word. The third sacramentary, called *Gregorian*, is apparently the book sent by Pope Adrian I to Charlemagne probably between 781 and 791 (ibid.). It contains additional Masses since Gregory's time and a set of supplements gradually incorporated into the original book, giving Frankish (i e. older Roman and Gallican) additions. Dom Suitbert Bäumer ("Ueber das sogen. Sacram. Gelasianum" in the "Histor. Jahrbuch", 1893, pp. 241–301) and Mr. Edmund Bishop ("The Earliest Roman Massbook" in "Dublin Review", 1894, pp. 245–78) explain the development of the Roman Rite from the ninth to the eleventh century in this way: The (pure) Roman Sacramentary sent by Adrian to Charlemagne was ordered by the king to be used alone throughout the Frankish Kingdom. But the people were attached to their old use, which was partly Roman (Gelasian) and partly Gallican. So when the Gregorian book was copied they (notably Alcuin, d. 804) added to it these Frankish supplements. Gradually the supplements became incorporated into the original book. So composed it came back to Rome (through the influence of the Carlovingian emperors) and became the "use of the Roman Church". The "Missale Romanum Lateranense" of the eleventh century (ed. Azevedo, Rome, 1752) shows this fused rite complete as the only one in use at Rome. The Roman Mass has thus gone through this last change since Gregory the Great, a partial fusion with Gallican elements. According to Bäumer and Bishop the Gallican influence is noticeable chiefly in the variations for the course of the year. Their view is that Gregory had given the Mass more uniformity (since the time of the Leonine book), had brought it rather to the model of the unchanging Eastern liturgies. Its present variety for different days and seasons came back again with the mixed books later. Gallican influence is also seen in many dramatic and symbolic ceremonies foreign to the stern pure Roman Rite (see Bishop, "The Genius of the Roman Rite"). Such ceremonies are the blessing of candles, ashes, palms, much of the Holy Week ritual, etc.

The Roman Ordines, of which twelve were published by Mabillon in his "Museum Italicum" (others since by De Rossi and Duchesne), are valuable sources that supplement the sacramentaries. They are descriptions of ceremonial without the prayers (like the "Cærimoniale Episcoporum"), and extend from the eighth to the fourteenth or fifteenth centuries. The first (eighth century) and second (based on the first, with Frankish additions) are the most important (see LITURGICAL BOOKS). From these and the sacramentaries we can reconstruct the Mass at Rome in the eighth or ninth century. There were as yet no preparatory prayers said before the altar. The pope, attended by a great retinue of deacons, subdeacons, acolytes, and singers, entered while the Introit psalm was sung. After a prostration the Kyrie eleison was sung, as now with nine invocations (see KYRIE ELEISON); any other litany had disappeared. The Gloria followed on feasts (see GLORIA IN EXCELSIS). The

pope sang the prayer of the day (see COLLECT), two or three lessons followed (see LESSONS IN THE LITURGY), interspersed with psalms (see GRADUAL). The prayers of the faithful had gone, leaving only the one word *Oremus* as a fragment. The people brought up the bread and wine while the Offertory psalm was sung; the gifts were arranged on the altar by the deacons. The Secret was said (at that time the only Offertory prayer) after the pope had washed his hands. The Preface, Sanctus, and all the Canon followed as now. A reference to the fruits of the earth led to the words "per quem hæc omnia" etc. Then came the Lord's Prayer, the Fraction with a complicated ceremony, the kiss of peace, the Agnus Dei (since Pope Sergius, 687–701), the Communion under both kinds, during which the Communion psalm was sung (see COMMUNION-ANTIPHON), the Post-Communion prayer, the dismissal (see ITE MISSA EST), and the procession back to the sacristy (for a more detailed account see C. Atchley, "Ordo Romanus Primus", London, 1905; Duchesne, "Origines du Culte chrétien", vi).

It has been explained how this (mixed) Roman Rite gradually drove out the Gallican Use (see LITURGY). By about the tenth or eleventh century the Roman Mass was practically the only one in use in the West. Then a few additions (none of them very important) were made to the Mass at different times. The Nicene Creed is an importation from Constantinople. It is said that in 1014 Emperor Henry II (1002–24) persuaded Pope Benedict VIII (1012–24) to add it after the Gospel (Berno of Reichenau, "De quibusdam rebus ad Missæ offic. pertin.", ii). It had already been adopted in Spain, Gaul, and Germany. All the present ritual and the prayers said by the celebrant at the Offertory were introduced from France about the thirteenth century ("Ordo Rom. XIV", liii, is the first witness; P. L., LXXVIII, 1163–4); before that the secrets were the only Offertory prayers ("Micrologus", xi, in P. L., CLI, 984). There was considerable variety as to these prayers throughout the Middle Ages until the revised Missal of Pius V (1570). The incensing of persons and things is again due to Gallican influence; it was not adopted at Rome till the eleventh or twelfth century (Micrologus, ix). Before that time incense was burned only during processions (the entrance and Gospel procession; see C. Atchley, "Ordo Rom. Primus", 17–18). The three prayers said by the celebrant before his communion are private devotions introduced gradually into the official text. Durandus (thirteenth century, "Rationale," IV, liii) mentions the first (for peace); the Sarum Rite had instead another prayer addressed to God the Father ("Deus Pater fons et origo totius bonitatis," ed. Burntisland, 625). Micrologus mentions only the second (D. I. Chr. qui ex voluntate Patris), but says that many other private prayers were said at this place (xviii). Here too there was great diversity through the Middle Ages till Pius V's Missal. The latest additions to the Mass are its present beginning and end. The psalm "Iudica me", the Confession, and the other prayers said at the foot of the altar, are all part of the celebrant's preparation, once said (with many other psalms and prayers) in the sacristy, as the "Præparatio ad Missam" in the Missal now is. There was great diversity as to this preparation till Pius V established our modern rule of saying so much only before the altar. In the same way all that follows the "Ite missa est" is an afterthought, part of the thanksgiving, not formally admitted till Pius V.

We have thus accounted for all the elements of the Mass. The next stage of its development is the growth of numerous local varieties of the Roman Mass in the Middle Ages. These medieval rites (Paris, Rouen, Trier, Sarum, and so on all over Western Europe) are simply exuberant local modifications of the old Roman rite. The same applies to the particular uses of various religious orders (Carthusians, Dominicans, Carmelites etc.). None of these deserves to be called even a derived rite; their changes are only ornate additions and amplifications; though certain special points, such as the Dominican preparation of the offerings before the Mass begins, represent more Gallican influence. The Milanese and Mozarabic liturgies stand on quite a different footing; they are the descendants of a really different rite—the original Gallican—though they too have been considerably Romanized (see LITURGY).

Meanwhile the Mass was developing in other ways also. During the first centuries it had been a common custom for a number of priests to *concelebrate;* standing around their bishop, they joined in his prayers and consecrated the oblation with him. This is still common in the Eastern rites. In the West it had become rare by the thirteenth century. St. Thomas Aquinas (d. 1274) discusses the question, "Whether several priests can consecrate one and the same host" (Summa Theol., III, Q. lxxxii, a. 2). He answers of course that they can, but quotes as an example only the case of ordination. In this case only has the practice been preserved. At the ordination of priests and bishops all the ordained concelebrate with the ordainer. In other cases concelebration was in the early Middle Ages replaced by separate private celebrations. No doubt the custom of offering each Mass for a special intention helped to bring about this change. The separate celebrations then involved the building of many altars in one church and the reduction of the ritual to the simplest possible form. The deacon and subdeacon were in this case dispensed with; the celebrant took their part as well as his own. One server took the part of the choir and of all the other ministers, everything was said instead of being sung, the incense and kiss of peace were omitted. So we have the well-known rite of *low* Mass (*missa privata*). This then reacted on *high* Mass (*missa solemnis*), so that at high Mass too the celebrant himself recites everything, even though it be also sung by the deacon, subdeacon, or choir.

The custom of the intention of the Mass further led to Mass being said every day by each priest. But this has by no means been uniformly carried out. On the one hand, we hear of an abuse of the same priest saying Mass several times in the day, which medieval councils constantly forbid. Again, many most pious priests did not celebrate daily. Bossuet (d. 1704), for instance, said Mass only on Sundays, Feasts, every day in Lent, and at other times when a special ferial Mass is provided in the Missal. There is still no obligation for a priest to celebrate daily, though the custom is now very common. The Council of Trent desired that priests should celebrate at least on Sundays and solemn feasts (Sess. XXIII, cap. xiv). Celebration with no assistants at all (*missa solitaria*) has continually been forbidden, as by the Synod of Mainz in 813. Another abuse was the *missa bifaciata* or *trifaciata*, in which the celebrant said the first part, from the Introit to the Preface, several times over and then joined to all one Canon, in order to satisfy several intentions. This too was forbidden by medieval councils (Durandus, "Rationale", IV, i, 22). The *missa sicca* (dry Mass) was a common form of devotion used for funerals or marriages in the afternoon, when a real Mass could not be said. It consisted of all the Mass except the Offertory, Consecration and Communion (Durandus, ibid., 23). The *missa nautica* and *missa venatoria*, said at sea in rough weather and for hunters in a hurry, were kinds of dry Masses. In some monasteries each priest was obliged to say a dry Mass after the real (conventual) Mass. Cardinal Bona (Rerum liturg. libr. duo, I, xv) argues against the practice of saying dry Masses. Since the reform of Pius V it has gradually disappeared. The Mass of the *Presanctified* (*missa præsanctificatorum*, λειτουργία τῶν προηγιασμένων) is a very old custom described by the Quinisext Council (Second Trullan

Synod, 692). It is a Service (not really a Mass at all) of Communion from an oblation consecrated at a previous Mass and reserved. It is used in the Byzantine Church on the week-days of Lent (except Saturdays); in the Roman Rite only on Good Friday.

Finally came uniformity in the old Roman Rite and the abolition of nearly all the medieval variants. The Council of Trent considered the question and formed a commission to prepare a uniform Missal. Eventually the Missal was published by Pius V by the Bull "Quo primum" (still printed in it) of 14 July, 1570. That is really the last stage of the history of the Roman Mass. It is Pius V's Missal that is used throughout the Latin Church, except in a few cases where he allowed a modified use that had a prescription of at least two centuries. This exception saved the variants used by some religious orders and a few local rites as well as the Milanese and Mozarabic liturgies. Clement VIII (1604), Urban VIII (1634), and Leo XIII (1884) revised the book slightly in the rubrics and the texts of Scripture (see LITURGICAL BOOKS). Pius X has revised the chant (1908.) But these revisions leave it still the Missal of Pius V. There has been since the early Middle Ages unceasing change in the sense of additions of masses for new feasts, the Missal now has a number of supplements that still grow (LITURGICAL BOOKS), but liturgically these additions represent no real change. The new Masses are all built up exactly on the lines of the older ones.

We turn now to the present Roman Mass, without comparison the most important and widespread, as it it is in many ways the most archaic service of the Holy Eucharist in Christendom.

E. *The Present Roman Mass.*—It is not the object of this paragraph to give instruction as to how the Roman Mass is celebrated. The very complicated rules of all kinds, the minute rubrics that must be obeyed by the celebrant and his ministers, all the details of coincidence and commemoration—these things, studied at length by students before they are ordained, must be sought in a book of ceremonial (Le Vavasseur, quoted in the bibliography, is perhaps now the best). Moreover, articles on all the chief parts of the Mass, describing how they are carried out, and others on vestments, music, and the other ornaments of the service, will be found in THE CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA. It will be sufficient here to give a general outline of the arrangement. The ritual of the Mass is affected by (1) the person who celebrates, (2) the day or the special occasion on which it is said, (3) the kind of Mass (high or low) celebrated. But in all cases the general scheme is the same. The normal ideal may be taken as high Mass sung by a priest on an ordinary Sunday or feast that has no exceptional feature.

Normally, Mass must be celebrated in a consecrated or blessed Church (private oratories or even rooms are allowed for special reasons: see Le Vavasseur, I, 200–4) and at a consecrated altar (or at least on a consecrated altar-stone), and may be celebrated on any day in the year except Good Friday (restrictions are made against private celebrations on Holy Saturday and in the case of private oratories for certain great feasts) at any time between dawn and midday. A priest may say only one Mass each day, except that on Christmas Day he may say three, and the first may (or rather, should) then be said immediately after midnight. In some countries (Spain and Portugal) a priest may also celebrate three times on All Souls' Day (2 November). Bishops may give leave to a priest to celebrate twice on Sundays and feasts of obligation, if otherwise the people could not fulfil their duty of hearing Mass. In cathedral and collegiate churches, as well as in those of religious orders who are bound to say the Canonical Hours every day publicly, there is a daily Mass corresponding to the Office and forming with it the complete cycle of the public worship of God. This official public Mass is called the *conventual* Mass; if possible it should be a high Mass, but, even if it be not, it always has some of the features of high Mass. The time for this conventual Mass on feasts and Sundays is after Terce has been said in choir. On Simples and feriæ the time is after Sext; on feriæ of Advent, Lent, on Vigils and Ember days after None. Votive Masses and the Requiem on All Souls' Day are said also after None; but ordinary requiems are said after Prime. The celebrant of Mass must be in the state of grace, fasting from midnight, free of irregularity and censure, and must observe all the rubrics and laws concerning the matter (azyme bread and pure wine), vestments, vessels, and ceremony.

The scheme of high Mass is this: the procession comes to the altar, consisting of thurifer, acolytes, master of ceremonies, subdeacon, deacon, and celebrant, all vested as the rubrics direct (see VESTMENTS). First, the preparatory prayers are said at the foot of the altar; the altar is incensed, the celebrant reads at the south (Epistle) side the Introit and Kyrie. Meanwhile the choir sing the Introit and Kyrie. On days on which the "Te Deum" is said in the office, the celebrant intones the "Gloria in excelsis", which is continued by the choir. Meanwhile he, the deacon, and subdeacon recite it, after which they may sit down till the choir has finished. After the greeting "Dominus vobiscum", and its answer "Et cum spiritu tuo", the celebrant chants the collect of the day, and after it as many more collects as are required either to commemorate other feasts or occasions, or are to be said by order of the bishop, or (on lesser days) are chosen by himself at his discretion from the collection in the Missal, according to the rubrics. The subdeacon chants the Epistle and the choir sings the Gradual. Both are read by the celebrant at the altar, according to the present law that he is also to recite whatever is sung by any one else. He blesses the incense, says the "Munda Cor meum" prayer, and reads the Gospel at the north (Gospel) side. Meanwhile the deacon prepares to sing the Gospel. He goes in procession with the subdeacon, thurifer, and acolytes to a place on the north of the choir, and there chants it, the subdeacon holding the book, unless an ambo be used. If there is a sermon, it should be preached immediately after the Gospel. This is the traditional place for the homily, after the lessons (Justin Martyr, "I Apolog.", lxvii, 4). On Sundays and certain feasts the Creed is sung next, just as was the Gloria. At this point, before or after the Creed (which is a later introduction, as we have seen), ends in theory the Mass of the Catechumens. The celebrant at the middle of the altar chants "Dominus vobiscum" and "Oremus"—the last remnant of the old prayers of the faithful. Then follows the Offertory. The bread is offered to God with the prayer "Suscipe sancte Pater"; the deacon pours wine into the chalice and the subdeacon water. The chalice is offered by the celebrant in the same way as the bread (Offerimus tibi Domine), after which the gifts, the altar, the celebrant, ministers, and people are all incensed. Meanwhile the choir sings the Offertory. The celebrant washes his hands saying the "Lavabo". After another offertory prayer (Suscipe sancta Trinitas), and an address to the people (Orate fratres) with its answer, which is not sung (it is a late addition), the celebrant says the secrets, corresponding to the collects. The last secret ends with an *Ekphonesis* (Per omnia sæcula sæculorum). This is only a warning of what is coming. When prayers began to be said silently, it still remained necessary to mark their ending, that people might know what is going on. So the last clauses were said or sung aloud. This so-called *Ekphonesis* is much developed in the Eastern rites. In the Roman Mass there are three cases of it—always the words: "Per omnia sæcula sæculorum", to which the choir answers "Amen". After the Ekphonesis of

the Secret comes the dialogue, "Sursum Corda", etc., used with slight variations in all rites, and so the beginning of the Eucharistic prayer which we call the Preface, no longer counted as part of the Canon. The choir sings and the celebrant says the Sanctus. Then follows the Canon, beginning "Te igitur" and ending with an ekphonesis before the Lord's Prayer. All its parts are described in the article CANON OF THE MASS. The Lord's Prayer follows, introduced by a little clause (Præceptis salutaribus moniti) and followed by an embolism (see LIBERA NOS), said silently and ending with the third ekphonesis. The Fraction follows with the versicle "Pax domini sit semper vobiscum", meant to introduce the kiss of peace. The choir sings the Agnus Dei, which is said by the celebrant together with the first Communion prayer, before he gives the kiss to the deacon. He then says the two other Communion prayers, and receives Communion under both kinds. The Communion of the people (now rare at high Mass) follows. Meanwhile the choir sings the Communion (see COMMUNION-ANTIPHON). The chalice is purified and the post-Communions are sung, corresponding to the collects and secrets. Like the collects, they are introduced by the greeting "Dominus vobiscum" and its answer, and said at the south side. After another greeting by the celebrant the deacon sings the dismissal (see ITE MISSA EST). There still follow, however, three later additions, a blessing by the celebrant, a short prayer that God may be pleased with the sacrifice (Placeat tibi), and the Last Gospel, normally the beginning of St. John (see GOSPEL IN THE LITURGY). The procession goes back to the sacristy.

This high Mass is the norm; it is only in the complete rite with deacon and subdeacon that the ceremonies can be understood. Thus, the rubrics of the Ordinary of the Mass always suppose that the Mass is high. Low Mass, said by a priest alone with one server, is a shortened and simplified form of the same thing. Its ritual can be explained only by a reference to high Mass. For instance, the celebrant goes over to the north side of the altar to read the Gospel, because that is the side to which the deacon goes in procession at high Mass; he turns round always by the right, because at high Mass he should not turn his back to the deacon, and so on. A *sung* Mass (*missa Cantata*) is a modern compromise. It is really a low Mass, since the essence of high Mass is not the music but the deacon and subdeacon. Only in churches which have no ordained person except one priest, and in which high Mass is thus impossible, is it allowed to celebrate the Mass (on Sundays and feasts) with most of the adornment borrowed from high Mass, with singing and (generally) with incense. The Sacred Congregation of Rites has on several occasions (9 June, 1884; 7 December, 1888) forbidden the use of incense at a Missa Cantata; nevertheless, exceptions have been made for several dioceses, and the custom of using it is generally tolerated (Le Vavasseur, op. cit., I, 514–5). In this case, too, the celebrant takes the part of deacon and subdeacon; there is no kiss of peace.

The ritual of the Mass is further affected by the dignity of the celebrant, whether bishop or only priest. There is something to be said for taking the pontifical Mass as the standard, and explaining that of the simple priest as a modified form, just as low Mass is a modified form of high Mass. On the other hand historically the case is not parallel throughout; some of the more elaborate pontifical ceremony is an afterthought, an adornment added later. Here it need only be said that the main difference of the pontifical Mass (apart from some special vestments) is that the bishop remains at his throne (except for the preparatory prayers at the altar steps and the incensing of the altar) till the Offertory; so in this case the change from the Mass of the Catechumens to that of the Faithful is still clearly marked. He also does not put on the maniple till after the preparatory prayers, again an archaic touch that marks them as being outside the original service. At low Mass the bishop's rank is marked only by a few unimportant details and by the later assumption of the maniple. Certain prelates, not bishops, use some pontifical ceremonies at Mass. The pope again has certain special ceremonies in his Mass, of which some represent remnants of older customs. Of these we note especially that he makes his Communion seated on the throne and drinks the consecrated wine through a little tube called *fistula*.

Durandus (Rationale, IV, i) and all the symbolic authors distinguish various parts of the Mass according to mystic principles. Thus it has four parts, corresponding to the four kinds of prayer named in I Tim., ii, 1. It is an *Obsecratio* from the Introit to the Offertory, an *Oratio* from the Offertory to the Pater Noster, a *Postulatio* to the Communion, a *Gratiarum actio* from then to the end (Durandus, ibid.; see MASS, SACRIFICE OF THE: Vol. X). The Canon especially has been divided according to all manner of systems, some very ingenious. But the distinctions that are really important to the student of liturgy are, first the historic division between the Mass of the Catechumens and Mass of the Faithful, already explained, and then the great practical distinction between the changeable and unchangeable parts. The Mass consists of an unchanged framework into which at certain fixed points the variable prayers, lessons, and chants are fitted. The two elements are the *Common* and the *Proper of the day* (which, however, may again be taken from a common Mass provided for a number of similar occasions, as are the Commons of various classes of saints). The Common is the Ordinary of the Mass (*Ordinarium Missæ*), now printed and inserted in the Missal between Holy Saturday and Easter Day. Every Mass is fitted into that scheme; to follow Mass one must first find that. In it occur rubrics directing that something is to be said or sung, which is not printed at this place. The first rubric of this kind occurs after the incensing at the beginning: "Then the Celebrant signing himself with the sign of the Cross begins the Introit." But no Introit follows. He must know what Mass he is to say and find the Introit, and all the other proper parts, under their heading among the large collection of masses that fill the book. These proper or variable parts are first the four chants of the choir, the Introit, Gradual (or tract, Alleluia, and perhaps after it a Sequence), Offertory, and Communion; then the lessons (Epistle, Gospel, sometimes Old Testament lessons too), then the prayers said by the celebrant (Collect, Secret, post-Communion; often several of each to commemorate other feasts or days). By fitting these into their places in the Ordinary the whole Mass is put together. There are, however, two other elements that occupy an intermediate place between the Ordinary and the Proper. These are the Preface and a part of the Canon. We have now only eleven prefaces, ten special ones and a common preface. They do not then change sufficiently to be printed over and over again among the proper Masses, so all are inserted in the Ordinary; from them naturally the right one must be chosen according to the rubrics. In the same way, five great feasts have a special clause in the *Communicantes* prayer in the Canon, two (Easter and Whitsunday) have a special "Hanc Igitur" prayer, one day (Maundy Thursday) affects the "Qui pridie" form. These exceptions are printed after the corresponding prefaces; but Maundy Thursday, as it occurs only once, is to be found in the Proper of the day (see CANON OF THE MASS).

It is these parts of the Mass that vary, and, because of them, we speak of the Mass of such a day or of such a feast. To be able to find the Mass for any given day requires knowledge of a complicated set of rules. These rules are given in the rubrics at the beginning of the

Missal. In outline the system is this. First a Mass is provided for every day in the year, according to the seasons of the Church. Ordinary week days (feriæ) have the Mass of the preceding Sunday with certain regular changes; but feriæ of Lent, rogation and ember days, and vigils have special Masses. All this makes up the first part of the Missal called *Proprium de tempore*. The year is then overladen, as it were, by a great quantity of feasts of saints or of special events determined by the day of the month (these make up the *Proprium Sanctorum*). Nearly every day in the year is now a feast of some kind; often there are several on one day. There is then constantly *coincidence* (concurrentia) of several possible Masses on one day. There are cases in which two or more conventual Masses are said, one for each of the coinciding offices. Thus, on feriæ that have a special office, if a feast occurs as well, the Mass of the feast is said after Terce, that of the feria after None. If a feast falls on the Eve of Ascension Day there are three Conventual Masses—of the feast after Terce, of the Vigil after Sext, of Rogation day after None. But, in churches that have no official conventual Mass and in the case of the priest who says Mass for his own devotion, one only of the coinciding Masses is said, the others being (usually) commemorated by saying their collects, secrets, and post-Communions after those of the Mass chosen. To know which Mass to choose one must know their various degrees of dignity. All days or feasts are arranged in this scale: feria, simple, semidouble, double, greater double, double of the second class, double of the first class. The greater feast then is the one kept: by transferring feasts to the next free day, it is arranged that two feasts of the same rank do not coincide. Certain important days are privileged, so that a higher feast cannot displace them. Thus nothing can displace the first Sundays of Advent and Lent, Passion and Palm Sundays. These are the so-called first-class Sundays. In the same way nothing can displace Ash Wednesday or any day of Holy Week. Other days (for instance the so-called second-class Sundays, that is the others in Advent and Lent, and Septuagesima, Sexagesima, and Quinquagesima) can only be replaced by doubles of the first class. Ordinary Sundays count as semidoubles, but have precedence over other semidoubles. The days of an octave are semidoubles; the octave day is a double. The octaves of Epiphany, Easter, and Pentecost (the original three greatest feasts of all) are closed against any other feast. The displaced feast is commemorated, except in the case of a great inferiority: the rules for this are given among the "Rubricæ generales" of the Missal (VII: de Commemorationibus). On semidoubles and days below that in rank other collects are always added to that of the day to make up an uneven number. Certain ones are prescribed regularly in the Missal, the celebrant may add others at his discretion. The bishop of the diocese may also order collects for special reasons (the so-called *Orationes imperatæ*). As a general rule the Mass must correspond to the Office of the day, including its commemorations. But the Missal contains a collection of *Votive Masses*, that may be said on days not above a semidouble in rank. The bishop or pope may order a Votive Mass for a public cause to be said on any day but the very highest. All these rules are explained in detail by Le Vavasseur (op. cit., I, 216–31) as well as in the rubrics of the Missal (Rubr. gen., IV). There are two other Masses which, inasmuch as they do not correspond to the office, may be considered a kind of Votive Mass: the *Nuptial* Mass (*missa pro sponso et sponsa*), said at weddings, and the *Requiem* Mass, said for the faithful departed, which have a number of special characteristics (see NUPTIAL MASS and REQUIEM MASS). The calendar (*Ordo*) published yearly in each diocese or province gives the office and Mass for every day. (Concerning Mass stipends, see MASS, SACRIFICE OF THE: Vol. X.)

That the Mass, around which such complicated rules have grown, is the central feature of the Catholic religion hardly needs to be said. During the Reformation and always the Mass has been the test. The word of the Reformers: "It is the Mass that matters", was true. The Cornish insurgents in 1549 rose against the new religion, and expressed their whole cause in their demand to have the Prayer-book Communion Service taken away and the old Mass restored. The long persecution of Catholics in England took the practical form of laws chiefly against saying Mass; for centuries the occupant of the English throne was obliged to manifest his Protestantism, not by a general denial of the whole system of Catholic dogma, but by a formal repudiation of the doctrine of Transubstantiation and of the Mass. As union with Rome is the bond between Catholics, so is our common share in this, the most venerable rite in Christendom, the witness and safeguard of that bond. It is by his share in the Mass in Communion that the Catholic proclaims his union with the great Church. As excommunication means the loss of that right in those who are expelled, so the Mass and Communion are the visible bond between people, priest, and bishop, who are all one body who share the one Bread.

I. HISTORY OF THE MASS.—DUCHESNE, *Origines du Culte chrétien* (2nd ed., Paris, 1898); GIHR, *Das heilige Messopfer* (6th ed., Freiburg, 1897); RIETSCHEL, *Lehrbuch der Liturgik*, I (Berlin, 1900); PROBST, *Liturgie der drei ersten christlichen Jahrhunderte* (Tübingen, 1870); IDEM, *Liturgie des vierten Jahrhunderts u. deren Reform* (Münster, 1893); IDEM, *Die ältesten römischen Sacramentarien u. Ordines* (Münster, 1892); CABROL, *Les Origines liturgiques* (Paris, 1906); IDEM, *Le Livre de la prière antique* (Paris, 1900); BISHOP, *The Genius of the Roman Rite* in STALEY, *Essays on Ceremonial* (London, 1904), 283–307; SEMERIA, *La Messa* (Rome, 1907); RAUSCHEN, *Eucharistie u. Bussakrament* (Freiburg, 1908); DREWS, *Zur Entstehungsgesch. des Kanons* (Tübingen, 1902); IDEM, *Untersuchungen über die sogen. clementinische Liturgie* (Tübingen, 1906); BAUMSTARK, *Liturgia Romana e liturgia dell' Esarcato* (Rome, 1904); ALSTON AND TOURTON, *Origines Eucharisticæ* (London, 1908); WARREN, *Liturgy of the Ante-Nicene Church* (London, 1907); ROTTMANNER, *Ueber neuere und ältere Deutungen des Wortes Missa* in *Tübinger Quartalschr.* (1889), pp. 532 sqq.; DURANDUS (Bishop of Mende, d. 1296), *Rationale divinorum officiorum Libri VIII*, is the classical example of the medieval commentary; see others in CANON OF THE MASS. BENEDICT XIV (1740–58), *De SS. Sacrificio Missæ*, best edition by SCHNEIDER (Mainz, 1879), is also a standard work of its kind.

II. TEXTS.—CABROL AND LECLERCQ, *Monumenta ecclesiæ liturgica*, I, 1 (Paris, 1900–2); RAUSCHEN, *Florilegium Patristicum:* VII, *Monumenta eucharistica et liturgica vetustissima* (Bonn, 1909); FELTOE, *Sacramentarium Leonianum* (Cambridge, 1896); WILSON, *The Gelasian Sacramentary* (Oxford, 1894); *Gregorian Sacramentary* and the Roman *Ordines* in *P. L.*, LXXVIII; ATCHLEY, *Ordo Romanus Primus* (London, 1905); DANIEL, *Codex Liturgicus Ecclesiæ universæ*, I (Leipzig, 1847); MASKELL, *The Ancient Liturgy of the Church of England* (London, 1846); DICKENSON, *Missale Sarum* (Burntisland, 1861–83).

III. PRESENT USE.—Besides the Rubrics in the Missal, consult DE HERDT, *Sacræ Liturgicæ Praxis* (3 vols., 9th ed., Louvain, 1894); LE VAVASSEUR, *Manuel de Liturgie* (2 vols., 10th ed., Paris, 1910); MANY, *Prælectiones de Missa* (Paris, 1903). See further bibliography in CABROL, *Introduction aux études liturgiques* (Paris, 1907), in CANON OF THE MASS and other articles on the separate parts of the Mass.

ADRIAN FORTESCUE.

I

J. J. Little & Ives Co.
New York—Printers.
J. F. Tapley Co.
New York—Binders.

FOR REFERENCE
NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM